

Adriana Stan

The Truth within the Text: Paradoxes of Authenticity in Romanian Literature of the 1980s

Abstract: The study tries to delineate the strategies of authenticity in the Romanian poetry and prose of the Eighties Generation as a departure from the postmodern paradigm, which is fictionally adapted in its distrust with epistemological certainties, but not in its relativization of the individual subject as well. Romanian literature of the 1980s deploys intertwined mechanisms of realism and meta-discourse in order to reach a sort of experimental authenticity, marked both by the recovery of the biographical persona of the author and by an acute awareness of the constructed nature of literarity.

Keywords: Postmodernism; Biography; Authenticity; Dialogism; Convention; Referentiality.

ADRIANA STAN

“Sextil Pușcariu” Institute of Linguistics and Literary History, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
 arstan@yahoo.ca

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2019.36.29

In recent literature, the return to authenticity has been one of the definitive signs of the fact that the postmodern paradigm has been overcome¹. In its most fundamental understanding – that of the possibility of the autonomous subject to directly experience reality – the matter of authenticity engages the distinct, but corresponding fields of subjectivity and realism. Indeed, postmodernism had deconstructed both of the latter with irony and scepticism, thereby reducing them to epiphenomena of the contingent play of different languages or discourses. The crisis of authenticity thus accompanied the crisis of representation in postmodern art, which made up for the twofold deficit through an excess of theorization². Generically included in the lineage of postmodernism, the Romanian literature of the 1980s remains the local literary movement with the most powerful self-legitimizing narrative. All writers of the Eighties Generation attempt to theorize their own creation practices, either separately or metatextually, from within fiction proper. Commonly described as cerebral, the literature of the ‘80s appropriates a certain awareness of convention that

remains active even when writers express the desire to “stare reality in the face”³. From textual experimentalism to minimalist realism, from the biographical approach of the Monday Circle in Bucharest to the neoexpressionist lyricism specific to Transylvania, the creative modes of literature in the ‘80s blend, in various proportions, the use of technique, artifice, and a bookish approach with the desire for a new “authenticity”, to be governed by the subject who writes (and is aware of the intrinsic artificial nature of writing). Albeit less acknowledged by the commentators of ‘80s literature, this desire shapes even those formulas most comparable to postmodern meta-literature, including the so-called “textualism”.

The inclination towards authenticity is the main point of contradiction between the Romanian literature of the 1980s and the typical assumptions of Occidental Postmodernism. It can be explained, however, by the intention of the Eighties Generation to rebel against the literature of the Sixties Generation, which was assimilated to poetic neomodernism and the great political novel. Young writers of the ‘80s contest the abstractness and heavy use of metaphor in neomodernism (embodied especially in the monumental figure of Nichita Stănescu), as well as the omniscient ambitions of the political novel. Nevertheless, contrary to the evolution of Occidental postmodernism towards anti-mimesis, the Romanian literature of the ‘80s redeploys the issue of referentiality through a recovery of the real, biographical persona of the author.

In his article “Words against the Typewriter”, Mircea Cărtărescu formulates one of the most transparent pleas for the

return of the author. Here, the young poet accuses “modernist poetry” of “losing touch with the actual world”, but also of the formalism under which the writer could no longer “express himself in his own text, express his feelings, his thoughts”⁴. As such, new poetry would re-establish the connection to “the human reality” and, more importantly, it would recover the “voice of the one who has written the poem”. The realist scope of such a program has no precedent in the history of Romanian poetry, provided that we understand realism in its complexity and separated from narrow positivism, as a mode that does not exclude, but rather integrates the imagination: “An attempt to transform your life, your unique, individual, unrepeatable life, into poetry, with its every corner, with its every needle and every sun you’ve ever seen in reality or in a dream, with every thought and every sensation”⁵. American personalism (O’Hara, Ginsberg) had a significant impact on Romanian poets of the Eighties Generation, to whom it offered the perfect point of reference for the deconstruction of modernist impersonality. As envisioned by the Eighties Generation, biographical poetry implies a radical rejection of lyricism, the spatial and temporal localization of discourse, as well as a realist repository of objects, situations, and attitudes. It is a “profoundly subjective” poetry that “revolves around the personality of the writer” and produces the “effect of honesty”: “What I feel, what I see, what I think in the ordinary circumstances of my life as an ordinary person constitutes the content of poetry (...). The character is me, without a mask, as I rely not on stylistic veils, but on that which is truly interesting (if anything is) about my personality”⁶. It is true

that the writing of Cărtărescu postulates a maximal “I” that cancels the difference between inside and outside, while also erasing the outlines of the real world. Nevertheless, the poetry of the “personal voice” works for most poets of his generation, particularly since the literature of the ‘80s was developed in the context of literary circles due to institutional blocks and growing ideological pressure during the last decade of Ceaușescu’s reign. The socializing and conversational experience of literary circles marked literature in the 1980s to its most intimate details, thus endowing it with an oral and transmissible nature.

An additional mechanism of poetic authenticity, eclecticism complicates the issue of referentiality. The mix of languages, writing styles, or bookish models works towards the general aim to de-conventionalize and marks the refusal of the poet to confine himself to a single rhetorical strategy. Moreover, the lived experience that is translated into poetry is fused with cultural and scholarly experience. Mircea Cărtărescu’s *Love Poems* illustrate perfectly the uncanny blend of high parody and an insertion of the poetic into the raw quotidian. Stylistic eclecticism reflects precisely the plural, polymorphous reality of the world, which cannot be reduced to a single segment or voice. By alternating between language registers, the ‘80s poet seems to provide a live demonstration of his efforts to find his way in the world. For him, it is more vital to participate, in this manner, in a moving reality than to deliver a homogeneous, coherent, and therefore artificial poetic construct. In this case, the authenticity of his attitude is based on the apparently hap-hazardous construction of the poem, especially when compared to the stylistic

perfectionism of modernist writers. Thus conceived, the poetic object can be dispersed indefinitely, as Caius Dobrescu envisions: “the poem opens up on both ends to the reality outside of it, with numerous allusions to actual people, places, moments (...); the poem constantly suggests that it draws its life force from a hinterland of reality and that it is always surrounded by the halo of concrete, sensible, live presences”⁷. The eclectic construction of such a poem nevertheless maintains the overall appearance of colloquial speech because it does not employ sophisticated figures of speech, but rather real communication (this is especially the aim of the group in Brașov: Caius Dobrescu, Andrei Bodi, Marius Oprea, Simona Popescu). On the other hand, it is also true that the multilingualism and pluriperspectivism implied in the above quote by Dobrescu describe a poetic object that is not always legible and/or transmissible because the reader cannot easily assimilate it to a (single) confessional poetic voice⁸.

In any case, the exaltation of the individual – though not of private life – is the anti-communist expression of the frustration of the Eighties Generation against a regime whose ideology prioritizes the collective and uniformity. In the manner of the Renaissance, the literature of the ‘80s re-instates man at the centre of things through an “intrinsically democratic reaction that seeks to affirm the absolute within each human being beyond the inequalities generated by social force, opportunism, and structures”⁹. The poetry of the generation seeks to rediscover “human biography, minor quotidian happenings, unsophisticated sentiments, unmediated sensations”, “the actual physical and sensorial coordinates

of the human being in our existence here and now"¹⁰. According to Simona Popescu, poetry should completely overlap the "being who emanates it and who is honest and unpretentious", thus producing the "effect of authenticity" through the "natural language of communication"¹¹.

Let us consider, then, the poetic programme outlined in the poems of Andrei Bodiou and of Simona Popescu, included (together with those of Caius Dobrescu and Marius Oprea) in the volume *Pause for Breathing* (1991)¹². Displaying the enthusiasm of the Beatles, the authors declare their intention to write honest verse that touches the heart of the human being and speaks the language of ordinary people. The faith of Andrei Bodiou in "the power of day-to-day life to suggest that which is essential for man", the desire of Caius Dobrescu to translate "real situations of communication" into literature or the attempts of Simona Popescu to deconstruct "high" languages in favour of "life" and "feeling" configure a veritable form of poetic realism. In Braşov, this tendency found a favourable environment to grow in, stimulated in particular by the proximal example of an epic poet such as Mircea Ivănescu, but also by the activity of two of the most significant writers and theoreticians of the Eighties Generation, Alexandru Muşina and Gheorghe Crăciun, who launched notions such as "new anthropocentrism", "the poetry of the quotidian", or "transmissible poetry". Characteristics such as the democratization of discourse, the theme of the derisory, narrativization, orality, and the preference for the prosaic and for biography – largely common across the entire poetic movement of the Eighties Generation – are better defined in the work of poets from

Braşov than in that of the histrionic, verbose members of the Monday Circle and even more so than in the case of poets from Transylvania who are, by custom, inclined towards modernist gravitas.

In the poetry of Andrei Bodiou, writing takes the shape of a dry report based on coordinates that are clearly fixated by situational verbs and demonstratives, in the absence of many adjectives to crowd the verse. The universe of daily movements is described without metaphors and emphasis and is characterized by a palpable weight as if it had been filmed during daylight, with eyes wide open. The descriptive overwhelms the poetic space with an almost geometric accuracy: "Above is the sky. The sun./ Underneath am I. I"¹³. Andrei Bodiou seeks a certain calm, a certain classicism, which is why he chooses simple grammatical structures ("Here I sit", "By me sits an old man", "Then the finger hit the air") and employs the period generously as if to stop the zeal of imagination in its tracks. For the same reason, singular impressions are replaced by depersonalized phrases that record facts statistically: "The day was very short./ The night was also very short./ The northern wind assuaged the southern wind./ Yesterday wind came from the west"¹⁴. In such an epic makeover, poetry is significantly altered. It does not, however, reach a point zero, because as Bodiou seems to have learned from Bacovia, the purely prosaic hides a lyrical I that is plagued with certain conflicts. There are, in this respect, several repetitive structures in his poems: the 15 occurrences of the adverb "here" in the poem "319", the predilection for the repetition of the same phrase, like an echo in an empty room, or lines such as those from "Epilogue": "Both our head and

our hands are/ closed they are tied/ we see nothing/ nothing/ I am here here here/ we are placed one next to the other/ we move in circles/ we feel the warmth and the cold and the rain and the snow and the cold/ that's it/ that's it"¹⁵. In such verses, the poet puts his finger on the more profound wound of a fundamental lack of meaning. Even so, he remains loyal to the poetics of surfaces and does not dramatize this conflict, keeping it on mute instead.

Simona Popescu perceives reality in a much more Brownian manner. If Andrei Bodiș conceives his poems as frozen frames, the author of *Exuviae* creates frames that are mobile and slide from one scenario into the other. The poet is fascinated by metamorphoses and changing identities, which she hopes to find in the biological and spiritual ages of the human being and which turn into obstacles every step of the way. This is why she feels like "all as a spiral in a motley World"¹⁶, but also why she is as exulted as a postmodern mathematician when stating that chaos, and not order, is actually at the heart of things. Her reaction is, generally speaking, a form of euphoric perplexity that often emulates inability and naiveté: "(...) the world is actually knowable/ but you've no clue the world you live in"¹⁷. There is something simply contagious about the jubilation with which the poet, pretending to be ignorant, breaks ideologies, stereotypes, and serious discourses: "people use big words/ as if that were enough/ I make my bed to nap at their monotonous mumble/ (eternity nothingness infinity memory insanity zenith land hearth...)/ I make my bed but someone shakes me/ "the hell are you doing?"/ I'm running I'm running don't worry!"¹⁸. The scholarly is in

the creative DNA of Simona Popescu, but it is not at all inhibited. Instead, it generates a positive propulsion force and participates in the scenario of the liberation of "senses" from ideologies. This founding scene, which we will find in *Exuviae* and especially in *Works in Green*, is developed dramatically, theatrically even, because Simona Popescu has the ability, unmatched to this day, to diversify herself in many lyrical voices, some of which she has seemingly gathered directly from the street, using a recorder. The same tendency confers to her poems an epic, cavalcade rhythm. Reality appears to be unhinged, and yet, somehow, the reader is eventually convinced that this is, in fact, the natural order of things.

The matter of authenticity raises different theoretical issues in prose, where, setting aside conventions of the first-person narrative, the effect of sincerity is more difficult to produce than in poetry. Still, the Romanian prose of the 1980s seeks this effect without confining itself to that subjective perspective specific to Romanian inter-war prose (once more, the prose writer most dedicated to narrative subjectivism remains Mircea Cărtărescu). Authenticity is, on the other hand, challenged from within the conventions of realist narrative by the third person, in an overall mutation from omniscience to dialogism. Mircea Nedelciu explains this transaction when he observes that, although "the issue of authenticity is connected to the personal identity of the transcriber", "literature that features characters" complicates "the possibility to determine the authenticity of any one sentence of the author". Even so,

the document, the act, the direct transmission of an event that took place in

reality can become part of the economy of the literary text, where it will no longer be artistically transfigured, but rather authenticated. In the list of real people (author, the person upon which a character is based, the reader), a more democratic relationship intervenes and the task each of the above must perform is an authentic act¹⁹.

In a polemic with the great social and political novel of the '60s and '70s, prose in the 1980s programmatically opts for the short forms of sketches, novellas, and short stories, all of which allow it to tackle the privileged perspective that is recording reality. Often stepping into the text he is writing, the narrator shares his disorientation regarding the reality he proceeds to discover one step at a time, together with the reader. The narrator is, furthermore, confused by the numerous ways in which one might transpose reality into literature: in his first phrase of "Interesting Fact", Cristian Teodorescu notes: "It seems that there are countless ways to tell the story of an event"²⁰. Hereof results an uncanny mix of authenticity and narrative sophistication, of realism and textualism, which seem to function in equal proportions for the representative prose writers of the generation, Gheorghe Crăciun and Mircea Nedelciu. Some of the best volumes of prose by the Eighties Generation – Ștefan Agopian's *The Textbook of Happenings*, Ioan Groșan's *The Cinematography Caravan*, Cristian Teodorescu's *The Master of Lights* – explore the ambiguity, in fiction, between a "paper world", which constantly exhibits its conventions, and the "real world". The authenticity of certain slices of reality – obvious, for instance, in the fact that dialogues

seem to be "transcribed" – is doubled by its permanent textual problematizing, which targets, first and foremost, "relations of aesthetic production"²¹: between writing and reading, between author, narrator, and characters. Parallel to the author who steps down into the text, the reader is invited to witness the process of textual engineering.

Yet is this theoretical awareness, this knowledge of the construction of the text, propitious for or inhibiting to the effect of authenticity, which is as essential for prose writers as it is for poets? In fact, not only those fragments of raw reality in the prose of the Eighties Generation are "authentic", but also the metafictional conversation they carry wielding the weapons of literary theory, albeit in the manner of direct confession. To show what the text is made of is, essentially, a way to naturalize it, to unravel the illusion of artifice, to lay one's cards on the table. Nevertheless, a contradiction remains between purpose – the effect of authenticity, the recording of concrete reality – and formalist means. Ion Bogdan Lefter accurately observes the "polarization of the levels of the text" between "maximal artificiality and maximal naturalness":

on the one hand, the recording of authentic quotidian experience is sought through a kind of transcription of everything a microphone and a camera would register, and, on the other hand, there is an acute acknowledgment of the artificiality of prose, of its literary conventions; the author thus knowingly manipulates his tools as a highly qualified specialist. (...) Meta-text is used in the service of a prose of existence, while authenticism (understood through textual problematizing)

uncovers for itself a range of action far broader than permitted by immediate experience²².

Gheorghe Crăciun similarly ties “authenticity” – a common word for the new literary consciousness – to textual mechanics. This mode of authorial positioning is different from that envisioned in the anti-philocaly program of Camil Petrescu, even though the inter-war reference point remains more relevant than that of the novel of the ‘60s and ‘70s. New authenticity is “experimental” and consciously perceived as a convention. It is based not so much on mimesis, but on the “clarity and density of representations” or the ability to bring the often contradictory dialectics of the world into the text. “One’s personal experience of the world” becomes the “centre of gravity of the narrative act”, provided that this experience is “exponential and problematic for the entire community”²³. As in the case of poetry, autobiography functions as the primary resource for prose in the 1980s. However, because this is the autobiography of writers, it includes, in addition to the experience of the quotidian banal (studentship, dormitories, commutes, holidays, urban drifting), a scholarly, intellectual experience. The narrative time literally blends with the time of reading and the time of writing, while the authenticity of feeling and the authenticity of the literary artifice are equalled from an ontological point of view. The realism of such an attitude is no longer a matter of recording facts, but also one of phythology.

No matter how bare their “transcription” is, fragments of quotidian existence are always suggestive of the rapport between the individuals and the systems

wherein they integrate: social, political, or narrative. In relation to any of the latter, the text, unfastened from its articulations and kept in a virtual state, expresses the implicit refusal of dogmatization. Theories about the text proposed by the Romanian Eighties Generation fulfil an ideological role similar to that of quotidian “live transmissions”: both strategies challenge not only traditional mimesis, but also the authoritarian voice of the regime as symbolically represented by an omniscient narrative. In his notorious preface to *The Confabulatory Treatment*, Mircea Nedelciu employs such a twofold message – narrative and political – when he affirms that the action of “rules specific to literary language” is a “constructive activity by means of which one might intervene in the world, and not a form of textuality that opposes the world”²⁴. Nevertheless, the limitations of this engagement with reality are the very limitations of the language of Eighties literature, since its experimental and metafictional nature make it difficult to read the political attitude of the narrator. It was no mere chance that Mircea Nedelciu felt the need to clarify his strategy in the edition of the novel published after December 1989:

In the context of communism (...), my idea was to turn the novel into a useful object, an instrument to achieve an increased resistance to manipulation (...). This was more or less the only message I would address to my readers: to be more than manipulable masses, let’s build refuges and shelters from our own confabulations (...), a counter-utopia to the Orwellian dystopia we then experienced in the reality of 1984²⁵.

Often understood as an “active intervention” or a “significant practice”²⁶, the textualism of the Eighties Generation implied none of the sterility of formalism and none of the theoretical aridity of the French *Tel Quel* movement, the latter of which served as an important source of inspiration. On the contrary, it acquired regenerative connotations, sometimes directly reminiscent of the anarchy of inter-war philosophies of being:

Writing pregnant with the rhythm of being, the music of sexuality, and the biological and energetic mists of the body. Energy obtained through the shattering of codes, the shifting of syntax, the semantic leap. (...) Textualism is of an intellectualist origin, powered by universities, but thirsty for the street, for the wilderness of disposition, and for life²⁷.

The veritable “obsession for the real and for life”²⁸ distinguishes Romanian writers of the Eighties Generation from Western postmodernists. Though the former share with the latter certain rhetorical strategies (including the use of meta-text and the blend of languages) and manifest a similar scepticism towards “grand narratives”, as well as a similar awareness of the uncertainty of language, the Romanian Eighties Generation does not discredit the individual subject together with other epistemological certainties²⁹. On the contrary, it consolidates its role as a coherent centre of the world. There are references to Western literature, but the existential side of writing is recovered by the Eighties Generation particularly as a means to differentiate itself from the Romanian literature

of the 1960s. Indeed, the neomodernist poetry of the Sixties Generation had been defined through its heavy use of metaphor, conceptualism, metaphysical openness and the deliberate return to inter-war modernism. Still, if only through its numerous forms of confessional and sentimental lyricism, Romanian neomodernism did not entirely confirm the abstract and anti-realist portrait outlined for it by the Romanian Eighties Generation, and which was inspired especially from Hugo Friedrich’s *The Structure of Modern Poetry*. Exaggeration, however, serves a polemic purpose, while the programme for authenticity of the Eighties Generation is better highlighted when viewed against the alleged isolation of their predecessors in an ivory tower of literature. Paradoxically, it is, in fact, the theory of writing proposed by *Tel Quel* that inspires Romanian writers and that tied the “transformative” activity of literature to certain formal devices familiar to high modernism (particularly in regards to the mechanisms of self-referentiality). At any rate, although they refuse modernism, the Eighties Generation restores an affiliation with the avant-garde based on the same “active principle of one’s positioning towards language” and on an attitude of “artistic insurrection” and “insubordination against the automatisms of literature”³⁰.

From the point of view of criticism and literature, textualism is, for some time, the most relevant concept for the Eighties Generation, even though it cannot ascribe its entire creative reality. The rise of new literature is generously greeted, even enthusiastically so, by critics, although the latter do not always possess current instruments for analysis other than those

indicated through metatext by the writers themselves. The true exegesis of the literature of the 1980s would take shape after 1993. Though postmodernism becomes the most frequently employed notion in the second half of the 1980s, it is employed in conceptual debates, rather than in factual analyses, leading to “several discrepancies between postmodernism as it was understood by its creators and postmodernism understood by commentators”³¹. On the other hand, criticism during the 1980s – of the movement or of its ideas – did not manifest the preference of literature for authentic subjectivity, nor did it assume the posture of relativity typical of postmodernism. The lack of conceptual overlap sometimes leads to disputes: even Radu G. Țeposu, one of the most active critics of the generation, ultimately criticizes the “exhausting self-referentiality”³² of Mircea Nedelciu and Gheorghe Crăciun – something that the two writers, in fact, deliberately assumed.

Inspired by Italian semiotics and the French *Tel Quel* movement, Marin Mincu came very close to identifying the critical perspective suitable for the twofold nature of the literature of the 1980s, which was split between formalism and existentialism, between the “materiality” of the text and the “authenticity of writing”. Without reducing the latter to a single stylistic formula, the critic believes that it “demands a certain embedding of the authorial category into the discourse”³³. According to this framework, even metatext can be a form of authenticity, since it illustrates the “dramatic nature” of writing. Nevertheless, Marin Mincu dislikes writers who are too preoccupied with *techné* – as many of the Eighties Generation were – and seeks the

signs of “an existential experience” or of a “palpitation of life”, both of which are more difficult to localize in the material framework of the text. As a matter of fact, beginning with the second half of the ‘80s, the notion of textualism loses more and more ground in favour of other concepts (postmodernism, new antropocentrism, etc.), and accumulates the negative connotations of an artificial and hypertechanical literature that becomes increasingly irrelevant after 1989.

The context following December 1989, which registered a boom of autobiographical writing and “testimonies” from communist times, was, indeed, hostile towards the strictly theoretical discussions on the making of fiction carried out by the Eighties Generation. In *Essay on the Poetic Text III* (1993), Marin Mincu decries the “repudiation” of textualism, which he had attempted to endorse in criticism. Yet, the commentator does not abandon the concept. On the contrary, up to the year 2000, he attempts to extend its applicability to any type of literature. In his synthesis on the Romanian poetry of the 20th century, Marin Mincu places *all* poetic forms under the umbrella of “textualization” and of “the existential sphere” identified in the attitude of the poetic subject.³⁴ By and large, the notion of “authenticity” remains functional in Romanian literature after December 1989, and even acquires new meaning in the anti-philocaly and minimalist program of the literature of the 2000s. Through the literary circle “Euridice”, Marin Mincu becomes one of the foremost mentors of young poets making their debut around the year 2000. Their poetics, however, radically opposes the sophisticated theoretical programme of the Eighties Generation.

Still, Marin Mincu remains, for some time, a bridge between the two generations, at least so long as he insists to maintain notions of “textualism” in the equation of authenticity.

This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Research and Innovation, CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P1-1.2-PCCDI-2017-0326/49 PCCDI, within PNCDI III.

WORKS CITED

- Bodiu, Andrei, Simona Popescu, Caius Dobrescu, Marius Oprea, *Pauză de respirație* [*Pause for Breathing*], Bucharest, Litera, 1991; second edition, Bucharest, Tracus Arte, 2011.
- Butler, Christopher, *Postmodernism. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Cărtărescu, Mircea, «Cuvinte împotriva mașinii de scris» [«A few Words against the Typewriter»], *Caiete critice*, no. 1-2, 1986.
- Crăciun, Gheorghe (ed.), *Competiția continuă. Generația '80 în texte teoretice* [*Neverending Competition. The Eighties Generation in Theoretical Texts*], Pitești, Paralela 45, 1999.
- Ghica, Magdalena, *Hipermatéria* [*Hypermatter*], Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1980.
- Haselstein, Ulla, MaryAnn Snyder-Körber, Andrew Gross (eds.), *The Pathos of Authenticity: American Passions of the Real*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010.
- Hutcheon, Linda, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*, London & New York, Routledge, 1988.
- Iova, Gheorghe, *Acțiunea textuală. Bunul simț vizionar* [*Textual Action. The Visionary Common-Sense*], Pitești, Paralela 45, 1999.
- Mincu, Marin, *Textualism și autenticitate: eseu despre textul poetic, III* [*Textualism and Authenticity: Essay about the Poetic Text*], Constanța, Pontica, 1993.
- Mincu, Marin, *O panoramă critică a poeziei românești din secolul al XX-lea (de la Al. Macedonski la Cristian Popescu)*, [*A Critical Panorama of 20th century Romanian Poetry (From Al. Macedonski to Cristian Popescu)*], Constanța, Pontica, 2007.
- Nedelciu, Mircea, *Tratament fabulatoriu* [*The Confabulatory Treatment*], Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1986.
- Nedelciu, Mircea, *Tratament fabulatoriu* [*The Confabulatory Treatment*], Bucharest, Allfa, 1996.
- Teodorescu, Cristian, *Maestrul de lumini* [*The Lights Master*], Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1985.
- Țeposu, Radu G., *Istoria tragică și grotescă a întunecatului deceniu literar nouă* [*The Tragical and Grotesque History of the Dark Literary Decade of the 1980s*], Bucharest, Eminescu, 1993.

NOTES

1. See Ulla Haselstein, MaryAnn Snyder-Körber, Andrew Gross (eds.), *The Pathos of Authenticity: American Passions of the Real*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010.
2. See Christopher Butler, *Postmodernism. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
3. See Magdalena Ghica, *Hipermatéria* [*Hypermatter*], Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1980.
4. Mircea Cărtărescu, «Cuvinte împotriva mașinii de scris» [«A few Words against the Typewriter»], *Caiete critice*, no. 1-2, 1986, p. 132.
5. Mircea Cărtărescu, «Realismul poeziei tinere» [«The Realism of Young Poetry»], in Gheorghe Crăciun (ed.), *Competiția continuă. Generația '80 în texte teoretice* [*Neverending Competition. The Eighties Generation in Theoretical Texts*], Pitești, Paralela 45, 1999, p. 121.
6. Mircea Cărtărescu, «Ce este biografismul?» [«What is Biographism?»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 124.

7. Caius Dobrescu, «Micile speranțe» [«Small Hopes»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 144.
8. Gheorghe Perian, «Restul e literatură» [«The Rest is Literature»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 75.
9. Alexandru Mușina, «Poezia cotidianului» [«The Poetry of the Everyday»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 166.
10. Alexandru Mușina, «Poezia – o șansă...» [«Poetry – a Chance»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 169-171.
11. Simona Popescu, «Sensul poeziei, astăzi» [«The Sense of Poetry, Today»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 177-181.
12. Andrei Bodi, Simona Popescu, Caius Dobrescu, Marius Oprea, *Pauză de respirație [Pause for Breathing]*, Bucharest, Litera, 1991.
13. Andrei Bodi, «Trezirea» [«Waking Up»], in Andrei Bodi, Simona Popescu, Caius Dobrescu, Marius Oprea, *Pauză de respirație [Pause for Breathing]*, Bucharest, Tracus Arte, 2011, p. 7.
14. *Ibidem*.
15. Andrei Bodi, «Epilog» [«Epilog»], in Bodi, *Pauză*, 2011, p. 18.
16. Simona Popescu, «Vulpea roșie» [«The Red Fox»], in Bodi, *Pauză*, 2011, p. 22.
17. Simona Popescu, «Eu sînt doar un strămoș» [«I am just an Ancestor»], in Bodi, *Pauză*, 2011, p. 33.
18. Simona Popescu, «Cursa» [«The Race»], in Bodi, *Pauză*, 2011, p. 29.
19. Mircea Nedelciu, «Dialogul în proza scurtă (III) – Autenticitate, autor, personaje» [«The Dialogue in Short Prose (III) – Authenticity, Author, Character»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 310-311.
20. See Cristian Teodorescu, *Maestrul de lumini [The Lights Master]*, Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1985.
21. Gheorghe Crăciun, «Arhipelagul '70-'80 și noul flux» [«The 70-80s' Archipelago and the New Flux»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 215.
22. Ion Bogdan Lefter, «Introducere în noua poetică a prozei» [«Introduction to the New Poetics of Prose»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 228-229.
23. Gheorghe Crăciun, «Autenticitatea ca metodă de lucru» [«Authenticity as a Work Method»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 269-270.
24. Mircea Nedelciu, *Tratament fabulatoriu [The Confabulatory Treatment]*, Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 1986, p. 47.
25. Mircea Nedelciu, *Tratament fabulatoriu [The Confabulatory Treatment]*, Bucharest, Allfa, 1996, p. 23.
26. See Gheorghe Iova, *Acțiunea textuală. Bunul simț vizionar [Textual Action. The Visionary Common-Sense]*, Pitești, Paralela 45, 1999.
27. Vasile Andru, «Textualismul» [«Textualism»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 382, 385, 387.
28. Alexandru Mușina, «Postmodernismul, o frumoasă poveste» [«Postmodernism, a Beautiful Story»], in Crăciun, *Competiția*, p. 432.
29. Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*, London & New York, Routledge, 1988, p. xiii.
30. Gheorghe Crăciun, *În căutarea referinței [Searching for the Reference]*, Pitești, Paralela 45, 1998, p. 33.
31. Gheorghe Perian, *Literatura în schimbare [Changing Literature]*, Cluj-Napoca, Limes, 2010, p. 144.
32. Radu G. Țeposu, *Istoria tragică și grotescă a întunecatului deceniu literar nouă [The Tragical and Grotesque History of the Dark Literary Decade of the 1980s]*, Bucharest, Eminescu, 1993, p. 154.
33. Marin Mincu, *Textualism și autenticitate: eseu despre textul poetic, III [Textualism and Authenticity: Essay about the Poetic Text]*, Constanța, Pontica, 1993, p. 183.
34. See Marin Mincu, *O panoramă critică a poeziei românești din secolul al XX-lea (de la Al. Macedonski la Cristian Popescu), [A Critical Panorama of 20th century Romanian Poetry (From Al. Macedonski to Cristian Popescu)]*, Constanța, Pontica, 2007.