

SUMMARY of the work

"Romanian prose during the relative liberalization. The novel towards literary "

The work „**Romanian prose during the relative liberalization. The novel by literary** "aims to study the evolution over Romanian novel in the context of liberalization of the Romanian society after 1964.

The paper is structured in three parts: **Preliminaries** - some judgments on literary, **Ideology of "liberalization"** and **Prose Writers**. Literary would be "a dynamic linguistic building", according to Yuri Tînianov in *What is Literature? Formal Russian School*. We interpret in this paradigm, the work of **Zaharia Stancu, Fănuș Neagu, Nicolae Breban, Al. Ivasiuc, M. Ciobanu**.

The change of Romanian Labor Party Policy (prepared discreet but officially announced through "Declaration of April" 1964) and change of priorities order have created a climate of creativity, if not completely new, even different. However, it was accelerated the literature removal of any ideology, process started shortly before by several writers.

Recovery trend of the time wasted during the great socialist-realist wandering is more visible in poetry, where every day there is a gaining of new lyrical territories where modernization makes impressive progress. Slowly, the regeneration of prose contributed however decisively to restore normality of artistic creation in general, to smooth the way to literature as literature.

The focus could move, slowly but surely, from ideological message to *literary* because the writers no longer faced the ruthlessness of the party critics.

Consequences of "April 1964 Statement" prove that not the wearing of patterns or changing generations (in the biological sense) made the literature

way after 1948, but political events to follow ideologically. 1948, 1964 and 1971 are key dates, the milestones of literary history. Regardless of their age or the direction they feel that is, writers meet the challenge of the political factor in a way that hold their literary destiny and groups them in a variety of creation "generations" marked ideological: ideological generations.

Theoretical controversy (which continues after so many years of the Revolution) concerning the existence and succession of generations or promotions seem meaningless under a terror regime that cause writers group other way than the purely aesthetic criteria of normal times. '60s writers and no less '70s writers contributed equally to '80s writers to maintain, after 1971, an honorable intellectual share during the process of liberalization and to Europeanization of Romanian literature. And it is not random "discovery" by the initiators of doubtful theories of 80's postmodernism of surprising postmodernist elements to the writers of other ages than Cărtărescu in 80's.

After 1960 and especially after 1964, the "group" who served to the ideological becoming of literature during the disaster of socialist realism will be stronger competed by a "generation" of normalization decided to remove literature from ideology and to assert its autonomy. The group who serve the Party policy continued to write a literature approved by the authorities, adapted to their wishes. It was now composed of some of the veterans of socialist realism and of the new promotions by "activists" on literature front line, hurry to have a job.

In its evolution, the literature politically "approved" has a certain degree of predictability, in all three stages, responding to party headquarters. Fascinating, with its incredible excesses, is only the literature practiced in the early years of the communist regime, when it was not competed by any other type of literature. At all said stages this literature is appropriate to speak of the mood and psychology of its author hungry for power, but also of respectability, concerned about and bright side, too.

What might surprise the youth of today interested in the phenomenon of “literature under communism” is that many writers who used propaganda up to the last moment of the system have not felt as an exceptional moment of Romanian literature destiny and as a Freedom, the decision of the Party to no longer compel the writers to submit schemes of socialist realism. Taught to use the narrative solutions, conflicts and top prescribed issues, they woke up, around 1964, in a certain climate of freedom that compels them to draw some new subjects for survival or to wait further orders and other recipes.

After 1966 there emerged birth conditions for a species of prose that only under totalitarian regimes can be found: *disclosure prose with justice accents*. It says that we are dealing with an awareness literature responding to *the verdict vocation* and being a reaction to the ideological mystification of the real, operated by socialist realism. The process of ideology removal of literature and the process of leaving the realism doctrine meant the gradual conquest of literature as literature, but also the gradual conquest of political and social truth.

Romanian intellectuals interpreted a typical communist gesture as a sign of lucky political circumstances. It seemed an incentive to release the past, the lies and fear and many writers believed in a radical change of the artistic climate, the more so as it was correlated with the release of national sentiment.

The progress of literature during that "happy" period was a reply. Good condition means “the least of the evil condition from the past”. In a way, there were writers on the border between normal and pathological, suffering, as Freud hysterical people, the "remnants" and encountering difficulties in adapting. Psychoanalyzing the artistic manifestations after 1964, we can interpret them as disguised expressions of satisfaction of repressed impulses. Pathogenic source was state of terror produced in existing plan by physical atrocities and in the plan of creation, by aberrations imposed to artistic consciousness during Stalinism.

In each of the great prose writers, who is reinforcing their career after 1964 and even those who publish their writings later (after 1971, when power changed their message and creative climate had become dull and loaded with a diffuse fear) is felt desire of revenge, of the '50s hated confrontation. Horror of mental trauma, artistic poverty, and obedience to power precipitated the configuration of particular stylistic tendencies.

Broadly speaking, the directions of development of prose, as a result of creation climate change after 1964, were extended after 1971, whereas cultural revolution could not slow down the change.

On the artistic forms and means, towards the end of this phase, began a rapid process of synchronization with the experiences of the new novel, known to us much later. And other narrative experiences begin to be assimilated as translations of increasingly many carried in the new conditions of liberalization. So that we can talk about an extension of narrative formulas and the narratological report, about the beginning of a modernization that will be continuously deepened.

The narrative has suffered in the stylistic level, dramatic changes, but a little later, the writers of citizenship and irritated by the abuse of the new regime sought solutions for occultation and relativization of the message. Note that in prose, unlike poetry, modernization was done at first call to Western models and not in the interwar Romanian ones, yet instructive. **At the themes level** and artistic universe rich, the prose at this stage can hardly be compared with that written shortly before. On her canvas, their social environments are rather unorthodox (intellectuals world, middle class city, trade and slums world), feelings, conflicts and human eternal psychological movements, that is free of ideological explanations, passions, spiritual accidents, crimes and love without partisan support, myth and fantasy dreams. Even more, even the errors of early communism appear.

Register of situations and effects enriches himself: the tragic, grotesque, comic, even absurd pierce authoritarian silence of state optimism. The characters begin to shift from prose to one another and no fewer authors betray their ambition to build an autonomous universe, a world of their own, recognizable. Fiction resumes its rights.

Thus, Zaharia Stancu can mean slipping from myth to profane, from the collective values to personal life events. *Barefoot* could be auto-fiction more than autobiography. Zaharia Stancu novelist says, describes, holds a speech or makes an actor to speak. "*Playing with death* - said Eugen Simion in *Romanian writers of today*- consecrated Zaharia Stancu as a genre for which he didn't prove in youth essential skills. The book is a book about war, not directly described, but through his echoes. The theme of the book would have discovered the world of a curious teenager in some difficult times.

Next book, *Forest crazy* (1963) means, after *Barefoot*, most substantial book. Epic area sends to Ruşii-de-Vede, and the time area sends soon after First World War.

Zaharia Stancu frequently resorts to dialogue in his novels, making many of the expressive resources. Dialogue is the essential process by which the reader perceives the narrative representation. The text of his novels by Zaharia Stancu, has the dialogue characters, that interrupt the epic flow of the discourse and constitute as a narrative separate plan.

How much I loved you send to substantiality of critical interrogations of life. Main subject of *How much I loved you* is death. Zaharia Stancu's metaphysical lyricism moves the universe.

Zaharia Stancu wrote a confession about life, oblivion, luck, destiny, death, where we come from and where we go.

Romanian literature by Fănuş Neagu and his *Angel cried*, develops a complex key thematic expression, a significant and substantial production. It is

actually a tragic cosmology, the clothes of mythos. Fănuș Neagu creates destinies, such as C. Andrei. Ion Mohreanu is present in all moments of evocation, *his role being* - Eugen Simion said in the *Romanian writers of today* - especially to portray others. Fănuș Neagu seeks aurorality, sublimates angelic the world.

Nicolae Breban means, obviously, in Romanian literature, space of psychology, psychoanalysis abyss.

Main Subject requires a moral reality that the author is obsessed. We detect so, in Nicolae Breban's prose a feeling of diffuse textualism.

The evolution of an actor is interrupted, the reader is lured by the sensational, drawn then in the ontological abyss spaces. It is not interesting the story novelty, but metamorphoses of personal myth, structured for actors.

Studying psychology of crime and its impact on individuals following a subconscious loaded, Nicolae Breban seeks darkness and not their sublimation.

Alexandru Ivasiuc is an original novelist, having idea imagination, modern in its obsessions, concerned about the renewals of substance and structure of contemporary prose. Professional of the idea, Al. Ivasiuc approaches through his prose by some of the writers of the interwar period - Camil Petrescu, Mihail Sebastian, Mircea Eliade, Anton Holban-which have both fiction and journalism, reforming the Romanian novel from intellectual angle.

We are dealing with an intellectualist, psychologist and autobiographical novel, in the sense thought by 30s' generation. It appears, for the first time to Ivasiuc, the reason of crushing heredity and family functioning as a tribe, with the laws and rituals stator.

We have the novel of an individual who loves, the novel of mass revolution and a novel of power. We are interested in *Vestibule* in the philosophy of a man's personality, biography or his failure. In *Water*, the fate of a community in which the characters are a relay for the history, raised by

history, like the temporary incarnation of the universal spirit. In *Racul*, the policy is used by some people as blind instruments. Heroes of *Water* are psychologically differentiated beings, players who play certain roles but the heroes of *Racul* are simple masks, symbols, even clichés.

Mircea Ciobanu's prose of the novel *Istorii* (five volumes), propose a parabolic archetypal fabric, being modern, approaching complex Thanatos, fight with joy, taking guilty involuntary and therefore tragically, alienation, halving. A bookish horizon of the writer delivers to the archetypes of the Bible, to Dostoevsky, and from there, to Camusian tragedy and Kafkaian arbitrary agglomerations. Designed as a river novel in five volumes, each divided except the last, in three books, *Istorii* appearing over a decade 1977-1986.

Modern strategy of the narrator is the story of a degradation of the novel, rooted in a long bivalent sacred and profane, converting the epic in symbolic and the social in universal.

Mircea Ciobanu's novel did not conceptualize indoor time, but tries to capture in a speech arising imaging and behavior in a real spiritual time. Portrait of Gh. Polovda comes alive due to a monstrous "epic patience".

Countless details are focused in terms of time and flashes in the past, which is followed after a teleological type narrative logic, oriented to the end, to death of the protagonist.

It is a destiny built according not of the past but the future. *Istorii* is facing the birth, *Istorii* II, with Eros and *Istorii* III with death. Volumes IV and V, remain in the sphere of Thanatos symbols, which is associated with loneliness, fear, cowardice. The shadow of the end protects the ternary structure of each volume that secures the same narrative structure to another temporality.

Finally, after 1964, two are capital matters of Romanian prose: *literarity problem* (of literature as literature) and the *question of truth* (of literature as a reflection). Aspiration to truth will give rise to political prose, reparative type, and the literary aspirations - a prose interested in aesthetic effects, non-political

in intent, not the consequences and will not delay to become, after a while, escapist, formalistic, autoreflexiv.

So, during "*little liberalization*" (1964-1971), is found unforeseen events, which point out that they lived among the ruins of a literature, in an unnatural environment, troubled by the memory of '50s literary atrocities and the trial of communist authorities to evacuate the culture of a nation.

It happened then, what happened whenever the national being was in danger: compensatory myths were turned abruptly and confused the developments, attempted to mature trends, giving impetus to the idealized representation of the past. In the '60s, the institution of literature in high-speed, rebuild their departments, their list and increase their "staff" and initiatives. As in all good epochs of literary history, quantity was important, not critical spirit.

Assessing the "episode" of literary history that concludes the stage of "little liberalization", and anticipating what will follow, Eugen Negrici concludes in *Illusions of Romanian literature*: "distancing of historiography view marked by dogmatism and Romanian-phobia of the '50s produced such of slippage situation. Immediately after Ceaușescu's cultural minirevolution, these interpretative distortions, stimulated by the reactivation of identity myths, will gain amplitude on the background of a debilitation of critical spirit and a loss of culture of scientific rigor. "