

MOVING WORDS ABOUT MOVING PICTURES IN ANDREI GORZO AND MIHAI IOVĂNEL'S DIALOGUE: A COMMENTARY

Christene D'ANCA

University of California, Santa Barbara
E-mail: christene_danca@ucsb.edu

MOVING WORDS ABOUT MOVING PICTURES
IN ANDREI GORZO AND MIHAI IOVĂNEL'S DIALOGUE: A COMMENTARY

Abstract: In this commentary on *Desene mișcătoare: Dialoguri despre critică și cinema* [Moving Pictures: Dialogues about Criticism and Cinema], I aim to show that the series of dialogues between Andrei Gorzo and Mihai Iovănel can be considered as significantly more than a compilation of various discussions about their niche cinematic interests, and instead they offer a new approach to Romanian cinema and film criticism by entering it into conversations with its occidental counterparts, and consequently reposition it on the world stage. They weave together the works of greats from both traditions, shifting their discussion between Nae Caranfil and Quentin Tarantino, or Alex. Leo Șerban and Pauline Kael, among others, in order to contextualize the contribution of these figures to their corresponding timeframes as they each responded to different desiderata in media studies. This in turn leads the two authors to reassess these characters' contemporary status (or lack thereof), as often divorced from their unquestionable relevance.

Keywords: moving pictures, film, Romanian cinema, literature.

Citation suggestion: D'Anca, Christene. "Moving Words About Moving Pictures in Andrei Gorzo and Mihai Iovănel's Dialogue: A Commentary." *Transilvania*, no. 9 (2023): 64-70.
<https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2023.09.07>.



Reading *Desene mișcătoare: Dialoguri despre critică și cinema* [Moving Pictures: Dialogues about Criticism and Cinema] by Andrei Gorzo and Mihai Iovănel instantly reminded me of watching Siskel and Ebert on TV in the 90s, but without the intense rivalry between the two Chicago film critics. As the title suggests, each of the seven chapters is framed as a dialogue between Gorzo and Iovănel as they respond to each other while simultaneously speaking to the reader. Without eschewing the great amount of scholarship and research that went into producing the work, as evident from the copious footnotes and references, through its conversational style that is incredibly easy to read and follow along with, the book is clearly intended for a larger audience who is interested in the intricacies of

cinematic history. Consequently, despite the seemingly specific topics for each chapter that correspond to the authors' respective personal fascinations, each of the niche themes are tied into the broader cinematic landscape. Gorzo best explains the inception, rationale, and construction for the book:

"Once the dialogues about Alex. Leo Șerban and Quentin Tarantino were written (with the latter originally appearing in the magazine *Derive*, coordinated by Andrei Rus and Mihaela Michailov, whom we thank), we found that we had touched on some topics - the ones listed by you plus one more: what it means to remain contemporary, or on the contrary, to be contemporary until you no longer are - all of which required further investigation. Additionally,

we constituted that Pauline Kael featured as a prominent secondary figure in both texts. And that's when we said to ourselves: let it be a book; not just a collection of dialogues on various topics of mutual interest (although exploring some of the affinities I share with you has always been a significant part of the *thrill* for me), but a book planned as a book, with internal rhymes, foreshadowing and echoes, themes placed on *stand-by* to be later resumed or suddenly tackled from another perspective, etc. And with characters – six main and multiple secondary ones; and the main character of each chapter would break through their frames – sometimes stealthily, other times unabashedly – and make appearances in the chapters belonging to others.”¹

Yet, while this may have been the beginning of the book itself, both the main and minor characters who populate the text have traipsed, sometimes in passing and other times straightforwardly, through the authors' other works. Andrei Gorzo, even before earning his doctorate in film and theater studies from the National University of Theater Arts and Cinema “I.L. Caragiale”, began publishing in his field, with his doctoral thesis turning into one of the most seminal theoretical works on New Romanian Cinema – *Lucruri care nu pot fi spuse altfel: Un mod de a gândi cinemaul, de la André Bazin la Cristi Puiu*² [Things That Could Not Be Said Otherwise: A Way of Thinking About Cinema from André Bazin to Cristi Puiu]. Now, among almost a dozen books and countless published articles, two of his more recent works, *Viața, moartea, și iar viața criticii de film*³ [Life, Death, and the New Life of Film Critics] and *Beyond the New Romanian Cinema: Romanian Culture, History, and the Films of Radu Jude*,⁴ co-authored with Veronica Lazăr, demonstrate his ongoing efforts to not only contribute to the discipline, but further bring Romanian film criticism into international conversations. Additionally, aside from his formal publications, Gorzo also maintains a blog,⁵ which he regularly updates with similarly relevant, insightful, and in-depth posts about the ongoings of cinema, such as his most recent entry (at the time this article was written) about Cristi Puiu's newest film, *MMXX*. Arguably, Andrei Gorzo has done more than any other critic to integrate Romanian films into the larger cinematic world stage.

Mihai Iovănel has led a parallel path within literary criticism. Shortly after earning his doctorate in philology from the University of Bucharest, his early monographs as well as his other publications, such as “Puncte de rezistență. O posibilă schiță a câmpului literar postcomunist”⁶ (Points of Resistance. A possible account of the post-communist literary field) or “The aesthetic placebo: deconstructions of aesthetic autonomy in current Romanian criticism,”⁷ straddled both Romanian literature and recent history, accounting for the shift in literary production in the post-communist era. Moreover, his vast contribution of entries in *Dicționarul general al literaturii române* [The Great Dictionary of Romanian

Literature] as well as to various online magazines, most notably Scena9.ro, paved the way towards the production of quite possibly the most important book in recent Romanian literary criticism – *Istoria literaturii române contemporane: 1990–2020*⁸ [The History of Romanian Contemporary Literature: 1990–2020]. Its astounding breadth covers almost every genre, and more importantly, each text mentioned is contextualized and placed into conversation with not only other literature, but relevant contemporaneous cultural events. Moreover, Iovănel expanded the scope of his studies, and simultaneously explored Romanian's literature place within the larger sphere of World Literature, specifically in “Temporal Webs of World Literature: Rebranding Games and Global Relevance after World War II–Mircea Eliade, E. M. Cioran, Eugène Ionesco”⁹ and “Neocritique: Sherlock Holmes Investigates Literature”¹⁰ featured in two renowned volumes that have greatly helped situate Romanian literature on the international map.

Germaine, therefore, to the present discussion about *Desene mișcătoare*, a cursory glance at the trajectory of the authors' careers and oeuvres underscores the considerable overlap of personal and professional interests that have accumulated over the years and have thus rendered their current undertaking an almost inevitable foregone conclusion.

Tellingly, after the brief introduction, the second chapter is dedicated to Alex. Leo Șerban, whom Iovănel asserts has all but disappeared from public discourse, despite having been considered a formidable cultural figure throughout the 90s and into the early aughts, as earlier noted in *Istoria literaturii*, in which Leo and Gorzo are the only two film critics mentioned in the second chapter concerned with the evolution of ideologies. Here, the chapter traces Leo's career, as well as his interactions with other critics, including the two authors who personally knew him, and thus intersperse their discussion with anecdotes and commentaries. I found this aspect particularly interesting as it reconstructs an entire social network to which many were privy, but which has fallen out of cultural memory.

Gorzo, for example, reminisces about his early relationship with Leo, admitting that he “was right to note that my sensibility back then was more literary than cinematic: when I watched a film, I was more sensitive to the atmosphere in general than to the film as an object constructed of images and sounds.”¹¹ Nevertheless, even though Gorzo at times disagreed with Leo's perspectives on films, such as *Kill Bill* or *LOTR*, he holds fast to his initial perceptions, and moreover laments that “at around 25 years old, as I was then, I was not able to challenge him, to stimulate him to delve further into his understanding of these things, to up his game,”¹² underscoring the potential Gorzo believes Leo held before his untimely death.

Iovănel, on the other hand, recalls Leo's polemic and

volatile personal interactions with far less nostalgia. And even though he comments on the ways in which Leo was correct in many of his critical assessments, he ultimately concludes that in speaking about him “in the way we are speaking, imagining scenarios in which he would have done this or that, I realize that we thus invalidate the theory from which I started, that we would no longer be contemporaries. This séance that we have organized shows that we are referring to him as a living person,”¹³ which serves as a perfect segue into the next chapter, a discussion on Tarantino, a contemporary cultural idol, and game changer in the cinematic present and arguably, future.

Having read and written about *Cinema Speculation* shortly after it came out, I particularly enjoyed the direction Gorzo and Iovănel took their discussion in this chapter.¹⁴ While I broached the autobiographical nature of Tarantino’s book from a personal perspective – having grown up just a few blocks from the areas he had frequented as a child around the same age, and having shared many of the same experiences, albeit decades apart – I mainly focused on the background information Tarantino provided about how some of the most iconic movies were made, such as which producers had initially take the projects, which stars were originally signed on to play the leading roles, the various dynamics between leading Hollywood figures, etc. However, for Gorzo and Iovănel, the autobiographical aspect of Tarantino’s career is central to their dialogue as they point out the nuances of his writing, enumerating his various idiosyncrasies, such as his propensity for italics and repetition, they discuss his education, (or lack thereof), and his autodidactic inclinations as resulting in the ways in which he wrote not just the book, but his characters, his plots – his movies in general. His mother’s upbringing may have led him to the cinema, but everything else shaped the products of his later labors, including his predilections for transgressive films, which the authors outline in the second part of the chapter, breaking down the different types of transgressive acts he did (or did not) pursue throughout his filmography. As Tarantino announces in *Cinema Speculation* that his next film will be his last before retiring from moviemaking, this chapter in *Desene mișcătoare* notably ends with Iovănel’s speculation on the genre of Tarantino’s last film – horror – not only because it is a genre Tarantino has not yet fully undertaken, but because “horror allows maximum transgressions in the area of violence that Tarantino likes so much.”¹⁵ Later in the book Iovănel updates the movie’s status, stating that the primary character is reported as being a 70s movie critic who writes for an adult magazine. It’s worth noting that Iovănel’s stipulation on the genre, and his findings about the movie are not mutually exclusive, so at this point it’s a waiting game.

In the meantime, the book brings our attention to Nae Caranfil in a chapter that ties together the three-part

dialogue series previously published in *Films in Frame*. Admittedly, much as with Alex. Leo Șerban, I was not very familiar with Caranfil. At such points I’m grateful for the authors’ detailed descriptions and explanations, where they don’t take the readers’ prior knowledge for granted. Consequently, they begin by discussing their respective relationships to Caranfil’s oeuvre. *Asfalt Tango* [*Asphalt Tango*], Caranfil’s second full length film, was formative for both authors.

For Gorzo because “in a culture where cinema had rarely been anything other than dry, rigid, clumsy, Caranfil’s images and sound had *flow*; in the background there existed an understanding between these elements – of visual and sound – as formal elements that had to be interwoven, and there was an orchestration, there was a musicality.”¹⁶ Iovănel’s initial infatuation with the film was less cinematically oriented, but after having recently rewatched it he became aware of “the way in which the film captures as in a *freeze frame* both the historicity of the moment in which it appeared and the mental state of a viewer in that era.”¹⁷ After a succinct summary of the various cultural shifts transpiring in Romania at the time, including the transition from communism that took numerous tolls on the population, he states that “*Asphalt Tango* places upon the stage and dramatizes all of these elements.”¹⁸ However, in doing so, the film loses its contemporary status, and becomes an emblem of the past, as do several of Caranfil’s other films that remain relevant as markers of their time, and certainly beautiful for their cinematographic quality, but as Gorzo later states about *Filantropica* [*Philanthropy*] it “didn’t age well.”¹⁹ Yet, there are instances, albeit brief, that speak to the modern age, and recur throughout Caranfil’s filmography as reminders of all the things that haven’t changed, as for example Iovănel draws the parallel between the opening scenes of *Closer to the Moon* and *E pericoloso sporgersi*, or those between the latter and Tarantino’s *Reservoir Dogs*. In fact, the multiple, intricate connections between the films and figures that feature throughout the dialogues harken back to Gorzo’s initial claim that the authors wanted to unite the chapters of the book through echoes and recurring themes, which they have seamlessly achieved here as well as in the following sections that build off of one another like a Jenga puzzle that grows in height by removing pieces from disparate places in the lower rungs to add to the top, in much the same way Iovănel ends his discussion on what it means to be contemporary with the assertion that “our present is composed from endless layers of the past.”²⁰

Considering the breadths of films discussed in the previous sections, the next chapter dedicated to Pauline Kael, who is an important figure in the careers of many of the personalities mentioned throughout, acts as an intermission. Following the examination of what it means to be contemporary, here the authors explore the distinctions between high and low culture, films regarded

as masterpieces and those seen as guilty pleasures in light of how they were received by their contemporaries and the reasons behind these perspectives. As art became commodified and repackaged for the masses, this division arose, and with the rise of the New Hollywood era of filmmaking, the merit of films produced was brought into question, with many arguing in favor of the new cinema as worthy for unprecedented reasons, as was the case with the rave reviews Hitchcock got for the technical/mechanical aspects of his films – a category that had not previously been considered by critics.

A similar cultural shift happened in the realm of literature. I bring this up while writing about a book concerned with cinema because notably both cultural movements occurred simultaneously (along with the shift that was also taking place within the visual arts), which is hardly a coincidence. The rise of middlebrow culture as a result of the popularization of books through various mediums, not least of which were reviews of popular books published in newspapers as opposed to academic journals, and these books' commodification by publishing houses eager to participate in the mass production of saleable goods in line with what was in demand, along with other factors helped bridge the gap between high culture and popular sensibility. Joan Shelley Rubin excellently details this phenomenon in *The Making of Middlebrow Culture*,²¹ and in a more niche series of case studies, Oana Sabo interrogates the diverse players in the popularization of literature in *The Migrant Cannon in Twentieth Century France*.²² In terms of film studies, in his earlier book, *Viața, moartea, și iar viața criticii de film*, Gorzo informs readers that "at a time when film sells had fewer channels to spread the word that their products were on the market, film chronicles served this function, often splitting the newspaper page with advertisements paid for by the sellers."²³ What all of these changes showcase, is that it wasn't just art (visual, literary, or cinematic) that was becoming popular, but the ways in which it was presented to the public, and the role critics played in this rebranding effort, which is part of what Gorzo and Iovănel elucidate through the multiple examples of criticism from both ends of the spectrum.

Interestingly, according to Gorzo, Kael, one of the greatest American film critics, who spent 25 years writing about many of the films considered trash, instead of "defending *trash* as a great misunderstood art, she defends it as *trash*. She cultivates a fine-tuned appreciation for some of the 'inferior' pleasures, – does not negate that they are 'inferior' – but in fact insists upon it – upon what *trash* can offer."²⁴ Thus, despite her enjoyment of these films, when others were reconsidering what could be included into the definition of art along with the various overlaps between high and popular art, she remained a staunch defender of the divide. Nevertheless, it was many of her idiosyncrasies, even those that were considered unpleasant, that created

her allure as a person and critic. These traits were even embellished by authors who used her persona as models for their characters, such as Theodore Roszak's Clare Swann in his 1991 novel *Flicker*,²⁵ in which he crafted a much sexier and intriguing figure than the real-life Kael. As Tarantino was briefly rumored to use Kael as the inspiration for the lead in his upcoming film, it would have been interesting to see what he would have done with her. Yet, even as she did not live up to the expectations some might have had, she managed to create a long and successful career within her confines, as demonstrated by the numerous topics she confronted, as outlined throughout the chapter in which the authors place her against the larger theoretical framework in which she operated, concluding that she is indispensable in the conversation on criticism and continues to teach us about film regardless of whether she may no longer be considered a contemporary critic.

In much the same way Pauline Kael shepherded in a new era of film criticism, even if she did not always want to participate in it, French New Wave films stood, according to Iovănel "at the root of the aesthetic reconsideration of consumer cinema."²⁶ The directors breached the divide between high art and popular culture by creating a multitude of films, artistic to be sure, but made for mass consumption. This same connection can be made between this New Wave and Henry James, the topic of the following chapter, as his simultaneous desire for success and status as an author and playwright produced a certain tension. Moreover, as stated by Iovănel, "the way his literature illustrates the idea of high culture enters into a dialectical relationship with other conversations on mainstream cinema."²⁷ Nevertheless, as Gorzo reminds the reader, the difficulty with James is that

"the moment something is glimpsed, it tends to be followed by dozens of pages of hair-splitting on the subject of the thing glimpsed – until it sometimes arrives to the point of evaporating. As Alex. Leo Șerban suggests, those who dive deeply into James's texts end up savoring this vertigo of the referent's quasi-disappearance, 'of the work's verbal slide into nothing.' Once again, this experience is rather rarely found in his early writings, but instead almost always accompanies a dive into his later texts. There, the pages proliferate in which James proceeds to describe something in a roundabout way – because it is subtle, something impossible to pin down in two words – through a suite of sparkling metaphors, lengthening the sentence as he acrobatically moves from one metaphor to another, metaphors introduced to 'explain' other metaphors, until the thing he was writing about threatens to be lost altogether among blinding sparks and marvels of verbal equilibrium, as if it never existed."²⁸

And I think this is precisely why James's work lends itself

to a comparison with the French New Wave that was characterized by its experimental filming style, which could often times seem as dizzying and ambiguous as James's sentences and descriptions. However, there is another noteworthy facet of James's oeuvre that I think parallels what the French New Wave directors and critics were trying to achieve.

As French New Wave movies were made for mass consumption, they also broached relevant social issues, essentially responding to popular culture while producing it. With the ever-growing number of novels in the late nineteenth century, James had access to a bevy of sources to influence and inspire him, and to which he could write in response. William Veeder spends much time on James's appropriation of popular culture in *Henry James—The Lessons of the Master: Popular Fiction and Personal Style in the Nineteenth Century*.²⁹ Notably, the main purpose of his book is not to enumerate the ways in which James is indebted to the works of others, but rather point out the ways in which James dovetails and then departs from his contemporaries, and subsequently demonstrate James's superiority. However, since the 1970s much has changed in the ways popular culture is viewed and discussed, especially within academia, and many of the original conceptions of popular culture have been reversed. While high culture is currently often associated with an oppressive normativity, popular culture is now examined for its innovativeness, and resistance to dominant ideology – which should sound like many of the characteristics of the French New Wave. And it must be noted that according to this revision of popular culture's definition, Veeder's argument is turned on its head, as James's departure from the mainstream is now what explicitly constitutes his membership within the realm of nineteenth century popular culture. However, it is not fair to fault Verdeen for operating within the acceptable boundaries of criticism for his time, nor overlook the massive contribution he has made to James scholarship through his meticulous collection of references, cross references, and citations. Instead, it would be better to turn towards more modern voices that have taken up the work, such as John Carlos Rowe, whom the authors of *Desene mișcătoare* cite, and who like them, in *Our Henry James in Fiction, Film, and Popular Culture*,³⁰ attempts to account for the presence of James' works in over 150 films and pinpoint his place within popular culture contemporaneously and contemporarily.

Yet, while Henry James is alive and well on the silver screen (and here I'm also referring to the cinematic

fascination with the author himself beyond his works), Gorzo and Iovănel, in the last chapter of the book, lament the slow death of the western, which Gorzo agonizingly outlines by numbering the paltry number of westerns that appeared in each year of the 70s. There was a similar lull in the 80s, but they make a small comeback in the 90s. With the timeline complete, the main topic for the chapter comes into focus, which is not westerns in general, but rather those directed by Clint Eastwood, and more specifically, *Unforgiven*, that according to Iovănel "is a masterpiece not only because it is integrated into the history of cinema, but also because it includes a series of elements that are irreducible in the first instance of analysis – those 'sinews' [?] that are undigestible through theory, that Jonathan Lethem talked about in regard to *The Searchers*. Above all, *Unforgiven* is an enigma. It appears to offer a deceptive reflection, of a mirror held up to a genre (the western), but it invariably returns an opacity that in fact dislocates the report of simple reflection.³¹ Instead of reflecting the genre from which it is derived, *Unforgiven* uses the genre conventions of a western to offer something more "real," for lack of a better term. There is a relatability that few other western films offer a modern audience, especially considering it came out in 1992 and has not lost its ability to connect with the viewer.

The rest of the chapter is dedicated to the numerous facets of the movie that render it a remarkable film, including its many ambiguities and synthesized ideas, as well as Eastwood's ability to take into consideration themes of peccability, penitence, and loss of the soul, as mentioned by Gorzo. Then, in lieu of a structured conclusion, the dialogue ends with Iovănel's affirmation that as a result of the film's multiple attractive attributes, it will live forever in our collective memories, and long after we are all gone, it will continue to exist. Thus also ends the arc of the book's internal discussion on what it means to be contemporary – with quite possibly the most contemporary example of them all.

Overall, aside from the aforementioned ease with which I was able to read the book, I enjoyed it foremost for the authors' ability to synthesize ideas spanning different cultures, genres, and decades. By not focusing solely on Romanian film and criticism, they pulled Romania out of isolation, and further created a rich tapestry of media references that speak to each other in much the same way the two authors do. Perhaps the lack of a formal ending means that the conversations can continue.

Notes

1. "Odată scrise dialogurile despre Alex. Leo Șerban și Quentin Tarantino (aceasta din urmă a apărut inițial în revista *Derive*, coordonată de Andrei Rus și Mihaela Michailov, cărora le mulțumim), am constatat că deschiseserăm niște teme – cele

- enumerate de tine plus încă una: ce înseamnă să rămâi contemporan, sau dimpotrivă, să fii contemporan până când nu mai ești – care se cereau urmărite mai departe. Am mai constatat că Pauline Kael figura ca personaj secundar proeminent în ambele texte. Și atunci ne-am zis: hai să fie o carte; nu doar o culegere de dialoguri pe diverse teme care ne interesează pe amândoi (deși explorarea unor dintre afinitățile pe care le am cu tine a constituit în permanentă pentru mine o parte însemnată din *thrill*), ci o carte plănuită ca o carte, cu rime interne, cu prefigurări și ecouri, cu teme puse pe *stand-by*, reluate, atacate brusc dintr-o altă direcție etc. Și cu personaje – șase principale și multe secundare; iar personajul principal din fiecare capitol să treacă prin cadru – uneori furtiv, alteori călcând apăsător – și prin capitolele celorlalte personaje.” Andrei Gorzo and Mihai Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare: Dialoguri despre critică și cinema* (Bucharest: Polirom, 2024), 9. All translations in this paper are mine. See an article of the two authors on Alex. Leo Șerban in Mihai Iovănel and Andrei Gorzo, “Alex. Leo Șerban – un *Tory Anarchist* în România anilor ‘90-2000: Mihai Iovănel în dialog cu Andrei Gorzo,” *Transilvania*, no. 3 (2022): 10-20.
2. Andrei Gorzo, *Lucruri care nu [ot fi spuse altfel: Un mod de a gândi cinemaul, de la André Bazin la Cristi Puiu* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2012).
 3. Andrei Gorzo, *Viața, moartea, și iar viața criticii de film* (Bucharest: Polirom, 2019).
 4. Andrei Gorzo, Veronica Lazăr, *Beyond the New Romanian Cinema: Romanian Culture, History, and the Films of Radu Jûde* (Sibiu: Editura ULBS, 2023).
 5. <https://andreigorzoblog.wordpress.com/>.
 6. Mihai Iovănel, “Puncte de rezistență. O posibilă schiță a câmpului literar postcomunist,” *Meridian critic. Annals Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava. Philology Series* 24, no. 1 (2015): 145-150. See also Mihai Iovănel, *Ideologiile literaturii în postcomunismul românesc* (Bucharest: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române, 2017).
 7. Mihai Iovănel, “The Aesthetic Placebo: Deconstructions of Aesthetic Autonomy in Current Romanian Criticism,” *Alea. Estudos Neolatinos* 16, no. 1 (2014): 35-51.
 8. Mihai Iovănel, *Istoria literaturii române contemporane: 1990-2020* (Iași: Polirom, 2021).
 9. Mihai Iovănel, “Temporal Webs of World Literature: Rebranding Games and Global Relevance after the Second World War – Mircea Eliade, E.M. Cioran, Eugène Ionesco,” in *Romanian Literature as World Literature*, eds. Mircea Martin, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian (New York: Bloomsbury, 2018), 217-235.
 10. Mihai Iovănel, “Neocritique: Sherlock Holmes Investigates Literature,” in *Theory in the “Post” Era: A Vocabulary for the Twenty-First-Century Conceptual Commons*, eds. Alexandru Matei, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian (New York: Bloomsbury, 2021), 251-266.
 11. “avea dreptate să remarc că sensibilitatea mea pe-atunci era mai curând literară decât cinematografică: când urmăream un film, eram mai sensibil la atmosferă în general decât la film ca obiect construit din imagini și sunete,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 46-47.
 12. “la circa 25 de ani, câți aveam pe-atunci, n-am fost în stare să-l provoc, să-l stimulez să meargă mai departe în cunoașterea obiectelor respective, să-și ridice nivelul propriului joc,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 47.
 13. “în felul în care vorbim, imaginând scenarii în care ar fi făcut asta sau ailaltă, îmi dau seama că astfel invalidăm ipoteza de la care eu plecasem, că nu am mai fi contemporani. Ședința de spiritism pe care am organizat-o arată că ne raportăm la el ca la un personaj viu,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 50.
 14. Quentin Tarantino, *Cinema Speculation* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2022).
 15. “hororul permite transgresiuni maxime în zona de violență care lui Tarantino îi place atât de tare,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 85.
 16. “într-o cultură în care rareori se făcuse cinema altfel decât crispat, rigid, împiedicat, imaginile și sunetele lui Caranfil aveau *flow*; în spate exista o înțelegere a lor – a elementelor vizuale și sonore – ca elemente formale care trebuie împletite, exista o orchestrare, exista o muzicalitate,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 88.
 17. “felul în care filmul captează ca într-un *freeze frame* atât istoricitatea momentului în care a apărut, cât și dispoziția mentală a unui spectator din acea epocă,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene Mișcătoare*, 90.
 18. “*Asfalt Tango* pune în scenă, într-o formă dramatizată, toate aceste elemente,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 91.
 19. “nu a îmbătrânit bine,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 104.
 20. “prezentul nostru e compus din nesfârșite straturi de trecut,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 134.
 21. Joan Shelley Rubin, *The Making of Middlebrow Culture* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
 22. Oana Sabo, *The Migrant Cannon in Twentieth Century France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018).
 23. “pe vremea când vânzătorii de filme aveau la dispoziție mai puține canale prin care să răspândească vestea că produsele lor sunt pe piață, cronicile de film îndeplineau această funcție, împărțind adesea pagina de ziar cu reclame plătite de vânzători,” Gorzo, *Viața, moartea, și iar viața criticii de film*.
 24. “să apere *trash*-ul ca mare artă neînțeleasă, ea îl apără ca *trash*. Își cultivă o apreciere plină de distincții fine a unora dintre plăcerile ‘inferioare’ – nu neagă că sunt ‘inferioare’, bă chiar insistă pe asta – pe care *trash*-ul le poate oferi,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 154.
 25. Theodore Roszak, *Flicker* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 1991).

26. “la rădăcina reconsiderării estetice a cinemaului de consum,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, p. 193.
27. “felul în care literatura lui ilustrează ideea de cultură înaltă într-un raport dialectic cu celelalte discuții despre cinemaul de masă,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 193.
28. “momentului întrezăririi tind să-i urmeze zeci de pagini de despicare a firului în patru pe tema lucrului întezărit – până când aceasta ajunge uneori pe punctul de a se evapora. După cum sugerează Alex. Leo Șerban, scufundătorii de cursă lungă în scrierile lui James ajung să savureze aceste vertij al cvasidispariției referentului ‘al alunecării verbale a operei în neant.’ Încă o dată, experiența asta e mai degrabă rară la citirea scrierilor de tinerețe, în schimb poate însoți aproape în permanență scufundarea în scrierile târzii. Acolo proliferază paginile în care James purcede la descriere a ceva prin încercuire – căci e ceva subtil, ceva imposibil de ținut în două vorbe –, printr-o suită de metafore scânteietoare, tot lungind fraza în timp ce trece acrobatic de la o metaforă la alta, metafore introduse pentru ‘explica’ alte metafore, până când lucrul despre care vorbea amenință să se piardă de tot printre scânteieri orbitoare și minuni de echilibristică verbală, ca și când nici n-ar fi existat,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 211.
29. William Vedeer, *Henry James—The Lessons of the Master: Popular Fiction and Personal Style in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).
30. John Carlos Rowe, *Our Henry James in Fiction, Film, and Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2022).
31. “este o capodoperă nu doar pentru că se integrează în istoria cinemaului, ci și pentru că include o serie de elemente ireductibile în prima instanță la analiză – acele ‘zgârciuri’ nedigerabile prin teorie de care vorbea Jonathan Lethem în legătură cu *The Searchers*. Înainte de toate, *Unforgiven* este o enigmă. Pare să ofere o reflectare înșelătoare, de oglindă plimbată prin fața unui gen (westernul), dar întoarce invariabil o opacitate care dislocă de fapt datele simplei reflectări,” Gorzo and Iovănel, *Desene mișcătoare*, 260.

Bibliography

- Gorzo, Andrei, and Mihai Iovănel. *Desene mișcătoare: Dialoguri despre critică și cinema* [Moving Pictures: Dialogues on Criticism and Cinema]. Bucharest: Polirom, 2023.
- Gorzo, Andrei, and Veronica Lazăr. *Beyond the New Romanian Cinema: Romanian Culture, History, and the Films of Radu Jude*. Sibiu: Editura ULBS, 2023.
- Gorzo, Andrei. *Lucruri care nu [ot fi spuse altfel: Un mod de a gândi cinemaul, de la André Bazin la Cristi Puiu* [Things that Cannot be Told Differently: A Mode of Thinking Cinema From Andre Bazin to Cristi Puiu]. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2012.
- Gorzo, Andrei. *Viața, moartea, și iar viața criticii de film* [The Life, the Death, and Again the Life of Film Criticism]. Bucharest: Polirom, 2019.
- Iovănel, Mihai. “Neocritique: Sherlock Holmes Investigates Literature.” In *Theory in the “Post” Era: A Vocabulary for the Twenty-First-Century Conceptual Commons*, edited by Alexandru Matei, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian. 251-266. New York: Bloomsbury, 2021.
- Iovănel, Mihai. “Puncte de rezistență. O posibilă schiță a câmpului literar postcomunist” [Points of Resistance: A Possible Sketch of the Postcommunist Literary Field]. *Meridian critic. Annals Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava. Philology Series* 24, no. 1 (2015): 145-150.
- Iovănel, Mihai. “Temporal Webs of World Literature: Rebranding Games and Global Relevance after the Second World War – Mircea Eliade, E.M. Cioran, Eugène Ionesco.” In *Romanian Literature as World Literature*, edited by Mircea Martin, Christian Moraru, and Andrei Terian, 217-235. New York: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Iovănel, Mihai. “The Aesthetic Placebo: Deconstructions of Aesthetic Autonomy in Current Romanian Criticism.” *Alea. Estudos Neolatinos* 16, no. 1 (2014): 35-51.
- Iovănel, Mihai. *Ideologiile literaturii în postcomunismul românesc*. Bucharest: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române, 2017.
- Iovănel, Mihai. *Istoria literaturii române contemporane: 1990-2020*. Iași: Polirom, 2021.
- Iovănel, Mihai, and Andrei Gorzo. “Alex. Leo Șerban – un Tory Anarchist în România anilor ’90-2000: Mihai Iovănel în dialog cu Andrei Gorzo” [Alex. Leo Șerban – A Tory anarchist in Romania during the 90s and 2000s: A Dialogue between Mihai Iovănel and Andrei Gorzo]. *Transilvania*, no. 3 (2022): 10-20.
- Roszak, Theodore. *Flicker*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 1991.
- Rowe, John Carlos. *Our Henry James in Fiction, Film, and Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2022.
- Sabo, Oana. *The Migrant Cannon in Twentieth Century France*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018.
- Shelley Rubin, Joan. *The Making of Middlebrow Culture*. Chapel Hill NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Tarantino, Quentin. *Cinema Speculation*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2022.
- Vedeer, William. *Henry James—The Lessons of the Master: Popular Fiction and Personal Style in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.