...and for certain technical data.

That's why my presence on... in the online space is not so obvious, instead I try to compensate by my physical presence, by my work which, I repeat once again, I never get tired working on it thoroughly.

Because there are two types of writer, according to Jean Racine, he said there are writers who accumulate their glory, literary glory in a very, very fast time and there are writers who accumulate it, accumulate it over decades.

But the important thing is to re- is to remember, that those who accumulate their glory very, very quickly and are very present, are consumed very quickly, and those who try this satisfaction, this pleasure, if you want... they try to spread it over many years, over a longer period, then certainly the weight and the impact of the works are impressive.

I take it, your magnum opus is still to come, right?

Writers are always saying that their most important book has not yet been written and when writers are asked, which of their books they think is the most important, the delineation is very complicated.

It's like choosing which of your children is the most beautiful, which one is the most intelligent, so it's up to literary criticism to do that.

That's why I- the prose writer, the writer in me is always doubled by the literary critic.

It's very complicated to analyse your own works, it's much, much easier to analyse the works of your fellow writers.

But I have always tried to strengthen my own work, to focus my attention on writers who have passed away, and not because the works of our contemporaries are worthless.

I have the impression that historical events, as literary works, have to pass a certain period of time in order for these works to mature.

My Bucharest professor Eugen Simion used to tell me that the popularity or the lack of popularity of a writer during his lifetime says nothing, but absolutely nothing, about the value of his work.

Because we have to admit, there are these influential people, who occupy certain positions, who, by virtue of a certain, a certain financial situation can promote their literary work more, do so with more ardour during their lifetime.

And there are writers who will only be discovered once they have passed into the eternal world.

Moreover, there is a very important thing, for a great writer it is important to have this chance to be born in a period in which a very important literary critic is also born, who will highlight, reflect and bring to light the most important attributes of this creation.

Then a writer in the full sense of the word does not have to be as you see me here, modelled after me.

In what sense?

In the sense that he has to be completely free of daily worries.

So when I refer to an aristocratic writer in the noble sense of the word, I am referring to Vasile Alecsandri, who was a country squire, who had a lot of servants and who could really afford to create works that were not to be missed.

But even this example is not one hundred percent relevant, we have the case of Eminescu, who was stimulated by misery to create truly fundamental works.

But what is important is that the writer must always keep his job, be at the writing table.

From this point of view, I’m thinking of Émile Zola – a titan of French literature, who, in order to be able to create a lasting work hid himself away from his family somewhere in the south of France, in a very small guesthouse so that absolutely no one would know him, because there were no mobile phones, there was, of course, no internet, and only on Sundays would someone come with a cup of tea and tell him: "Mr Zola, today is Sunday".

So this self-forgetfulness, if you like, the writer resembles in this respect a monk who finds a hermitage, the hermitage being the work he has to create, and he divests himself of worldly things.

It is more difficult in the Republic of Moldova to be able to have a family, to have a career and to be a writer according to the classical model.

So was George Calinescu, who was categorically against his involvement in all kinds of councils and committees.

He considered these things a waste of time.

Although he was an academic, although he was a professor and everyone wanted to have him in various honorary councils, he hid in the attic of his house and did not forget the most important thing: to pull his ladder behind him so that no one could reach, reach him.

These are cases, these are famous cases, these are famous cases of writers.

However, in my opinion, at the beginning of the third millennium, in the twenty-first century and especially in the Republic of Moldova, being a writer also implies active civic participation.

A writer, in my view, is like a farmer, he must get involved in everything that is happening in society, even if this, I repeat once again, brings a certain prejudice and even the benefits are far from, far from... embracing him.

But this is the condition of the modern writer, a writer who no longer has a feather, no longer has an ink jar, a writer...