Novels as big data: A genre-centric approach to the Romanian novel (1900-1940)

Daiana GÂRDAN

Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai" din Cluj-Napoca, Facultatea de Litere
Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Faculty of Letters
Personal e-mail: alexandra.gardan@gmail.com

Novels as big data: A genre-centric approach to the Romanian novel (1900-1940)

My paper aims to present the premises, objectives and both methodological and theoretical framework of my doctoral research. The main ambition of my thesis is to investigate the evolutionary process of the Romanian novel published between 1900 and 1940 from a transnational, quantitative approach. My paper shall focus on the circulation of literary ideas and narrative formulas in the Romanian literary space, as well as on the literary and cultural import and the contribution of western literature to the modernization process of the autochthonous novel. By means of computational analysis, macroanalysis (Jockers), and quantitative research models (Moretti) the aim of my research is to generate a series of data, visual representations, and statistics in order to provide a factual accurate image of the evolution of the Romanian novel, exposing, at the same time, the fair amount of thematic and formal elements that have been imported by the Romanian writers in their works. The quantitative analysis will engage the following aspects: genre, theme, narrative formula, style, lexical elements and geographical distribution, while the primary sources will be constituted by both data bases such as chronological dictionaries and indexes, and novels.

Keywords: quantitative studies, macroanalysis, computational analysis, transnational studies, the Romanian novel

Introduction: towards a genre-centric approach

As all theoretical subfields concerned with the study of literature, genre theory follows canon. Canonical writings, by virtue of their own privileged position, dictated, in retrospect, more often than not, the general perception on a given historical period. However, the literary canon, while seminal for the understanding of the evolution of a genre, can never tell the whole story. Genre evolution follows, in great part, time and space, and so literary products that are "of their time" are, I believe, more critical to our insight on genre evolution than the canonical writings that merely act as peaks of aesthetic achievement. Canonical writings, at the same time, cannot account for the so-called "aesthetic battles" between sub-genres[1]. It is my belief that minor literary works, by their inherently obedient (mimetic) logic towards the actuality of their time and the general expectations of their contemporary reading public, can shed light on the faces of the very modernity that produced what we deem now as literary canon. What I intend to propose in the following pages is a genre-centric panorama of the Romanian novel in the first half of the twentieth century, focusing on its own internal logic that, at first glance, would seem arbitrary. The premise of this "shift" of perspective follows the recent theoretical frameworks in the field of *World Literature*, according to which genre – the novel, in particular – does not follow a straight or hierarchic evolutionary path, but

is rather part of a network that includes spatial and temporal coordinates that also factor in aspects that pertain to local literary market, historical context, cultural influence and interliterary interference. This is why what interests me is the circulation of the novel in a transnational context that follows its manifestation, its evolution, and, in some cases, the dissolution of its subgenres and the rise of others.

On genres, Wai Chee Dimock asserts that they are the prime candidates "to give us a new heuristic map"[2] and proposes a few new definitions, of which at least one is noteworthy: "I invoke genres less as a law, a rigid taxonomic landscape, and more as a self-obsoleting system, a provisional set that will always be bent and pulled and stretched by its many subsets. Such bending and pulling and stretching are unavoidable, for what genre is dealing with is a volatile body of material, still developing, still in transit, and always on the verge of taking flight, in some unknown and unpredictable direction"[3]. In light of this definition, the ambitions of my study are to recalibrate the perspective on the study of the Romanian novel by making use of a rather emerging "paradigm tester"[4], *distant reading*. What interests me is not the particularities of certain canonical novels, but the evolutionary itinerary of the genre, and its position in the transnational constellation in which it entered in intercultural dialogues, its shifts and movements, its borrowings, and its cycles of revisiting "outmoded" literary formulas. My temporal selection (early-to-mid twentieth century) has its own reason. First, the existence of a temporal limit is inevitable when using emergent methodologies in an individual study. Second, certain historical shifts in the evolution of the Romanian novel need to be treated outside an exhaustive temporal framework, as they mark deviations that need to be analyzed in a more isolated context (no different is the case of the Romanian novel during Communism, for instance). Finally, seeing as the vast majority of Romanian canonical novels belong to the interwar period, I consider this temporal segment to be the most promising candidate for testing the recent theoretical methodologies.

Following this general premise, my doctoral research intends to analyze, by using distant reading methods (building on Franco Moretti's findings) and macroanalysis (as it is exemplified by Matthew L. Jockers), the process of emulating foreign (particularly western) literary models in the Romanian novel, the circulation of imported narrative forms and the exchanges of imaginary and thematic devices between the western literatures – what Damrosch would call *the hypercanon*[5] – and peripheral literatures. By generating an "alternative" overview of the modern Romanian novel through a *big data* approach that can be rendered through graphs, I believe I can extract and register patterns, phenomena and internal shifts in the development of the genre (and

its subgenres), as well as test verdicts that were already given by the traditional critical discourse.

What are we working with? Tools, endowments, legacy

Seen "from above", the image of the Romanian novel in the first half of the twentieth century appears as a sum of formal and methodological intercalations: works that contain their own conceptual definition, written by authors that are themselves theoreticians of the genre (Camil Petrescu, Anton Holban), novels written by literary critics (Eugen Lovinescu, Garabet Ibrăileanu, G. Călinescu), revisions of outmoded, pre-modern literary forms (epistolary, sentimental, romance novels), literary experiments based on communal experiences (novels written in co-authorship), thematic and formal migrations as an effect of external pressures (the case of Hortensia Papadat-Bengescu and her literary connections with the *Sburătorul* literary circle is exemplary) and others. The process of contamination through the ever-transient state of the writers in this period is explainable, in part, through the more generalized imperatives of a belated, emergent literature: import, imitation, exercise and experiment, as well as the ubiquitous presence of the novelists in the public cultural sphere are symptomatic to a collective effort of building a national literature that attempts to recover historical handicaps. Seen as rather evident phenomena that are tributary to the emergence of literary modernism and the formation of an aesthetically valid national literature, they nevertheless shaped the way the literary historiography has been written and established in the literary canon.

A clear consequence of this development can be detected in the evolution of national literary criticism. The traditional impressionist literary criticism, that constitutes the core of Romanian literary historiography, has equal effects on the perception of autochthonous literature as it has on the evolution of the critical discourse that seeks to analyze it. From this perspective, computational or quantitative approaches that seek to identify patterns or explain the prevalence of some literary devices over the other through factual evidence are seen as betrayals to the core values of the established literary criticism. While I will not dwell on this rather recurrent resistance to alternative methods of analysis, I will argue that such resistance did have clear institutional consequences on the development of "third party" methodological instruments that are used in contemporary researches. The overwhelming lack of digitalized literary corpus, as well as the general absence of primary instruments (databases, dictionaries, bibliographies), and the mainly redundant metadata that are present (in the case of the novel, the inaccurate information regarding narrative perspective, thematic

frame or literary formula) are factors that inhibit any exhaustive quantitative approach on Romanian literature[6]. The deficiency concerning the selection, definition and denomination of subgenres in literary histories, databases and chronological dictionaries of the novel[7] only makes difficult the homogenous treatment of the object of study. Take for instance a former quantitative research that I have done[8], in which I made use of categories such as "erotic novel", "social novel" or "peasant novel". These data entries required from the very beginning a certain level of personal interpretation, as the database used for my analysis[9] only index authors, titles, publishing houses (in the case of feuilletons, the magazine that published it), and year, following short descriptions of the plots (that more often than not did not register metadata such as narrative perspective or clear subgenre-related information) and several critical references. Further difficulties were encountered in data entries that completely lack descriptions of the novels (close to a quarter of the total entries), entries that have no clear demarcations related to spatial information (urban or rural sceneries), or pertinent data regarding structure and form. Thematic framings are also lacking, as well as the absence of a clear, homogenous critical vocabulary used in the descriptions, which led to many personal interpretations that hinder objective delineations in the data corroboration. An even more unfortunate case concerns DCRT-1 and DCRT-2, that only index the author, title, year of publication and nationality[10].

Such problems raise another question: to what extent can quantitative analysis produced through such instruments generate anything else than what might be considered, by passive observers, merely large-scale intuitions? The most obvious solution to this impediment is as clear as it is difficult to achieve: the integral digitalization of the literary corpus, followed by a reassessment of the lexicographical instruments in order to fill in the blanks and account for the metadata necessary for distant readings. However, such efforts need to be collective, not individual and unilateral[11]. With this in mind, the current state of contemporary Romanian literary criticism points toward the necessity for more collective efforts (Franco Moretti considered this a fundamental principle and a necessary shift in current literary studies) in approaching literature. At the same time, the dichotomy of quantity vs. quality needs to be readdressed, especially since, due to historical precedents that have generated a powerful aversion towards quantitative aspects in all matters of life (the shared communist experience), what Franco Moretti called "the noise"[12] is at risk of retaining its marginal position even when it has the chance of emerging into the spotlight as generative arguments for an evolutionary model of literary phenomena. Such obstacles pertaining to both mentalitary and pragmatic

aspects can however be overcome. Quantitative analyses may yet be relevant, even if they do not necessarily refute traditional critical clichés. Even with critical stances that account for the limitations of quantitative approaches in mind, the general rethinking of literary studies can be as valuable as the results that these approaches provide. Such dialogues between the old ways and the new can provide constructive and necessary discussions that may be further used to recalibrate the mechanisms of a national critical discourse and adapt it to recent shifts in theoretical frameworks.

Methodological and theoretical frameworks

My research methodology can be placed at the intersection between quantitative studies, transnational studies, and descriptive translation studies. In order to give my research a clear comparative scope, I intend to build upon the theoretical grounds proposed by Dionýz Ďurišin in his *Theory of Interliterary Process*[13] as well as what Andrei Terian called "processual comparatism"[14].

The quantitative approach proposed in my research follows closely Franco Moretti's theoretical framework and its premises. One of the core endeavors of the Morettian method on which I intend to expand in the study of the Romanian novel concerns the shift in the perspective on the literary canon: "The difference is that, for me, my aim is not so much a change in the canon – the discovery of precursors to the canon or alternatives to it, to be restored to a prominent position – as a change in how we look at *all* at literary history: canonical and noncanonical: together"[15]. What Moretti proposes is an alternative method of reading literature, *distant reading*, as well as an alternative method of research, one that is based on statistics. Because the Morettian method works within the boundaries of mathematical and statistical conventions, with instruments belonging to the "hard sciences", what interests in quantitative approaches are the repetitive elements, the patterns, the structures that pertain to form and textual architecture. In the introduction of his research on crime fiction (particularly the literary works that "survived", Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Agatha Christie), Moretti asserts explicitly that it is *form* that assures the success or survival of a literary work in the general public, and the general public is the one that insures the transmissibility of forms and produce, in actuality, the phenomenon of canonization (the *world canon*, at least). He then speaks of "formal choices that try to 'eradicate' their competitors. Devices – in the market: this is the idea. Formalism, and literary history"[16]. The functional process in this Darwinist paradigm is one that relies on trial and error, on finding the operational *device* and re-operationalizing it.

Matthew L. Jockers continues this line of research and develops what he calls macroanalysis, through

which he makes use of metadata (genre, subgenre, theme, structure, narrative perspective, nationality). Factual data such as words, phrases, spaces or microstructures from within the novels, all visualized and rendered graphically (through graphs and network renders), reveal thematic, formal and structural patterns that are then corroborated and interpreted.

For both of these perspectives to be functional, however, a broader theoretical framework is necessary. The field of World Literature (and transnational studies in particular) are used as the fundamental basis for my research, seeking to reveal the transnational network that includes the Romanian novel, as well as the interferences that occur through cultural imports. Transnational studies also constitute a methodological basis for the systematic study of intercultural relations, facilitating a transition from a canonical reading of a given national literature to a reassessment of extra-literary aspects that are crucial to the development of a literary system.

Among the theoretical principles proposed by scholars of World Literature studies that are significant for my doctoral research, the following are what I find most influential: the triadic structure of the canon, as proposed by David Damrosch[17], the principle of emulation foreign "hard" models by authors from peripheral, "weak" countries[18], the definition that Damrosch gives to "world literature" ("World Literature is not a set canon of texts but a mode of reading: a form of detached engagement with words beyond our own place and time"[19]), the transnational *and* subnational condition of literature, particularly of the novel[20], the application of the principles of fractal geometry in the study of literature and genre evolution[21], and the evolutionary principle through which a work of art is the product of a process of constant trial and error – the work of art as a predictable outcome, not as an outstanding exception[22], proposed by Wai Chee Dimock; the dichotomic nature of the canon (static vs. dynamic[23]), as it is proposed by Itamar Even-Zohar, and, last, but not least, Moretti's considerations on the pragmatic and mathematical nature behind the evolutionary aspects of literary genres[24].

An alternate component that I will use in conjunction to the aforementioned theoretical frameworks deal with descriptive translation studies, that I will employ in order to account for the cultural role[25] that translations have in the Romanian culture. Because this subfield involves the analysis of literary translation according to the needs of the target-culture (the source-culture has less of an importance in this process[26]) and relies on the assumption that literature is a complex set of subsystems that includes the translational system, I find that a parallel translational reading of the Romanian novel is of paramount importance to the establishment of the modernization of the novel itself. Finally, processual comparatism, as delineated by

Andrei Terian, constitutes an important aspect in my final assessment. In trying to explain the different formal permutation of Romanian prose fiction and its relation to processes of cultural interferences, the existence of a "tertium comparationis" (represented by the East-Central European geoliterary space[27]) in my analysis will seek to reveal not only "intracultural" processes (limited only to Romanian literature), but also intercultural processes that could provide an adequate term of comparison, through the assessment of interferences that occurred in other peripheral national literatures.

Note:

1. See, for instance, Margaret Cohen, *The Sentimental Education of the Novel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).
2. Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents. American Literature Across Deep Time* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006), 73.
3. Dimock, *Through Other Continents*, 73-4.
4. See Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).
5. See David Damrosch, *World Literature in a Postcanonical, Hypercanonical Age*, in Haun Saussy (Ed.), *Comparative Literature in the Age of Globalization* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 43-53.
6. In some cases, private datasets were used long before the existence of lexicographical instruments, see Mircea Popa, "Analyse quantitative du roman publié dans la presse de Transylvanie de 1838 à 1918", in "Synthesis", VI, 1979, Paul Cornea, "Constituirea unui gen. Între 'romance' și 'novel': romanul românesc în secolul al XIX-lea", in *Regula jocului. Versantul colectiv al literaturii: concepte, convenții, modele* (București: Eminescu, 1980), 263-285, Paul Cornea, "Anul de aur al romanului românesc interbelic", in *Aproapele și departele* (București: Cartea Românească, 1990), 375-384, Marius Lazăr, *Paradoxuri ale modernizării. Elemente pentru o sociologie a elitelor culturale românești* (Cluj-Napoca: Limes, 2002), Ioana Drăgan, *Romanul popular în România. Literar și paraliterar* (Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2006), Ioana Macrea-Toma, *Privilighenția. Instituții literare în comunismul românesc* (Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2009), the latter using datasets borrowed from Mihai Dinu Gheorghiu, *Scena literaturii: Elemente pentru o sociologie a culturii românești* (București: Minerva, 1982). For more recent studies that used personal datasets, see Ovio Olaru, "Translating Nordic Noir Bestsellers. Towards a Comparative View on German and Romanian Markets", Vlad Pojoga, "A Survey of Poetry Translations in Romanian Periodicals (1990-2015)", *The Culture of Translation in Romania / Übersetzungskultur und Literaturübersetzen in Rumänien*, Eds. Maria Sass, Ștefan Baghiu, Vlad Pojoga (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2018).
7. Presently the only instruments that can be used in the quantitative analysis of the novel are *Dicționarul cronologic*

al romanului românesc de la origini până la 1989 (București: Editura Academiei Române, 2004), *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului românesc: 1990–2000* (București: Editura Academiei Române, 2011), *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România de la origini până la 1989* (București: Editura Academiei Române, 2005), and *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România: 1990–2000* (București: Editura Academiei Române, 2017). For further mentions of these dictionaries, I will abbreviate them as follows: DCRR-1, DCRR-2, DCRT-1 and DCRT-2 respectively.

8. See Daiana Gârdan, *Evoluția romanului erotic românesc din prima jumătate a secolului al XX-lea*, in "Transilvania", n. 7 (July 2018), 23-28.

9. In this case, DCRR-1.

10. And yet, studies based on DCRT-1 have managed to make use of the few metadata provided. See Ștefan Baghiu, "Translating Novels in Romania: The Age of Socialist Realism. From an Ideological Center to Geographical Margins", *Studia UBB Philologia* LXI, no. 1 (2016), Idem, "Strong Domination and Subtle Dispersion: A Distant Reading of Novel Translation in Communist Romania (1944-1989)", *The Culture of Translation in Romania / Übersetzungskultur und Literaturübersetzen in Rumänien*, Eds. Maria Sass, Ștefan Baghiu, Vlad Pojoga (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2018).

11. Several collective projects are already ongoing. See Mihaela Ursa, "Is Romanian Culture Ready for the Digital Turn?", *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory* 1, no. 1 (October 2015): 80-97.

12. See Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History* (New York. London: Verso, 2005).

13. Dionýz Ďurišin, *Theory of Interliterary Process* (Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1989).

14. Andrei Terian, "The Incomparable as Uninterpretable: Comparative Literature and the Question of Relevant (Re) contextualization", in "World Literature Studies" 2, no. 5 (22), 2013, 52-63. See also Andrei Terian, *Critica de export* (București: Muzeul Literaturii Române, 2013), 27-47.

15. Franco Moretti, "The Slaughterhouse of Literature", Duke University Press, *Modern Language Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (March 2000) 208.

16. Moretti, *The Slaughterhouse*, 212.

17. "In place of this older, two-tiered model, our new system has three levels: a hypercanon, a countercanon, and a shadow canon. The hypercanon is populated by the older "major" authors who have held their own or even gained ground over the past twenty years. The countercanon is composed of the subaltern and "contestatory" voices of writers in languages less commonly taught and in minor literatures within great-power languages. Many, even most, of the old major authors coexist quite comfortably with these new arrivals to the neighborhood, very few of whom have yet accumulated anything like their fund of cultural capital. Far from being threatened by these unfamiliar neighbors, the old major authors gain new vitality from

association with them, and only rarely do they need to admit one of them directly into their club. By "they", of course, I really mean "us": it is we teachers and scholars who determine which writers will have an effective life in today's canon of world literature". Damrosch, *World Literature in a Postcanonical, Hypercanonical Age*, 43.

18. "The writer from a marginal culture is in a double bind. With little to go on at home, a young writer can only achieve greatness by emulating desirable foreign models", David Damrosch, *What is World Literature?* (Princeton. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003), 9.

19. Damrosch, *What is World Literature?*, 281.

20. Discussing Henry James's *The portrait of a lady*, Wai Chee Dimock concludes that "its frame is indeed global, but the global here, bearing the compass of time, enfolds rather than erases its scalar opposite. [Isabel's] suffering, trivially unremarkable, is vividly before us because it is both smaller and larger than the jurisdictional plane of the nation. The prenational and the subnational come together here to creatae an irregular beat, a fractal loop both above and below the nation's linear cross-section". Dimock, *Through Other Continents*, 88

21. "The epic seems always to have been a genre spurred by cultural contact. since this is the case, since the proximity of the alien is its genetic condition, it stands to reason that this genre should have some sort of formal vehicle to register that fact, to mark the foreignness of foreign words (…) Nonstandard speech is a lexical marker that gives the epic its peculiar morphology (…) The linguistic fabric of the epic is, for that reason, not in the least smooth. It is a rough cut, with dents and bumps, each representing a coil of time, a cyst-like protuberance, in which an antecedent moment is embedded, bearing the weight of that past and burrowing into the present as a warp, a deformation. In this way, the lexical map of the epic is a map not only of space, but also of time. The cumulative life of human kind is captured here as a looping, bulging, swirling net, featuring both the linguistic norm and its nonstandard variants. It is this that gives the epic its scope. It also makes this genre a prime candidate for fractal geometry". Dimock, *Through Other Continents*, 83-84.

22. "An analytic scale pitched at the level of population does not give a special status to anyone, because the perceptual field here is organized to highlight what holds true for the system as a whole, what exhibits patterns of regularity. These patterns, emerging as a result of scale enlargement, make it possible to speak of frequencies of recurrence, frequencies that are scale-induced, mathematically determined, and therefore also mathematically calculable. A law of large numbers comes into play when the database is sufficiently large. This law turns each individual, however exceptional, into a systemic effect, a quantifiable instance. This too is a legacy of the large-scale science (…) The large databases are unknowable in the individual instances that comprise them, but they are aggregately calculable. Given millions of people, we can count on the existence of at least one

good basketball player. Given millions of people, we can count on the existence of someone with perfect pitch. The exceptional individual, in other words, is simply the mathematical consequence of a large enough population pool. He or she is not so much an aberration as a rare but nonetheless systemic effect. What looks like an exception is, in fact, part of the rule. This elimination of exceptions means that there is no circumference wider than the law of large numbers. This is a truly global postulate, generalizable in every phenomenon". Dimock, *Through Other Continents,* 55-56.

23. "It therefore seems imperative to clearly distinguish between two different uses of the term "canonicity," one referring to the level of texts, the other to the level of models. For it is one thing to introduce a text into the literary canon, and another to introduce it through its model into some repertoire. In the first case, which may be called static canonicity, a certain text is accepted as a finalized product and inserted into a set of sanctified texts literature (culture) wants to preserve. In the second case, which may be called dynamic canonicity, a certain literary model manages to establish itself as a productive principle in the system through the latter's repertoire. It is this latter kind of canonization which is the most crucial for the system's dynamics". Itamar Even-Zohar, "Polysystem Theory, Polysystem Studies", *Poetics Today* 11, no. 1 (1990), 20.

24. See Franco Moretti, *Graphs, maps, trees.*

25. See Susan Bassnett, André Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1998).

26. See Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action* (London: Routlege, 2014).

27. See Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer, „General Introduction", in Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer (Eds.), *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries,* vol. 1 (Amestardam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004), 1-18.

References

*** *DCRR: Dicționarul cronologic al romanului românesc, de la origini până la 1989.* Cluj-Napoca: Academia Română, 2004.

*** *DCRT*: *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România, de la origini până la 1989.* Cluj-Napoca: Academia Română, 2005.

Baghiu, Ștefan. "Strong Domination and Subtle Dispersion: A Distant Reading of Novel Translation in Communist Romania (1944-1989)". *The Culture of Translation in Romania / Übersetzungskultur und Literaturübersetzen in Rumänien*, eds. Maria Sass, Ștefan Baghiu, Vlad Pojoga. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2018.

Baghiu, Ștefan. "Translating Novels in Romania: The Age of Socialist Realism. From an Ideological Center to Geographical Margins". *Studia UBB Philologia* LXI, no. 1, 2016.

Bassnett, Susan, Lefevere, André (Eds.). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1998.

Cornea, Paul. *Aproapele și departele*. București: Cartea Românească, 1990.

Cornea, Paul. *Regula jocului. Versantul colectiv al literaturii: concepte, convenții, modele*. București: Eminescu, 1980.

Cornis-Pope, Marcel and John Neubauer (Eds). *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. vol. 1, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004.

Damrosch, David. „World Literature in a Postcanonical, Hypercanonical Age". *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Ed. Haun Saussy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006: 43-53.

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Dimock, Wai Chee. *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Drăgan, Ioana. *Romanul popular în România. Literar și paraliterar*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2006.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Theory, Polysystem Studies". *Poetics Today* 11, no. 1 (1990): 9-27.

Gârdan, Daiana. "Evoluția romanului erotic românesc din prima jumătate a secolului al XX-lea. Între exercițiu și canonizare" ["The Evolution of the Romanian Erotic Novel from the First Half of the 20th Century. Between Exercise and Cannonization"]. *Transilvania*, no. 7 (July 2018): 23-28.

Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu. *Scena literaturii: Elemente pentru o sociologie a culturii românești*. București: Minerva, 1982.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Lazăr, Marius. *Paradoxuri ale modernizării. Elemente pentru o sociologie a elitelor culturale românești*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes, 2002.

Macrea-Toma, Ioana. *Privilighenția. Instituții literare în comunismul românesc*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2009.

Moretti, Franco. "The Slaughterhouse of Literature". Duke University Press, *Modern Language Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (March 2000): 207-227.

Moretti, Franco. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. New York. London: Verso, 2005.

Popa, Mircea. "Analyse quantitative du roman publié dans la presse de Transylvanie de 1838 à 1918". *Synthesis* VI, 1979.

Reiss, Katharina, Vermeer Hans J. (Eds.). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action*. London: Routlege, 2014.

Terian, Andrei. "The Incomparable as Uninterpretable: Comparative Literature and the Question of Relevant (Re)contextualization". *World Literature Studies* 2, no. 5 (22), 2013: 52-63.

Terian, Andrei. *Critica de Export* [*Export Criticism*]. București: Muzeul Literaturii Române, 2013.

Ursa, Mihaela. "Is Romanian Culture Ready for the Digital Turn?". *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory* 1, no. 1 (October 2015): 80-97.