

Adrian Marino or the Daemon of Erudition

Mircea POPA

Faculty of Letters,

"1 December 1918" University, Alba Iulia

Keywords: professional, *uomo universale*, comparatist, road-finder and opener, European values

Abstract

The paper presents Adrian Marino, the daemon of erudition, the *uomo universale* in extinction. He was that type of erudite who lived at the confluence of two or three cultures, and aspired towards the universal Republic of Letters. He had fought for an open and dialogical culture, though his aspirations towards culture had been rejected for more than a decade by the interdiction of his signature right. Each of Adrian Marino's books from *Viața lui Alexandru Macedonski*, until the *Biografia ideii de literatură*, and *Pentru Europa* put up in value the national potential of literary ideology, the authentic signals of our Europeanisation. Marino the comparativist and the ideologue was a voice that we needed, a constructive civic spirit who always had in sight each stratum of society, sailing over vast spaces the way he used to do in his literary works.

E-mail: philobib@bcucluj.ro

Adrian Marino, the renowned man of culture and the outstanding comparatist unexpectedly passed away in Cluj on the night of 16 and 17 March in full creative power. He was a real phenomenon in the domains of our literary criticism and history that substantially marked Romanian literary life for a half century. In a period, when books were written about party activists and about the literary stream of the "Contemporanul" (magazine published by the socialist circle) Marino demonstrated that our literature had an other side as well, and which absolutely deserved to be explored and emphasized: symbolism, modernism, avant-garde. Thus he revealed the European vocation of Romanian literature along the Romanian presence in the international value-circulation. In a period of suppression by the postulations of the protochronist literature, by the suburban spirit of the *Groapa* and of Morometian ruralism, Adrian Marino turned our face towards Europe, revealing to us another model of our cultural mentality built up with such

enhancement in *Cahiers roumains d'études Littéraires* through which we attained another view on literature. For many the journal from Cluj represented a genuine literary school, a model of literary manifestation beyond serial novels and welcome criticism that dominated the literary actuality of the period.

Settled down in Cluj after eight years of detention and other six of house arrest, Adrian Marino was the author of a literary creation, which together with the work of the members of the Sibiu Literary Circle – who also returned after a long absence – had visibly influenced the literary destiny of many creators, thus essentially contributing to the opening of ideas which appeared at the horizon simultaneously with the political loosening that scattered the mists of a smothering and obscure proletarian culture. The expressive and stylistic refinement, the ample circumscription of the problems were nourished by an elaborate and high quality culture which fertilized new spiritual realms for example that of the literary mentalities and ideas. Adrian Marino was a champion of ideological criticism, of the comparatist approach, and of the literary idea – a line launched in 1973 (with his *Dictionary of the Literary Ideas* and the above mentioned journal which was edited by him in 1973–1980). This was conceived as a kind of alternative option to the official culture, for the stiffened officials of the age refused to offer him a position worthy of his knowledge and competence. Later, it was him who rejected the socialist charity and preferred working without “service certificate” or, as he liked to declare, “I remained up to this very day an entirely free professional”.

The comparatist phase was also sustained both by means of a long series of study travels and by means of books attempting to bring the West home to us, for “I in the first place wanted to study in foreign libraries, to publish in another environment, arrested and imprisoned in full intellectual growth, nipped in the bud.”

An entire sequence of travel journals, impressions and commentaries were thus born, such as *Ole Espagna*, 1974, *Carnete Europene* (European Notebooks), 1976, *Prezențe românești și realități europene* (Romanian Presences and European Realities), 1978. This was the time when he wrote his first book published in our country about Mircea Eliade [*Hermeneutica lui Mircea Eliade* (The Hermeneutics of Mircea Eliade), 1980], and another book about a French comparatist, Etiemble (*Etiemble ou le comparatisme militant*, 1982). “Militant comparatism” was a befitting characterization to him as well, for he indeed *militated* for the renewal of tradition in the interwar period: “I

wanted to start a tradition of Romanian theoretical studies, a completely neglected territory before". He used the contact with the western world, his preoccupation with outdated texts and problems also as a method of self-defense, of survival beyond daily realities. "I was practically living in another world and another experience materialized through the books, coins, ceramics and different objects, reminding me of famous games and cultural monuments which were essential for me". Work brought its well-earned retribution. His books were translated and published in France, Italy, the United States, Japan, and his activity was remunerated with the Herder Prize in 1985. However, he systematically refused any honour from the Romanian state (the proposal of "Honorary Citizen" of Cluj, the "*doctor honoris causa*" grade of the University of Cluj, and the membership of the Romanian Academy). He understood that he was meant to carry his cross until the end, because for many "I was and I continued to be a political prisoner", willing to demonstrate that there was life beyond the institutional medium of a system that turned him into a marginal character. In all these years he was working at home in Rákóczi Street 72 (today Eremia Grigorescu 72), where during his working hours he disliked being disturbed even by phone, which was usually answered by his wife, Mrs Lidia Bote. This does not mean that he was not an affable host to his friends and acquaintances, what is more, many bookish people from Cluj found at him an open door, precious advice, encouragement, and often books missing from the common library network. He led a Benedictine life – the life of a "solitary" man. He entitled his memoirs – which are to be published within five years from his death – *Viața unui om singur* (The Life of a Solitary Man), and preferred to turn his own personal space of living into a place of European ideas and celebration of our culture.

With Adrian Marino a species in process of extinction dies out: the type of *uomo universale* which lived at the confluence of two or three cultures, and which aspired towards the universal Republic of Letters, where every humanist of the age should have right of residence. He permanently sought to bring Europe to us, if we could not reach it in the period of communist terrorism where any contact with Europe was frozen. He described countries and institutions of culture, characterized the people he had known. He permanently fought for opening and dialogue in culture, he, the person whose aspirations towards culture had been rejected for more than a decade by interdiction of his right of signature. When it was given back, he knew how to humiliate his generation colleagues – former and more recent adepts of proletarian

culture – with his erudition, productiveness and tenacity for the creative work. He was a phenomenon of which those in my generation had taken full benefit. I visited him as many times as I could, as many times as I felt the need to find a book, information, a piece of advice, encouragement.

A strange thing happened to Adrian Marino the critic. He made his debut in literature in the period before the Second World War under the patronage of George Călinescu, when the “divine critic” was publishing the review *Jurnalul literar* (Literary Journal), which Adrian Marino, student at that period used to read with devotion. The student dared to address a letter to the master, which he encouragingly answered to the post address of the editorial office: “Adrian Marino forget coyness. Come and let us talk!” (No. 47/1939). Willing to follow the Lovinescian example and launch a review for “those who come” (evidence that some later succesful critics and poets had made their debuts here, such as Al. Piru, G. Ivaşcu or Şt. Aug. Doinaş), Călinescu encouraged him and protected him, and later on made Marino his assistant next to Al. Piru, G. Ivaşcu and Dinu Pillat. Marino even made his doctoral dissertation under his supervision in 1946, choosing as his research theme in disagreement with the master’s inclination, who was then charmed by Eminescu, exactly his most contested rival, Alexanru Macedonski’s Life (*Viaţa lui Al. Macedonski*). The book could not appear until 1966, when his detachment from the master – formally decided back in 1946–47, as an answer to Călinescu’s servility towards the new power – was received with open surprise by some of his collaborators and could be made public. In a dialogue on the Călinescian inheritance Adrian Marino had shown himself to be more on the side of Tudor Vianu and the detachment gained more intensity with time. The few letters received from Călinescu and preserved in Adrian Marino’s archive, published by us in the *Tribuna* (The Tribune) review in 1996, did not yet indicate the rupture (though in some letters sent to him by Al. Piru, some teasing tones can be detected on the “Old Man’s” account, who used to put them to the prolonged toil of proofreading his works). The program and the aspirations of the young man can be seen in one of his rare public appearances, namely within the conference text held in 1944 at a sort of student congress, where he spoke *About Literary Culture* (*Despre cultura literară*). The text was published in the same year in the student review *U. Preocupări universitare* (U. University Preoccupations). In this he fixed some guidelines of a clearly assumed program of study and activity: rigorous lecture, detailed knowledge of the classical literature, profound and specialized school, suppression of dilettantism and of undigested impressions, the assuming

of some objectives with encyclopaedic character. Seen from the angle of his realizations the juvenile program of the young critic, Adrian Marino was perfectly adapted to his lifestyle and performances. The young student recommended a state of seriousness absolutely necessary for a new fulfilment on the European value scale. He felt that his generation must carry on the work began by Mircea Eliade's generation and round it up to another level. He did not consider that serial-novels and critical impressionism would represent a solution, or that the Călinescian-exacerbated imagery enthusiastically imitated by contemporaries – jostling towards fragmentation and not towards the constructions of synthesis – would be recommendable for the critical spirit of the moment. Instead these partial enquiries he proposed far-reaching cultural initiatives, with a conceptually dominated theoretic reflection, in a context crossed by doctrinarian confrontations in which the life of the ideas is placed in the foreground. The hermeneutic perspective, comparativism, literary ideology in general, mentality studies, the political and literary imaginary dominated his works. He often declared that he was an “ideologue” and not a literary critic, a critic of ideas as it is more adequate to say. He instinctively felt “I do not belong to «the literary life», where I have always been a foreign entity, marginal, with all the troubles, qualities and deficiencies of this difficult status. The men of letters felt that I am not one of their species.” “We are still the victims of the aestheticist prejudice” – he used to say, reason for which he openly declared his separation from literary journalism, from peripatetic formulations, intellectual prudishness, and he had thus chosen another field of action for which he manifested the force and the enthusiasm of a *neo-paşoptist*. With his pioneer calling he placed his activity into the middle of other tides under other sailcloths, which could carry him far as possible towards other more fertile areas. He was an equal dialogue partner to the world's great comparatists, with great creators of aesthetic and ideological systems, and by following his letters we are surprised to find that all literary values of the moment were keeping a fertile dialogue with the “solitary” from Cluj. Seemingly isolated from his contemporaries – more or less devoted servants of an official ideology – Marino was connected to another system of norms and values based on the idea of intransigence, on the superior ethics of writing. He never ignored the document, the biographic source, namely the most precise source (in time and place) of information, because in his opinion the age of improvisations, quotes by ear, unfounded take-overs, with other words the age of critical amateurism had reached its end, and he pleaded for the

documentation of the assertions with their exact sources based on authentic documents, which were capable of correcting the errors of approximation, the evaluating judgments, the stages of reception. He considered both the ideological as well as the sociologic, anthropologic, historical, literary and cultural context, a fact which often transfigured the critical act into a clumsy, heavy-weight machinery. This was therefore hard to control in its intimate functionality, as some contemporaries believed it to be, for whom the hyperbolized development of an enormous system of notes represented even the abolishment of the genuine critical intuition.

Thus the critic delineated the object of his new preoccupation regarding this issue: "The criticism of the literary ideas starts on the other hand with the premise that the pleasure of analyzing a qualitatively literary idea makes level with the analysis of literary texts, sometimes even more superior and intense due to the profusion of intellectual associations and connotations implied by it". In his opinion this critical direction was neither compatible with serial-novels and fragmentariness, nor with the generally impressionistic act and the elementary subjectivism. The critic had carried several campaigns on this theme and had irritated many spirits. However, he kept his attitude and position unaltered and sustained it with convincing scientific arguments, for each of his works from the period following the declaration of his belief evolved his point of view and turned it even more stable. It was also the case of *Critica ideilor literare* (The Critique of the Literary Ideas) (1974), a unique work of the kind in our literary historiography, where the concept of "criticism of the literary ideas" received new connotations. The delimitation from the past was more categorical not lacking the attempt of retrieving some forgotten or lost senses, but also through integration into a pre-existent system through a permanent process of algorithms and rapport to the ideological context of the time. This alteration of angles and various reference systems based on the careful examination of the dialectics of opposites simultaneously presupposing evolution and rupture made him approach the hermeneutic working system, applied on other occasions as well.

This deep organic militarism permanently regards the situation of Romanian literature within European currents of value – a fundamental issue of his books. All over, where he talked about literary currents and tendencies, the Romanian comparatist insisted upon the method in which these currents had been born and configured on national scale, weaving each time a deep network of interconnections, influences, similitudes,

convergences between the great literatures of the world and our literature. What Wellek and Warren had forgotten to do was done by Adrian Marino, conferring thus other dimensions to the precursory renewals of the Avant-garde, as well as of Romanticism or Realism. Often the immense crucible of the literary ideas, manifesting in the national space was not only recurring, but it was also the bearer of new senses and nuances, which often placed us in a favourable world context. Each of Adrian Marino's books from *Viața lui Alexandru Macedonski*, until the *Biografia ideii de literatură*, and *Pentru Europa* put up in value the national potential of literary ideology, the authentic signals of our Europeanization.

However, Adrian Marino's creational dimension has to be measured from the perspective of the obtained results, of his books, which recognize better than any speculation the preceding stages, and the alterations and silt marked by time. These phases opened up, naturally, with his Macedonskian writing phase. This phase was marked by the elaboration of the monographs *Viața lui Alexandru Macedonski* (The Life of Alexandru Macedonski) (1966), *Opera lui Alexandru Macedonski* (The Work of Alexandru Macedonski) (1967), and the publication of *Opere I-VIII* (Works I-VIII) (1966-1980), realized in collaboration with Elisabeta Brâncuși. This was a phase of systematic radiograph of the period the inimitable poet wrote and lived in, a phase of plunging into the profundity of Macedonski's works, a phase not entirely abolishing historicism, instead subjecting it to the stipulation of restructuring the creative personality of the analyzed subject in rapport to a cultural pattern: Macedonskianism being a way of existence determined according to the conceptions on art and literature. It was the first well-articulated biography of man and work, which corresponded to the inner voice, as it was dealing with a complex personality with various faces, but towards which he proved to have certain structural affinities. The Macedonskian self-respect, idolatry, singularity, and the expansive feature of the taken measures were continuously situated "à rebours" compared with the contemporaries, the "wounded" withdrawal within the frames of a singular programme, the wide range of preoccupations, the ambition of becoming a European, rapid connection to the different systems and currents of idea, sometimes even contrary to each other, fanaticism, programmed defiance of the realities: all these made the Macedonskian character a man of transition, a man exceeding his age. The writer's "rehabilitation" had been made by an exemplary method, by revealing the real dimensions of a genial creator in permanent contrast

with his age. Marino's books dedicated to Macedonski unquestionably represented the most spectacular restoring to actuality of an unjustly forgotten and misinterpreted Romanian writer.

The appearance of these writings with a twenty-year delay occurred in a moment when the critic Adrian Marino was making his first steps towards another type of comprehending literature. The sequence of articles published in the *Lumea* (The World), review dedicated to the Romanian Enlightenment, already attested the new orientation that he was inclining towards: the criticism of the literary ideas. This phase was directly inaugurated by the *Dicționarul de idei literare* (The Dictionary of the Literary Ideas) from 1973 and consolidated by the *Critica ideilor literare* (The Critique of the Literary Ideas) (1974), *Hermenetica lui Mircea Eliade* (Mircea Eliade's Hermeneutics) (1980) and *Hermenetica ideii de literatură* (The Hermeneutics of the Idea of Literature) (1987). These books appeared on the market after some kind of initiation in domain with *Introducere în critica literară* (Introduction to Literary Criticism) (1968), *Modern, modernism și modernitate* (Modern, Modernism and Modernity) (1969), and *Clasicism, baroc, romantism* (Classicism, Baroque, Romatism) (1971). Systematically following the way in which the acceptations and invariants of the term of literature were constituted, the author operated in a double system from the beginning: terminological and significant, referring thus to philological, cultural and historical arguments. First of all the "original frame" was delimited in which the literary idea had been born, and its cultural circuit had been established, because the idea as such could not be understood inside its tradition and history. The term was drawn out of all its external and encrusted meanings by the analysis of its etymologic, *litterae* and *gramata* meanings by way of setting-up two oppositional groups – written/oral, sacred/profane –, the dialectic of which determined the establishment of a genuine mythology of literature as a sum of the books and as a utopia of the library. The practiced hermeneutic approach, was reiterated in other dimensions and parameters in the massive series of the *Biografia ideii de literatură* (The Biography of the Idea of Literature), in which all the sense-generating metamorphoses and reifoldings related to the harmonization endured by them in the reading process were repeated. It is an international work, worthy of any research institute in the world both through the entirely modern and actual theme, and through its method. Each volume contains over one hundred pages of bibliography, from which nothing worthy of attention is missing. If the first volume has a rather introductive character, distinctly with theoretical debates, then

with the second, consecrated to the Century of Lights, we actually enter into the mentality alterations and the enrichment of the concept in the 20th century. The differentiating notes, the formative accents, moments of crisis, and diversification are observed. Thus, if in the Century of Lights the accent was placed more on "popularization", now specialization and elitism start to predominate, the rapport between the sacred and profane literature changes in favour of the latter, and the cleavage between poetry and other literary branches, as well as between written and oral registers increases significantly. The chapter "Literature about Literature" is totally remarkable by its excellent analysis of the tendencies from actual criticism and through the significant conceptual explanations. The last chapter "Classicizing of the Idea of Literature" discusses on both a national and international scale the situation of books, libraries, bibliographic and encyclopaedic instruments regarding literature. When reading it, the reader becomes acquainted with the constructive and informative efforts of the author.

The fifth volume comes with important reflections regarding the six dominant concepts: national literature, universal literature, popular literature, mass literature, subliterature and paraliterature. If the first concepts are older, and have a past and evolution that can be tracked in time, the last ones are creations of the 20th century when the diversity of literary forms and reader types has multiplied. The terms are followed by the author in all their complexity and acceptations in a hermeneutical come-and-go, part-and-whole movement that highlight his analytic qualities, in such a way that the domain of the history of literary ideas now gains a new configuration. The method the author uses to record the conceptual changes of meaning brought up by the totalitarian regimes, especially the communist ones, which deliberately altered the meaning of certain terms, for example "popular literature" gaining the meaning of "literature for the people". The author brings an essential contribution to the elucidation of the notions of subliterature and paraliterature, the first being opposed to the binomial distribution of major literature – minor literature. The latter finding rapports to the mass-media system, comic books, movie and television scripts, production for consume magazines, etc., beginning to infest the traditional creation.

The critic of idea's ambitious project conceived as a culmination of a life-long activity finishes with the author's intention to offer "a basic reference point for critical and literary historical orientation and valuation." The sixth volume constitutes a well-thought and balanced conclusion of the previously uttered points of view, in which many of the

concepts entered the crisis phase and needed to be reconsidered as well. This is the same in the case of the concept of literature – too restrictively defined by the reductionists, or too indulgently by the avantgardists –, which also must be given back its original meaning. Beyond these extreme forms and situations, the author searches viable points of view, the secure ground for reinstalling the terms can only be the aesthetic valorisation, discussing confidently the criteria of a good definition, and with his accustomed methodological rigorousness and superior spirit of synthesis lingering over each factor of the discussion, namely over the cultural, ideological, aesthetical, historical, sociological, etc. criteria, by abolishing the stereotypes, digressing discussions and common places. The book signals all these mental mutations, takes sides, expresses his position, creates a situation of mental comfort. His ideas in *Epilog* (Epilogue) are especially noteworthy, being a kind of creed of the author intransigently on duty for over six decades, a man devoted to writing and to his great problems transforming him in into a front-liner, and into a solitary long-distance runner.

Beginning with the year of the Romanian revolution the preoccupations of comparativism underwent certain changes and accommodations. We now perceive the critic's new orientation, his new definition in rapport with the mentality shifts that occurred. His pro-European attitude increased by materializing in categorical journalistic appearances, as well as in his active political engagement to the National Democratic Peasants' Party beside Corneliu Coposu, Doina Cornea, Ana Blandiana (on the Civic Alliance line), or in the circles of the Anti-Totalitarian Front, to which he gave structure and operational base. On the other hand, the books that he opted for have an obvious political-ideological dimension. The first one was *Pentru Europa. Întegrarea României. Aspecte ideologice și culturale* (For Europe. Romania's Intergration. Ideological and Cultural Aspects) (1995), then followed by *Politică și cultură. Pentru o nouă cultură română* (Politics and Culture. For a New Romanian Culture) (1996), *Revenirea în Europa, idei și controverse românești, 1990–1995* (Return to Europe, Romanian Ideas and Controverses 1990–1995) (1996), or even *Cenzura în România* (Censorship in Romania), a small "introductory historical sketch" (2000), a kind of introduction to a vast work, *Cenzură și libertate în România* (Censorship and Liberty in Romania) on which he worked until the last moment and which was never finished. His point of view was nuanced in the Sorin Antohi interview book *Al treilea discurs. Cultură, ideologie și politică în România* (The Third Discourse. Culture, Ideology and Politics

in Romania) published in 2001 by the Polirom Publishing House. This book follows ruthlessly and by no *parti pris* the actual situation of Romanian culture at that hour, the manner in which we positioned and will position ourselves towards the changes occurring in the country. This was actually initiated in *Politics and Culture*, where the starting point was constituted by the situation of Romanian culture in the totalitarian period, situation that marked ideologically and morally each generation implicated in the development of the present day Romanian culture. The frames of this situation are marked in various situations and aspects, and the liberation from the past induced a significant exaggeration of the political factor: "we are living a period of intensive politization of Romanian society and culture, but things still have a predominantly spontaneous, sometimes even fuzzy feature. A well-formulated, argued politics of idea is what we are often short of" – stated Adrian Marino in the introduction of the article "Literatură și politică" (Literature and Politics). He argued for firmer steps for the writer on the field of political ideas, because the transition phase must also be a welcomed clarifying and settling phase of society and of the cultural flux on other structural basis. The line of continuity must reflect the resumption of our culture's tradition of resistance against the interference of the political factor and against the distortion of applied aesthetics. The repudiation of any kind of irrationalism and dogmatism, of accidental tendencies and nationalist reminiscences represent actions of emergency regarding the elimination of the disastrous effects of communist collaborationism. One's finding the way out from the labyrinth has to be a test of individual experience, from this results also the analysis of some specific cases: the Noica case, the Mircea Eliade case, the *Cetatea Totală* (Total Fortress) case of Constantin Dumitrescu, then the books of some insurgents of the type of Andrei Pleșu, Mircea Dinescu, Alina Mungiu, Octavian Paler, Ioan Petru Culianu, Horia R. Patapievici, Doina Cornea, Virgil Nemoianu, Matei Călinescu, Andrei Cornea, Sorin Antohi and others, who directly attacked the stringent problems of our society. The fundamental attitude towards these phenomena was called by Adrian Marino "*neo-paşoptism*" and it was discussed in the Sorin Antohi interview-book. This would be similar to the "third discourse", the one at the confluence between autochthonism and Europeanism, between the isolation holding on to specificities and European integration. "In my opinion – asserted Adrian Marino – it is important for the present day Romanian youth to see that everything does not start with 1989 or 2000, that there are local traditions of liberal thinking and even of actions in the sense of some liberal ideas... I might

write a book, a message for Romania in the spirit of *neo-paşoptism*, but for now I have other plans instead. I am talking to an *alter ego* and I am making confessions in an unusual manner. I do not have anything to hide, I am an extrovert temper, and I tell everything I have in my head. I believe that after a period of inhibitions, of censorship and fear, of isolation and of total Romanian muzzling, Romanians should start to speak freely and openly.”

Such phrasings are to be met at each step in Adrian Marino's writings after 1989. He truly felt obliged to be actively present at the democratization of the country, at the public debate, to step out in the limelight and mobilize the conformist spirits petrified in their apolitical attitudes, by the necessity of a more strenuous activity from the civil society in order to establish another climate of feeling and thinking. His signature can be traced in publications of a great variety, beginning with *Sfera politicii* (The Sphere of Politics), *Libertatea* (Liberty), *Mozaicul* (The Mosaic), *Timpul* (The Time), *Tribuna Aredaalului* (Transylvanian Tribune), *Observatorul cultural* (Cultural Observer), *Dilema* (The Dilemma), 22, etc., where his fundamentally liberal, rationalist, *neo-paşoptist* way of thinking comprehensively attacked all serious problems of Romania, lashing the governing political class for its immorality and immobility, emphasizing the dangers of stagnation in transitions. A firm conscience, a persuasive and intransigent action style, a stable scale of values, clear objectives are the essential elements of this tireless effort for returning to normality, for the effacement of any shapes of totalitarianism. Adrian Marino, who endured year after year obstruction, moral misery, and the effects of “class-struggle” that induced him to make his publishing debut at 44, was not merciful with the thick-headed and pervert individuals supported by the communist system, for whom the Lustration law should have been applied back in the first year of the Revolution. In certain cases he felt the need of delimiting even from Cioran or Noica, by not agreeing to the idea of “Romanians in delirium”, with some brethren's dark or exalted state of spirit, who lost the sight of the final task. Intolerant towards himself and towards others, Marino the comparativist and the ideologue was a voice that we needed, a constructive civic spirit who always had in sight each stratum of society, sailing over vast spaces the way he used to do in his literary works. His house on Eremia Grigorescu Street in Cluj Napoca, stuffed with countless books, files and notes was a House of ideas, a kind of free Institute, a meeting point of meridians of freedom, competition and simulative action. Now, when Romanian comparativism is flimsier than ever,

lacking personalities, the absence of Adrian Marino from the battlefield of the ideas and from public literary life represents an enormous loss. We miss him more and more, his encouraging, and guiding glance, and the need for masters is growing acuter than ever.