

## Self-Censoring Memorial Writing: Crainic's Case<sup>1</sup>

Prof. univ. dr. Laura BĂDESCU  
Institutul de Istorie și Teorie Literară „G. Călinescu” din București

**Abstract:** In her article "Self-Censoring Memorial Writing: Crainic's Case" Laura Bădescu discusses the memoirs of Nichifor Crainic (1889–1972). Conceived during the Transylvanian War, between 1945–1946, these memoirs were rewritten by the mentor of "Gândirea" in the years 1963–1964, with the aim of his rehabilitation and reintegration into public life. However, this second variant did not pass by the censorship, remaining in the manuscript until after the 1989 revolution. After the revolution, only the first version (V1) was published. The one restored under ideological pressure has remained, to date, in typed form at the Library of the Romanian Academy under A3515 (V2). The article proposes a comparative reading of the two versions, observing the ideological, social and aesthetic tensions that determined in V2 the modification of the memorial writer's reception angle.

**Keywords:** Nichifor Crainic, memorial writing, comparative reading.

Nichifor Crainic's destiny can be described by means of terms such as grandeur, suffering, humiliation, betrayal, struggle and humiliation again. The climb, the fall, the rehabilitation attempt after the jailbreak are the sequences of a man's life that in the interwar period oriented the Romanian letters towards one of the original trends of our culture: *gândirismul* (*thinkingism*).

An authentic poet, with roots in the line of traditionalists, a memorable theologian and, above all, a professor with university audience at the courses of dogmatic and universal literature, etc., Nichifor Crainic remains in the memory of our culture through the directorate and ideological (and financial) support of the magazine "Gândirea". Occurred in a cultural setting where the major tendencies were the rural democracy from "Viața Românească", the "Sburătorul" aesthetics and the modernism of the "Contimporanul", "Gândirea" promoted the preservation of the spiritual specificity materialized in formulas such as autochthonism and orthodoxy. Particularly, Crainic saw religion an

---

<sup>1</sup> Lucrare realizată în cadrul Proiectului *Prezervarea și valorificarea patrimoniului literar românesc folosind soluții digitale inteligente pentru extragerea și sistematizarea de cunoștințe* (INTELLIT), PN-III-P1-1.2-PCCDI-2017-0821/ Nr 54PCCDI/ 2018.

intermediary of the knowledge of the psychological structure of this people, knowledge fecundated by capitalizing on the perennial structures of folk culture. True to the belief that "religious lyricism is not dogma, it is usually over-confessional" ("lirismul religios nefiind dogmă e, de obicei, supraconfesional") (Crainic, *Zile*, (Days) 169), Crainic also allowed artistic freedom to all collaborators, not infringing their literary productions. He has thus ensured for the magazine long-term collaborations with first-rate names of interwar literature. Observing only the lyrical path of the magazine, we see that Lucian Blaga (80 titles), I. Pillat (122 titles), V. Voiculescu (112 titles), St. Baciuc (72), T. Arghezi (7 titles), V. Horia (23 titles), I. Minulescu (13 titles) and also V. Carianopol (28 titles), D. Ciurezu (29 titles), N. Crevedia (30 titles), G. Gregorian (18 titles), I.M.Sadoveanu (13 titles), Zaharia Stancu (32 titles), Al.O.Teodoreanu (11 titles), S.Tudor (25 titles), Gh. Tuleș (68 titles) etc.

After 1944, fallen in the disgrace of the new political order, Nichifor Crainic decides to evade the judicial parodies through a self-exile in Transylvania, where to wait for wiser times and rulers ... This is the period 1945–1946, the one which coincides with the writing of the first variant of *Memorii* (V1) (Memoirs), published almost 20 years after the author's death, in 1991, under the title *Zile albe–Zile negre* (White Days–Black Days).

After years of communist imprisonment, with dramatic sequences of humiliation and betrayal, Crainic tries to return to the journalistic space, and the censors of that time promote him as an example in diaspora magazines. In 1963–1964 he rewrites, under the promise of printing, the memoirs, which are preserved today in printed form at the Library of the Romanian Academy under the quota A3515. The A3515 manuscript covers four files, disposed in two volumes as follows: Volume I comprises File 1 (tabs 1-132) and File 2 (tabs 133-296); Volume II comprises File 3 (tabs 297–464) and File 4 (tabs 465–615). Folder 1 and Folder 3 each comprises a manuscript sheet that reproduces the contents of volumes 1 and 2 respectively.

He had access to their first version, which he corrected. It is known that the manuscript of the first variant was preserved during the entire period of Crainic's detention by Father Ion Sămărghișan, a former student of the memorial writer. After Alexandru Cojan's testimony to the liberation of Nichifor Crainic from prison in 1962, Father Sămărghișan returned the manuscript, which explains the direct relationship of the two variants of the memoirs.

Nichifor Crainic had long worked on rewriting the memoirs (V2). This is evident both from their form, by the arrangement of the epic matter in chronologically ordered chapters, by means of significant titles of a "journey"

and from their content, where, without any spectacular changes, there are shades and subtleties that are mostly operated in the first part, and to a limited extent in the final one. In the first version of the memoirs, there was no taxonomic delimitation, the only epic separation procedure being the one established by paragraph and white space.

When publishing the first version of the memoirs (V1), in 1991, Nedic Lemnaru explained the option for this variant, in that the memorial writer himself had expressly stated it. Was it a denial of the polished version under certain pressure? Or did the rhythm of post-December cultural returns did not permit the acceptance of texts ordered by the old regime or non-stylized texts?

By their particularity of existing in two variants, the *Memoirs* of Nichifor Crainic raise the question of the relationship between the present writing and the subject that it raises.

Thus, in V1, the confessional narrative appears to be written under the imminent threat posed by the verdict of condemnation of life, of wanderings and of uncertainty. The dominant tone is of an ideological testament, with many intrusions into the polemics carried through public life. By evoking these polemics, through the firmness of enunciating some of the decisions taken during the political career, the memorial writer actually indicated the area of controversy that triggered the beginning of the persecution.

In order to argue his innocence, the author introduces not only motives and statements of fact or value, but also strategy reasons (We use the terminology given by Rybacki, *O introducere*, 124-39). The terms in which he builds his speech on these reasons are dominantly evaluating and less justifiable.

In V2, the confessional narrative is in a genetic relationship with V1. However, the wording of the text is different: Crainic proceeds to re-write V1 under the "promise of social reintegration with the restitution of the right to publish or republish the works" (Crainic, *Zile-*, XX), aware of the party's policy by means of which opposers were assimilated or destroyed: "The representatives of the opposition must be incarcerated: the taking over of those opponents who enjoy the indigenous peoples' esteem will be tried by all means. If they do not surrender, they have to be compromised by a denigration campaign. Before they become ingrained in the consciousness of the masses, they must be liquidated by so-called unforeseen events or imprisoned under accusation of high treason." ("Trebuie ca reprezentanții opoziției să fie închiși: se va încerca prin toate mijloacele racolarea acelor opozanți care se bucură de stima populației băștinașe. Dacă nu cedează, trebuie compromiși prin campanie

de denigrare. Înainte ca ei să se întipărească în conștiința maselor, trebuie lichidați prin așa-numite întâmplări neprevăzute sau închiși sub acuzația de înaltă trădare”) Further: “Rehabilitation of those convicted in political processes must be prevented at any cost. If this rehabilitation becomes inevitable, it is allowed only if the case is considered a legal error; the convict will not be judged, but only pardoned: there will be no resumption of trial”. (“Trebuie împiedicată cu orice preț reabilitarea celor condamnați în procese politice. Dacă această reabilitate devine inevitabilă, se admite doar cu condiția ca acel caz să fie considerat o greșală judecătorească; condamnatul nu va fi judecat, ci doar grațiat: nu va avea loc reluarea procesului...”) (Andrew and Gordievski, *Istoria*, 490-91). Perhaps the memorial author believed at first in the masquerade of forgiveness, for the promise of the work being published respected by the publishing in “*Glasul Patriei*”, a newspaper exclusively addressing the Romanian diaspora.

That is why, perhaps, he (re)-begins to plead for himself. The dominant tone is now justifiable, and the argumentation is supported by factual and value statements, almost totally lacking in the strategy one. Thus, in V2 he rebuilt his portrait (without departing from V1) in the letter of the resorts by which the new man is made: he declares his peasant origin. We have, thus, reproduced in V2, disputes between him and the first father-in-law. However, the double observation of social origin did not appear in V1: “During the discussion, the offense that had lingered in him that he had given his child to such a low-born writer exploded in a bomb full of absolute contempt, (two words, impossible to reconstitute appear as crossed and in their place it is noted) branding my peasant origin.” (“În timpul discuției, jignirea ce mocnise în el că și-a dat copila după un scriitor de origine atât de joasă, a explodat într-o bombă plină de suprem dispreț, (apar tăiate două cuvinte, imposibil de reconstituit iar în locul lor este notat) înfierând obârșia mea țărănească.” (V2, Tab 172). Also, the activities dedicated to the Romanian peasant: “I thought of the peasantry, which absolutely no one was dealing with. In the media of that time, there was only the city as a sensational phenomenon and the political sterility. I introduced weekly “*Pagina satului*”, and to my deep regret, I did not find experienced collaborators presenting serious problems, whose persistence increased the rural misery”. (“M-am gândit la țărănime, de care absolut nimeni nu se ocupa. În presa de-atunci nu exista decât orașul ca fenomen senzațional și sterilitatea politicianistă. Am introdus săptămânal “*Pagina satului*” și spre adâncul meu regret, n-am găsit colaboratori versați care să prezinte problemele grave, a căror persistență sporea mizeria rurală...” (V2, Tab 387). And, similarly, he notes his

emotional and ideological involvement in art disputes: "My ideological preparation was pushing me firmly on Gherea's side. [...] For me, inspired transcendently or challenged by the ambient reality, the artist creates personally and consciously, with a certain purpose, the happier when this purpose is moral. Gherea considered art a creative act with a revolutionary function. My theological education led me to accept it, because I knew Christian art tended to transform man and the world. My colleagues felt like me when they were watching the big polemic. Now, after the outbreak of the Russian revolution and the experience of the war, the socialist idea was an ongoing actuality..." ("Pregătirea mea ideologică mă împingea hotărât de partea lui Gherea. [...] Pentru mine, inspirat în mod transcendent sau provocat de realitatea ambiantă, artistul creează personal și conștient, cu un scop anumit, cu atât mai fericit când acest scop e moral. Gherea considera arta un act creator în funcție revoluționară. Educația mea teologică mă determina să-l accept, fiindcă știam că arta creștină tinde în transformarea omului și a lumii. Ca mine simțeau și colegii mei când urmăreau marea polemică. Acum, după izbucnirea revoluției rusești și după experiența războiului, ideea socialistă era o actualitate în mers....") (see V2, Tab 213).

He wants to change the opinion on his own figure, for he emphasizes the healthy origin and the moral principles that are in line with the rules imposed by the party. While in V1 Crainic builds his *leadership* position, in V2 it fades into a kind of general protectorate, authentic in fact, because Crainic displayed a lot of acts of generosity, towards old friends or even his rivals: "Blaga told me I was the second person to write about him". ("Blaga mi-a spus că sunt al doilea om care a scris despre el".) (V2, Tab 215).

The concessions he makes are not disturbing or unforgiveable, as they conform to certain realities arranged now in a matrix destined for other readers.

It is true that styling in the spirit of the propaganda rules of a *healthy* literature implies both the level of content and the lexical content. By reading V2 we see Crainic's concern for the latter, for one of the dominant operations is that of replacing religious terms with neutral ones. In this sense, he makes changes or deletions of terms, expressions or phrases. "Evangelical"(generosity) is replaced by "human" (generosity) (V2, Tab 123), the "dogmatic" (line) appears as the "required" (line) (V2, Tab 134), "holy" excitement appears as *pure* enthusiasm (V2, Tab 149). The sentence "the substance of ancient thought is repressed as in a retort and assimilated in Christian philosophy, in which the limited Greek-Roman humanism, dilated by evangelical generosity, takes infinite dimensions" ("substanța cugetării antice e retopită ca într-o retortă și

asimilată în filozofia creștină, în care limitatul umanism greco-roman, dilatat de generozitatea evanghelică, ia dimensiuni infinite") appears to be substituted by "ancient thinking fuses with the Christian one" ("gândirea antică fuzionează cu cea creștină") (V2, Tab 129); "The substance of Orthodox morality is love, irradiated in the New Testament, lived and analyzed in thousands of hues by the immense spiritual literature, which is the glory of the Byzantine East, but not yet settled in a treatise at the height of its nobility" ("Substanța moralei ortodoxe e dragostea, iradiată din Noul Testament, trăită și analizată în mii de nuanțe de imensa literatură spirituală, care e gloria Răsăritului bizantin, dar neadunată încă într-un tratat la înălțimea nobleței ei.") (V2, Tab 131). The fragment is deleted: "Philosophy is an auxiliary of theology in the sense that, being the highest expression of the human spirit, it facilitates the understanding of the special essence of religion". ("Filozofia e un auxiliar al teologiei în sensul că, fiind expresia cea mai înaltă a spiritului uman, înlesnește înțelegerea esenței speciale a religiei.") (V2, Tab 134). In the statement, "From our modern painting (appears as crossed "the Bible is missing and the Bible missing") man is missing" ("Din pictura noastră modernă însă (n.n apare tăiat "lipsește Biblia și lipsind Biblia") lipsește omul").(V2, Tab 273). We note that this statement is one of the few that has a correspondent in V1: "The curiosity of curiosities is that our art completely lacks the *Bible* and by the fact that the *Bible* is missing and missing the *Bible*, man is too". ("Curiozitatea curiozităților e că din arta noastră lipsește cu desăvârșire *Biblia* și lipsind *Biblia*, lipsește omul").(V1, 167).

However, here it has to be mentioned that during the rewriting of the memoirs (V2), Crainic changes his attitude towards the corrections of the religious terms. Thus, while in the first part these terms were constantly replaced, in the second part, they begin to appear in the text: "Do we have a painting that rivals the values of European museums? No doubt, we have (such a painting). But it's not modern painting. It is the old painting of the churches, especially of the Bucovina ones. It is the painting, which was born, as well as the Italian one, of the Bible. On the same spiritual level with it, if not higher, its artistic value is nothing lower than the Italian one. It is born of a special tension. The artists who created it were fasting and praying before climbing the scaffolding. It has a chromatic vision of paradise, because it was born of the Bible". ("Avem noi o pictură care să rivalizeze cu valorile muzeelor europene? Avem, fără îndoială. Dar nu e pictura modernă. E zugrăveala veche a bisericilor, în special a celor bucovinene. E pictura, care s-a născut, ca și cea italiană, din Biblie. La același nivel spiritual cu ea, dacă nu mai înalt, valoarea ei artistică nu e cu nimic mai prejos față de cea italiană. E născută dintr-o tensiune aparte.

Artiștii, care au creat-o, țineau post și rugăciuni înainte de a se urca pe schele. Are o viziune cromatică de paradis, fiindcă s-a născut din Biblie".) (V2, Tab 273), culminating by the introduction of rhetorical constructs that support the testimony of the faith of so many *new* men in the face of death: "Why did N. D. Cocea, ideological ideologue, but an icon collector, was buried with nine priests? Why did Mihail Sadoveanu ask to be served at home by the priest? Why did Tudor Vianu ask for confession service on the hospital bed? Why did G. Călinescu ask twelve priests for the funeral?" ("De ce N. D. Cocea, ștregar ideologic, dar colecționar de icoane, s-a înmormântat cu nouă preoți? De ce Mihail Sadoveanu a cerut să fie slujit acasă de preot? De ce Tudor Vianu a cerut să fie împărțit pe patul de spital? De ce G. Călinescu a cerut doisprezece preoți la înmormântare?") (V2, Tab 568).

We do not know whether this relatively small reversal of the stylistic registry can be attributed to political reasons. It is of importance that Nicolae Ceausescu thought it was unconceivable to publish the work of Nichifor Crainic, according to the *Shorthand recording of the discussions* held between July 16-17, 1959, between N. Ceaușescu, L. Răutu, Ghizela Vass, Iosif Ardeleanu and comrade Gyula Kállay. Meeting, July 16, 1959: "Comrade N. Ceausescu: I would like to highlight a few problems that. Comrade Răutu pointed out quite justly. If we published these poems by Petőfi, we would in no way help the friendship between the Romanian and the Hungarian people, on the contrary, we would instrument the Romanian nationalist elements, first of all by publishing such poems that offend the Romanian people, and then these elements could say, "If you bring and publish Petőfi's poems, let's also publish Nichifor Crainic, Goga, Radu Gyr and others". ("Tov. N. Ceaușescu: Aș vrea să subliniez câteva probleme pe care le-a arătat tov. Răutu foarte just. Dacă noi am publica aceste poezii ale lui Petőfi, noi n-am servi cu nimic cauza prieteniei între poporul român și maghiar, dimpotrivă, am da instrumente în mâna elementelor naționaliste române, în primul rând publicând asemenea poezii care jignesc poporul român și pe urmă aceste elemente ar putea spune: "dacă aduceți și publicați poeziile lui Petőfi, hai să publicăm și pe Nichifor Crainic, pe Goga, pe Radu Gyr și pe alții".) (<<http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/maghiarii2/d563-684.pdf>>).

In 1967, 60.000 copies of *Antologia poeziei moderne* (Anthology of Modern Poetry) elaborated by Nicolae Manolescu were "melted", due to the introduction of right-wing poets unaccepted by the regime (Radu Gyr, Nichifor Crainic) or living abroad (Horia Stamatu, Ștefan Baciu).

Was he aware that his rehabilitation was just formal? Did he count on the superficiality of censors? Or was he struggling against the dogmatism of the dogma? Something from each of these, for Crainic's attentive attitude towards the church and its people remained constant in the two variants of the memoirs: "The priest should not interfere with politics. His mission is so overwhelming that he does not have the energy to spend on worldly vanities. If he embraces the cause of a party, he removes the adherents of the other parties from the Church. The political colouring of the priest brings discord in the parish and only damages Christian life. Particularly in the democratic regime, with its multiple partisan hunt, the priest must remain the parish's reconciliation and harmony factor". ("Preotul să nu se amestece în politică. Misiunea lui e atât de covârșitoare încât nu-i rămân energii de cheltuit în deșertăciuni lumești. Dacă el îmbrățișează cauza unui partid, îndepărtează de la Biserică pe aderenții celorlalte partide. Colorarea politică a preotului aduce discordie în parohie și numai pagubă vieții creștine. Mai cu seamă în regimul democratic, cu multipla lui vânătăre de partizani, preotul trebuie să rămână factorul de împăciuire și de armonie al parohiei").(V1, 271). And "We introduced the *School and Church* page (in the *Calendar* n.n.) to stimulate primary class teachers and priests to deal with their true mission in the midst of the people. The morbidity of politics has greatly diminished the apostolic zeal of these two bodies, the only ones meant to devote themselves to the culture and morals of the people in the country. I have written many articles about the priests, demonstrating that by belonging to a party, whatever it was, they cancelled their role of spiritual factors in the parish community". ("Am introdus pagina *Scoala și Biserica* (în "*Calendarul*" n.n.) pentru a stimula pe învățători și pe preoți să se ocupe de misiunea lor adevărată în mijlocul poporului. Morbul politicianismului măcinase grozav zelul apostolic al acestor două corpuri, singurele menite pe-atunci să se dedice culturii și moralizării poporului de la țară. Am scris numeroase articole despre preoți, demonstrându-le că apartenența la un partid, oricare ar fi fost el, le anulează rolul de factori spirituali în comunitatea parohială"). (V2, Tab 387).

Whatever the compromises he made in prison, we tend to believe that they were contextual rather than principled. The vocational theological spirit has survived, and this is evident not only in V2, but in all the writings left in the manuscript and published after 1989 like *Spiritualitatea poeziei românești* (The Spirituality of Romanian Poetry).

At content level, in V2, there are many fragments whereby the memorial author decides to socially justify himself and explain his attitude. In such a passage, he identifies himself with the most authorized voice of the moment:



“As far as the working people in the industry are concerned, I have minimized their revolutionary role, considering their number small as compared to the immense rural population. Besides, the revolutionary era was dominated by Stalinism subsequently condemned by the Communist Party itself in the USSR, and Stalinism could not favorably impress a mentality as I had. Nicolae Ceaușescu himself, with the authority he was invested, criticizing the Communist movement of the past, from our country, finds, for the time which I refer, a regrettable deviation of dislocating of the minorities from the Romanian state, which would have led to its dismemberment”. (“În ce privește lumea muncitoare din industrie, eu i-am minimalizat rolul revoluționar, considerând numărul ei redus față de imensa populație rurală. Afară de aceasta, epoca revoluționară era dominată de stalinismul condamnat ulterior de însuși partidul comunist din U.R.S.S., iar stalinismul nu putea impresiona favorabil o mentalitate cum o aveam eu. Însuși Nicolae Ceaușescu, cu autoritatea cu care e investit, făcând critica mișcării comuniste din trecut, de la noi din țară, constată, pentru vremea de care vorbesc, o deviere regretabilă de dislocare a minorităților din comunitatea statului român, ceea ce ar fi dus la desmembrarea lui”). (V2, Tab 475).

Generally, in V2 Crainic does not remove passages. The central operation is the amplification, the detailing and nuancing of previous opinions. The confession built around personal achievements does not avoid evoking failures. In V2, this attitude is more obvious, going to the statement in any of the variants: “It’s not easy to talk about yourself and especially about personal joys. You have the impression that you are offending the one who listens to you or reads you. When you tell your troubles or misfortunes, you are listened with pleasure because you put yourself in a state of inferiority. When you tell your successes, no matter how objectively, however, you seem to become adorned as a clown and you become almost unbearable”. (“Nu e ușor să vorbești despre tine și mai ales despre bucuriile personale. Ai impresia că jignești pe cel care te ascultă sau te citește. Când îți povestești neazurile sau nenorocirile, ești ascultat cu plăcere fiindcă te pui în stare de inferioritate. Când îți relatezi oricât de obiectiv izbânzile, lași impresia că te înzorzonezi ca o piaiță și devii aproape nesuferit”) (V2, Tab 516).

However, as the bases of these were the human inter-relations, the memorial author performs an unusual panorama of the pre-war and inter-war Romanian elite. Crainic has a long memory because the portraits are made in a black and white color that oscillates to gray only in V2, when they have to

rehabilitate the old literary enemies now accepted by the system. Is this another way by means of which the text overcomes censure?

In this world of elites, Crainic distinguishes among the political, traditional, functional administrative, intellectual or cultural ones. The "political" elite is divided into a "meritocratic" one and another of "blood" or "status". The first one includes personalities such as Nicolae Iorga, Nicolae Titulescu, Ioan Petrovici and others, and the second one includes the royal family, punishable by means of Carol II, but praiseworthy by Ferdinand I or princess Marioara. The "traditional" elite, represented by the clergy (Iuliu Scriban, Bishop Conon) and the aristocracy (Zizi Cantacuzino), is constantly retrograde compared to the "entrepreneurial" one made up of technocrats, owners (D. Mociorniță, Titus Enacovici), symbolic figures (N. Iorga, Mussolini), ideological (Mihai Stelea) or charismatic (Corneliu Zelea Codreanu). The "functional-administrative" elite characterized by the alternation of the governmental/ non-governmental position is subject to instability that is not always in relation to the heads of government (Iuliu Maniu, Antonescu, Bratianu) but to the status elite. The "intellectual" elite is a hybrid, cumulative of public figures coming mainly from the political and educational area (teachers). Crainic presents his models, who are in fact the models of an entire generation (Al. Vlahuta, N. Iorga, Ion Petrovici, Eng. Zamfir Christodorescu).

The memorial writer observes the preponderant role of the *cultural elite* in the social life, showing that its representatives may at some point be decision makers. This includes painters (Theodorescu-Sion), sculptors (O. Han), doctors (C. Mihăilescu), scientists (Emil Racoviță) and especially writers of different valences and orientations (Lucian Blaga, Cezar Petrescu, Ion Pillat, Al. Busuioceanu, Pamfil Șeicaru, Panait Istrati, Tudor Arghezi, Mihail Sadoveanu, etc.). In the description of most of the representatives of this elite, Crainic did not change his opinion, but, where appropriate, he nuanced it. The memorial author pursued, in V2, some of the categories of writers, distinguishing between those who have adapted to some extent to the party line (Tudor Arghezi, Gala Galaction, Mihail Sadoveanu), those who have been subjected to the purge, to moral and physical humiliations culminating with imprisonment or death in the communist gulag (Lucian Blaga, Ion Petrovici, Alexandru Tzigara-Samurçaș etc.), those who died before 1945 (N. Iorga, E. Lovinescu, Panait Istrati, Mihail Dragomirescu, O. Goga) and those who emigrated (Panait Istrati, Al. Busuioceanu).

The narrative relationship established by Crainic in V2 with the representatives of the cultural elite functions as a barometer of self-censorship.

It must be said that the memorial writer did not withdraw his admiration for the people who had passed through the Romanian gulag, such as Ion Petrovici, who remains an academic orator, a distinguished man: "Following his example, a single professor from Iasi Ion Petrovici, reopened his course of *History of Modern Philosophy* in spring in the amphitheatre of St. Spiridon Hospital. He spoke freely, with impeccable expression, whose deliberate oratorical effects did not sacrifice anything of the clarity of the ideas he exposed. An admirer of Maiorescu, as the other disciples of the same generation, Petrovici had nothing to do with the imitation (the term "imitation" replaces "aping") of the others. He was a unique speaker. I did not suspect, while listening to him, that this distinguished man would play a decisive role in my university career". ("Urmându-i pilda, un singur profesor ieșean, Ion Petrovici, și-a redeschis cursul de *Istoria filozofiei moderne*, primăvara, în amfiteatrul spitalului Sfântul Spiridon. Vorbea liber, în frază impecabilă, ale cărei efecte oratorice voite nu sacrificau nimic din claritatea ideilor expuse. Maiorescian înfocat ca și ceilalți condiscipoli din generație, Petrovici n-avea însă nimic din imitația (n.n termenul "imitația" înlocuiește "măimiuțarea") scandată a celorlalți. Era un orator academic de timbru personal. Nu bănuiam, ascultându-l, că omul acesta distins avea să joace un rol hotărâtor în cariera mea universitară".) (V2, Tab 200). For comparison see V1, 128.

Among those who had favored the new regime, Crainic did not have many friends. An interesting case is that of Tudor Arghezi. As it is known, the two had some non-amicable arguments (see Anania, *Rotonda*, 24), and Nichifor Crainic made him, in V1, not at all an honourable portrait (See V1, 142, 203) accusing him of cowardice and treason, and so on. In V2, the tabs corresponding to Tudor Arghezi's evocation are missing, the manuscript presenting the observation: "Tabs missing taken out from publishing: 236, 237". Does Arghezi's portrait keep the same shadows in V2? Probablye. The basis of this assumption is that the memorial writer did not return drastically to any figure. We see that all of the old rivals benefit in their characterizations from augmentations of the antipathy of the memorial author, who in V2 replaces laconic phrases of the type "with Eugen Lovinescu I could not bind a friendship" ("cu Eugen Lovinescu n-am putut lega prietenie") (V1, 149), with passages justifying his attitude: "Hortensia Papadat Bengescu had released her first book, the volume of novels *Ape adânci* (*Deep Waters*) I noticed the novelty of this vigorous talent in "*Revista critică*". No one had yet spoken about this writer. Eugen Lovinescu appropriated my appreciation in an article by excusing himself with the words: "We have the same opinions". Here the following appears cut without being

replaced: "I strengthened my belief that he had no intuition in the face of a work of art". ("Hortensia Papadat Bengescu scosese prima ei carte, volumul de nuvele *Ape adânci*. Am remarcat noutatea acestui talent viguros în *Revista critică*. Nu vorbise încă nimeni despre această scriitoare. Eugen Lovinescu mi-a însușit întocmai aprecierile într-un articol al său scuzându-se cu vorbele: "Ne potrivim în păreri". (n.n. Aici apare tăiat fără să fie înlocuit: "Mi-am întărit atunci convingerea pe care o aveam că dânsul n-are intuiție proprie în fața unei opere de artă".) (V2, Tab 211).

As for the restored portraits of friends, a certain care is taken not to provide information or harmful appraisals. Thus, evoking Al. Busuioceanu (1896, Slatina-1961, Madrid) in V2, he eliminates the remark "who would become in the last part of his life a remarkable poet in Spanish" ("care avea să ajungă în ultima parte a vieții remarcabil poet de limbă spaniolă") (V2 tab 267), "the political horse trade" ("geambașlâcul politic") of the Goga brothers' V1 (V1, 261) becomes in V2 "a poet's naivité" ("naivitate de poet") (V2, tab 437). Some figures are kept exactly as in V2: so the brightest portrait, that of Vlahuță, appears.

Borrowing the mask of objectivity the memorial writer, in V2 becomes aware of the images by means of which he projects the cultural elite, as he replaces the personal notes with documented references to the testimonies published in the media of the time. See in this sense the evocation of Panait Istrati (V1, 225, namely V2, Tab 311).

Observing the two levels of the modifications made by Nichifor Crainic in the second version of the memoirs, the unpublished one, we see that they are part of a superficial line of acceptance of the new ideology. While at the lexical level he operates by eliminating/ replacing (see religious terms), at content level, the basic operation is the amplification and, rarely, the addition of new passages in accord with the times. These operations are imposed both by changing the reception angle of the memorial author who becomes himself a spectator to his own life, and by his consciousness that he writes for another reader. He now comes to detail his statements, knowing that the distance in time between the two variants implies, beyond censorship, another horizon of reading. Thus, while the first variation of the memoirs was intended for a contemporary willing to understand, to have sympathies or antipathy towards his heroes, in the second variant, the lecturer appears as a legal entity. Everything is alien to him, and therefore he has to evaluate everything, based on the terms imposed by the ideological expectation projected on the social grid of rehabilitation, which lacks the aesthetic coagulant. This invalidates the literary dimension of

memos (V2) which became evidence in a (pseudo) indictment that Crainic understood to bring to himself. By choosing to publish the first version of the memoirs, the thinker-mentor assumed the river style of the speech ordered only by a fulminating rhetoric, so common in his interwar essay work. Without social and political pressure, without the trauma of communist imprisonment, the rewriting of the first version would probably have respected only the taxonomic framing.

The differences in content and argumentation are traced noting–, the factual, value and strategy motions, attempting to understand both the mechanism of restoring autobiography by self-censorship as well as the author's express option to publish only the first version.

#### **Works Cited:**

Anania, Valeriu. *Rotonda plopilor aprinși* (Rotonda of burning poplars). Bucharest: Florile Dalbe, 1995.

Andrew, Christopher and Gordievski, Oleg. *Istoria secretă a operațiunilor sale externe de la Lenin la Gorbaciov* (KGB-The Secret History of Its Foreign Operations from Lenin to Gorbachev). Bucharest: ALL, 1994.

Crainic, Nichifor. *Zile albe–zile negre. Memorii* (White days–Black days. Memoirs). Bucharest: Casa editorială Gândirea, 1991.

Crainic, Nichifor. *Memorii* (Memoirs). Ms A3515 BAR.

Rășlescu-Zoner, Ș., D. Bușe and B. Marinescu. *Instaurarea totalitarismului comunist în România* (The Establishment of Communist Totalitarianism in Romania). Bucharest: Cavallioti, 2002.

Rybacki, Karyn C. and Rybacki, Donald J. *O introducere în arta argumentării* (An Introduction to the Art of Argumentation). Bucharest: Polirom, 2004.

*Shorthand recording of the discussions of N. Ceaușescu, Leonte Răutu, Ghizela Vass and Iosif Ardeleanu, on the one hand, and Gyula Kállay, Hungarian state secretary, on the other hand, on the topic of Romanian-Hungarian relations, as well as a series of debated issues as regards the cultural relations.* Bucharest: July 16-17, 1959: <<http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/maghiarii2/d563-684.pdf>