Alex Ciorogar

"The 6th Face of Modernity" – Postmillennial Romanian Poetry and Metamodernism: Supernatural Naturalism, or the Poetics of Provision

Abstract: This paper critically examines the *metamodernization* of Romanian poetry in the broader historical context of its post-communist culture. Metamodernism will be swiftly defined as "the 6th face of modernity" (with a nod to M. Călinescu) and as a form of "supernatural naturalism" (inverting M.H. Abrams' famous formulation). The article then analyses the metamodern stylization of the lyrical subject (*the corporeal lyric of the anonymous*) in a posthuman framework. As a *cultural sub-commodity chain*, contemporary Romanian poetry and its "poetics of provision" can only be understood, it will be argued, within the matrix of neoliberal capitalism which produces a myriad of situated subjectivities of *postmillennial consociates* where the metamodern logistics of affect typically percolates.
Keywords: Romanian Metamodern Poetry; Posthumanism; The 6th Face of Modernity; Supernatural Naturalism; Corporeal Lyric; Cultural Sub-Commodity Chain; Poetics of Provision; Consociates; *Parrhêsia*; *Aletheia*; World-Systems; Ludwig Fleck.

Alex Ciorogar
Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
alexandru.ciorogar@ubbcluj.ro

Against the backdrop of an ever-evolving media landscape and in the wake of Romania's transitional phase, this study focuses on the evolution of some elements and segments of both poetic and critical discourses circulating over the last decade or so, tracking the changes in lyric subjectivity within the works of post-millennial authors. The paper critically examines the frameworks that have come to inform and shape the development of said Romanian poetry beyond postmodernism, exploring, among others, the intellectual affordances of metamodernism and posthumanism, which offer insights into how recent poetic works interact with issues of identity, technology, capitalism, and the environment, while also thinking about the ways in which poetic discourses intersect with feminist and decolonial critical theories that subvert existing power relations and promote otherwise semiperipheral or subaltern voices[1]. Ultimately, the article sheds light on the dynamic role of contemporary Romanian poetry by placing it within the broader scaffolding of a combined and uneven world-systems perspective, showing

that its diversity matches the sociological and identitarian fragmentation unfolding in the aftermath of Romania's European integration.

The ongoing geopolitical tragedies and technological advancements have led to dramatic transformations and tensions, raising questions about what humanity can still account for. These changes, of course, accompany capitalist crises and environmental disasters and constitute the social and political context in which the poetry I examine here has been written and published. Grappling with both the legacies of the modernist past and our digitally globalized contemporary moment, recent Romanian poetry is also, among a myriad of other factors that have influenced its morphology, the product of a generation affected by various waves of economic migration, revealing the consequences of brutal mechanisms of social disintegration, as well as the atomizing consequences of neoliberalist transformations. After 1989, Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro sustain, "East European labourers were available to the West in ways that facilitated downwards wage pressures"[2]. Contrarily, however, with sparse exceptions[3], the only way in which this transnational dynamic presents itself within recent lyric poetry is through figurative and phenomenological displacement.

Written and published almost entirely after Romania's transitional and integrative processes within the EU, post-millennial poetry nevertheless continues to remain simultaneously flanked by both external dependencies and the workings of domestic institutions[4]. Given the morphology of the capitalist world-system (one and unequal), neoliberalism is, of course, differently or asymmetrically mobilized in a post-communist, semiperipheral country. Romanian contemporary poetry is geopolitically wedged in a localized form of neoliberal development. In this sense, Mihai Iovănel's work, and especially his 'points of resistance' demonstration, represents, to date, the most attentive discussion of glocal literary transformations[5]. Without trying to highlight these verdicts in negative terms, I would maintain, however, that the ideological and cultural class consciousness of contemporary Romanian poetry appears to be dissociative. What this phrase insinuates is that recent poetry demands a diffractive form of reading[6] which reveals more clearly how a cluster of symptomatic manifestations refract the inconsistencies of today's digital semiosphere[7], concurrently blending and segregating disparate identitarian and ideological communities[8].

Within all its complexity, then, Romanian metamodern poetry presupposes and requires a communal way of reading[9]: an interpretative strategy that is planetary in reach and ecological in scope, uniting, in the words of Isabelle Stengers, "multiple, divergent worlds"[10] of humans and non-humans alike. Romanian metamodern poetry, it will be argued, redefines the lyric subject by enacting the 'displacement of our worldview away from the human epicenter' and 'establishing a continuum with the animal, mineral, vegetable, extra-terrestrial, and technological worlds', as Braidotti puts it[11]. The rationale behind upholding such an unorthodox view lies not necessarily in my paper's post-Marxist distinctiveness, although it does retain some of its emphasis on discursiveness, social plurality, contingency, and anti-essentialist critique of hegemony, but rather in

a post-Bourdieusian perspective stemming from the psychological sociology of dispositional singularity which has empirically uncovered, in the work of Bernard Lahire, for instance, a plurality of contextually embodied practices coexisting within individual subjectivities[12].

The way I use the terms lyric poetry and subjectivity are conceptually indebted to Jonathan Culler's theoretical work on the topic, where he defines the lyric genre as a tension between ritualistic and fictional elements, identifying the 'lyric address' as one of the major features of poetry. More importantly, through numerous examples and brilliant close-readings, Culler also demonstrates the central importance of apostrophe as 'the invocation of absent or nonhuman addressees'[13]. This speaks, then, to the connection between lyric poetry and its sociohistorical context simultaneously regarded as social critique and wishful prayer. This conception is receptive to the aims pursued by this article – namely, to grasp the intersections between poetic discourse and 'everyday life', since the suppleness of Culler's theorization directly lend itself to metamodernism's central tenets and its *poetics of provision*. Penning one of the best overviews concerning the metamodern debate, Antony Rowland unfortunately restricts his own use of the term to an Adornoian understanding of 'enigmaticalness'[14]. Nevertheless, I am fully aware that discussions of metamodernism can typically drift toward confusion due to the various objects and disciplines or discursive formations it supposedly ought to address.

Consequently, to supplement and extend both Rowland's contextualizing efforts and Culler's poetics, the idea of subjectivity will also be treated partly as an Althusserian form of positional interpellation[15] and as a Foucauldian *dispositif*[16]. I will try to show that the metamodern subject unwillingly and unknowingly submits to the socio-political power structures and relations that govern its existence, yet also resists the totalizing or unexamined self-inscription of neoliberal biopolitics within its own lyric subjectivity. This post-author rightfully acknowledges the function of the Derridean trace of the other (whether the other's trace is of animal, machine, human, or any other nature) in its processual constitution[17]. As Paul de Man famously showed, any text 'is, to some extent, autobiographical'[18], which also means that Romanian metamodern poetry could, at least theoretically, prefigure a post-anthropocentric subject.

Consequently, my metamodern formula does not necessarily point to a fixed or recoverable truth of contemporary lyricism, but it somewhat tries to approximate the cultural idiosyncratic intelligibility of our times. While approaching today's literary trends, then, one great idea is to forego trite generational (or rather decennial) distinctions by discerning between Raymod Williams's residual, dominant, and emergent structures of feeling within contemporary Romanian poetry[19]. An even more sophisticated approach would further affirm that, if Romanian metamodern poetry (from now on abbreviated as RoMePo) does, indeed, represent the emerging poetic trend in recent lyrical production, it is because it includes a series of writerx who, irrespective of how they tend to relate to their predecessors, are not just contemporaries but, more importantly, *consociates*[20]. This concept stems from the social phenomenology of Alfred Schutz

and brings together a cluster of cultural patterns in terms of personal identity, temporal order and behavioural style. Briefly put, consociates are, in Clifford Geertz's words, 'individuals who actually meet, persons who encounter one another somewhere in the course of daily life. They thus share, however briefly or superficially, not only a community of time but also of space'[21]. With entangled biographies and co-maturing processes, they have immediate, continuous, and face-to-face relationships brought together by some collective and enduring purpose. I borrow the term here to show that metamodernism merely serves as a speculative instrument, delimiting and socially restructuring the field of contemporary lyric poetry in a useful way. Metamodernism is not an abstract entity with precise or essential features, but an expository theoretical convenience/convention which helps specify what *I believe* to be the most salient features of recent poetic texts.

Since the beginning of the previous decade, most historical frameworks have been thrown into considerable disarray by several poetic movements which coincided in refocusing their attention from autobiographical narratives to surveys of phenomenological intersubjectivity. The reception of this new type of poetry was radically indeterminate, since no coherent set of categories had been developed to analyse these lyrical texts. In short, with the use of a label like *post-2000 poetry*,[22] the language-games and the specific rules and conventions of post-millennial poetry haven't been differentially acknowledged. Poetic models might be classified according to their primary orientation and dominant metaphors. Tropes function like

useful analogies for understanding a specific epistemology, its theoretical premises and logical forms of argumentation.

Andrei Terian has aptly demonstrated, for instance, the utility of interpreting the history of Romanian literary criticism from the perspective of Thomas Kuhn's paradigm theory[23]. However, this framework turns out to be rather pernicious when applied to the realm of poetry since the perception of constant interference of modalities that Terian dully acknowledges remains inoperable when applied to contemporary lyricism since the recorded infestation and constant slippage is not an outside form of contagion but rather, on the basis of Vermeulen, Gibbons and van den Akker's oscillatory conceptualization[24], the inherent rational of current metamodern lyricism. What we need, then, is a new model to account for the incorporation of lyrical innovations. Instead of thinking about breaks or paradigmatic revolutions in the context of post-communist Romanian poetry, we should alternatively focus on spiralling loops or zigzags[25], paying close attention to the ways in which the interactions within recent poetic transformations have been thoroughly negotiated.

This paper consequently builds on world-systems analysis yet organizes its discursive lines of inquiry around an alternative epistemological approach borrowed from the sociology of science. The first and most obvious advantage of doing so is that a new conceptual framework helps avoid neo-pragmatist positions which typically insist, with the likes of Richard Rorty[26], that a constant redescription of vocabularies and an inevitable recontextualization necessarily represent a sort of Benthamite end-goal for all critical investigations.

Seemingly unaware of how it manipulatively sidesteps scientific norms, Rorty's postmodern impartiality bias unembarrassedly translates into his own, unforgiving utilitarian blind spot. This seems to apply to Terian's critical practice as well, since his discussion of various theories, methods and strategies used during the history of Romanian literary criticism represents a similar comparative approach to the specifically neo-pragmatist analysis he previously performed in his monography dedicate to G. Călinescu[27].

Here are two reasons why I believe a paradigmatic and neo-pragmatist solution is not entirely adequate. One, contextual and historical factors condition literary truths, theoretical forms of knowledge, and lyrical innovations, and not the other way around. Two, new models require a specific set of coordinates to gain scientific or at least theoretical status. For this to happen the constraints of an old 'thought-style' must be removed since it seems almost impossible to simply and immediately grasp something new. The 'collective mood' must change, and a new thought-style must emerge for an explanatory label to acquire epistemological validity. It is as if the process of defamiliarization must act in reverse. Before a new concept stabilizes itself, a specific mode of thinking is necessary. An important idea, for instance, will not be picked up by the autochthonous literary community if the social mood does not change first. The knowledge function of any and every concept is, therefore, the effect of the relationship between individual researchers, their object of study, and the community of thinking (other scholars in the field, both national and international). Some might have already recognized these

hypotheses as belonging to none other than Ludwig Fleck[28].

Now, as opposed to Thomas Kuhn, Fleck believes that the very act of opposing a thought-style is unthinkable. We see the literary world through the dominant thought-style and any form of incoherence within this thought style is typically ignored or deemed unimportant. The literary problems the academic community chooses to solve are already laid out before them. Fleck's historical sociology represents a keyway out of this epistemological deadlock. It allows us to keep the debate rolling since we can discuss the transient nature of poetic change without dwelling on the controversial concept of paradigmatic revolutions. I tend to agree, then, with Alexandra Dumitrescu who argues that metamodern literary practices or ideas (Fleck would call them 'proto-ideas') are not restricted to any poetic generation in particular[29]. Nevertheless, even if metamodern logistics of affect are, indeed, transgenerational they do percolate rather insidiously within the ranks of what I call *postmillennial consociates* and the diversity of their lyrical discourses, speaking to what Sara Ahmed pertinently recognized as the 'cultural politics of emotion'[30].

Keeping Fleck's sociology in mind, it could be further noted that the appearance of the so-called 'posthumanist dispersal' in Mihai Iovănel's 2021 literary history[31] is explainable through his rather artificial and unquestioned incorporation of such 'recent' theoretical transformations. What his adoption engendered, nevertheless, due to his prominent position in the field was, inversely, the quasi-officialization of the term in the Romanian vocabulary of contemporary literary criticism and history.

Before Iovănel's sanctification, the term had had a somewhat bad rap in the literary community and was sparingly used and always accompanied by a certain self-ironic scorn, especially when it reared its ugly head in book reviews (as opposed to philosophical discussions). On the other hand, since 2022 a similar yet inverse gesture has made itself transparent in the work of younger authors who are slowly but surely incorporating such theoretical innovations as metamodernism or posthumanism and finally breaking scientific ground[32]. An identical span of time has passed between my first use of the term 'posthumanism' to describe recent Romanian poetry and Iovănel's inclusion of the concept in his literary history[33] and my first use of the term 'metamodernism' to analyse contemporary poetry and the younger generation's adoption of the same label in current debates[34]. Single tradable elements (or proto-ideas, to revert once more to Fleck's terminology), posthumanism and metamodernism represent conceptual propositions that showcase possible scenarios for how the systematic sociology of conceptual incorporations works. Beyond the accurate description of recent poetry, there are two additional reasons for why these transformations in the discourse of recent literary history and criticism might additionally prove beneficial: 1) they might become symptomatic of the limits previous critical approaches have imposed and 2) because they already symbolize and chart the expanding disciplinary horizons and ongoing professionalization of young academic scholarship today.

However, one would be indeed hard pressed to find other academic papers on the topic of postmillennial Romanian poetry that would convey, especially in their opening paragraphs, such a dense conceptual mishmash as one surprisingly discovers in Teona Farmatu's recent article[35]. It is unfortunate, first, because the confusing theoretical mixture rendered here lies in her non-Bloomian misreading and misinterpretation of other scholars' work. In said history of contemporary Romanian literature, Mihai Iovănel never indicates that posthumanism represents an epistemological turn but, in his own words, a direction, a style, a wave, or a new form of poetics. On the one hand, Iovănel does instrumentalize posthumanism as a periodization scheme, while, on the other, as an aesthetic and ideological concept. More than anything else, then, Farmatu reluctantly divulges her own bias towards posthumanism, which she portrays as an antagonistic and hegemonic figure of thought, the eponymous underdog being none other than the rising and radicalizing queer/feminist bent of contemporary Romanian poetry.

While it is difficult to understand how or why posthumanism might stipulate anything (*i.e.* demand or specify a requirement), Farmatu goes on to affirm that it does so through marking a subject-matter error. The explanation, Farmatu maintains, is that posthumanism has been perceived as encompassing various other directions. If posthumanism is a philosophical perspective that could, at least theoretically, be made applicable to any subject-matter, then the way in which something is or has been received in a semiperipheral space is in no way, shape, or form identical to its subject-matter. Feminist theory and queer studies are, indeed, both research perspectives yet they do not logically or necessarily amount to being the subject-matter of posthumanism or vice-versa. Diana

Huțanu's recent article, on the other hand, focusing on queer/feminist poetry, has successfully broached post-socialist poetics through the lens of *geofeminism* and, thus, acknowledged the multiple and even transnational layers and processes of marginalization[36], not unlike Alisa Tite's similar take on gender difference in contemporary Romanian feminist poetry. While Tite recognizes thematic and textual patterns, her argument is similarly directed towards the need to emphasize a more fluid type of identity and to highlight the peripheral position of both feminism and women writers in the Romanian literary field. The critique of this radical inequality, she suggests, might gain from a poststructuralist and neo-materialist (or even posthuman) interpretation[37].

My argument, therefore, is that we could be doing a lot worse than affirming that, alongside its more watered-down stylistic exhibitions, RoMePo does, indeed, encompass a multiplicity of derivative strands: feminist, ecological, queer, and posthuman forms of lyrical deployment[38]. What all these types of poetic discourse have in common, though, are the principle of 1) *parrhêsia*, which could be translated as the necessary freedom of speech in all frankness and in all situations, inevitably hinged to a second principle of 2) *aletheia,* or the opening of a possibility for the truthful appearance of things in the world. Of course, not all poems will portray both principles, since they are arranged, distributed, or even trickled down within the confines of a differential identity politics. This topic has constituted and continues to constitute one of the major springs of ideological debates, testifying to the constructivist dimension of contemporary thought

and practice. Identity has similarly been the subject of numerous militant or activist forms of instrumentalization, particularly in the context of feminist, gay/lesbian/queer struggles, and the demands of ethnic or class minorities, informed by postcolonial theories and decolonial actions.

Whether one analyses a writer's identity, or any other parameter such as gender or ethnic origin, subjectivity is the result of some form of symbolic interaction[39]. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that queer, ecological, feminist, and posthuman poetic trends readily define identity as the nexus of ideological stakes of socio-political struggles. Identity exists only insofar as it is performed and effectively recognized through the mechanism of interpellation. The subtleness of a lyric's political codes and its underlying types of syntax readily determine the ideology of contemporary Romanian poetry in its specific historicity. RoMePo is a concrete, material, and situated form of ideological representation and as such mythologizes current conflicts and other economic and cultural realities by sublimating its conjunctural contradictions[40] (I think it unnecessary to expand on the neo-Marxist scaffolding my argument takes here, as it especially borrows and blends various arguments from the likes of Macherey, Eagleton, and Jameson). Put briefly, what I am trying to convey, first, is that RoMePo contains both overtly activist poems and ideologically evasive ones and, second, that irrespective of how they carry themselves both remain politically charged yet in uniquely diverging ways.

If poetry is, indeed, the locus of such symbolic violence, the social recognition of new types of subjectivity is, therefore, paramount: what feminist, queer, ecological,

and posthuman poetics are doing today, with their employment of non-essentialized and performative dimensions, is, in fact, questioning the legitimacy of previous heteronormative lyric representations[41]. What I think is also particular to RoMePo and, actually, one of the reasons why I describe it as metamodern is because of its focus on postmodern struggles pertaining to queer, feminist, ecological, or posthuman identities – which justify the need to overpower and critique the limits of existing configurations - and its simultaneous emphasis on a modernist renewal of a 21st century subjectivity as a dynamic, performative, free, and flexible interaction between human and non-human agents alike.

The realization that identity is partly given but also party gained, and the even more important appreciation that lyric poetry can participate and shake things up in this ongoing cultural and political dialogue is not something that postmillennial poetry was first to grasp. Responding to neoliberal crisis and environmental catastrophes, it did, however, caught on new overtones that weren't previously perceptible, especially since global and digital infrastructures nowadays afford instant and perpetual cognitive and emotional communication. Katherine Hayles herself wrote that 'embodiment makes clear that thought is a much broader cognitive function depending for its specificities on the embodied form enacting it'[42]. This realization simply erases the liberal humanist subject and gives birth to *the posthuman actor-network*. One formal innovation of RoMePo is, thus, its instantiation of *the corporeal lyric of the anonymous*. Such poetry registers various kinds of experience

–lives and identities not previously made visible or at best marginally lyricized in the autochthonous history of the genre. They account for what it's like to live *in* or *as* a specific body politic: female, queer, gay, trans, bisexual, or lesbian. This translates as the act of writing politically oriented poetry about *odd bodies* and counteractively moving away from what Julia Kristeva called abjection[43] to alternatively rejoice in the Barthesian *pleasure of the text* and the equally important *pleasures of the body*[44]. A significant literary development, then, RoMePo is, indeed, a threshold type of lyric poetry in which some previously silent or silenced groups have now been given serios and central voice.

The rise of new feminist, ecological, queer and posthuman, or generally anti-systemic poetic strands is obviously linked to the practices of previously marginalized, silenced, or oppressed groups which are now democratically and understandably claiming their cultural and political rights (all of these are discrete concretizations of the principle of *parrhêsia*). Heather Milne also contends that 'much innovative and avant-garde poetry is deeply engaged with the pressing social, economic, and geopolitical issues of our time and that its potential as a site of political engagement and protest warrants examination'[45]. This type of lyric speech is especially significant since these authorx and their literary productions have been generally considered irrelevant by mainstream culture and various institutional gatekeepers. Their work has now garnered a rhetorical dimension, showing that the subaltern can, indeed, perlocutionary speak for itself. RoMePo performs, in a somewhat political guise, a social and relational

type of epideictic work. It equally demands a commensurate type of reading which are not the suspicious, allegorical, or hermeneutic modes of doing things with texts which we are accustomed to, but, similar to Rita Felski and others' reconceptualization of theory, a somewhat post-critical and affective call to action[46], allowing these *fragments du discours amoureux*[47] to engage with us, irrespective of how that might happen, whether at a personal or collective level, just as the texts themselves appear to be intimately and creatively entangled to or with their authorx. Affectively and historically charged, the materiality of poetic language and the transcription of authorial physical bodies speak to metamodernism's social rather than individualistic aspects.

Without keeping myself hostage to an adamant opinion of exactly how this new ideology will look and feel like in a couple of years, I would nevertheless confess that RoMePo appears to be both retrospective and prospective, because it displays militant, recuperative, and healing functions, while simultaneously constructing emancipatory, visionary and forward looking perspectives which involve the proactive creation of new relational identities, communities, and forms of collective co-existence. This amounts to what I call a *poetics of provision*, in the sense that, while RoMe-Po does provide specific cultural services or affective requirements which befit, to use Jameson's phrase, the ontology of the present[48], it might also attend and sustain a certain political foresight, or a lyrical type of social foreseeing.

Ensconced within a perceptual or contemplative model where one is supposed to confront a poem or, the other way round, to be confronted by a poem, RoMePo is a pragmatic type of poetry built on a means-end relationship, the manner of poetic delivery pertaining mainly to its real-life effects and consequences. The end goal, then, of these strands of RoMePo are intended to teach or, better yet, to instruct and move at the same time, shifting the emphasis from depicting the nature of Romanian social realities (the mimetic and neo-expressivist models of the 2000s) to the navigation of the constructiveness of gender and class, on the one hand, and on neo-organic exploration of novel forms of life, compossible elements and ecological relations[49], on the other (here, the principle of *aletheia* is quite obvious). Alexandra Dumitrescu also contends that this networked metamodern structure of feeling is loosely characterized by interconnected affective relationships: 'from humans to complex systems such as the ecological and the microscopic'[50].

RoMePo represents certain social and professional spheres, while critiquing institutions and the dynamics of social and geopolitical mobility within today's neoliberal ideological conditions. RoMePo includes newcomers and as such marginalized representatives of a lyric minority working or fighting against an established culture of veterans. Poetry is, was and always will be political since it irrevocably involves the distribution and appropriation of a historically construed public literary space[51]. As the pillars of Romanian culture were, indeed, built on patriarchal principles, it is easy to see why feminist, queer, ecological, and posthuman lyric productions currently attempt to build a counter-canon directed against phallocentric, masculinist, sexist, heteronormative, capitalist, and humanist aesthetics and traditions[52]. The historical and lyrical change I am describing is a

systemic and dynamic relationship between core authors and peripheral insurgentx. A set of innovative poetic possibilities might become (and have, indeed, partially done so already) the readily available moves of a certain poetic repertoire, reconfiguring the apparatus of today's literary understanding. Although it implies a transversal existence of a libidinal type of queerness directed against gender-based forms of oppression, the plangent authorial anxiety of RoMe-Po isn't or shouldn't remain confined to psychoanalytic readings, since it opens itself up to a concrete materialization, or to the Barthesian *punctum*[53] of a situated and marginalized subjectivity.

Post-socialist and neoliberal at the same instant, RoMePo boasts a myriad of radical poetic forms and subcultural heterogeneity, including modes of public activism. RoMePo is exploring fragmented subjectivities, while trying to also make sense of the increasing digitized globalization of common experience through realistically yet intimately representing the incongruous languages, mixed registers, post-ironic affects, figurative bugs, polyphonic or multivocal subjectivity, flickering indeterminacy, material fragmentation and the penury of needs that surround us today. Combining affective authenticity with sincere or naive practices of documentation (a post-ironic use of conceptual or found poetry, for instance), RoMePo includes and ideologically surpasses both modernist and postmodernist aesthetics[54], performing an ecological and somatic type of expressiveness by thinking in a non-dialectical and post-anthropocentric way about our acting role in the computational sublime while also questioning the exceptionality of the human subject. Sloterdijk's

anthropotechnics[55] must be theoretically and historically replaced, I believe, with something I like to call *the ecotechnics of subjectivity*.

This novel form of relational subjectivity and its attendant lyrical registration distills new types of embodied policies which follow at least two coordinates: automatic assemblage and productive potentiality. Here is just one example of how this works. Although I rely on Kenneth Burke's 'A Rhetoric of Motives'[56], where he describes a form of anticipation and potential rebuttal, I believe that, by adding the prefix 'self-' to this rhetorical strategy, I am able to update the concept in order to accurately describe a specifically metamodern poetic device wherein the lyric speaker prefigures the implied listener's future possible reactions, thus adjusting the tonality of voice in order to address viable critiques before they even arise, often to humorous or otherwise endearing effects. *Proleptic self-irony* is, therefore, also similar to Mark Currie's description[57] of a fictional mechanism at work in narrative temporality, wherein an instance of communication imagines a future moment that allows one to actually register the present as already being a past moment (mimicking the logic of social media posts and stories) that you can look back on and reflect, in order to determine the level of embarrassment or the 'ugly feelings'[58] in a yet-to-come-retrospective recounting of the event, especially to a future self or to the reading community per se. Kennedy and Shapiro similarly argue that contemporary self-fashioning narratives equate 'freedom with consumer choice and lifestyle, but also reflect the severe and growing inequalities[59]. Here's just one representative example. In an untitled

poem, Tudor Pop writes: 'Prin al meu over/ Sharing se pierde/ Intimitate// Credibilitatea : (// Pot doar a mă promova/ Precum un concept// De ce scriu// Așa// Pentru cine postez/ Acest încântător selfie?'.

Before moving forward, though, I need to briefly consider an alternate take on recent Romanian poetry[60]. Although I think Andrei Doboș is wrong to pursue his demonstration from the standpoint of what he calls 'denarrativization', he nevertheless makes some interesting points about recent Romanian poetry. However, I would first counter by stressing that autobiographical poetry is still very much existent and central within RoMePo and, contrary to what Doboș believes, it maintains its capacity to relate an ethos-driven narrative of justification for and by the young poetic community. And while there are valid arguments to start sociological discussions around the belated postmodern condition or transformation of the Romanian semiperipheral space[61] and its incipient postmaterialist values, there is no clear connection or structural homology between such historical possibilities and recent poetry with its digital-therapeutic culture or tendency towards obscure artistic sources or comedic influences, as Doboș puts it. For one thing, even before the advent of the internet, every literary generation has had its own equally obstruse or arcane genealogies. Secondly, while Doboș appears to be utterly unimpressed by what he calls the super-diversification of themes, registers, and emotions of contemporary Romanian poetry, he nonetheless revels in hipsters' ideological pluralism. Seemingly unaware of N. Luhman's indictment against the epistemological laziness of pluralism, Doboș fails to acknowledge that

even abstract or formal elements, such as subject matter, diction, and affect, mediate or rather express various ideologies.

I am on board with the idea of amalgamation and/or assemblage to describe the avant-garde or procedural mechanics of contemporary poetry. Not a huge fan, though, of what he calls "gentrified lyricism". First off, the recovery of older poetic genres (such as the elegy, the sonnet, or even the mock-heroic epic poem) was already something specific to postmodernism and, secondly, the reaching back to more remote elements of Romanticism and/or modernism represents nothing short of how metamodernism is currently defined by its Dutch theoreticians. Moreover, it also worth remembering, as Jonathan Culler suggests in his *Theory of the Lyric* (2015), that, while pretending to describe and work through an intimate sentimental conundrum, the complex formal acrobatics of various fixed forms, such as the sonnet, simultaneously endows these poetic genres with a certain collective magnitude whence, in truth, the poet using or abusing the form can showcase his or her skills or intelligence and lyrically assert dominance as such over other players in the field[62].

Furthermore, Doboș himself combines poetic traits he cleverly extracts, via Ciprian State[63], through a reflection of various social groups to explain the ingredients of a movement the exploration of which he inexplicably abandons to jump back in the saddle of enumerating the causes of denarrativization. Once again, though, I do have to concur here with his diagnostic[64]. It is hard to keep track of the many inconsistencies pulling apart his next paragraph though. I will, therefore, highlight just

a hefty few. The inner fragmentalism of what he calls HHH, and that he so eagerly strived to verbally string into existence, is suddenly reified as a unity through self-reflexivity. It is not clear, however, why this new state would necessarily reflect what he believes to be a form of maturity or why the causes he identifies would be connected to said maturity. The problematization of the literary medium, the consolidation of experimental techniques, and the ethical dimension of poetic discourses – this list looks, indeed, a lot like a description of High Modernism, but not much else.

Two things that Doboș somehow loses sight of: one, there is no speech free of ethics, and two, if it ever had one, the notion of taste has long ago lost is prerogative as a taxonomical criterion. However radicalized, indeed, one needs to emphasize that, contrary to what Doboș believes, queer, feminist, or vegan strands of recent poetry are most certainly not based on postmaterialist values[65]. Finally, then, I would also point out that his argumentative sketch on the apparition of the algorithmic subject further disqualifies his HHH-hypothesis since it demonstrates that Doboș remains ultimately unaware of Katherine N. Hayles' famous work on the same topic and unacquainted, most importantly, with the crucial points she so convincingly developed way back in the late nineties to both explain and critique the disembodiment of cybernetic subjectivity.

Moving on, then, by simultaneously turning to M.H. Abrams' famous demonstration regarding historical Romanticism[66] and flipping the argument inside out, while also playing on Vermeulen and van den Akker proposition that 'that the metamodern is most clearly, yet not exclusively, expressed by the neoromantic turn of late'[67], I would venture into arguing that, through both the recovery of postmodern ritualistic conventions and the modernist reconversions of rebellion, RoMePo could be ultimately fashioned as a refurbished spiralling search for new roots, a 'cruel optimism'[68] amounting to an almost metaphysical antimetabole of *supernatural naturalism*[69], or, alternatively, by extending Matei Călinescu's equally famous demonstration, a '6th face of modernity'[70]. These are just a couple of tactical suggestions that indicate, according to Ludwig Fleck's historical and epistemological sociology, that RoMePo continues to incorporate former innovations and conceive itself not only in relation to the modern age, but also to the Romantic tradition, although obviously in reaction or even against it, attempting to phenomenologically destabilize its controlled and therefore patriarchal expressiveness. Neo-Romantic mysticism, posthuman or ecological coexistence, and the partial and locally embedded rehabilitation of grand narratives within the situated/feminist/queer self are just some of the elements that underpin RoMePo's entire set of relations that the lyric subject ethically establishes with its environment.

It therefore mediates or partially produces what Jacques Rancière calls a new 'partage du sensible', or a new ideological organization of the sphere of experience[71]. RoMePo reimagines the current collective disposition of our semiopsphere by retracing the sensual and sensuous forms and contours of our common world, while also prefiguring, in a Foucauldian manner, the type of subjects we might become and the type of objects or geographies that we may share and inhabit. In a way, Rancière's concept

might actually be put to better use if we allow certain improbable similarities to shine through: if we understand capitalism as a worlding ecology[72], one that develops through successive regimes that organize human and non-human entities, RoMePo, as a *semiperipheral commodity*[73], consequently appears to be exploring and transforming the socioecological conditions of the world-system upon which its production depends. This poetic regime could turn out to be a valuable solution, I believe, to not only slow down the apparently endless proliferation of incommunicable echo chambers of today but to also envision alternative communities. I will further explore this aspect of metamodernism by rehashing a few arguments I've worked through, and which are showcased in a chapter on the relationship between cosmopolitanism and posthumanism in the context of postmillennial Romanian poetry.[74]

I would first make use of Antonio Gramsci's "conjuncture theory", which maintains that a specific cultural moment could be explained by examining the eclectic elements that register the current particularities of the capitalist world-system[75]. In this sense, we must resist the temptation of periodization, maintaining, for instance, that the onset of metamodernism should automatically be assumed just because there is an ongoing crisis of postmodernism[76]. We should, instead, be thinking about more advanced or nuanced forms of periodicity. The first move, then, is to explain the transformations of recent poetry by moving away from the binary perspective of liberal centrism and developmentalism. Going slightly back in time, we can say that, with the onset of democracy and capitalism after the Romanian Revolution, not only the

political and economic systems entered a phase of transitional crisis, but the literary one as well[77]. This inevitable transfer of power also gave birth to new forms of poetic ideology. In this context, the 1990s were inevitably *conservative* (retreating into what Mihai Iovănel rightly calls a metaphysics of irony, à la Cristian Popescu, or an autobiographical one, as seen in Ioan Es. Pop's texts[78]) or *reactionary* (anti-communist positions, for example, or the recovery of interwar writers and intellectuals) and *liberal* (Mircea Cărtărescu's lingering postmodern generation or other right-wing authors). One other ideological response was the *radical/extremist* response of the so-called 2000s generation. Minimalist, realist, autobiographical, brutal, beatnik, or even "fractured" forms of poetry appeared at that point (Marius Ianuș, Elena Vlădăreanu, Dan Sociu, and Ruxandra Novac).

Nonetheless, with the internet's emergence, a shift occurred in the social morphology of local communities, and poetry itself underwent certain ontological mutations. Just as Romania has benefited from multiple EU funding schemes in the first decade of the new millennium[79], the poetry collections published immediately after the waning of the 2000s generation also interestingly started to show early signs of an unprecedent transformation, emerging with debutantes, such as val chimic (2010), Gabi Eftimie (2006), Vlad Moldovan (2008), Cosmina Moroșan (2006) and Andrei Doboș (2007), thus marking the shift from the objective transcription of lived life to the phenomenological registration of post-anthropocentric traces and the multiplicity of (co)existence. To paraphrase none other than Shelley, it seems that Romanian metamodern poets are the

unacknowledged semiperipheral registrars of the combined and uneven world-system. Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro have argued that, since 2010, our present moment represents 'the last phase of a long cycle and the start of either a third neoliberal phase or of something else entirely'[80].

Donna Haraway also famously argued that all three ideologies outlined above became more or less irrelevant in the face of global digital technologies[81]. If millennial poetry was a form of confessional and autobiographical writing, it seems that post-millennial metamodern poetry amounts to *a lyrical variety of conversion writing*. To be sure, an ideological and political conversion but, nonetheless, a sudden transformation, from post-communist ideologies to a much broader spectrum of posthumanist, ecological, and queer theories or practices. Conceptualizing post-communist Romanian poetry as a tripartite engagement with *conservatism*, *liberalism*, and *extremism* will help us better understand its historical position, both locally and globally, within the capitalist world-system. Instead of looking at formal or thematic elements (as all commentators seem satisfied with), a more adequate approach would analyse the relationships between these socio-political transformations and their literary registration[82]. As we have seen, RoMePo is the only strand capable of expressing the current experiential lifeworld and conditions of the post-communist Romanian system, since the previous ideological positions have – to quote Bruno Latour –run out of steam[83]. This is why I agree with Heather Milne when she writes that 'I seek to avoid, as much as possible, a lag between production and critical reception, and I look instead at how poetry and theory, placed in dialogue, ask crucial

ethical and political questions that help us make sense of current geopolitics, economics, and environmental destruction and their effects on gendered, raced, and sexualized subjects'[84].

RoMePo is a *cultural sub-commodity* traveling in a combined and uneven world-system as it displaces and reassembles the heteroglossic pressures and the impact of late global forces in its semiperipheric geocultural habitat. As I have tried to show, it aims to deconstruct the channels and principles of liberal deployment, whether these be speciesism, ableism, or any other mechanism of systemic oppression and marginalization. The Romanian *zemiperiphery*, like all such areas[85], behaves like a mixer of central and marginal practices of cultural production, blending the local past with core actualities to envision unrealized or anticipated future projects and inventing formal solutions to the ongoing crisis of the capitalist world-system in its *poetics of provision*. It is reasonable to posit, as Sharae Deckard and Stephen Shapiro have argued, "that the semiperipheries are the zones where political economy receives its greatest cultural inflection, where socioeconomic and socio-ecological contradictions are amplified and mediated through new cultural innovations"[86]. Adding its own needs or anxieties in the process, the Romanian semiperiphery acts like a testing ground for inter-core (or even inter-imperial[87]) tensions and conflicts, as they are clearly mapped out in the unspoken tensions between metamodernism and posthumanism (or any other aesthetic ideology that may be construed as utterly post-postmodern[88]). As Thomas Foster has suggested about posthumanism in general[89], most strands of RoMePo similarly involve a critique of liberalism.

Our metamodern moment is best understood, therefore, as the simultaneous rearrangement of several cultural and economic circuits since it loosely coincides not only with the waning of the three ideological and material positions discussed above but also with the disintegration of three cycles of capitalist development and reconfiguration involving not only the State as such, but the apparatus of subjectivity as well. First, as Stephen Shapiro argues, 'neoliberalism begins to emerge eventually as a dominant form of liberalism, with the ascent of a second K-wave in the early 1970s'[90]. Shapiro adds that, after 1989, the last residues of Keynesian liberalism (the first Kondratieff or K-wave, which consists of approximately 40 or 50 years) are cleared away and, moreover, that "from the mid-1990s onwards, the corrosion of the middle-class proceeds until the economic crash of 2008-11 that concludes the second K-wave of neoliberalism's existence"[91]. This means, ultimately, that the period after 2011 is finally the one where neoliberalism rises to its fullest.

In this context, we can also assert neoliberalism merges well with cybernetic or AI models, as well as digital forms of production and distribution[92]. Shapiro further shows that the end of a K-wave typically coincides with the coagulation of a new Kress cycle (consisting of approximately 120 years) wherein the separation of ownership from management no longer seems attainable today: Facebook, Google, Amazon, and Tesla are perfect economic and corporate examples here. A third model of periodicity, which incorporates both Kress cycles and K-waves, is the hegemonic cycle or the so-called secular trend (Braudel's long duration—approximately 200 years) that started with the French Revolution

and might also be coming to an end today, as Deckard and Shapiro suggest. All these cycles and tendencies point to a crisis in and of the capitalist system, and my argument is that, as a *regional sub-commodity chain*, contemporary Romanian poetry is not only a superstructural reflection of the material and economic realm but a determining factor and bridge of these new socio-political and economic realities. In the spirit of Woolf's famous announcement that 'in or around December 1910 human nature changed'[93], I would also declare that contemporary Romanian poetry, as most critics and poets concur[94], also changed in or around 2010[95]. The relationship between poetic form and capitalism and its reproduction or subversion is at stake. Therefore, the metamodern form of poetic posthumanism and associated practices of literary production are not, in fact, just simple ways of mirroring critical discourses or trendy philosophical regimes, as others have argued, but, instead, a way of propelling and imagining new forms of cultural and ecological revolutions: alternative ways of ideologically relating to nature, work, and other communities.

A cultural materialist perspective, in the tradition of Raymond Williams[96], also aids in explaining the coming into existence of a particular generational organization of social and economic relations by allowing us to understand this situation as the codification of a certain horizon of readers' expectations[97]: RoMePo brings together multiple, heterogeneous cultural concerns expressed not so much by a generation or cohort, as critics typically indicate, but rather by the systemic shape of our shared economic, political, and cultural experiences of *postmillennial consociates*. As previously stated,

RoMePo's radical importance lies in that it comprises a deconstructive critique of how capitalism appropriates and excludes segments of the world through relational processes and the inequalities deriving from binary, exclusionary logics. If neoliberal accumulation of profit breeds social and economic inequity, its sociocultural regulation of biopolitics fosters modifications of self-technologies and subject-governmentality. I understand the current neoliberal moment as the 'contemporary' and, therefore, as the metamodern present, which is why I suggest that we should focus on *metamodernization* or the process of *metamodernizing* contemporary Romanian poetry.

First, the concept of *becoming-metamodern*, to use a Deleuzian turn of phrase, allows one to understand recent poetry as an ongoing process of reconfiguration, as opposed to a sudden paradigmatic break with the past – to move, therefore, beyond the kuhnian paradigm, as discussed above, to a fleckian theory of incorporation. Second, the concept of *metamodernization* will also make room for the possibility of multiple and contradictory features and practices coexisting within the generous corpus of contemporary Romanian poetry (whether superfluous or more ascendant trends), while also acknowledging that it registers and challenges the exploitation of not only people but also animals and the natural world. RoMePo follows a non-developmental progression, its emergence and establishment appearing as an ideological collision of both cultural and economic forces in the wake of neoliberal waves of expansion and contraction.

Conditioned by historical parameters, it is obviously difficult to analyse metamodern poetry while it is still unfolding. Rather than engage in utopian speculations, I have tried to describe the features of our current moment and the ways in which RoMePo both designs and questions our digital present. This metamodern type of semiperipheral aesthetic transpires and responds to the conjecturally enmeshed, yet uneven world engendered by neoliberal capitalism's ecological assemblages. The relationship between literary forms, neoliberal strategies of accumulation, and environmental transformations produces new conceptions of lyric subjectivity. Oppositional, materialist, queer, ecofeminist and posthuman, RoMePo may or has already facilitated a space of conceptualizing alternative forms of situated, embodied and networked agency through its politicized renderings of affectivity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, M. H., *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature,* New York, Norton, 1973.

Althusser, Louis, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)", in Louis Althusser, *Lenin and philosophy and other essays,* Translated by B. Brewster, London, New Left Books, 1970.

Athanasiou, Athena and Judith Butler, *Dispossession. The Performative in the Political,* London, Polity, 2013.

Ban, Cornel, *Dependență și dezvoltare. Economia politică a capitalismului românesc,* Translated by Ciprian Șiulea, Cluj-Napoca, Tact, 2014.

Braidotti, Rosi, *The Posthuman,* Cambridge, Polity, 2013.

Burke, Kenneth, *A Rhetoric of Motives,* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1950.

Călinescu, Matei, *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism,* Durham NC, Duke University Press, 1987.

Culler, Jonathan, *Theory of the Lyric,* Harvard, Harvard University Press, 2017.

Currie, Mark, *About Time. Narrative, Fiction, and The Philosophy of Time,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

de Man, Paul, 'Autobiography as De-Facement', in Paul de Man, *The Rhetoric of Romanticism,* New York, Columbia University Press, 1984.

Deckard, Sharae and Stephen Shapiro, "World-Culture and the Neoliberal World-System: An Introduction", in Sharae Deckard and Stephen Shapiro(eds.), *World Literature, Neoliberalism, and the Culture of Discontent*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Deckard, Sharae, "Capitalism's Long Spiral: Periodicity, Temporality, and the Global Contemporary in World Literature,", in Sarah Brouillette, Mathias Nilges, and Emilio Sauri (eds.), *Literature and the Global Contemporary*, London, Palgrave, 2017.

Doboș, Andrei, "Obiectul Kintsugi", in *Revista MATCA*, 2024.

Dumitrescu, Alexandra, *Towards a Metamodern Literature,* Otago, University of Otago, 2014.

Dumitrescu, Alexandra, "What is Metamodernism and Why Bother? Meditations on Metamodernism as a Period Term and as a Mode", in *Electronic Book Review,* 4 December, 2016.

Farmatu, Teona, "Radicalizarea postmilenialilor: direcția queer-feministă în poezia contemporană românească și ethosul său de diferențiere", in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 7, 2023, p. 26-35.

Fleck, Ludwik, *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, edited by Thaddeus J. Trenn and Robert K. Merton, Translated by Fred Bradley and Thaddeus J. Trenn, with a foreword by Thomas S. Kuhn, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Foster, Thomas, "Cybernetics and Posthumanism", in David R. Richter (ed).*A Companion to Literary Theory*, Hoboken, Wiley Blackwell, 2018.

Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper, New York, Pantheon Books, 1980.

Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Culture,* New York, Basic Books, 1973.

Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the prison notebooks,* New York, International Publishers, 1973.

Haraway, Donna, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century", in Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature,* Routledge, New York.

Hayles, N. Katherine, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics,* Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Huțanu, Diana, "Producing Space(s) Through Poetry: Geofeminism in Contemporary Romanian Poetry", in *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory,* no. 10.1, 2024.

Herbrechter, Stephan, Ivan Callus, Megen de Bruin-Mole´, Marija Grech, Christopher John Müller, and Manuela Rossini, "Critical Posthumanism: An Overview", in Stefan Herbrechter, Ivan Callus, Megen de Bruin-Mole´, Marija Grech, Christopher John Müller, and Manuela Rossin (eds.), *Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism*, London, Palgrave, 2022.

Iovănel, Mihai, *Ideologiile literaturii în postcomunismul românesc,* Bucharest, Editura MLR, 2017.

Iovănel, Mihai, *Istoria literaturii române contemporane. 1990-2020,* Jassy, Polirom, 2021.

Kennedy, Liam and Stephen Shapiro (eds.), *Neoliberalism and Contemporary American Literature,* Hanover, New Hampshire, Dartmouth College Press, 2019.

Kristeva, Julia, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, New York, Columbia University Press, 1982.

Lefebvre, Henry, *Critique of Everyday Life,* London and New York, Verso, 2014.

Lotman, Juri "On the Semiosphere", Translated by Wilma Clark, in *Sign Systems Studies*, no. 33.1, 2005, p. 205-225.

Matei, Alexandru, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian, "Introduction: Toward a Post Vocabulary - A Lab Report" in Alexandru Matei, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian (eds.), *Theory in the Post Era. A Vocabulary for the 21st-Century Commons,* New York, Bloomsbury, 2022.

Milne, Heather, *Poetry Matters. Neoliberalism, Affect, and the Posthuman in Twenty-First Century North-American Feminist Poetics,* Iowa, University of Iowa Press, 2018.

Moore, Jason W., *Capitalism in the Web of Life. Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital,* London, Verso, 2015.

Niblett, Michael, *World Literature and Ecology. The Aesthetics of Commodity Frontiers, 1890-1950,* Switzerland, Palgrave, 2020.

Rancière, Jacques, *Împărtășirea sensibilului: Estetică și politică*, Traducere și notă introductivă de Ciprian Mihali, Cluj-Napoca, Idea Design & Print, 2012.

Rowland, Antony, *Metamodernism and Contemporary British Poetry,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Shapiro, Stephen, "Conjunctures, Commodities, and Social State Marxism", in *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 24, no. 1 (2022).

Shapiro, Stephen, "The Cultural Fix: Capital, Genre, and the Times of American Studies", in J.-H. Coste, V. Dussol (eds.), *The Fictions of American Capitalism*, London, Palgrave, 2020.

Shapiro, Stephen, "The Weird's World-System: The Long Spiral and Literary-Cultural Studies", in *Paradoxa*, no. 28, 2016, p. 256-277.

Shapiro, Stephen, "What is World-Systems for Cultural Studies?", in Sharae Deckard, Michael Niblett, Stephen Shapiro, *Tracking Capital. World-Systems, World-Ecology, World-Culture,* SUNY Press, New York, 2024.

Sloterdijk, Peter, "The Anthropocene: A Process-State at the Edge of Geohistory?", in H. Davis and E. Turpin (eds.), *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies*, London, Open Humanities Press, 2015.

Stengers, Isabelle, "The Cosmopolitical Proposal", in Bruno Latour and P. Weibel (eds.), *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2005.

Terian, Andrei, *Teorii, metode și strategii de lectură în critica și istoriografia literară românească de la T. Maiorescu la E. Lovinescu o abordare comparatistă,* Bucharest, MNLR, 2013.

Terian, Andrei, *G. Călinescu. A cincea esență,* Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 2009.

Tite, Alisa, "Charting Gender Difference in Contemporary Romanian Feminist Poetry", in *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory,* no. 10.1, 2024.

van den Akker, Robin, Alison Gibbons, and Timotheus Vermeulen (eds.), *Metamodernism. Historicity, Affect, and Depth After Postmodernism,* Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.

van der Tuin, Iris, "Diffraction", in Rosi Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova (eds.), *Posthuman Glossary*, New York, Bloomsbury, 2018.

Vermeulen, Timotheus and Robin van den Akker, "Notes on Metamodernism", in *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture,* no. 2 (1), 2017.

Williams, Raymond, *Marxism and Literature,* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977.

Woolf, Virginia, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown", in Rachel Bowlby (ed.), *A Woman's Essays: Selected Essays*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1992.

Notes

1. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 1988, p. 271-313.
2. Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro (eds.), *Neoliberalism and Contemporary American Literature*, Hanover, New Hampshire, Dartmouth College Press, p. 12.
3. See, for instance, Mihnea Bâlici, *Cazzo,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022.

4. Cornel Ban, *Dependență și dezvoltare. Economia politică a capitalismului românesc,* Translated by Ciprian Șiulea, Cluj-Napoca, Tact, 2014.

5. See Mihai Iovănel's subchapter "Puncte de rezistență", in his recently published history of contemporary Romanian literature (fully referenced below), p. 272-347.

6. Stephan Herbrechter, Ivan Callus, Megen de Bruin-Mole, Marija Grech, Christopher John Müller, and Manuela Rossini, "Critical Posthumanism: An Overview", in Stefan Herbrechter, Ivan Callus, Megen de Bruin-Mole, Marija Grech, Christopher John Müller, and Manuela Rossin (eds.), *Palgrave Handbook of Critical Posthumanism*, London, Palgrave, 2022, p. 8: "new ways of knowing that focus on aspects of entanglement, co-implication, hybridity, and interdependence".

7. Juri Lotman, "On the Semiosphere", Translated by Wilma Clark in *Sign Systems Studies,* no. 33.1, 2005, p. 205-225.

8. See Iris van der Tuin, "Diffraction", in Rosi Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova (eds.), *Posthuman Glossary,* New York, Bloomsbury, 2018, p. 99-101.

9. Alexandru Matei, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian, "Introduction: Toward a Post Vocabulary – A Lab Report", Alexandru Matei, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian (eds.), *Theory in the Post Era. A Vocabulary for the 21st-Century Commons,* New York, Bloomsbury, 2022, p. 24.

10. Isabelle Stengers, "The Cosmopolitical Proposal", in Bruno Latour and P. Weibel (eds.), *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy,* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2005, p. 995.

11. Rosi Braidotti, *The Posthuman,* Cambridge, Polity, 2013, p. 183.

12. Bernard Lahire, *Omul plural. Către o sociologie psihologică,* Iași, Polirom, 2000; Bernard Lahire, *Franz Kafka: éléments pour une théorie de la création littéraire,* Paris, La Découverte, 2010; Bernard Lahire, *La Condition littéraire. La double vie des écrivains,* Paris, La Découverte, 2006; Bernard Lahire and Marlon Jones, "Literature is Not Just a Battlefield" in *New Literary History,* no. 46 (2015), p. 387-407.

13. Jonathan Culler, *Theory of the Lyric,* Harvard, Harvard University Press, 2017, p. 8.

14. Antony Rowland, *Metamodernism and Contemporary British Poetry,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2022, p. 1-24.

15. Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)", in Louis Althusser, *Lenin and philosophy and other essays,* translated by B. Brewster, London, New Left Books, 1970, p. 121-73.

16. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977,* Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper, New York, Pantheon Books, 1980, p. 194-228.

17. Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology,* translated by G.C. Spivak, Baltimore, MD, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976, p. 9.

18. Paul de Man, "Autobiography as De-Facement" in *The Rhetoric of Romanticism,* New York, Columbia University Press, 1984, p. 70-71.

19. Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature,* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 121-136.

20. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture,* New York, Basic Books, 1973, p. 364.

21. *Ibidem*, p. 365.

22. For a synthetical discussion, see Ovio Olaru, "Postdouămiismul. O Promoție", in *Revista Transilvania,* no. 7, 2017, p. 46-56.

23. Andrei Terian, *Teorii, metode și strategii de lectură în critica și istoriografia literară românească de la T. Maiorescu la E. Lovinescu o abordare comparatistă,* Bucharest, MNLR, 2013.

24. Robin van den Akker, Alison Gibbons, and Timotheus Vermeulen (eds.), *Metamodernism. Historicity, Affect, and Depth After Postmodernism,* Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.

25. See Stephen Shapiro, "The Weird's World-System: The Long Spiral and Literary-Cultural Studies", in *Paradoxa,* 2016, no. 28, p. 256-277 and Sharae Deckard, "Capitalism's Long Spiral: Periodicity, Temporality, and the Global Contemporary in World Literature", in Sarah Brouillette, Mathias Nilges, and Emilio Sauri (eds.), *Literature and the Global Contemporary*, London, Palgrave, 2017, p. 83-102.

26. See Richard Rorty, *Objectivity, Relativism and Truth,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991 and Richard Rorty, *Essays on Heidegger and Others: Philosophical Papers,* ii, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

27. Andrei Terian, *G. Călinescu. A cincea esență,* Bucharest, Cartea Românească, 2009, p. 31.

28. See Ludwik Fleck, *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact,* edited by Thaddeus J. Trenn and Robert K. Merton, Translated by Fred Bradley and Thaddeus J. Trenn, with a foreword by Thomas S. Kuhn, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

29. Alexandra Dumitrescu, *Towards A Metamodern Literature,* Otago, University of Otago, 2014.

30. See Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion,* Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2004.

31. Mihai Iovănel, *Istoria literaturii române contemporane. 1990-2020,* Iași, Polirom, 2021, p. 616-639.

32. Vișan Bogdan, "Is Posthumanism Metamodernism? Convergences and Divergences in Contemporary Romanian Poetry", in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 5-6 (2023); Andrada Strugaru, "Representations of Animals and the Dislocation of Anthropocentrism in Romanian Poetry of the 2000" in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 5-6 (2023); Emanuel Lupașcu, "Metamodernismul în teorie și practică: pentru o conceptualizare a modernității singulare în câmpul literar românesc", in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 5-6, 2023; Emanuel Lupașcu, "Postumanismul și poezia română contemporană", in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 6-7 (2022); Emanuel Lupașcu, "Asynchronous Instantaneity. The Posthuman Turn in the Romanian Literary System", in *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory* 9, no. 1 (2023).

33. Alex Ciorogar, "Postumanismul românesc", in *Revista Timpul,* 1st of November 2016.

34. Alex Ciorogar, "Metamodernism", in *Revista Tribuna*, 2016, Metamodernism – Tribuna Magazine (tribuna-magazine.com).

35. Teona Farmatu, "Radicalizarea postmilenialilor: direcția queer-feministă în poezia contemporană românească și ethosul său de diferențiere", in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 7 (2023), p. 26-35.

36. Diana Huțanu, "Producing Space(s) Through Poetry: Geofeminism in Contemporary Romanian Poetry", in *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory,* no. 10.1 (2024).

37. Alisa Tite, "Charting Gender Difference in Contemporary Romanian Feminist Poetry", in *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory* 10.1 (2024).

38. Here is (by no means an exhaustive) yet representative list: Sebastian Big, *Vată de sticlă,* Bistrița, Charmides, 2015; Cosmina Moroșan, *Beatitudine (eseu politic),* Bucharest, Nemira, 2017; Iuliana Lungu, *KOMMOS,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2018; Maia Șerbănescu, *Fuck Off, Mr. Charcot!,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2019; Tudor Pop, *softboi mimosa,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2019; Teona Galgoțiu, *Mă uit înapoi și dispare,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2020; Elena Boldor, *TRAXX,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2021; Cătălina Stanislav, *Nu mă întrerupe,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2021; Gabi Eftimie, *Sputnik în grădină,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2020; Emilian Cătălin Lungu, *Supine Dream,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022; Răzvan Andrei, *Raport către Walt Whitman. Poeme LGBT+,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022; Ioan Coroamă, *Colectiva,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022; Raluca Boantă, *La marginea bună a corpului,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022; Lucian Brad, *Un om mai important decât oamenii,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2020; Diana Cornea, *Setări avansate de lumină,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2022; Medeea Iancu (ed.), *Arta revendicării. Antologie de poezie feministă,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2020; Maria Martelli, Nóra Ugron, Corina Preda, Ceza Bularca (eds.), *Luminișuri. Antologie de literatură queer ecologică de Cenaclul X,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2022; Andrada Yonusoglu, *kısmet: oasele noastre se vor descompune atât de frumos,* Bucharest, CDPL, 2021; Ileana Negrea, *Jumătate din viața mea de acum,* Bucharest; frACTalia, 2021; Iuliana Lungu, *CantoHondo. Loba cîntă mai departe,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2021; Nóra Ugron, *Orlando Postuman,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2022; Alexandru Adam, *stilizări, ap.,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2022; Kali Ágnes, *Trofeu până ieri,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2023; Medeea Iancu, *Țesătoarea. Opera instrumentală,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2023; Mădălina Oprea, *Curriculum. Refrene ale recuperării și memoriei,* Bucharest, frACTalia, 2023.

39. See Howard S. Becker, *Art worlds,* Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2008.

40. Henry Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life,* London and New York, Verso, 2014, p. 43: "everyday life is defined by contradictions: illusion and truth, power and helplessness, the intersection of the sector man controls and the sector he does not control".

41. Stephen Shapiro, "What is World-Systems for Cultural Studies?", in Sharae Deckard, Michael Niblett, Stephen Shapiro, *Tracking Capital. World-Systems, World-Ecology, World-Culture,* SUNY Press, New York, 2024, p. 19: "to bring these aspects together, William's term *structure of feeling* might be replace with that of *experience-system* to likewise indicate the world-system's framework in shaping subjectivity within capitalism".

42. N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics,* Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, 1999, p. xiv.

43. Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, translated by Leon S. Roudiez, New York, Columbia University Press, 1982.

44. Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du Texte,* Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1973.

45. Heather Milne, *Poetry Matters. Neoliberalism, Affect, and the Posthuman in Twenty-First Century North-American Feminist Poetics,* Iowa, University of Iowa Press, 2018, p. 5.

46. Rita Felski, *The Limits of Critique,* Chicago, Chicago University Press, 2015.

47. Roland Barthes, *Fragments d'un discours amoureux,* Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1977.

48. Fredric Jameson, *A Singular Modernity: Essays on the Ontology of the Present,* London and New York, Verso, 2002.

49. Michael Niblett, *World Literature and Ecology. The Aesthetics of Commodity Frontiers, 1890–1950,* Cham, Palgrave, 2020, p. 7: "the term ecology should not be viewed as a synonym for the environment. Rather, it signifies the matrix of dialectical relationships and processes through which species (including humans) make environments and environments make species".

50. See Alexandra Dumitrescu, "What is Metamodernism and Why Bother? Meditations on Metamodernism as a Period Term and as a Mode", in *Electronic Book Review*, 4 December 2016.

51. See Terry Eagleton, *The Function of Criticism. From the Spectator to Poststructuralism,* London and New York, Verso, 1984.

52. Athena Athanasiou and Judith Butler, *Dispossession. The Performative in the Political,* London, Polity, 2013, p. 40-41: "neoliberalism has everything to do with questions of racism, sexism, homophobia, heteronormativity, ableism, and familialism [...] The capitalism of our times has everything to do with the biopolitics of social Darwinism – with all its implications of race, gender, sexuality, class, and ability – inherent in neoliberal governmentality".

53. Roland Barthes, *Camera lucida,* New York, Hill and Wang, 1981.

54. Alexandra Dumitrescu, *What is Metamodernism*, 'The core value of metamodernism is to welcome the syntheses that draw the best features from its predecessors'.

55. See Peter Sloterdijk, "The Anthropocene: A Process-State at the Edge of Geohistory?", in H. Davis and E. Turpin (eds.), *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters Among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments and Epistemologies,* London, Open Humanities Press, 2015, p. 337-339.

56. Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives,* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1950.

57. Mark Currie, *About Time. Narrative, Fiction, and The Philosophy of Time,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

58. Sianne Ngai, *Ugly Feelings,* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2005.

59. Lian Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro, *Neoliberalism*, p. 14.

60. Andrei Doboș, "Obiectul Kintsugi", in *Revista MATCA*, Obiectul Kintsugi – Matca Literară (matcaliterara.ro).

61. For Emanuel Lupașcu, metamodernism remains nothing more than a Eurocentric theoretical fiction since "there cannot yet be a postmodernity in Eastern Europe". Emanuel Lupașcu, "Metamodernismul în teorie și practică: pentru o conceptualizare a modernității singulare în câmpul literar românesc" in *Revista Transilvania*, no. 5-6, 2023, p. 28.

62. The clearest example of such a phenomenal feat is to be found obvious state in Florentin Popa, *Sutta,* Alba Iulia, OMG, 2024.

63. Ciprian State, "Hipster, sinecdocă. Erou ideal al clasei de mijloc sau țap ispășitor? (Partea I)", in *TELETEXT*, 4 mai 2021, Hipster, sinecdocă. Erou ideal al clasei de mijloc sau țap ispășitor? (Partea I) – TLTXT.

64. See Alex Ciorogar, "New Abstraction", in *Revista Vatra,* no. 7, 2017, p. 17-20.

65. Heather Milne clarifyingly writes: "Feminist and queer thinkers share an awareness of the ways in which language can challenge heteronormative and heteropatriarchal structures and are especially attuned to issues like biopolitics and bodily self-determination, the importance of collective oppositional forms of struggle, and the fact that the personal cannot be separated from the political. These concepts are central to feminism as well as to struggles for queer rights and trans rights", Heather Milne, *Poetry Matters*, p. 10.

66. M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature,* New York, Norton, 1973.

67. Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker, "Notes on Metamodernism," in *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture,* no. 2 (1), 2017.

68. Lauren Berlant, *Cruel Optimism,* Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2011.

69. See Alex Ciorogar, "Neo-Biedermeier", in *Revista Vatra*, no. 9-10, 2016, p. 22-25.

70. Matei Călinescu famously argued that aesthetic modernity should be understood as a conceptual crisis engulfed in a triple dialogical opposition with tradition, with the utilitarian, rational, progress-laden bourgeois civilization, and, finally, with itself, as far as it perceives itself as a new form of authority. See Matei Călinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism,* Durham NC, Duke University Press, 1987. Metamodernism, as the sixth face of modernity, accepts and no longer opposes the authority of tradition, just as it accepts that capitalism simply bends and does not break, while extending postmodernism's replacement of grand narratives with what I would call *local metanarratives*.

71. Jacques Rancière, *Împărtăşirea sensibilului: Estetică şi politică,* Translation by Ciprian Mihali, Cluj-Napoca, Idea Design & Print, 2012.

72. See Jason W. Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life. Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital,* London, Verso, 2015.

73. Shapiro, "What is World-Systems", in Sharae Deckard, Michael Niblett and Stephen Shapiro, *Tracking Capital*, p. 72: "Commodity chains track the waged and unwaged labor as they snake through the zemiperipheries".

74. See Alex Ciorogar, "The Ecological World-System of Posthuman Cosmopolitanism and Contemporary Romanian Poetry", in Alex Goldiş and Mihaela Ursa (eds.), *Romanian Literary Networks Outside National Framings: A Case Study for Peripheralized Cosmopolitanisms,* Berlin, Peter Lang, 2024..

75. See Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the prison notebooks,* New York, International Publishers, 1973.

76. Antony Rowland asserts that "modernism is paradoxically over, but not finished". Antony Rowland, *Metamodernism and Contemporary British Poetry,* p. 135. Moreover, Jeffrey T. Nealon's book *Post-Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism,* Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2012 points into the same direction.

77. The 1989 fall of the Soviet imperial system is simultaneously described, in a world-systems perspective, as an inflection period within the second phase of neoliberal rise (between the early 1970s and the financial crises of 2008-2011) and as formal end to the Cold War. See Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro, *Neoliberalism*, p. 3.

78. Mihai Iovănel, *Ideologiile literaturii în postcomunismul românesc,* Bucharest, Editura MLR, 2017, p. 149.

79. *Ibidem*, p. 207.

80. Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro, *Neoliberalism*, p. 12.

81. Donna Haraway, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century", in Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*, Routledge, New York, p. 149-183.

82. WReC, *Combined and Uneven Development Towards a New Theory of World-Literature,* Liverpool University Press, 2015, p. 9-14.

83. Bruno Latour, "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern", in *Critical Inquiry,* no. 30:2, 2004, p. 225-248.

84. Heather Milne, *Poetry Matters*, p. 13.

85. Stephen Shapiro, "What Is World-Systems ", in Deckard, Niblett, and Shapiro, *Tracking Capital*, p. 50: "Thus, the zemiperipheries link the core and periphery in a contorting and convulsing fashion [...] the zemiperipheral links necessarily bend or kink the commodity chain in ways that leave traces of its struggles".

86. Sharae Deckard and Stephen Shapiro, "World-Culture and the Neoliberal World-System: An Introduction", in Sharae Deckard and Stephen Shapiro (eds.), *World Literature, Neoliberalism, and the Culture of Discontent*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, p. 11.

87. Anca Parvulescu and Manuela Boatcă, *Creolizing the Modern: Transylvania across Empires,* New York, Cornell University Press, 2022.

88. Sianne Ngai, *Our Aesthetic Categories. Zany, Cute, Interesting,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2012.

89. Thomas Foster, "Cybernetics and Posthumanism", in David R. Richter (ed.), *A Companion to Literary Theory*, Hoboken, Wiley Blackwell, 2018, p. 451.

90. Stephen Shapiro, "Conjunctures, Commodities, and Social State Marxism", in *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 24, no. 1, 2022, p. 3.

91. Shapiro, "Conjunctures," p. 3.

92. Sharae Deckard and Stephen Shapiro, "World-Culture and the Neoliberal World-System: An Introduction," in Sharae Deckards, Stephen Sahpiro (eds.), *World Literature, Neoliberalism, and the Culture of Discontent*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, p. 2.

93. Virginia Woolf, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown", in Rachel Bowlby (ed.), *A Woman's Essays: Selected Essays,* Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1992, p. 70.

94. Radu Vancu: "Da, cred că tinerii poeți debutați după 2010 (adică după constituirea a ceea ce putem numi douămiismul poetic) sunt suficient de net diferiți de antecesorii lor pentru a putea fi considerați o nouă promoție", in Alex Ciorogar (coord.), "Noua poezie nouă. Dincolo de douămiism", in *Revista Cultura,* III series, no. 10 (566), 9 March 2017.

95. Liam Kennedy and Stephen Shapiro, *Neoliberalism*, p. 3: "We do believe that the 2010s stand as a linking moment between two greater cycles".

96. See Raymond Williams, *Keywords. A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana Press, London, 1983, and Raymond Williams, *The Raymond Williams Reader*, Edited by John Higgins, Blackwell Publishers, 2005.

97. Stephen Shapiro, "The Cultural Fix: Capital, Genre, and the Times of American Studies" in J.-H. Coste, V. Dussol (eds.), *The Fictions of American Capitalism,* London, Palgrave, 2020, p. 91.