

OVIDIUS UNIVERSITY, CONSTANȚA

DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC SCIENCES
DOCTORAL FIELD: PHYLOGOLOGY

DOCTORAL THESIS

POLYSEMANISM AND AMBIGUITY IN MARIN SORESCU'S DRAMA

PhD SUPERVISOR,

PhD. habil. Marina CAP-BUN

PhD STUDENT,

Mihaela AIRINEI

**CONSTANȚA
2020**

POLYSEMANISM AND AMBIGUITY IN MARIN SORESCU'S DRAMATURGY

Contents.....	3-4
Argument.....	5-17

CHAPTER I – LITERATURE – A TERRITORY OF CREATION UNDER THE HORRORS OF THE CENTURY WITH *BROKEN SPINE*

1.1. Totalitarianism – a time of illusions and trials.....	18-23
1.2. The Romanian literary phenomenon between non-annihilation and resistance (1948-1989. A retrospective).....	23-28
1.3. The condition of the Romanian intellectual under the sign of the ancient hero Femios.....	28-31
1.4. The Self – lector and <i>the grip of the thrilling time</i>	31-37
1.5. Proletcultism vs. socialist realism (terminological aporia).....	37-43
1.6. Literature and <i>resistance</i> to the norms of the doctrinal canon (diachronic signs)	43-89

CHAPTER II - POST-WAR ROMANIAN DRAMA BETWEEN THE CONSTRAINT MILESTONES

2.1. Theater - the <i>stage of the turmoil of the present</i>	89-96
2.2. <i>Subversivity</i> in the diagonals of lexicons.....	96-101
2.3. Sorescian literature or the assumption of the frond against canonizing patterns	
2.3.1. <i>The call to literature – signs of the existential and artistic journey</i>	101-105
2.3.2. „ <i>As I would write, if I were No-matter-who. All in all : YES, OF COURSE!</i> ”- <i>Exercises on a lyrical keyboard</i>	106-108
2.3.3. „ <i>The entrance to literature is through the great door of the places from where you left.</i> ”	109-111

2.3.4. „Greatest authors cannot be comprised in a definition, yet there are reins all around, you name it!”	111-113
2.3.5. „Books are sentences with a mere beginning” (stages of creation).....	113-115
2.3.6. „As of craftsmanship, there are methods and there are methods... ”....	116-117
2.3.7. „When I have nothing to do... ”	117-128
2.3.8. „When you are yourself, I believe you are unique too.”	129-130
2.3.9. „I have never started from some models or authors, I have disregarded models.”	130-134
2.4. Marin Sorescu and the criticism „hand on the trigger”	
2.4.1. „The nuance is answered with a nuance!”.....	134-138
2.4.2. <i>Marin Sorescu and „a new kind of totalitarianism”</i>	138-144
CHAPTER III - „THEATER– ALONG WITH THE POETRY AND PROSE– IS LITERATURE ITSELF AND DESERVES THE SAME ATTENTION!”	
3.1. „...Eroding the edges of the genres”	148-155
3.2. „Theater is a job!”	
3.2.1. <i>Marin Sorescu under the sign of Ullise’s fight against Scylle and Charibde</i>	155-157
3.2.2. „In general, plays continue my poems. In particular they are very different!”.....	157-174
3.2.3. „Let us have the Romanian sensitivity go beyond borders ”	174-177
3.3. Sorescian dystopia and the proximities of “surveillance”	177-227
Conclusions.....	228-235
Bibliography.....	236-256

ABSTRACT

Key-words: postwar literature, dramaturgy, theater, repertoire, stage, reader, debate, polemics, censorship, censor, literary critic, critical reception, concentrational universe, totalitarianism, ideology, creative methods, socialist realism, socialist humanism, proletcultism, canonizing models, utopia, dystopia, negative utopia, resistance through culture /literature, aesthetic autonomy, resistance strategies, tragedy, comedy, drama, parable, allusive literature, subversive literature, subversive, subversion, subversivity.

Ever since the beginning of his literary *journey*, Marin Sorescu announces his doubtful and interrogative consciousness and by exercising on various *keyboards*, the 60's generation representative foreshadows a new freshness, *sideways* from the uniform space of canons imposed by the political scene. His own style, unusual of the author, ready to break all barriers is sensed in high words by the chronicals of G. Călinescu from „Contemporanul”, „A young poet, a literary portrait”. Bearing the title of being *different*, he is considered lucky to be entering Călinescu's *hall of light*. He shall always consider that entering this space of literature is to be done through the great gate of the birthplace. Moreover, the place of the writer's ontical literary origin shall be reflected in every stitch of his writing. Hovering over its entirety, we will discover a plenary spirit, an intellectual enthusiastic about the act of writing, which depicts the Romanian literary environment (confronted with a complicated and constantly moving geography) its artistic versatility. Even if he is addressing an archipelago of genres, I chose to research into his plenary expressiveness in dramaturgy. It is a common place that, in communism, Sorescu's theater enjoyed an aura of legend. Intelligence show in motion succeeds in deserting from the ideological hedges of the era, his plays offering in the limelight forms to challenge *uniformity*. Philosophy and popular stylistics, the inverted meaning given to events, the „capsizing”, free play of words and events, invention of the characters' names reveal without a doubt an original writer, freed from the armour of doctrines in time. Dedicated to the search of truth about man and his world where he is born, he sees in playwriting a means of expressing and communication. The mixture of vitality and intellectuality, of obsessive will to overcome the limits and lucid reflection make Marin Sorescu's dramaturgy a living bridge to the soul of the General Public. The author realizes

his dramaturgy as a re-creation of the world in front of the audience. By stating that what man is as a *character*, in his multiple metaphors, this could reveal the creator manifesting in fact his will to redeem his great loneliness. The cry of need to communicate is felt from the first lyrical exercises (*Singur printre poeți*). Further on, his reflective writings of introspection, of probing the inner universe, of an effort to reveal the Self, in self-discovery, dedicated to the scene of a theater, exhibits *man's mere fight with nature*, „a tragic struggle in essence”, yet altogether the struggle to *submerge* from the dramatic existential state of man cloistered or „swallowed”, to “a clearing of thought and existence”. What amazes is the wealth of resources with which the playwright operates to convey the message, managing to touch and slip the great and terrible truths of existence. And it does not do so by appealing only to the serious register of the ontological, tragic, dramatic dimension, but it twins in the subtle register, the ludic dimension. With this message the playwright definitely wins his audience and makes them his travel companions. *Then*, through metaphors, the only illusion of freedom, *now*, through the fascinating re-connection to his Creation.

Questioning both the originality of the dramatic formula, confusing the current connotation with the deep semantic background of his plays, and the transformative character of the Sorescian theater in terms of resistance to the official culture of the time, I shall focus this research on the quest for an interior dynamics of the Sorescian creation, appealing to maintain a constant dialogue between the playwright and his reception.

The doctoral thesis *Polisemantism and ambiguity in Marin Sorescu's dramaturgy* identifies from the very title the scope of the research. The attempt to decipher the meaning of the Romanian literature, but especially the obvious cleavage between the legendary success during communism, on the one hand, and the scale and duration of the denigrating debates in the post-December period, on the other hand, justifies the choice of this theme of the present research approach. The current study aims to reveal the authentic springs from which the Sorescian dramaturgical creation was articulated, and by interrogating the causes of the difference of reception to bring, in a necessary way partially, some evidence of resistance. I base this survey by putting in "dialogue" the voices of those who demand the restoration of the synoptic picture of authentic values vitiated in the nine lusters of communist dictatorship and those who advocate for an art deliberately removed from the political event and the options that it proclaims, on the one hand, and the repertoire of the confessions *of the blamed, confessions* that the playwright had the

generosity to share with us, already filtered by his critical spirit, an emblem of lucidity, in the area of miscellaneous, interviews, diacritics, but also in essays that articulate the Sorescian "theoretical" aesthetic system.

The investigation of the Sorescian plays was undergone by other researchers from multifold perspectives (Eugen Simion, Nicolae Manolescu, Horia Lovinescu, Mircea Martin, Edgar Papu, Cornel Ungureanu, Vladimir Streinu, Lucian Raicu, Nicolae Balotă, Mihaela Andreescu, Fănuș Băileșteanu, Maria Vodă Căpușan, Romulus Diaconescu, Mircea Ghițulescu, Ion Cocora, Ilarie Hinoveanu), and the young exegets Gabriel Dimisianu, Mircea Scarlat, Iulian Boldea, Monica Spiridon, Marian Popescu, Livius Petru Bercea, Ana Maria Tupan, Ion Bogdan Lefter, Paul Cernea, Crenguța Gâncă, Maria Ionică, Ada Stuparu, Liana Ștefan, Gabriela Rusu-Păsărin, Cristian Stamatoiu, Ștefania Maria Custură, Tatiana Scorțanu and Ion Jianu offered solutions of critical interpretation tangential to our theme. Thus, the reference of the research endeavour has as coordinates extensive critical negotiations on the subject of polisemantism and Sorescian ambiguity in dramaturgy and, specifically, that of the forms of cultural resistance relative to the narrowness of the realist-socialist canons, well known as controversies and divergent opinions raised in the postcommunist years. Naturally, the question emerged: what is the point of another approach to research about Marin Sorescu's dramaturgy, at a scale where, at first sight, all cardinal points have already been uttered? Considering that investigating such an open theme by other researchers too never lead to the elimination of all aporias, I shall propose a resizing of the perspective of analysis, by orienting the investigation of the phenomenon upon correcting the reception of Sorescian dramaturgy by starting from what the playwright states himself.

Investigating the theoretical phenomenon shall be performed on various levels (monographic, social, political), the idea that resides in the premises being that the original meeting of the writer (poet, novelist, playwright, essayist) with the theater and adjoining arts was never circumstantial, but yet axiologically founded. In analyzing the literary plan I shall not disregard the essential *mutations* from the socio-political sphere, both for a proper framing in the context but also for a better understanding of the potential meanings of the lunge.

Based on a theoretical and critical biography recovered rather as a basis of ideas than chronologically and in conformity with the proposed aims, the paper is structured in three ample sequences of research, each of these supporting arguments that confirm the validity of the

hypothesis that Sorecian drama contributes decisively to the shaping of postwar theatrical scheme.

I base my demonstration using a methodological approach, specific to a qualitative research, which includes: historical-literary research, analysis of interactions (sociological criticism and psychoanalytic formulae, in retrieving suggestions from political science, sociology, history, philosophy), associated with biographical details, analysis and synthesis of content by theorizing, the analysis of the details of the genesis of the work, the filiations, the ways of symbolization, the thematic, but also the analysis of the adjacent fields that lead to the identification of the marks of specificity and difference of the Sorescian dramaturgy.

In the first chapter, *Literature – a territory of creation under the horrors of the century “with a broken spine”*, the research amply recomposes the diachronic image of authoritarian, autocratic and oligarchic leaderships, drawing the coordinates of the influence of political and ideological propaganda on art in general and literature in particular. *Totalitarianism - a time of illusions and trials*, the first sequence in research elucidates, in summary, the defining features of totalitarian society and establishes the coordinates of the "new reality": the *new culture*, the *new morality*, the *new teaching*, the *new man*. Starting from the theoretical suggestions in political science, sociology, history, philosophy (Alain Besançon, Karl Mannheim, Raymond Ruyer, Paul Ricoeur, Tzvetan Todorov, Hannah Arendt, Michel Aucouturier, Guy Debord, Milan Kundera, Krishan Kumar, Herbert Marcuse, Czeslaw Milosz, Rudolf Otto, Gianni Vattimo, Monica Lovinescu, Vladimir Tismăneanu, Bogdan Crețu, Vasile Dem. Zamfirescu, Radu Clint, Dan Lungu, Anca Hațegan) regarding both the consequences of the utopianism of totalitarianism, the mechanisms of "captive thinking" and the dissimulation of the "double man", as well as to the specific symptomatology of alienation (freezing in decline, lack of perspectives, deepening the cleavage between the constructed image and the social reality), I analyzed the concept of *ideology* in its Marxist sense. Marxist-Leninist social engineering exercises absolute control over all social domains through the repressive instruments of the regime: political police and propaganda. By establishing its cult, totalitarian power mystifies all the functions of power, amplifying its unlimited importance, hiding the enormous means that ensure it and denying the role of objective realities. From the richness of the phenomenon, we chose the elements that highlight the ideological fixations in the attempt to distort, diminish, alter and confuse the critical spirit. In order to clarify the point of view I am invoking, I must emphasize the fact that the

illustration of the socio-political concept and *ideology* is essential in the research, through the cardinal influence it exerted on the Romanian literature under the communist regime.

The attention was then switched on to a necessary general reflection of the state of post-war Romanian literature, relevant for the penetration in the thickets of the respective time, as well as the condition of the Romanian intellectual, which I was tempted to put under the sign of the legendary ancient hero Femios. Without claiming to give an exhaustive analysis of the cultural and ideological phenomenon under the pressure of the programmed demystification process, I investigated, on the one hand, retrospectively in the sequence *The Romanian literary phenomenon between non-anihilation and resistance (1948-1989. A Retrospective)*, the uneven character of the 50 years of literature under communism, and, in extension of these relevant references, in the sequence *The condition of the Romanian intellectual under the sign of the legendary ancient hero Femios*, the conditions in which the Romanian intellectual, in general, the artist, in particular, is obliged to choose "the type of reaction". In its need for legitimacy, the regime is courting writers who, like Femios, are forced to put the difficult alphabet of freedom and dignity on the page. Whether he chooses to put mystification within the brackets of silence, or makes certain concessions to power, hoping that in this way he will be allowed to publish, the Romanian writer lives the true drama of the struggle for survival.

Within the same area of interest, I shall formulate another fertile idea in debate: the direct link between *writing* and *reading*. The following step in research the Self – lector and *the grip of the thrilling time*, restricts the discussion especially on the aspects that analyze the presence of the reader in the building up of the subversive message, but also the complicity of the reader/lector – writer/ creator. Considering it opportune to gloss some investigative grids on the reading experience in the life of an ordinary reader and, explicitly, in the reading pattern of the latter during communism, I shall cover some problematic sideslips. After carefully having deciphered the creation climate of the era, I was especially interested in analyzing the reception of the works during the communist era by ordinary consumers of literature. Starting from *fact* reading (standard reading), that does not engage the reader in depth, but only outlines in general the victories of the guidelines imposed by the party in various areas, I emphasized especially the difficulties and risks in investigating the reading patterns, and also the inconveniences of getting into the complicated historical context in other epochs. In this approach it is quite revealing the analysis of rigorous research that shall operate with special instruments for exploring such

aspects. The exceptions are presented in the studies by Sanda Cordoş (*Lectura clandestină în România comunistă*), Simona Sora (*Cum citeam în comunism*), Maria Bucur (*Colecționarea de cărți și cititul în Brașov. România sub comunism*) and Catrinela Popa (*Dosar – Lectura în fabricile și uzinele comuniste – Programul impus*). Concentrating information on *what, how* and especially *why* people read during the totalitarian system highlighted that during communism, due to the ideological misinterpretation popularized by an enslaved National Television and due to absences of alternatives for spare time and personal development, people contrasted *reading* as a genuine compensatory universe.

The next research step, *Proletcultism vs. socialist realism (terminological aporias)*, tries to recover, for the benefit of the language of literary history and not only, the semantic avatars of the two key concepts in the survey of the period after 1947: *proletcultism* and *socialist realism*. The honest writer lives the drama of a culture in the midst of an aesthetic crisis, struggling between the regret of the ideological compromise agreed in different degrees and forms, on the one hand, and the need to face the regime, on the other. I x-rayed this problematic set using a synthetic approach of opinions, not infrequently divergent, of the personalities who closely researched this phenomenon of ideological confiscation of the cardinal concepts of the Romanian literature, by multiplying and transforming them into propaganda tools, after 1989. (Eugen Simion, Nicolae Manolescu, Marian Popa, Florin Mihăilescu, Vladimir Tismăneanu, Angelo Mitchievici, Ion Manolescu, Ioan Stanomir, Carmen Mușat, Cristian Vasile, M. Nițescu, Liviu Țeghiu, Ion Simuț, Paul Goma, Ruxandra Cesereanu, Sanda Cordoș, Mircea Martin, Monica Lovinescu, Adrian Marino, Paul Cernat, Sorin Antohi, George Banu, Eugen Negrici, Alex Ștefănescu, Nicolae Breban, Doina Jela, Andrei Grigor, Alexandru Cistelecan and others). Regarding this ideological fiction and the obtuse formulas for creation as recommended by the regime, Marin Sorescu manifests his position in journalism. Sensing the danger of the *isms* of the time, he then avoids acquiring the methods of regimentation, demonstrating through his entire work the unique integration of both identity and otherness, as well as that of specificity and difference. The most difficult moment of this research was the realization of a pertinent differentiation between the moral and the aesthetic arguments, between literary ideas and the ideology of oppressive type doctrine, between the relief of forms and "formula" of compromise and those of cultural samizdat and resistance through culture/literature. In the last subchapter *Literature and resistance to the norms of the doctrinal*

canon (diachronic signs) I intended to highlight the dynamics of critical relationships and recoveries regarding the resistance through culture. Placing on the dialogical scaffold proofs of the justice/injustice of the points of view regarding the presence of the intellectual, especially the one of the writer, under the dominating sign of time, I brought into discussion allegations located at the intersection of literary history with literary sociology, literary socio-criticism, comparative theory, culturology and "discursive" analysis. Recovered selectively, the generous bibliography of the field (Czeslaw Milosz, Milan Kundera, Tzvetan Todorov, Ion Negoițescu Eugen Simion Dumitru Țepeneag, Lawrence Ulici Vladimir Tismaneanu Ion Simuț, Paul Cernat, Angelo Mitchievici Ion Manolescu, John Stanomir, M. Nițescu, Paul Goma, Corin Braga, Ruxandra Cesereanu, Sanda Cordoș, Mircea Martin, Adrian Marino, Sorin Antohi, George Banu, Alex Ștefănescu, Nicolae Breban, Carmen Mușat, Monica Lovinescu, Andrei Grigor, Alexandru Cistelecan, Ovidiu Pecican, Gheorghe Grigurcu) allowed me to identify the perspective that governs the critical reception relative to the issue of resistance to the norms of the doctrinal canon. Also, another important point of reference for this sequence is the discussion of the heated controversies triggered after the fall of the communist regime, on the need to re-evaluate the post-war Romanian literature. From the range of problematic debates of the effervescent transition period, I placed in a "dialogue" the surveys carried out by two prestigious editorials of the time: that of the *Calendars* (1991-1993) and that of the *Critical Notebooks* (1996), respectively. The statements launched by the interviewees formed two "camps": one that maintains its inquisitive tone, denouncing the "value hierarchies" of the communist period (Gheorghe Grigurcu, Gheorghe Crăciun, Virgil Podoabă, Mircea Iorgulescu, Paul Goma, Al. Cistelecan, Al. Th. Ionescu, Alexandru George), the other, which highlights a modulation of discourse, inviting objectivity, decision, dedication and lack of passion in the complex process of gradually clarifying all the details related to postwar Romanian literature (Mircea Nedelciu, Elisabeta Lăsconi, Elena Zaharia-Filipaș, Geo Vasile, Vasile Bardan, Nicolae Bârna, Ioan Constantinescu, Dan Mănuță, Andrei Grigor, Lucian Chișu, Alexandra Crăciun, Jeana Morărescu, Valentin F. Mihăescu, Livius Ciocârlie, Dumitru Micu, Eugen Simion, Ioan Lăcustă, Daniel Cristea-Enache, Dan Laurențiu, George Cușnarencu, Răzvan Voncu, Bogdan Popescu, Răzvan Petrescu, Alexandru Paleologu, Caius Traian Dragomir, Adrian Popescu, Nicolae Breban, Costache Olăreanu, Octavian Paler, Cătălin Țirlea, Adrian Dinu Rachieru, Tudor Dumitru Savu, Călin Căliman, Vasile Bardan, Vasile Igna and others). Regarding the possible interferences of the Sorescian literary principles

with those of the ideology of the regime, I considered, like many literary critics, that the presence of Marin Sorescu in this field remains a matter of perspective. The serious gaps and “mass” or, on the contrary, trivializing reconsiderations regarding the Sorescian literary edifice I find that they are particularly dangerous for a valuable identification of the writer. This can be achieved only on the basis of the fundamental law of aesthetic criterion, with lucidity, calm, equidistance and last but not least, with harmonized instruments to the literary reasons.

The second chapter, *The Playwright is beyond any condition. Provided he is a playwright*, continues on another level of the subscribing the Sorescian literature in the one that brings back the organization of hierarchies of the aesthetic criteria. Since it is difficult to reconstruct a global map of the post-war dramatic phenomenon, the accents aimed at contextualizing the emergence of Marin Sorescu's theater. The sequence *Theater - the scene of the turmoil of the present* oriented the investigation of the phenomenon to two cardinal realities faced by the Romanian dramaturgy after the War: on the one hand, the ideological commands of the regime and the pressures exerted by them and, on the other hand, the huge value boost recorded by the dramatic art in a universal plan (by looking for a creative, unbridled, improvised, frantic theater, taking the shape of expressionism, surrealism, existentialism). Well-knowing the interest of party and state in the theater, considered to be a decisive factor in the work of education and cultivation of the masses, attention is focused first on the organizational measures taken to transform it into a *lever for the transformation of the society and man*: the establishment institutions (*Union of Artists, Writers, Journalists - USASZ [1945], Higher Council for Dramatic Literature and Musical Creation [1947], General Directorate for Press and Print, and Committee for Press and Print [1949-1977]*) and some laws (*The Law regarding the organization of theaters, philharmonics and state operas as well as public performances [1947]*) which aimed at establishing a *new art and literature* to synchronize the ideological and cultural progress with the achieved one in the field of development of the productive forces. From this perspective I shall analyze the directions of the Party *Programme* in promoting the realist theater: assimilation of work principles of the soviet Theater School, participation of creators to “the heroic labour for building the new order”, „modernization” dramaturgic perspective (a repertoire always designed according to the system of principles and values that were to be found at the basis of the cultural politics of the socialist society), the affirmation of the plays with a militant characteristic, the profiling of a hero with a stunning resemblance to the revolution requirements a.s.o. In other

words, *education through theater* is under the social command. Further on, I aimed at following up to the methodical removal from the valuable traditions of the theater, glossing on the side of the theatrical representations during 1945-1963. By analyzing theater life through the repertoire, I perceived two types of “reactions” to the political ideological and cultural – educational activity to shape up the *new man* through theater: the one that strongly underlines the *new* condition, the ideals, the turmoil and aspirations of the *new man* (Mihail Davidoglu, Lucia Demetrius, Maria Banuș, Ana Covac, Tudor Șoimaru, Al. Mirodan, Mircea Ștefănescu, Dorel Dorian, Al. Voitin, Dan Tărchilă, Ionel Hristea ș.a.) and the one that fails to find congruent shapes of the *revolutionary content* (Teodor Mazilu, Horia Lovinescu, Aurel Baranga, Ion Băieșu, G. M. Zamfirescu, Camil Petrescu, Lucian Blaga, Alexandru Kirițescu, Valeriu Anania, Ion D. Sîrbu, Marin Sorescu). The next passage of research, *Subversivity in the lexicon diagonals*, aims at offering theoretical benchmarks, to justify the assuming of senses that I operate with in my research approach. I appreciate the set of definitions offered in the dictionaries studied as very opportune in „clarifying” *the picture* of the forms of cardinal concepts of „subversion/subjectivity” and, respectively, „subversive” and, equally, I deem them useful in developing the in depth significance of the Sorescian creative act.

To this point of the paper I favoured an ample, socio-political-ideological-cultural contextualization of the Romanian post-war literature, by pointing out key aspects, most precisely those where literature/ dramaturgy is molded between the constraints of the regime, in subchapter *Sorescian literature or the assumption of the frond against canonizing models* I shall open my investigating “the history” of building the Sorescian dramaturgy edifice. I had in mind the fundamentals of the coordinates in this project by appealing to the ontological and epistemological arguments, privileging the aesthetic ones as provided by the playwright. As from the perspective of the canonic dynamics, contemporary Romanian literature has yet to confirm its territory, its peaks, its absolute critical voices, I shall propose widening up the investigation area from the one of investigation to the one meant for the critical reception of Marin Sorescu’s work, especially to his plays, to the generous „bio-bibliographic resource”, the author’s confession, „reading” his work through its prism. A clarification is to be noted: his multiple values artistic keyboard forces the ordering of milestones of the writer’s existential and artistic path, a necessary filter for the introduction within the network of senses and symbols that the imagery of his works implies.

Heading from these considerations, the investigative pretext led to the revelation of the signs of the existential and artistic route (the call to writing manifested instead of the ontic and literary origin, the village with almost “a thousand baskets”, Bulzești, the first high school “attempts”, in *the Call to literature – signs of the existential and artistic journey*; the first *locating in “shocking” anticanonical poetry - parodies*, the first „printing failures”, but also his dawn of literary creation, in „*As I would write, if I were No-matter-who. All in all : YES, OF COURSE!- Exercises on a lyrical keyboard* the chain of hurdles that he undergoes in his *journey*, invincible as he proves and losing himself in the spark of inspiration that transforms failure into victory, in „*The entrance to literature is through the great door of the places from where you left*”; an advocate of the '60s Generation, in „*Greatest authors cannot be comprised in a definition, yet there are reins all around, you name it!*”; the stages of creation in „*Books are sentences with a mere beginning*”; the original „technique” of creation, in the sequence „*As of craftsmanship, there are methods and there are methods...*”; appreciation of Marin Sorescu’s dramaturgy not only as text but also as a possibility to stage show, and also to continue at a thematic and expressive level – looking for his own voice – the translation – a source of literary geography, in „*When I have nothing to do...*”; on popularity, in the sequence „*When you are yourself, I believe you are unique too*”; about style and „affiliations”, in „*I have never started from some models or authors, I have disregarded models*”).

The subchapter *Marin Sorescu and the criticism „hand on the trigger”* re-launches the debate of the playwright with the literary critique. In the sequence “*The nuance is answered with a nuance!*” I captured both the extremely unequal manifestation of the criticism to the Sorescian work, and the literary critiques oscillations promptly compensated by the solid presence of the Great Public , Sorescian text-loving , the reading „friends” and „the very talented” public, those to whom Marin Sorescu wishes to „always be the most spontaneous and most sincere critics of his works”. Moreover, in *Marin Sorescu and „the new kind of totalitarianism”* I brought in the limelight the price of „adaptation to void” paid by Marin Sorescu under the aspect of public image (notoriety, in Ceaușescu’s time, contestation, in transition), by bringing to the surface “strong” discussions, polemics, that, until 1989 were carried out under the fight for ideas slogan, and after this landmark moment in our national history, they changed into angry attacks. I understood, consequently, following the writer’s observations, that the marriage between *writer-critique* has always been under the doomed sign of separation. I quoted these ideas in order to

justify the writer's position, Marin Sorescu, towards the inexplicable attitude of the critic who lacks passion for the *leaden-filled new books*, who writes pornographies on about the forgotten writers and is completely absent from the current phenomenon of literature.

The most consistent contribution to this approach of research is to be found in Chapter III, entitled „*Teatrul – along with the poetry and prose – is literature itself and deserves the same attention!*”. Marin Sorescu's dramatic creation enjoys a multiplicity of interpretations. In order to have a more ample image of the latter, I fostered the method of dialogical analysis, conjugating the spiritual dynamism of reception, the „carcasses” where the critical space strives to fix it, on one hand, with the playwright's *confessions to somebody*, the confessional digressions, the theoretical speculations so fertile in the Sorescian aesthetic *interventions*. In the subchapter „*...Eroding the edges of literary genres*”, resettling the epistemological landmarks of the Sorescian playwright destiny I can but notice the fact that Marin Sorescu's theater comes after a political poetry experience dominated by a single magnetic pole. He approaches the stage precisely because of a need to voice to the *other* pole, to balance them. Stirred up in his subconscious, or in the mere deep of the creation act, this second character, who is clothed in various forms, offers victory to the theater in general, which must be a dialogue. Convinced of the *sine qua non* bound that must exist between those *who write* and *those who receive*, Marin Sorescu assumes the demonstration that not only the theater „glued to the moment” is actual, but also the metaphorical, parabolic one that engages, with enough fertile resources, to mirror life and its plural valences. Theater ... on a continent of poetry, inhales *facts, dramas, destinies* and author's persistence „to write things that make you think..., untheatrically.” Taking these into consideration, the next research approach, in the subchapter „*Theater is a job!*”, continues, on a different level, the trial to shape up a Sorescian *ars dramatica*, which deems itself from the Romanian and European interwar theatalogy and which does not reject the ideas of nowadays. Thus, after I underline the Sorescian dramaturgy relief in the section *Marin Sorescu under the sigh of Ulisse's fights against Scylle and Charibde*, in a “broken mirror” of critical formulas, in the section „*In general, plays continue my poems. In particular they are very different!*” I illustrated the multiplicity of the dramatic creation interpretation of Marin Sorescu, by holding onto the method of dialogue analysis, in capitalizing the dynamic spirit of reception, on one hand, and the fragments of journalism, essays and the “collection” of interviews, that Marin Sorescu founds his dramatic construct. In accordance to this approach, I oriented my investigation by

putting in value the complex mechanisms that generates the creating act, the resorts from where the Sorescian dramaturgy creation had emerged. My attention was focused onto the horizon of the sources of inspiration that became dramatic conflicts, on the thematic "preferences" on the modalities of symbols through characters, the analysis of the stages and Sorescian dramatic formulas, affiliates/ received influences, the modalities of expression in a modern or post modern aspect, but also on the techniques of approach and, most certainly, on the concrete innovations that define the formula of his originality. The questioning led to the fact that Marin Sorescu never gives up to the dramatic modality of literary expression. The aspect of the *echoes* of his plays in the context of international representations, but mostly in the one regarding the risk of the possibility of *universalization* for the Romanian theater by shunning away from the *specific*, was mirrored in the paragraph „*Let the Romanian sensitivity go beyond borders*”. The playwright is convinced that the *specific* must not be searched, since it is „implicit” and writing „about what you know best”, the playwright envisages the Maiorescian view: „One becomes universal if you try to express what you own, what you already know for a long time”. Another benefit of this approach in this project is that of identification of the ethical component of the Sorescian theater, that resides in the aspect of the active or passive resistant, transposed in his plays. With the premise of revealing the role of Sorescian dramaturgy in highlighting the conflicts of the "most acute present", the last subchapter, *Sorescian Dystopias and the proximity of "surveillance"*, places on the page, in a problematic set, first a necessary foray into the „history” of inferences of the *Secret Police* over the word, censorship, in any *manifestation* likely to be contrary to the regime, so that, later on, the research to be focused on the conditioning, amputation and diversion of the meanings of the Sorescian dramaturgical texts. The proximity of the *surveillance* of Marin Sorescu's theater was recovered by analyzing some *Notes* of the State Security, in which the quasi-totality of the dissent acts from the space of his literature are meticulously and concretely recorded. The documentary sources that I appealed to are the volumes from the *Security White Paper* series, which, together with other reference works published in the 1990s, revealed that, through the "backbone" of his literature, Marin Sorescu manifests a continuous form of resistance to the aggressions of the absurd visions of the totalitarian regime. "Read" in the grid of the Securitate *Informative notes*, which target the writer, his presence in the deepest articulations of the post-war Romanian intellectual field, outline a legitimate replica to the imperative of revisions on his criteria other than the aesthetic ones and, of course, the entire campaign of

denigration that he had to resist, immediately after having gained the freedom of expression exercise. I placed a revealing window to the background of the problem opened by the Securitate's transcripts, documentary *testimonials* that targeted Marin Sorescu in a "multidisciplinary" way, the political context of the time offering to me a complementary touch. The investigation of the relationship between the intersection of the Sorescian literary principles with those of the official ideology led me to the conclusion that, beyond all hostile circumstances, the Sorescian dramaturgy produces the irrevocable cleavage of the nationalist-proletcultist canon and its creative methods (the "socialist realism") and the "socialist humanism"), the dystopia from the theatrical register demonstrating the mechanism of utopianism, in portraying the gaps and also the social, psychological, aesthetic consequences. Marin Sorescu "attacks" steamy topics of the time, maintaining an angle of perspective on the man found in a full existential crisis. By escaping into language, organically participating in the recovery of the territory of literature, generating values subversive as a strategy of resistance, the Sorescian theatre becomes a genuine anti-system weapon.