The Anti-Ruralism of the Sibiu Literary Circle: I. Negoițescu and the "Pășunism" in Romanian Modernist Literature

Ionucu POP

Universitatea „Babeș Bolyai" din Cluj-Napoca
Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca
E-mail: pop.ionucu@yahoo.com; pop.ioan2@ubbcluj.ro

The Anti-Ruralism of the Sibiu Literary Circle:
I. Negoițescu and the "Pășunism" in Romanian Modernist Literature

Abstract: The members of the Sibiu Literary Circle coined and disseminated the rather abusive term "pășunism" (from the Romanian word "pășune," meaning pasture) in order to combat the confusion between ethnic, ethical and aesthetic. In the spirit of Eugen Lovinescu's literary ideology, this was considered by the Literary Circle as an urgent mission in the context of Romanian literature in the 1940s. Originally intended to ironize (neo)"sămănătorist" or "fascist-sămănătorist" literature, the term "pășunism," given the thematic aspect which it implies, gained a lax usage. Therefore, rural literature and folklore-inspired literature among others fit in the satirical term's category. The aim of the following paper is to investigate the origins and manifestations of the anti-ruralist tendencies of the Sibiu Literary Circle in its earlier days, starting from, but not limited to the writings of I. Negoițescu.
Keywords: Sibiu Literary Circle, Ion Negoițescu, anti-ruralism, Romanian literary history, "pășunism"

Citation suggestion: Pop, Ionucu. "The Anti-Ruralism of the Sibiu Literary Circle: I. Negoițescu and the "Pășunism" in Romanian Modernist Literature." Transilvania, no. 5 (2022): 81-89.
https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2022.05.11.

It is well-known that when the Sibiu Literary Circle chose E. Lovinescu as a model for their literary ideology, the members of the group became the second generation after Lovinescu, and the fourth generation embracing Titu Maiorescu's principle of aesthetic autonomy (in the context of Romanian literary history). The ideological preference will expand during the history of the group, culminating with the Euphorion project and the idea of euphorionism, which pleaded for a more bountiful axiological complexity. The positive influence of E. Lovinescu on the Literary Circle has been analysed and commented by all critics who focused on the Transylvanian literary group. And the present study should not be read as having the intention to undermine the role and prestige of the critic, nor to diminish the importance and fascination of the Sibiu group which honours Lovinescu. However, the aim is not to repeat a discourse which seems to validate anti-rural tendencies, only because they are built-in the structure of a valuable literary generation. For not even the most detached or sceptical of the exegetes concerned with the Sibiu group ever tried to have second thoughts about the Literary Circle's dismissal of the rural. Therefore, no critic tried to make peace between the two.

Lovinescu's discriminating outlook on the rural material has been previously proven so by the works of researchers such as: Nicolae Bârna, Teodora Dumitru, Daiana Gârdan, Cosmin Borza, etc. In the article "The National No Man's Land. Imagining Rurality in the Romanian Literary Histories," Cosmin Borza offers an operable summary of the anti-rural cynicism present in the modernist critic's literary history and adjoining writings:

> "Thus, in Lovinescu's opinion, rurality means mysticism, primitivism, instinctiveness, psychological precarity, monopoly over the national identity and culture, regress in relation to the society's contemporary and natural evolution."[1]

In passing the torch from "Sburătorul" to the Sibiu Literary

Circle, although part of what seemed to be an aesthetically justified campaign against the revival of "Sămănătorism"[2] in Transylvania during the Second World War, a certain anti-rural bias had been passed down as well. This unfortunate aspect of Lovinescu's literary ideology appears to have resonated deeply with the young I. Negoițescu, who refered to the 1937 edition of Lovinescu's *Istoria literaturii române contemporane* [The Literary History of Contemporary Romanian Literature] as "my bible."[3] Being Lovinescu's most important emulator, although far from fitting into the definition of an epigone, I. Negoițescu[4] represents the main channel through which the influence of the theoretician of "synchronism" reaches and shapes the identity of the Sibiu literary group.

In 1943, the young critic undertakes the drafting of the famous "Scrisoarea Cercului Literar de la Sibiu" [Letter of the Literary Circle from Sibiu] to Mr. Lovinescu, a document also known as the "Manifesto Letter" of the same group. For a long time Negoițescu has been portrayed by most of his exegetes as the sole architect behind the "Manifesto Letter" and therefore the Literary Circle's singular strategist. The constant efforts of Ion Vartic and Marta Petreu managed to bring some clarifications and nuances to the aforementioned founding act. Other members of the Literary Circle, such as Radu Stanca, Victor Iancu, and Romeo Dăscălescu also contributed to the letter's final form:[5] "Radu Stanca scattered a lot of ideas and suggestions in his circle of friends, without necessarily wanting to mark his paternity. [...] Although this letter was reviewed by Stanca before it was sent to the great critic, some critical accents survive that illustrate the spiritual extravagance of the one who wrote it."[6]

The letter marks the Literary Circle's rally to Eugen Lovinescu's side of the barricade and has often been interpreted, first of all, as an attack on the 'fascist-*sămănătorist*' literature[7] of the fifth decade of the 20th century. The manifesto is, however, only the beginning of a campaign against a literary crisis that, according to the Literary Circle, peaked during the 1940s, making almost any Transylvanian periodical unreadable from an aesthetic perspective. The cultural magazine *Gândirea* is an important cause of this crisis, for continuing the mystified, romantically exalted view of the peasantry, who keep hindering the process of synchronization, despite the end of the original movement of "Sămănătorism." The members of the Sibiu Literary Circle coined and disseminated the now-famous and rather abusive term "păşunism" (from "păşune", meaning pasture in the Romanian language) in order to combat the confusion between ethnic, ethical and aesthetic. During this campaign, Negoițescu conveys both the initiative and the replies of the group in the literary landscape of the time. The anti-"păşunist" texts represent the battlefield on which Negoițescu's critical spirit matures. The most important articles of the respective controversy appear under signatures such as Damian Silvestru or Ioan Negoițescu, sometimes pronounced on behalf of the entire Sibiu Literary Circle. The conflict also incorporates (and develops as a result of) the varied responses to the "Manifesto Letter," most of them being rather unfavourable in the given historical context. The "birth certificate" of the Sibiu Literary Circle did cause "a public discussion," "but not in the sense that it would have provoked a proper debate, in our case debates are not possible, but in the one that [the Manifesto] triggered a passionate avalanche of reactions for and against, the latter politicized and violent."[8] From the point of view of overcoming regional and historical predetermination, the appendices of the "Manifesto Letter" from *Viața*, May 13, 1943 (answered by E. Lovinescu in *Viața*, May 23, 1943) are: "Câteva precizări" [A Few Clarifications] in *Viața*, June 3, 1943; "În jurul 'prostului gust'. Răspuns domnului Vasile Netea" [Concerning "Bad Taste": Answering Mr. Vasile Netea] from *Timpul*, June 25, 1943; "Curente noi in poezia din Ardeal" [New Movements in Transylvanian Poetry], *Vremea*, July 11, 1943, read by Lovinescu in manuscript, considered excellent and reedited in *Scriitori moderni* [Modern Writers] in 1966; "Păşunişti şi 'nemuritori'" [Păşunists and "Immortals"] from *Saeculum*, February, 1944; "Perspective" [Perspectives], *Revista Cercului Literar*, January, 1945, no. 1 (1945).[9]

The "spiritual extravagance" aformentioned by Ion Vartic might constitute the marker through which Negoițescu's "vocal stamp" can be identified in the collective letter. For example:

> "Transylvania did not produce a literary critic, such achievement being impossible, for criticism presupposes good taste and fair analysis, which ultimately rejects regionalism and its annexes [...] The critic is a *summum* of discernment, lucidity, analysis and synthesis, and together they exclude the inferiority complex of the Transylvanian culture, which wants (if such thing be!) a 'more Romanian' culture than that of the other brothers from over the mountains and waters... Respectable intention, but absurd! That is why, in order to save the spirituality in this region, we need a quick release from the anachronistic crust of "Sămănătorism," manifested in the bad taste of the endless research on Ilarie Chendi[10] or Maria Cunțan[11]..."[12]

There is no point in rehearsing the reception of the Manifesto yet, nor would it be useful to exhaustively analyse the document as a whole, for the tasks has been done with professionalism in the past by the likes of Ilie Guțan, Petru Poantă, Ovid. S. Crohmălniceanu, Dan Damaschin, Gabriela Gavril, Ion Vartic, Marta Petreu, Florentina Răcătăianu, and the list can extend much further. For the purpose of the study, the fragments of the letter and its appendices concerning rurality, ethnology and therefore a certain facet of Romanian identity will be prioritized. Given the previous coordinates, it becomes visible that the Sibiu Literary Circle's relationship with the model of Lucian Blaga should not be avoided. There are, of course, studies focusing on this subject alone, of which I will point only to two: one belongs to Dan Damaschin,[13] the other is an annex of the aforecited volume of Marta Petreu.

Trying to Resist the Model of Lucian Blaga

In order to combat provincialism in culture, the confusion between ethnic, ethical and aesthetic, which are consequences

of the "paroxysmal" resurrection of the "sămănătorist" spirit, the defining of the Sibiu Literary group is made in contrast to the favourable coordinates of such a retrograde spirit. Petru Poantă is the first critic who reads – between the lines of the Sibiu Literary Circle's genesis – hostilities towards the model of Lucian Blaga:

> "They extrapolate in Lucian Blaga a tendency to diminish the critical spirit in Romanian culture. The philosopher who praised the quality of a people by having 'boycotted' history could not be accepted by a generation for which the meaning of civilization and culture consists in active participation in history. The simplification was, of course, brutal and dramatic, but otherwise the 'desperate' appeal to the authority of Eugen Lovinescu is not fully explained."[14]

Therefore, Petru Poantă is also the first of the (very few) commentators to notice the abuses of the legitimizing text of the youthful Sibiu group. The critic from Cluj also brings a new nuance concerning the relationship with Lucian Blaga:

> "After all, he [E. Lovinescu] was no more Western than Blaga, the difference being that he represented the face of rational modernity, the myth of the positive bourgeoisie, of urbanism, while Blaga 'fell' under the influence of 'currents haunting over and from cultures outside our borders,' in which we are to identify not so much pan-Slavism as, say, expressionism, a current disapproved of within the Literary Circle."[15]

Petru Poantă's statement is correct in the first part, but rather debatable in the second. Especially regarding expressionism – a "current" which benefits from too little attention from critics and theorists in the Romanian cultural space, which has, however, first-hand contributions from members of the Literary Circle such as I. Negoițescu, Ștefan Aug. Doinaș, and Ovidiu Cotruș. It is true, however, that the members of the group favor "the face of rational modernity, the myth of the positive bourgeoisie, of urbanism" in relation to what Blaga represents: the face of irrational modernity, the myth of the demonic bourgeoisie, ruralism.

In accordance with Eugen Lovinescu's literary ideology, ruralism, the privileged space of "pășunism" and the hearth of minor culture is opposed by urbanity and the major culture. The collective character of folkloric creation is opposed by the individual character of written literature and so on:

> "It was natural for a literature without a classical past to start from folk poetry, which, although a minor creation and mostly of ethnographic interest, was still a definite source for the great future possibilities, meant to overcome those primordial forms, up to the complete detachment of the educational, cultured patterns. Historical examples show that a major culture begins where the collective and undifferentiated forms are replaced by a creation released from the common and strictly individual magma of the personality."[16]

This passage is not a reference only to *Spațiul mioritic* [The Mioritical Space] (1936 – see the chapter "Evolution and involution"), but to the first chapter ("Cultura minoră și cultura majoră" [Minor Culture and Major Culture]) in *Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii* [The Genesis of the Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture] (1937), belonging to the same trilogy. "Cultura minoră și cultura majoră" contains almost unaltered a large part of the "Elogiu satului românesc" [Eulogy of the Romanian Village] (the reception speech of Lucian Blaga at the Romanian Academy),[17] a text which the profoundly urbanite I. Negoițescu must have truly disliked, in the spirit of the literary master he consciously and publicly opts for. However, some passages of the "Manifesto" are structured in an almost mirrored response to the statements of the famous chapter of Blaga, especially to those fragments concerning the village-city dichotomy:

> "We therefore reach the problem of the distinction between 'village' and 'city.' The village is not located in a purely material geography and in the network of mechanical determinants of space, like the city; for its own consciousness the village is located in the center of the world and extends into myth. [...] Let us look at the city instead. [...] In the city, the consciousness of the early child is infected by the relative values of civilization, with which he becomes accustomed, without having the possibility to understand. We believe that we are not exaggerating by saying that childhood in the city has no apogee; the city ceases the developmental possibilities of childhood as such, bestowing upon their souls an elderly direction. In the city, the child is truly the 'ather of the man,' a preparation for the dry ages. In the village, childhood becomes an autonomous structure, which flourishes for itself. The man raised in the city manages to understand, or pretends to understand the surrounding causalities, but one never personally makes the living experience of the world as a whole, that is, an experience soaked in perspectives beyond the immediate and sensitive. To live in the city means to live in civilization. To live in the village means to live in cosmic horizon and in the consciousness of a destiny emanating from eternity."[18]

Dan Damaschin, clarifying the Literary Circle's reference to tradition, argues that the real opponents of the manifesto are the traditionalists: "Traditionalism, in the sense challenged by the members of the literary group, is the movement associated with this crisis and is manifested, in literary terms, by the proliferation of patriotic, regionalist, 'pășunist' poetry."[19] However, reading between the lines of the document of the Sibiu Literary Circle, it becomes increasingly clear that the model opposed in the manifesto resembles the model represented by Lucian Blaga. The professor is never called out in the polemical approach of the Literary Circle, but the selection of the attacked concepts cannot be accidental:

> "Because it did not belong to him in the past, the Transylvanian Romanian suspected and continues to

> suspect that the city is 'non-Romanian.' However, all the great cultures were accomplished in an urban environment, be it national or cosmopolitan, and they represented par excellence a significance of urbanity. The exaltation of the rural and the ethnic, although justifiable in social concerns, becomes a threatening vice when it tends to overwhelm the artistic phenomenon, which can only find its cultured and prosperous ambience, in the sense of a major creation, only in urbanity and aesthetic exclusivity."[20]

Marta Petreu, who thoroughly investigated the complex report between Lucian Blaga and the "Manifesto" also agrees that the text performs the function of a symbolic parricide, even though several arguments of the document are a direct consequence of the philosopher's influence.[21] Since Lucian Blaga represents the wing of irrational modernity and ruralism, and since folkloric literature and the exaltation of the village occupy central positions in Blaga's artistic and philosophical work, the members of the Sibiu Literary Circle renounce (at this stage) the archetypal village and the autochthonous mythology, preferring urbanity and the Western mythologies, properties and preconditions of the major cultures.

In support of the "Manifesto" and the statements about the inferiority of the minor culture, the "signatories" return with "Câteva precizări" [A Few Clarifications].[22] Meant to exonerate the members of the Literary Circle (united under the writing of the same critic) in relation to the attack on minor culture and rural issues, the few clarifications only manage to deepen the controversy:

> "One clarification: We hold nothing against folk art. We appreciate its delicious authenticity as well as the naive feeling that runs through it. However, we are against a cultural form of compromise, in which foreign interests invade the aesthetic, philosophical or scientific field. [...] We understand the power of the national feeling, as well as its close connection with the life of the village, therefore explaining a certain idealized conception of the village, as well as the moralizing tendency that emerges from it. But we do not understand why this idealizing conception, escalated to didacticism, should become a criterion of judging the work of art."[23]

There is perhaps another clarification that must be remembered before weighing the gesture of the Literary Circle at this early stage. Lucian Blaga in "Cultura minoră și cultura majoră" does not treat the subject as sharply (in any case, not as sharply as the Literary Circle) as the critics of Lucian Blaga would lead one to believe. The philosopher does not proclaim the minor culture as objectively more desirable or superior in value to the major one, but tries to highlight and defend its virtues, especially in the context in which the culture in whose service he put his efforts belongs (at the time of writing) rather to the first category. His sympathy for minor culture is obvious (no one denies that Blaga's pages are riddled with lyricism and subjectivity), but what Lucian Blaga considered really harmful was the installation of a preconception as an axiom. One that, unfortunately for the Romanian philosopher, is visible from the very name of this dichotomy: minor culture and major culture. However, a researcher should bear in mind the conclusions of this chapter:

> "With this, we only want to voice that a comparison of the minor culture and the major culture, from the angle of value, is not exactly simple. It seems so complicated to us that we are advised to touch it only with our shyness and silence. We prefer to leave this issue open for the time being."[24]

The Literary Circle programmatically close this "issue." Moreover, they do so believing that they won a battle against the philosophical system of their professor:

"We clearly distinguish major culture from minor culture. The minor culture appears to us undifferentiated, anonymous, a product of the community, while the major one is differentiated, individual. This emphasis, which in major creations is placed on the realization of individual possibilities, is essential. It gives the major culture that character of complexity, by manifesting the creative possibilitiesReinforcing the "Manifesto," the remarks, well chosen by Negoițescu, divert the offense from folkloric, minor, collective art to artistic mediocrity and to the danger of evaluating a work of art using criteria placed outside the sphere of the aesthetic (moralizing tendencies, didacticism, patriotism, sentimentalism and politics). Folk art remains minor and naive, but, as raw material, it can become part of a major edifice, when it is processed by a great individual artistic intelligence. It is as if the members of the group paused the reading of the "Elogiu satului românesc" right before its conclusion: "A major culture is not aroused by the programmatic imitation of minor culture. Not by imitating popular creations at any cost will we make the leap so many times tried in a major culture."[26] Moreover, Lucian Blaga anticipates by almost 20 years the 1943 "Manifesto's" criticism of ethnicist-ethnographic art. Marta Petreu has the merit of drawing the attention on the philosopher's 1925 article "Etnografie și artă" [Etnography and Art] which is an effort to diminish the "ethnographic zeal" of interwar traditionalism:

> "For the nationality of a work of art, the ethnographic is almost as indifferent as the elements of any other origin. The attempt of some artists and writers to limit inspiration to sources of folklore and ethnography or to locate at any cost subjects and mythologies, which by their very nature are outside of space and time, means a diminution of artistic freedom and, more reprehensible, a replacement of the ethnic fatality of any creative personality through lucid and programmatic reflection. The unconscious is replaced by the conscious, destiny by calculation, authentic 'ethnicity' by ethnography, the inner and living quality of blood by the outer and dead combination of folk realities."[27]

The Omnipresent "Păşunism"

Published in *Saeculum* (January-February 1944), "Păşunişti şi 'nemuritori'" [*Păşunists* and "Immortals"] ultimately coins the term that encompasses all the retrograde orientations and cultural sympathies deemed harmful by the Sibiu group in the letter to E. Lovinescu and its addenda.[28] On a close reading, it becomes clear that Negoiţescu's definition referred to a more exact writing profile and ridiculed only the inferior literary production that emerged out of confusion of values. The contemporary reader, accustomed to a wider, almost non-literary connotation, might encounter a surprise when meeting the real irradiation center of the term. Nonetheless, due to the thematic aspect of "păşunism," the term is bound to gain a lax usage. The satirical term's cathegory can extend to cover "sămănătorism," "poporanism," "neo-sămănătorism," "gândirism," "criterionism," "ortodoxism," "tradiţionalism," "fascism," and, along with them, all rural-inspired literature, folk-inspired literature, patriotic literature, etc. The literary production of the members of the Sibiu Literary Circle themselves stand as a proof that the significance of the concept is expanding beyond the intention and control of I. Negoiţescu. With time, the formula will make a career even "in the final stage of the communist regime and especially after 1989, when, amid the revitalization of the controversy between local and cosmopolitan groups, between 'crypto-communists' and anti-communists, etc., 'păşunism' is invoked to blame any traditionalist trend."[29] Moreover, the term will enter the slang of the Romanian language, losing its literary connotation. In the Romanian slang dictionary, "păşunist" means peasant, in a pejorative sense.[30] While in more recent edition the term "păşunar" also appears, being synonymous with the other term, having two meanings: 1 – (pejoratively) uneducated man, lacking in good manners; 2 – person originating from rural areas; peasant.[31]

At different points in their literary careers, even the very members of the Sibiu group found themselves faced with the label. In an interview realised by Marta Petreu, Cornel Regman comments on the heterogeneity of the Literary Circle: "among us there were 'păşunişts' and 'apteri' too – the two species abhorred by the Literary Circle, proof that even in our 'hymn' they were pointed at."[32] In his fascinating *Jurnalul unui jurnalist fără jurnal* [The Diary of a Diarist without Diary] Ion D. Sîrbu, Lucian Blaga's most faithful student, feels the need to clarify his affiliations: "I am not what Regman calls 'a păşunist;' I did not live in the countryside; I came into contact with folk art, dance, clothing and music only during my student years."[33] Even Ştefan Aug. Doinaş was confronted with the term on the obvious basis of his literary pseudonym: "My colleagues have assured me more than once, saying that my pseudonym is... păşunist. When I tried to change it, and wrote Vladimir Streiunu, who published it in the magazine *Kalende*, he gave me an answer somewhat laudatory: 'It is too late'."[34] Such statements require revisiting the ironic definition issued by Negoiţescu:

> "the modern and contemporary educated whose hearts are bellowing and whose souls bleat out of longing for the 'village in which they were born' [...] Consumed by the fever of exaltation when they scream the word 'ulture' at every corner, all of them being directors of patriotism, morality and poetry, in love with the 'holy ground' only because they look at it from the comfortable armchair of the city they blaspheme, the păşunists picture themselves day and night either at the horns of the plow, or at *Zamfira's wedding*, or courting *Dăscăliţa*... In the beginning, the păşunists were considered a kind of sect without a will, which cultivated traditional customs: to brush their teeth after dinner, to wear laquered shoes on Sundays, to attend festivals regularly, to tremble while reading *The Ostrogoth Queen*, to cry tenderly reading *Mamina* or *Tătunu* and to dance the tango but to ache after 'sârba'."[35]

Moreover, the Literary Circle's contemporary rival undergoes an update: "he frequents Camil Petrescu, discusses Baudelaire, dresses like a Malagambist, but thinks about the restoration of Maria Cunţan."[36] The same Maria Cunţan and Ilarie Chendi are recurrent characters in the anti-păşunist crusade. Damian Silvestru treats them extensively in the article "În jurul 'prostului gust'. Răspuns domnului Vasile Netea," text also abounding in irony and pamphleteering talent. The same talent is at work when the incisive critic imitates his rivals' own rhetoric, citing stereotypical expressions in order to highlight the ridiculousness of provincialism and of the ethnical intrusion into the aesthetics in the literary context of the time: "'Let us chant our longing!' They shouted pathetically. And the choir of 'enchanters' uttered the word betrayal in one voice! They sat with tears, moans, riots, 'chants,' with bellows, followed by festivities (to calm their bitterness!) And raised the Romanian letters to the peaks of Inău."[37]

Negoiţescu subversively inventories the commonplaces of the ethnographical zealous ("dor" [longing], "şezători" [sewing bee], "chiote" [shouts], "amar" [sorrow]), scorning the declamatory stylistics and the assumed adherence to provincialism. In Bogdan Creţu's words, who interprets the term "păşunism" as "absolutized Sămănătorism:" "Nego strikes where it hurts the most, mocking the props and fetishized motives of messianic poetry, which, otherwise, he did not bluntly disregard."[38] Furthermore, the Transylvanian critic subverts the laudatory cliché of using the renown of a mountain peak of regional fame to represent the height of a national literature or of a literary personality. In "Păşunişti şi 'nemuritori'," the height of the national literature owning a "păşunist" canon is illustrated with the help of a provincial geographical coordinate from the North of the country, less known and not counted among the highest peaks either. Thus, the Literary Circle call attention to the alarming situation of the "Romanian letters:" the almost anonymous and isolated (notice the resemblance with the textbook understanding of folklore) status of the national literature, a status that the literary climate of Transylvania in the 1940s allowed and preserved. Therefore, the Literary Circle of Sibiu promotes a divergent perception of Romanian spirituality. As stated at the

end of the "Manifesto:"

> "For us, Romanian literature does not mean a closed phenomenon, spent in an autarchic shore, nor a picturesque contribution to European ethnography, but a young branch of continental spirituality, a branch crossed by the same sap and loaded with the same fruits, even if the land in which it rooted is another."[39]

Besides fortifying the group's literary ideology, the same article attempts another ambiguous action. On a surface level, the text pays homage to both masters of the Literary Circle (Lucian Blaga and Eugen Lovinescu – the dragons from the title of Negoițescu's autobiography, *Straja dragonilor*), placing them on the same side of the barricade as true "destroyers of false idols" – a gesture of absolution in relation to his professor. But on a deeper level, Negoițescu is aiming at Blaga once more: "We are still struggling between the crystalline substrates of Latinity and the mudslides deposited by the Slavic waves. That clarity is destined to win is testified by the whole evolution of our culture, which knew the background of Maiorescianism."[40] With one hand, Lucian Blaga's work is used to counteract the "păşunişts," differing from them on account of value and refinement, but with the other, the philosopher is once again blamed – as demonstrated by the reference to "Revolta fondului nostru nelatin," a notorious article from *Gândirea*. The preface of the epistolary novel confirms and confesses the unfair treatment of Lucian Blaga at the hands of his young students and that the attempt to resist his model was an occurring phenomenon: "but being daily in his proximity, for so many years, in Sibiu and Cluj, created those reserves that often come from the instinct of independence, from the fear of not being his imitators."[41]

During the outlining of the "Euphorion" project, I. Negoițescu tries to strengthen and nuance the position of the group in relation to the autochthonous literary tradition. Unlike most of the other acts of foundations/manifestos in the history Romanian literature, the moment of the Sibiu Literary Circle does not reduce to nothing the literary past that led to the group in question. The edifice of the Sibiu Literary Circle is not built on the ashes of all their predecessors. On the contrary, the intention of the Literary Circle is one of healing, of re-establishing ties, of resuming a pro-Western self-definition initiated by the Transylvanian "and Latinist" School. The Literary Circle's vision of Romanian spirituality is both old and new, but certainly not dominant at the time of their emergence. For a different understanding of national specificity, a different kind of patriotism is needed. The tradition and the acceptance of the national specificity that the Literary Circle did *not* choose made the object of the present study for the following reason: the examination of what a literary group renounces can always lead substantial and revealing findings. In retrospect, Negoițescu clarifies the origins of the "Euphorion" program memorably:

> "After the war, in the moral chaos of that time (Romanians were beginning to show their true color, that's why I felt the need for this radical aesthetic position, more radical than the one in the Manifesto, also born against the păşunism of the villains, the literary profiteers of war), when artistic youth was fleeing to Western trends, to existentialism, neo-surrealism, we, seemingly retrograde and provincial, with our 'ballad' and our neo-romanticism, wanted for the first time to ignore Western seasonableness which was not useful to us, and delve into our structural problems: to write tragedies with non-Romanian themes, saving Romanians by fleeing away from what is Romanian!"[42]

Rurality and folklore are major "accomplices" of that meaning of "Romanianness" from which the cosmopolitan literary group "flees." They supported the ethnographical inflation which the Literary Circle has to counterbalance so that the Romanian spirituality would not freeze in that "picturesque contribution to European ethnography." In theory and in the public space, the offensive of the Sibiu Literary Circle appears moderate and refined, so that the literary critics who focused on the group mostly agree that the perspective is one of common (intellectual, aesthetic, political) sense. Nevertheless, in the intimacy of the memoir, or in that of the correspondence, I. Negoițescu nonchalantly reveals his anti-rural bias. The final evidence that the critic's crusade against "păşunism" goes beyond the aesthetic/value criterion, but that it also encompasses a biographical prejudice, can be uncovered due to the exceptional sincerity displayed in *Straja dragonilor* [The Watch of the Dragons]: "I have discovered myself in Mrs. Bengescu's novels, because that was my true homeland. The consciousness of my own urbanity (the lack of tenderness towards the village and the peasants has always characterized me) has definitely clarified in me."[43]

Negoițescu's anti-rural confessions may shed a new light on the critical project of the author in question. For, after having argued for a tendency in his critical lens, one can make sense of bizarre episodes in Negoițescu's literary career and discourse. His treatment of Liviu Rebreanu in his *Analize şi sinteze* [Analyses and Synthesis][44] *Istoria literaturii române: 1840-1945)* [The History of Romanian Literature (1840-1945)],[45] and *Scriitori contemporani* [Contemporary Writers][46] comes to mind. The fact that the severity of the critic, which is not limited to combating "păşunist" attitudes, but which also extends to writers of hardly disputable quality, who happen to favor a rural theme or imaginary might have a root in that tendency.

Notes:

1. Cosmin Borza, "The National No Man's Land. Imagining Rurality in the Romanian Literary Histories," *Dacoromania litteraria*, no. 6 (2019): 174.
2. See Z. Ornea, *Sămănătorismul*, third edition, revised (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Romane, 1998). On the long-lasting influence of the "sămănătorist" movement in the Romanian cultural history see Ionuț Butoi, "Recitindu-l pe Sthal," *Transilvania*, no. 1-2 (2022): 5-14.
3. I. Negoițescu, *Straja dragonilor* (Cluj-Napoca: Biblioteca Apostrof, 1994), 183: "biblia mea". Unless otherwise indicated, translations are mine.
4. As a part of a PhD research entitled *Myths, Rites and Folkloric Forms in the Writings of the Sibiu Literary Circle*, the present study shares the same construction site with the article "The Irony of I. Negoițescu," soon to be published in *Dacoromania litteraria*, no. 9 (2022). Several of the arguments and examples analysed in this study make the object of the subchapter "Irony as a Style Effect" belonging to the aforementioned article as well, focusing on the ironic dimension of Negoițescu's conflict with the "păşunism."
5. Marta Petreu, *Blaga, între legionari și comuniști* (Iași: Polirom, 2021), 251.
6. Ion Vartic, "Lovitura de stat de la Cercul Literar și urmările sale," *Apostrof*, no. 12 (2020), https://www.revista-apostrof.ro/arhiva/an2020/n12/a28/: "Radu Stanca a risipit în cercul lui de prieteni o mulțime de idei şi de sugestii, fără a dori neapărat să-şi marcheze paternitatea. [...] Deşi înainte de a fi trimisă marelui critic scrisoarea aceasta a fost revăzută de Stanca, în ea au rămas unele accente critice care ilustrează extravaganța spirituală a celui care a redactat-o."
7. The clarification is provided by I. Negoițescu in a footnote, 23 years after the publication of the "Manifesto," in "Curente noi în poezia din Ardeal," in I. Negoițescu, *Scriitori moderni* (Bucharest: Editura pentru Literatură, 1966), 369.
8. Petreu, *Blaga*, 256-257: "dar nu în sensul că ar fi provocat o dezbatere propriu-zisă, la noi dezbaterile nu sînt cu putință, ci în acela că a declanțat o avalanșă pasională de reacții pro și contra, acestea din urmă politizate și violente."
9. See also Cornel Regman, "Un regim pe sfârşite: Tradiţionalismul," *Revista Cercului Literar*, no. 6-8 (1945): 118; Cornel Regman, "Cu gândul la Gheorghe Şincai. Mitul latin," *Ardealul*, no. 21 (1944): 3, 7; Victor Iancu, "În chestiunea noii mişcări estetice din Ardeal. Ce este Cercul literar din Sibiu?," *Timpul*, no. 2192-2193 (1943): 2.
10. Ilarie Chendi (1871-1913) was a Romanian literary critic, one of the main supporters of "Sămănătorism," although posessing a different view of the literary movement compared to that of Nicolae Iorga.
11. Maria Cunțan (1862-1935) was a minor Romanian poet, almost forgotten nowadays, illustrative for the literary program of "Sămănătorism."
12. I. Negoițescu, *În cunoștință de cauză* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1991), 10-11: "Ardealul nu și-a dat sieși un critic literar, *aceasta fiind imposibil, deoarece critica presupune bun gust și justă analiză, ceea ce refuză regionalismul și anexele lui* [...] Criticul e un summum de discernământ, luciditate, analiză și spirit de sinteză, care împreună exclud complexul de inferioritate al culturalului ardelean, care vrea, (dacă se poate!) o cultură mai românească' decât a celorlalți frați de peste munți și de peste ape... *Respectabilă intenție, dar absurdă!* Iată de ce trebuie, spre salvarea spiritualității în această regiune, o cât mai grabnică liberare din crusta anacronică a sămănătorismului specifist, manifestat *în prostul gust al interminabilelor cercetări asupra lui Ilarie Chendi sau Maria Cunțan*...".
13. Dan Damaschin, *Cercul Literar de la Sibiu/Cluj: glosse/restituiri/corespondențe* (Cluj-Napoca: Ecou Transilvan, 2013).
14. Petru Poantă, *Cercul Literar de la Sibiu. Introducere în fenomenul originar* (Cluj-Napoca: CLUSIUM, 1997), 62: "Ei extrapolează în Lucian Blaga o tendință de diminuare a spiritului critic din cultura română. Filosoful care elogiase calitatea unui popor prin faptul de a fi 'boicotat' istoria nu avea cum să fie agreat de o generație pentru care sensul civilizației și al culturii constă în participarea activă la istorie. Simplificarea a fost, desigur, brutală și dramatică, însă altfel nu se explică întru totul apelul 'disperat' la autoritatea lui Eugen Lovinescu."
15. Poantă, *Cercul*, 62: "La urma urmelor, acesta [E. Lovinescu] nu era deloc mai occidental decât Blaga, atâta doar că reprezenta fața modernității raționale, mitul burgheziei pozitive, al urbanismului, pe când Blaga 'căzuse' sub influența unor 'curente ce bântuiau peste și dinspre culturi dinafara granițelor noastre,' în care trebuie să identificăm nu atât panslavismul, cât, să spunem, expresionismul, un curent deloc agreat în Cercul Literar."
16. Negoițescu, *În cunoștință de cauză*, 6-7: "Era firesc, pentru o literatură fără trecut clasic, să pornească de la poezia populară, care deși o creație minoră și în cea mai mare parte de interes etnografic, reprezenta totuși un izvor cert pentru marile posibilități viitoare, menite să depășească acele forme primordiale, până la completa detașare a tiparelor culte. Exemplele istorice ne arată că o cultură majoră începe acolo unde formele colective și nediferențiate sânt locuite cu o creație eliberată din magma comună și strict individuală a personalității."
17. Lucian Blaga, "Elogiu satului românesc," in *Discursuri de recepție la Academia Română*, ed. Octav Păun (Bucharest: Albatros, 1980), 250-264.
18. Lucian Blaga, *Trilogia culturii* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2011), 337: "Atingem cu aceasta problema deosebirii dintre 'sat' și 'oraș.' Satul nu este situat într-o geografie pur materială și în rețeaua determinantelor mecanice ale spațiului, ca orașul; pentru propria sa conștiință satul este situat în centrul lumii și se prelungește în mit. [...] Să privim în schimb orașul. [...] La oraș, conștiința copilului precoce e molipsită de valorile relative ale civilizației, cu care el se obișnuiește, fără de a avea posibilitatea de a înțelege. Credem că nu exagerăm spunând că la oraș copilăria n-are apogeu; orașul taie posibilitățile de dezvoltare ale copilăriei ca atare, dând sufletelor degrabă o îndrumare bătrânicioasă. La oraș copilul este în adevăr 'tatăl bărbatului,' adică o pregătire pentru vârstele seci. La sat copilăria devine o structură autonomă, care înflorește pentru sine. Omul crescut la oraș parvine să înțeleagă, sau să se prefacă a înțelege, cauzalitățile împrejmuitoare, dar el nu face personal niciodată experiența vie a lumii ca totalitate, adică o experiență muiată în perspective dincolo de imediat și sensibil. A trăi la oraș înseamnă a trăi în cadrul civilizației. A trăi la sat înseamnă a trăi în zarişte cosmică și în conștiința unui destin emanat de veşnicie."
19. Dan Damaschin, "*Cercul literar de la Sibiu/Cluj". Deschidere spre europeism și universalitate* (Cluj-Napoca: ZENIT, 2009), 193-194:

"Tradiționalismul, în accepția combătută de cerchiști, este curentul asociat acestei crize și se manifestă, în plan literar, prin proliferarea poeziei patriotarde, regionaliste, 'păsuniste'."

20. I. Negoițescu, *În cunoștință*, 6-7: "Pentru că nu i-a aparținut în trecut, românul ardelean a suspectat și continuă să suspecteze ca 'neromânesc' orașul. Toate marile culturi s-au realizat însă în mediu urban, fie el național sau cosmopolit, și au reprezentat prin excelență o semnificație de urbanitate. Exaltarea ruralului și a etnicului, de justificat în preocupări sociale, devine un viciu amenințător atunci când tinde să copleșească fenomenul artistic, care nu-și poate afla ambianța cultă și prosperă, în sensul unei creații majore, decât în urbanitate și în exclusivitate estetică."
21. Petreu, *Blaga*, 282-285.
22. Originally appeared in *Viața*, no. 764 (1943): 2.
23. Ion Negoițescu, *De la "elanul juvenil" la "visatul Euphorion" (Publicistica de tinerețe: 1938-1947)*, ed. Lelia Nicolescu (Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2007), 203-204: "O precizare: Nu suntem împotriva artei populare. Apreciem autenticitatea ei savuroasă precum și sentimentul naiv care o străbate. Suntem însă împotriva unei forme culturale de compromis, în care interese străine invadează domeniul estetic, filosofic sau științific. [...] Înțelegem puterea sentimentului național, precum și legătura lui strânsă cu viața satului, și de aici – apoi-o anumită concepție idealizată a satului, precum și tendința moralizatoare ce se desprinde din ea. Dar nu înțelegem ca această concepție idealizantă, dusă la didacticism, să fie criterii judecată a operei de artă".
24. Lucian Blaga, *Trilogia culturii*, 347: "Vrem să spunem cu aceasta numai că o comparație a culturii minore și a culturii majore, sub unghiul valorii, nu e tocmai simplă. Ea ni se pare chiar așa de complicată încât ne vedem sfătuiți să nu o atingem decât cu sfiala și tăcerea noastră. Preferăm să lăsăm această problemă deocamdată deschisă."
25. Negoițescu, *De la "elanul juvenil,"* 203.
26. Blaga, "Elogiu satului," 262.
27. Lucian Blaga, "Etnografie și artă," *Cuvântul*, no. 311 (1925), reedited in Lucian Blaga, *Zări și etape* (Minerva: Bucharest, 1990), 241: "Pentru naționalitatea unei opere de artă, etnograficul e aproape tot atât de indiferent ca elementele de orice altă provenință. Încercarea unor artiști și literați de a limita inspirația la izvoare de folclor și de etnografie sau de a localiza cu orice preț subiecte și mitologii, care prin însăși natura lor sunt în afară de spațiu și timp, înseamnă o diminuare a libertății artistice și, ceea ce e mai condamnabil, o înlocuire a fatalității etnice proprie oricărei personalități creatoare prin reflexie lucidă și programatică. Inconștientul e substituit prin conștient, destinul prin calcul, 'etnicitatea' autentică prin etnografie, calitatea interioară și vie a sângelui prin combinația exterioară și moartă a unor realități folclorice."
28. I. Negoițescu, "Păsuniști și 'nemuritori'," *Saeculum*, no. 1 (1944): 78-81.
29. Cosmin Borza, "Literatura rurală," in *Enciclopedia imaginariilor din România I. Imaginar literar*, ed. Corin Braga (Iași: Polirom, 2020), 197: "în etapa finală a regimului comunist și mai ales după 1989, când, pe fondul revitalizării polemicii dintre grupările autohtoniste și cele cosmopolite, dintre 'criptocomuniști' și anticomuniști etc., păsunismul este invocat pentru a blama orice tendință tradiționalistă".
30. George Volceanov, *Dicționar de argou al limbii române* (Bucharest: Niculescu, 2006), 186.
31. George Volceanov and George-Paul Volceanov, *Noul dicționar de argou al limbii române* (Bucharest: Grup Litera Media, 2019), 234.
32. Cornel Regman, "50 de ani de la'Manifestul Cercului Literar din Sibiu'," *Apostrof*, no. 9 (1994), reedited in Marta Petreu, *Conversații cu...*, vol. I., (Bucharest: Editura Universal Dalsi, 2004), 97: "erau printre noi și 'păsuniști' și 'apteri' – cele două spețe abhorate de cerchiști, dovadă că și în 'mnul' Cercului erau arătate cu degetul."
33. Ion D. Sîrbu, *Jurnalul unui jurnalist fără jurnal* (Bucharest: Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2013), 626: "Nu sunt ceea ce Regman numește 'un păsunist;' nu am trăit la țară; cu arta, dansul, portul și muzica populară am ajuns în contact abia în anii studenției."
34. Mihaela Doboș, *Tabloul unui destin – Ștefan Aug. Doinaș: o monografie* (Iași: Adenium, 2013), 14: "Cerchiștii m-au asigurat nu numai o dată, spunând că pseudonimul meu este... păsunist. Când am încercat să-l schimb, și i-am scirs în sensul acesta lui Vladimir Streiunu, care mă publica în revista *Kalende*, acesta mi-a dat un răspuns care era într-un fel laudativ: 'E prea târziu'."
35. Published originally in *Saeculum*, no. 1 (1944): 78-81, reedited in Negoițescu, *De la "elanul juvenil,"* 258: "școlarizații moderni și contemporani cărora le chiuie inima și le behăie sufletul de dorul 'satului în care s-au născut.' [...] Arși de febra exaltării când țipă la orice colț de stradă cuvântul 'cultură,' toți directori ai patriotismului, ai moralei și ai poeziei, înamorați de 'țarina sfântă' numai fiindcă o privesc din fotoliul comod al orașului pe care îl hulesc, păsuniștii se visează ziua și noaptea când la coarnele plugului, când la *nunta Zamfirii*, când făcând curte *Dăscăliței*... La început, păsuniștii au fost considerați ca un fel de sectă fără voie, care cultiva tradiționale obiceiuri: să stea cu scobitoarea în dinți după masă, să poarte dumineca pantofi de lac, să frecventeze regulat festivalurile, să se cutremure citind *Regina Ostrogoților*, să plângă de duioși citind *Mamina* și *Tătunu* și să danseze tangoul dar să-i doară inima după 'sârbă'."
36. Ibid., 258-259: "frecventează pe Camil Petrescu, discută pe Baudelaire, se îmbracă malagambist, însă cugetă la restaurarea Mariei Cunțan".
37. Ibid., 259: "'Lăsați-ne să ne cântăm dorul!...' au țipat patetic. Și corul 'cântăreților' a rostit într-un glas cuvântul trădare! Au ținut șezători cu lacrimi, cu gemete, cu revolte, cu 'cântece,' cu chiote, urmate de ptreceri (ca să-și mai potolească amarul!) și au înălțat literile române până-n piscurile Inăului."
38. Bogdan Crețu, "Tînărul Ion Negoițescu: Devenirea unui mare critic (I)," *Convorbiri literare*, no. 7 (2007): 59: "Nego love ște acolo unde doare mai tare, luând în răspăr recuzita și motivele fetișizate ale poeziei mesianice, pe care, altminteri, nu o desconsidera obtuz".
39. Negoițescu, *În cunoștință*, 12: "Pentru noi, literatura română nu înseamnă un fenomen închis, petrecut într-o țărmurire autarhică, nu o contribuție pitorească la etnografia europeană, ci o ramură tânără a spiritualității continentale, ramură străbătută de aceeași sevă și încărcată de aceleași roade, chiar dacă pământul în care s-au împlântat rădăcinile este altul."
40. Negoițescu, *De la "elanul juvenil,"* 260: "La noi se mai dă lupta între cristaline substraturi ale latinității și mâlurile depuse de valurile slave.

Că e dat clarității să învingă, ne-o spune toată evoluția culturii noastre, care a cunoscut fundalul maiorescianismului."

41. I. Negoițescu and Radu Stanca, *Un roman epistolar* (Bucharest: Albatros, 1978), VII: "dar apropierea zilnică de el, atâția ani, la Sibiu și la Cluj, a creat acele rezerve care adesea vin din instinctual de independență, din teama de a nu fi 'blagieni'."
42. Ion Negoițescu, ***, *Apostrof*, no. 6 (1997): 17: "După război, în haosul moral de atunci (românii începeau să-și dea arama pe față, de aceea am simțit nevoia acestei radicale poziții estetice, mai radicală decât cea din Manifest, și el născut împotriva pășunismului canaliilor, profitorilor literari de război), când tineretul artistic fugea spre moda occidentală, spre existențialism, neo-suprarealism, noi, aparent retrograzi și provinciali, cu "balada" și neoromantismul, pentru întâia oară voiam să ignorăm actualitatea occidentală, care nu ne era de folos, și să ne adâncim în gravele noastre probleme de structură: să scriem tragedii cu teme ne-românești, salvarea românilor prin fuga de românesc!"
43. I. Negoițescu, *Straja*, 178: "Mă descoperisem pe mine însumi în romanele doamnei Bengescu, pentru că asta-mi era patria. Conștiința propriei mele urbanități (lipsa duioșiei față de sat și țărani m-a caracterizat întotdeauna) s-a limpezit definitiv în mine."
44. I. Negoițescu, *Analize și sinteze* (Bucharest: Albatros, 1976), 157-165.
45. I. Negoițescu, *Istoria literaturii române: 1840-1945* (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 2002), 259.
46. I. Negoițescu, *Scriitori contemporani* (Ploiești: Paralela 45, 2000), 597.

Bibliography:

Blaga, Lucian. "Elogiu satului românesc" [Eulogy of the Romanian Village]. In *Discursuri de recepție la Academia Română* [Reception Speeches at the Romanian Academy], edited by Octav Păun, Bucharest: Albatros, 1980.

Blaga, Lucian. *Trilogia culturii* [Trilogy of Culture]. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2011.

Blaga, Lucian. *Zări și etape* [Horizons and Stages]. Bucharest: Minerva, 1990.

Borza, Cosmin. "Literatura rurală" [Rural literature]. In *Enciclopedia imaginariilor din România I. Imaginar literar* [*Encyclopedia of Romanian Imaginaries I. Literary Imaginary*], edited by Corin Braga, 191-210. Iași: Polirom, 2020.

Borza, Cosmin. "The National No Man's Land. Imagining Rurality in the Romanian Literary Histories." *Dacoromania litteraria*, no. 6 (2019): 170-180.

Butoi, Ionuț. "Recitindu-l pe Sthal" [Rereading Stahl]. *Transilvania*, no. 1-2 (2022): 5-14.

Crețu, Bogdan. "Tînărul Ion Negoițescu: Devenirea unui mare critic (I)" [The Young Ion Negoițescu: Becoming a Great Critic (I)]. *Convorbiri literare*, no. 7 (2007): 59.

Damaschin, Dan. *Cercul literar de la Sibiu/Cluj. Deschidere spre europeism și universalitate* [The Sibiu/Cluj Literary Circle. Openness to Europeanism and universality]. Cluj-Napoca: ZENIT, 2009.

Damaschin, Dan. *Cercul Literar de la Sibiu/Cluj: glosse/restituiri/corespondențe* [The Sibiu/Cluj Literary Circle: Glosses, Restorations, Correspondences]. Cluj-Napoca: Ecou Transilvan, 2013.

Doboș, Mihaela. *Tabloul unui destin – Ștefan Aug. Doinaș: o monografie* [The Painting of a Destiny – Ștefan Aug. Doinaș: a Monograph]. Iași: Adenium, 2013.

Iancu, Victor. "În chestiunea noii mișcări estetice din Ardeal. Ce este Cercul literar din Sibiu?" [On the Issue of the New Aesthetic Movement in Transylvania: What Is the Sibiu Literary Circle?]. *Timpul*, no. 2192-2193 (1943): 2.

Negoițescu, Ion. ***. *Apostrof*, no. 6 (1997): 17.

Negoițescu, I. "*Pășuniști și nemuritori*" [Pășunists and "Immortals"]. *Saeculum*, no. 1 (1944): 78-81.

Negoițescu, I. *Analize și sinteze* [Analyzes and Syntheses]. Bucharest: Albatros, 1976.

Negoițescu, I. *În cunoștință de cauză* [Knowingly]. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1991.

Negoițescu, I. *Istoria literaturii române: 1840-1945* [History of Romanian Literature: 1840-1945]. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 2002.

Negoițescu, I. *Scriitori contemporani* [Contemporary Writers]. Ploiești: Paralela 45, 2000.

Negoițescu, I. *Scriitori moderni* [Modern Writers]. Bucharest: Editura Pentru Literatură, 1966.

Negoițescu, I. *Straja dragonilor* [The Watch of the Dragons]. Cluj-Napoca: Biblioteca Apostrof, 1994.

Negoițescu, I., and Radu Stanca. *Un roman epistolary* [An Epistolary Novel]. Bucharest: Albatros, 1978.

Negoițescu, Ion. *De la "elanul juvenil" la "visatul Euphorion" (Publicistica de tinerețe: 1938-1947)* [From "Youthful Zeal" to "dreamed Euphorion" (Youth Publishing: 1938-1947)], edited by Lelia Nicolescu. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2007.

Ornea, Z. *Sămănătorismul*. third edition, revised. Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Romane, 1998.

Petreu, Marta. *Blaga, între legionari și comuniști* [Blaga, Between Legionnaires and Communists]. Iași: Polirom, 2021.

Poantă, Petru. *Cercul Literar de la Sibiu. Introducere în fenomenul originar* [The Sibiu Literary Circle. Introduction to the Original Phenomenon]. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium, 1997.

Regman, Cornel. "Cu gândul la Gheorghe Şincai. Mitul latin" [Thinking of Gheorghe Șincai. The Latin Myth]. *Ardealul*, no. 21 (1944): 3, 7.

Regman, Cornel. "Un regim pe sfârşite: Tradiţionalismul" [A Regime on its End: Traditionalism]. *Revista Cercului Literar*, no. 6-8 (1945): 118.

Sîrbu, Ion. D. *Jurnalul unui jurnalist fără jurnal* [The Journal of Journalist Without a Journal]. Bucharest: Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2013.

Vartic, Ion. "Lovitura de stat de la Cercul Literar și urmările sale ["The Coup d'Etat of the Literary Circle and its Aftermath"]. *Apostrof*, no. 12 (2020): https://www.revista-apostrof.ro/arhiva/an2020/n12/a28/.

Volceanov, George, and George-Paul Volceanov. *Noul dicționar de argou al limbii române* [*The New Romanian Slang Dictionary*]. Bucharest: Grup Litera Media, 2019.

Volceanov, George. *Dicționar de argou al limbii române* [Romanian Slang Dictionary]. Bucharest: Niculescu, 2006.