

NICOLAE MANOLESCU'S METAPHYSICS

Ion Popescu-Brădiceni, Assoc. Prof. PhD, “Constantin Brancusi” University of Targu Jiu

Abstract: Nicolae Manolescu's metacritics has an identity: it incorporates an ancient art but it is also an elitist, profound and highly intellectual, meta-logic phenomenon. It lies under the sign of the transmodern, of scienceart and under the mark of the prevalence of the truth and value, homologating a metaphilosophy and metaphilology. It is affirmed and redefined as critics of the creating conscience in the vision according to which the literary character would tend to be overrun towards a philosophical one, on the lookout for subjective reality, the inherent.

(Meta)critics has the mission to give the image of the degree of conservation of the masterpieces in the intertextual diachrony. A critical history of literature is also the history of this intertextual baton through which the diachronic axis is projected onto the synchronic one. It would complete a (re)valuing and a permanent (re)interpretation of each text and of literature in its entirety, as an infinite interglossing.

Becoming conscious of the topological fabric of culture/of (meta)literature/of the metamorphic relationship between the works (masterpieces), of the permutations, substitutions or the inter-animations it suffers.

Nicolae Manolescu (nota bene) admits that hermeneutics is the denied means of approaching any works, in spite of the “bending” of the topological space. (I.P.B.)

Keywords: *meta-art, transmodernity, critical history, masterpiece, the text's infinity.*

1. Executions: at the piano or at the gallows

I have read, and re-read, and metaread, please excuse either the marsupial irony “The Critical History...” of Mr. Nicolae Manolescu searching for the metacritic dimension [1].

A dictionary explicitly sends us to two meanings of the term of metacritic: 1. “which follows the critical period of a disease”; 2. “critics of the criticism”. We have borrowed the first meaning from the French (metacritique); we have inherited the second from the Germans (Metakritik). The meta- prefix means either “beyond”, “after” (spacial and temporal) either “modification”, “transposition”, “transfer”; but in Chemistry it means “polymer”, in physics and mathematics “resembling the base”; the Greek meta- is translated as “with”, “after, near”.

Meta-art is, in turn, the discourse of art on art; here things get somewhat complicated because the discourse is actually a metadiscourse and it needs to be received as a concrete realization of the metaspeech which is, woe, a metalanguage. I will not continue with these hermeneuthemes, currently used, and I shall enter ex abrupt in the problematic of this here article – I say – applied and necessary by its ambitious option to shed light in the so “desperate” case of “Manolescu”.

But is it, really a case? This is the question! The man tried something, why hustle Him? Whether he made it or not – this is a totally different business altogether (important as first order of the day? Yes and not really so). The desperation to have missed it is still there!

The first meaning that I give Manolescu's metacritics comes from the ancient Greek “meta-”. The critics always get the transferentiality. Almost always, the comment becomes an innocent metastory (?), charming, instructive. From a psychoanalytical point of view, this violation of the privacy of some poet or writer, playwright or essayist, this theme which

transcends the historical and criticism betrays the nostalgia of the authentic literary (to be read: proper). The “manolescian” disease is in fact the suite of transferential abuses, but is a beneficial one nonetheless, not paranoid/ but metanoic; this excess, transmodern, ultimately saves him. Although he has not self-scheduled himself for literaturity, he fell within; he let himself enticed by it as if by a divino-human “sweet order”. Thus, his “critical history...”, but also the “Themes”, contain a gallery of “the dead souls” and revived by its intelligent pen, ironic when needed and meta-narrative perseverant almost all the time.

Intertextuality is metamorphosed into interreferentiality and Nicolae Manolescu will walk in the footsteps of Paul Ricoeur in "The metaphoric vive". [2] The scientific methodology wax melts and interior fire mainly literary discourse and - why not? - Metaliterary. It matters not that the referent therefore continues as fable, allegory, enlarged by the overall level of the text. Correspondingly, poetic work taken as a whole projects a world and a meta-world.

Just as the apparent meaning of the allegorical text fades to send a second meaning, as the referent prime characteristic descriptive language, usually cancelled in literary text to make visible a second reviewer that such scientific model has the ability to redescribe reality.

Thus the reality image obtained by the transfer of language are what might be called scientific reviewer for both model and network-metonymic metaforico-metaliterary literary work and critical and Metacritic.

I tried to untangle the issue of the two hands. Nicolae Manolescu, like his illustrious predecessor, George Calinescu, was creating points of view from which to escape the structures and metaacceptable. [3]

What do you mean ... "acceptable"? The qualifier is the reverse, the negative, and blurred into a kind of epistemological uncertainty, and this because of the tension between historical and aesthetic (sic) times because ... unbridled pride of history, which fallible (flexible) opposes criticism selection, sometimes drastic, unjust or even entirely misleading if not, alas, "deeply" offensive, because the head of NM Literary Map of Romania are white spots: Gorj for example; and this I how the hell to overlook it; not the other, but not my best always.

In passing, let's take a look forewords, afterword and epilogue "Critical History ...". [4]. In the three pseudo studies (n critic defended ... what to do?!) NM is lost in the rubble diachronic or synchronic, the amendment of protochronism, literature papers mocking "old" (in Slavonic, Greek and Latin) and those who took it etc.

Interdisciplinarity represents progress, but NM nostalgia is about aesthetics. Amazing self, trust, puzzling. Well, aesthetics is not about sad legacy of the popular-socialist-communist-regime of the years 1945-1990?

Such "vicious circles" became exasperating, caragialesc and by denaturing them one can go crazy. Nicolae Manolescu cannot take and withstand stoutly, position, thanks to... hermeneutics and henceforth, I like his Highness. Kind of like the good old days, when we conversed for hours at the same table politicized dance (was PAC president) with Doru Strâmbulescu, Ion Pecie, Stefan Augustin Doinaş Stefan Radoff, Gheorghe Gorun etc.

Literary historian becomes a reader, and the reader who bears in itself. Literary work is rather a score that offers the possibility of many executions (the piano-or the scaffold?). Therefore, this is sensitive evil must know all kinds of designs from different eras.

Cantoned in H. R. Jauss, as didactic as possible, Nicolae Manolescu quickly denies it and reflects on good reason: new work opposes the consumption by the distance to the horizon of expectations, but it's not at all sure that in this case, a real measure value, not only temporarily successful. Is not there, in every age, many horizons waiting? Of course in this case there monumentality and grandeur of the work of M. Cărtărescu become relative, like everything else in postmodernism. On the contrary, also to M. Eminescu, and his N. Stanescu, and ...

Stop the scandalizing humour!

2. Relation of criticism to literature

Metacritic dimension follows the critical one. Then what is critical? Serge Doubrovsky explains that "criticism worthy of its name starts off as a self-criticism". On the epistemological critique causes a particular type of praxis and not knowledge, is existential. And the only possible ground of permanence of art "is the transitoricity of existential structures." "In short, all we can ask and should ask a true criticism is to be a philosophical semantics." Destiny conjugate of criticism and philosophy cannot be denaturalized. Literary criticism and philosophy part, implicitly or explicitly, the ideology produced each vintage; not have this ideology is a form of ideology: positivism. A reflection on literature is or philosophical, or has no value. [5]

But the metacritic begins to affirm since the natural self gave way to the cultural self, but he and I morphed into metaculture. Engaging in writing ... writer, critic commits inherently metawriting. So the genuine criticism is a particular branch of literature, literature that has as its subject. The very exact critic is a (meta) writer. Its second writing cannot be denounced as a minor genre or as parasitic literature. On the contrary the relationship of criticism with literature is not from the outside (in the name of aesthetic canons, for instance) but the internal one. "If there is otherness, this is the type of alter-ego: total employment of the writer in his attempt to save the language corresponds to the total employment of the critic in a similar attempt ... Like any writer, critic must first create its own language, in a direct and intimate relationship with the work of understanding parent, but governed by domestic law ". [6] Today, criticism must integrate speech vocabules of reflection (ie those of contemporary philosophy and various human sciences).

Therefore continue my plea pro domo, critical language cannot be any ordinary or proper literary nor philosophical nor purely scientific; irreducible in principle in all these different languages, he has yet to invent a synthesis of them. Therefore - concludes the same Serge Doubrovsky - critical language is a bastard language, baroque, eerie, showing, and transusefulness by its own beauty.

Nicolae Manolescu also aspires to a dialectical thinking. He is ambitioning that the immanent analysis of the sense can thus reach an imminent sense of the analysis. One dreams that his critical and metacritique work would be for the reader a form of self understanding, just as the literary work was an image of its own condition. Through the comment that the critic makes about the work, the reader should discover an understanding of man understood by another understanding, which will present for him as intelligibility that his age gives to the past and present of man. The triangle drawn by S.D. is a postmodern type: the works of the author is an understanding of man; the critic's comment is an understanding of man

understood by another understanding (it is therefore a metaunderstanding); the intelligibility of the époque is a transunderstanding because – let us remember – trans-historicity of the existential structures allows, often, that the work can say exactly the contrary of what we believed the author was saying.

Man is a common element of the triad: the creator man, the critic-author man, the reader man, the criticism is the third party between the writer and reader. Basarab Nicolescu takes as a prototype Eugen Simion praising his “apostolate” as leader of the Romanian Academy and his activity as an editor of Mihai Eminescu’s manuscripts [7]. In reverse, Nicolae Manolescu is in clear disagreement: “The Romanian Academy has made the editing of the books on which C. Noica drew attention. Literary, not one line from these represent any interest.”[8] On the road of the third party is also Jean-François Malherbe, an advocate of transcendence [9], but also Pompoliu Crăciunescu with his new concept which offers a royal means of understanding Eminescu: transcological and another means of valuing Vintila Horia’s work: transliterature (the transgressive view on the world [10]).

3. Age of aristocracy

Titu Maiorescu went to school. Profile did not leave instead of "contradictions". Therefore he was very lucky that he was in 1863 aged only 23 years. It's true that he was very young, but already having the high education. Indeed, founders of Junimea had taken his doctorate in Germany and in France and the same status they had wanted for Mihai Eminescu. The proof of our Europeanisms our intellectual and artistic elite was proved by Ion Creangă so abundantly, even anthropologically, not only ontologically.

But I let myself back in time to his article devoted Titu of "Critical History ..." by Nicolae Manolescu, hoping the first formulations Metacritic, still not very clear, although it should have already. After all - says Harold Bloom - any rhetoric, according to an occupied country, do not expect, in fact, a genuine release. Romania, appreciate their own name is in this situation. But literary criticism is indeed an ancient art and an elitist phenomenon, and the art of memory in its literary form. "Memory itself is always an art even when involuntary function". [11] "No critic (not even myself) is a tightly Prospero, exercising and white magic on an enchanted island" [12], it gives HB However, the sentence did not "catch" Titu nor any Nicolae Manolescu: each has ruled as Prince Ion Ghica, its Samos island. I am, of course, in a similar position [13].

The first canonical battle would have been held by - in the vision of Nicolae Manolescu – Titu Maiorescu. I cannot accept such an assertion. Personally, I'm busy studying Heliade Ion Radulescu and I would ask seeded with his "whole course of general poetry" and especially "Preface Grammar". Over the figure of the Labyrinth, the author innocent of text "rule" critical overlap (and Metacritic - nm IPB) grafted natural lingual another truth that "all knowledge and craft has its own language." "Preface" to "Romanian Grammar" is, for me, a poem connotations metalinguistic / metapoetic who transgresses considered irreducible opposition: science, art, so that the new concept of scienceart transterminological is operational only in this context. The demonstration we made an earlier study and there is no point to dwell [14].

Titu Maiorescu - to quote Nicolae Manolescu ("Critical History ...", p. 361) - belonged to a pressure group as Eugen Negrici designated as group of the eighties, but "perfect

hierarchical and ultimately closed ". And how "all criticism" which debuted Junimea "is cultural and not least" literary "automatic enterprise manolescian, metacultural and metaliterary.

Thus we have taken transhermeneutic some specific notes. Titu Maiorescu's general critique is as "the first canonical battle Romanian of culture". It hopes to prove the falsity of the old canon to impose on his everywhere: in literature, language, philosophy, law, history, etc.

I confess that it animates such a goal even if nowadays, it is (im) possible. (As you can see, I definitely closed "circle" or he and his metamorphosis as Poulet). Titu Maiorescu- as it often designated by Nicolae Manolescu, with enough application, not always, and inspired - often for "considerations" indulging in a summary of ideas and ... themes - and Junimea introduced, with critical spirit, a non-negotiable criteria: the truth. But the primacy of truth meant the primacy of value, aesthetic autonomy, a serious scientific basis of studies that maiorescianism approve a metaphilosophy and metaphilology. "The result was a project that current historians of language (George Brancusi, Flora Şuteu etc.) it considers exceptional" [Critical History ..., p. 363].

Giving attention to multiple layers and various poetics of Maiorescu (from "A critical research on Romanian poetry of 1867"), Nicolae Manolescu selects (cited Vladimir Streinu) the following metacritic elements:

- Psychological explanation of poetic, lyrical poems short stretch, and abundance stylistic ideal suggestion and engineering values to the composition;

- Renewing the concept of poetry, Titu Maiorescu pushes on lyrics and fantasy as opposed to prose (which has the attributes rationality and logic), the character "sensitive", ie figuratively, of poetic illogical, but not the emotional purely intellectual (size end is now outdated, ridiculous, unbalanced - nm);

- In fact, T. M. himself is reconsidering his position when he writes a sentence like this: "The word poet shall report either to the unknown among intellectual and natural world and discovers the way for a new harmony of nature."

Canon is made and loosened only by critics. Modern European spirit, T. M. however combats forms without substance, specifically how the principles of Western democracy were embodied in Romanian institutions. Eugen Lovinescu will persist thereafter the appearance of Romanian civilization in the nineteenth century travelled the road from form to substance, but strangely, in his monograph dedicated to the titan of Junimea, missed a crucial passage: "Everything is now as empty our public movements have turned into a felt reality because we introduced a very high degree of life outside of the European countries must raise our people to understand that all powers and a degree of political organization he suited me. ", whose core lies in filling the form, not giving it.

The reference to an article of HR Patapievici seems to me uselessly humiliating for Nicolae Manolescu and even futile, because the essayist overlaps files (but be it, his Highness knows better why he is doing such "servitudes").

The function of builder of literary criticism of Titu Maiorescu raises an important problem. Was he really a proper literary critic despite his theoretical and illustrative character of the preponderance of rhetoric? He was indeed, demonstrates the mentor of the "Mondayists"; because the laconic maiorescian criticism has combined the ironic summary

with the guillotine of sentence (again I dislike the procedure and have never turned to it – IPB) [15], have shown the critic-art way – also to the artisticity of critical dialectics, have received through humour, altitude, scholar presentation of forces, paternal and medical tone, have convinced through principiality, impersonality, methodical undestructiveness, aristocratism of the polemical duel (which is also syllogistical, yet not abstract, remarking itself through its decadence of metronome of arguments, the overloading of demonstration (Critical history...p. 370).

Harold Bloom, should he had been involved, he would have aimed higher in the most typical transmodernist canon; by the way: Theodor Codreanu has mailed to me an ample “metacritics” of the “Critical History”, pleading for the “The Canonical History of Romanian Literature” [16]; in a “warning” I am being made attentive that “Nicolae Manolescu is the promoter of an postmodernist ethos” placed, today, in agony (moreover NM himself concludes at a certain moment that “postmodernism starts to belong to the past” and “the confrontation with the 2000 generation (the transmodernist if I may add – IPB) is proving ever more difficult and aggressive”, a “new paradigm is much more likely to happen after more than a quarter of century”; the calculation indicated the exhaustion of the 35 years, not the 25 estimated) – whilst Harold Bloom represents the ethos of transmodernity.

What would have been sparkling in expertise, clearly, spiritually, revolting, heterodox, charming, and full of erudition and intellectual courage Harold Bloom:

- The aesthetic choice always guides every earthly aspect of the canonical formation;
- The individual self is the only method and the only standard for the understanding of the aesthetic value;
- The aesthetic value is by definition generated by an interaction between artists, an influence which always means interpretation;
- There is no poem (novel) in itself however something that cannot be reduced lurks within aesthetics;
- Any value that withstands is made of by a process of interartistic influence, which embodies the psychological, spiritual and social components, the defining element remaining the aesthetic one;
- The partisans of resentment either deny the unique value of Shakespeare (because he is also the earthly canonical, and also his predecessor and followers are defined through him in canonical purposes) or they demonstrate why his plays have been ensured a central place in the Western canonical; Mihai Eminescu’s situation is similar for Romania, because he is our Shakespeare and not...Mircea Cartarescu.

The philosophical direction that comes from Harold Bloom is the American neo-conservatism, is hostile to what Nicolae Manolescu called School resentment mirror politically correct postmodern mentality.

"Sensing the risk, Nicolae Manolescu invented method of writing on two hands, something like the unnatural cantemirien ... That should be a guarantee for success in manolescian history. But our author has distorted the concept of aesthetic sense and game parody postmodernist literary unnatural fatality that has not disappeared. "[18]

Therefore, impersonal (ie objective) T. Maiorescu won a "battle canonical" as well - you have seen above - we provide and Nicolae Manolescu, but because - I repeat - identified as M. Eminescu what and proved Centre national canon. Or. here just lost the battle Nicolae

Manolescu. I quote again my transmodernist individual, Theodor Codreanu, who called because of the defeat: "NM was seduced, ideological postmodern mentality destroying the Western canon and therefore, Romanian, attacking even the "centrality" Eminescu, on the pretext that the term "national poet" is an "aberration" culture. Moreover, to observe that Nicolae Manolescu is among the few major Romanian critics who failed before him Eminescu, that is the main test of critical vocation, as he called G. Călinescu. The question is meant to make us think: there is no serious study manolescian about Eminescu's genius ". [19]

Harold Bloom would have labelled the Titu to "aristocratic era", with Samuel Johnson, who turned critic canonical scholarship in intuition. After Junimea mentor, a second battle was assumed canonical Eugen Lovinescu and targeted towards pure poetry and Dionysian, subjectivity and lyricism obscured, irrational, sensitive, individualistic, private and sometimes singular, meta and trans-biographical. Modern poetry is one elitist, artist and / or visionary music and symbolizes able to catch subtle analogies ineffable "pure poetry was our whole obsession criticism from E. Lovinescu to I. Negoițescu". [20]

4. Theory of rereading

The impasse of Metacritic paracanonical (stranded in front of the Western canon and national) makes a self-deluded Nicolae Manolescu; it is believed that Conductor Elias Canetti, legislator, but not in music but in art letters; But deceiving illusions are narcotics (see Eugene Negrici: Illusions Romanian literature) and dangerous.

In the article dedicated to Eugen Lovinescu, it starts to signal the start of the gap / difference. Interpretive approach should be defined as creative critical consciousness and literary character tend to be passed to one philosophy, to seek subjective reality, consciousness inherent in the work.

Eugen Lovinescu was undoubtedly a critic of identification of an "Impressionism" abrupt and dialectic, studious and thorough; theory (criticism, aesthetics) literature as literature itself be regarded as fiction. I inclined to accept along with Antoine Campagnon that "the theory is like writing science fiction, the fiction just like us, but at least for a while, she would have had the ambition to become a science" [21]

Nicolae Manolescu thought at any cost that the minute book as possible - his ego reader will not be removed from the theory. There is truth in the theory, which gives it an appealing air, cannot be subject matter entirely, theorising. Attitude towards literary theory reminiscent of the doctrine of double truth of Catholic theology. To his followers, the theory is also the subject of faith and of withdrawal; they think, but it will still act as if they really believe. All interpretations seem valid canon without legitimacy (because he is double), the author died, in fact - consider Nicolae Manolescu - "older works and even die, for reasons that can keep themselves", although the aesthetics of reception would have required by poetic (re) of reading to catch up even as his vision E. Lovinescu to look skeletal. This mutation is essentially aesthetic values because - quote NM - "A general phenomenon of entropy values would rule the world.

There are only perishable values ". [22] But a critical history mission is to give the image the degree of conservation works. "Opera is a normal text style, we foresee an internal temporality at this level: a diachronic Intertextuality ... The history of literature is the history of this Intertextuality relay, which diachronic axis designing synchronous axis. Each work

changes (albeit imperceptibly) all works ". [23] Thus historian-critic and semantopragmahermeneut trying to grasp the body works echo each history is literature: suggest how the body changes over time (terribly slow) by influence hundreds of impacts suffered. Finally "history two hands" should behave "(re) valuation and (re) interpretation of each text permanent and literature as a whole, as glossing for infinite" [24]. Become aware of the fabric topology culture, metamorphic relationship between works, permutations, substitutions or inter-reanimations from which they suffer, Nicolae Manolescu (nota bene!) Recognizes that hermeneutics is the royal road approach any work, despite the "bending" topological space. Historical consciousness is inherent in artistic perception. If there were no aesthetic value, art history would not only be a huge repository of works whose chronological sequence would be meaningless. That face. Inside: only in the context of the historical evolution of art is discernible aesthetic value.

Against this background, it re-reads E. Lovinescu, Mr. Nicolae Manolescu critical reread it from the beginning. Re-reading saved text (and metatext) from repetition, we extract from its internal chronology (something happened before or after the other) and regain a mythic time (without before or after) produces a mobile structure of the text, filmed in slow motion. "Just rereading complex game can be found multiplicity and, indeed," infinity "text. Infinity (even) derived from Intertextuality. "[25]. The reader will be involved in the work, for it was placed inside them, willy-nilly will recreate a rewrite after taste and understanding of, substituting finally true creator. Eugen Simion identical thinks "literary, unlimited material structure is in a perpetual state of creation. Writing changes (means) indefinitely depending on taste, ideology, manufacturer's instruction. "[26] The reader becomes passive witness called an interpreter. Reading wear clothes spiritual participation.

The reader is "ou lecteur arhilecteur Pluriel" [27]. Yes and no. As far as I am concerned, to prevent the manifestation of subjectivity, impressionism in reading a literary text, I tip, as a scientist, to subscribe and a collective reading, (opinions and reactions on a discrete and effective investigation into several layers social). Allegedly, would prevail his popular message, but those points (stimuli) in the text to which individuals react. Criticism should be a system of computers placed under the control of a chief dispatcher: critic installed at the control panel of a huge plant.

Frightening prospect! So I think, as Eugen Simion, that could replace arhilector literary critic; more than would censure would rehumanize, would re-socialize. If performed as a solitary reader, subjective and imperfect, questionable and thereby causing a lecturer further reading, as my (the metalector) and they all subjective, imperfect insider revealed that during the mythical circular critic before authority totality exacerbated passion, fanaticism own ways, is simply (required) is a circular memory, transphenomenal, trans-seeing and trans-proustien. Past aesthetic unlike purely historical past, is now changed to the same extent that this is directed by the past. In a circular model of personal aesthetics, novelty occurrence (even amid involuntary expressiveness of Eugen Negrici) cannot be linked to any external timeline fixed. Such work "new" will change the perception of previous works in the reader's memory and will give rise to future expectations (horizons) reading choices, reactions and insights still relevant. Incongruity between personal reading mythical time and time unidirectional and conventional literary history can produce various appearances surprises and unintended ways, depending obviously on the angle from which they are seen (during

conventional in terms of time reading or vice versa). Any writer builds his precursors and forged, as a reward for them.

Eugen Lovinescu does likewise, self-proclaiming a "simple reader that has his sensations through his book" [cited in "Critical History", p. 558]. Theorists such as "silk worms that are not silk but" (as cited in NM, *ibid*) and frigidly aestheticians would be catastrophic because it would destroy confidence in her artistic nature and joy "revisionist" beneficent any Intertextuality and interreferentiality masterpieces. But who will implement the aesthetic criteria and critical literary history will be, which as Albert Thibaudet, a coveted academic careers and "not worth it (?!)".

Albert Thibaudet and Eugen Lovinescu were contemporaries and led a troubled life. A comparison between the two illustrious personalities of such potency directly francophone interanimation operates each one. [28]

Notes:

1 Nicolae Manolescu: *Critical History of Romanian literature. Five centuries of literature; Parallel 45*, Pitesti, 2008.

2 Paul Ricoeur: *vivid metaphor*; trans. Irina Mavrodin; Universe, Bucharest, 1984.

3 See George Calinescu: *History of Romanian literature from its origins to the present*; edit. and preface by Al. Piru; Minerva, Bucharest, 1985.

4 Nicolae Manolescu, *Op. cit.*

5 Serge Doubrovsky: *Why New Criticism? Criticism and objectivity*; trans. Dolores Thomas; stud. entered. The Rum Munteanu; Universe, Bucharest, 1977.

6 *Ibid, Ibid*, p. 282.

7 Basarab Nicolescu: *From Isarlik Uimirii.I Valley. Spiritual interference*; Old Court; Bucharest, 2011, p. 231.

8 Nicolae Manolescu, *ibid*, p. 408.

9 Jean-François Malherbe: *Le pardon, transcréation from violence*; *Mémoire du XXI e siècle*, no. 3-4 - "Création et transcréation" Monaco Rocher, 2001, p. 79-96.

10 Pompiliu Crăciunescu: *Vintilă Horia: Transliteration and reality*; trans. Olimpia Coroamă; pref. Basarab Nicolescu; Old Court; Bucharest, 2011.

11 Harold Bloom: *Western canon. Books and School era*; Translation by Diana Stanciu; afterword by Mihaela Irimia Anghelescu; Universe, Bucharest, 1998, p. 16-36.

12 *Ibid, Ibid*.

13 Ion Popescu-Bradicieni: *literary work - a mysterious island. Literary Theory. University course*; Academica Brancusi, Targu-Jiu, 2003.

14 Ion Popescu-Bradicieni: *Methodology live fire*; Star Napoca, Cluj, 2007, p. 51-114.

15 See Ion Popescu-Bradicieni: *Analysis of visual language*; Academic Brancusi, Targu-Jiu, 2012, 278 pages.

16 Theodor Codreanu *History "canonical" Romanian literature*; Princeps Edit, Science, 2009, pp. 5-8

17 Harold Bloom, *Op. cit., ibid.*

18 Theodor Codreanu, *Op. cit., ibid.*

19 Ibid.

20 Nicolae Manolescu: *Critical History of Romanian literature. Five centuries of literature; Parallel 45*; Pitesti, 2008, p. 554.

21 Antoine Campagnon: *Demon theory*; Equinox Publishing, Cluj, 2007; trans. Gabriel Marian and Andrew Paul Corescu, p. 316

22 Nicolae Manolescu, *ibid*, p. 13

23 *Ibid*

24 *Ibid*

25 Matei Calinescu: *A read, reread. Towards a poetics of (re) reading*; trad. Virgil Stanciu, Polirom, Iasi, 2003, p. 56-68.

26 Eugen Simion: *Return of the author. Essays on the creative relationship work*; Book Romanian, Bucharest, 1981, p. 417-421.

27 Michael Riffaterre "explanation literary works" - vol. 2 *Enseignement from Litterature*, Plon, 1971.

28 Albert Thibaudet: *Physiology critics; introductory study, selection, translation and notes* Savin Bratu; E.P.L.U., Bucharest, 1966