

## NICHITA STĂNESCU – KNOWLEDGE AND POETIC MYTH IN *II ELEGIES*

The poetic space which Nichita Stănescu delimits, in an equally lucid and pregnant assumption, can be labeled as a concomitant space of rupture and continuity. Thus, on the one hand, the poet programmatically dismisses didactic and epic poetry which “canonizes” reality and reduces it to its apparent manifestations and aspects, and, on the other hand, with natural alterations, he draws on the experience of interwar poetry which he integrates in his own poetic system as acceptance and assumption of the very essence of poeticity. This fertile duality of the *refusal* and *acceptance* is visible at the level of the poetic language which, far from relying on implied literality, slogan-like discursiveness or on the element of the “dissolution of the self in the generic of the *class*”, as Cristian Moraru stated, is integrated in a profoundly personalized (and personalizing) lyrical impulse, in which the subjective rhetoric gains the shape of a rediscovery of the self and the “transitivity” of the proletcultist poetic communication is rejected to the benefice of reflexivity and literarity, of connotative, substantially metaphorical writing.

In this regard, Nichita Stănescu’s former books (*Sensul iubirii* and *O viziune a sentimentelor*) make use of lyrics marked by accents of sensoriality and thus translate a true mythology of identity. The lyrical universe configured by these volumes in an auroral one, marked by a jubilation of living and of poetic discourse. As a matter of fact, it may be stated that this world of beginnings, in which conscience becomes acquainted, with participative exultance, of the miracle of being, the coincidence between living and telling is almost perfect. It is as if the shape of things found an instantaneous and complete reflection in the mirror of the poetic thought, as the poet’s words gained the substantiality, materiality and savor of things in the sense used by Nicolae Manolescu to talk about Nichita Stănescu’s lyrics as of “poetry which makes itself an object, in a continuous matter exchange with the world, which is literally being built in front of our eyes, while, assuming the real, it transmits its own verbal existence”.

Therefore, the poems belonging to this early period institute a lyricism of the celebration of cosmos unity, in which the contemplating I is

harmoniously integrated, without ontological spasms, freed from any skeptically reflexive accents, in an empathic communion which is not mediated with the elements whose manifestations become more and more analogue and complementary forms of the poet's vitalist soul. This Dionysian abundance of sensations is most accurately revealed in a poem such as *Dimineață marină*, in which the evocation is textually directed by juxtaposing some plastic images, of extreme concreteness, images whose chromatic dynamism is captured in the imperceptible tone; this poetics of the precisely reconstituted tone marks even more clearly the subjectivism of the lyrical state, the austere emotion which the impact between the conscience and things provokes, in an almost generic landscape, in its archetypal essentiality. The feeling of conscience *awakening* is, in fact, the revelation of knowledge which can be explained as a co-birth, a procreation which joins together, in an indestructible whole, the subject and the object, the I and the world: “: ‘O dungă roșie-n zări se iscăse/ și plopii, trezindu-se brusc, dinadins/ cu umbrele lor melodioase/ umerii încă dormind, mi i-au atins.// Mă ridicam din somn ca din mare, scuturându-mi șuvițele căzute pe frunte, visele,/ sprâncenele cristalizate de sare,/ abisele’” (*Dimineață marină*).

The ascending movement of the sun and the self together is drawn by the poet by a synesthetic reverberation in which senses are combined in a jubilation of the perception, which equals the knowledge of the exteriority to the knowledge of the self. Another significant poem for this theme of the union between the I and the world, of the identity between the subject and the object is *O călărire în zori*, which is not accidentally dedicated to tge “young Eminescu”; beyond the otherwise easily perceptible romanticism of the vision and living, the poem marks the transcendence of the slightly claustimating cognitive circle instated by sensations and the attempt to transcend the being's limited horizon towards that recuperatory meta-reality designed by the poetic word. This time, the lyrical impulse is directed towards the transcendence of the silence and the assumption, in a frenetic tonality, of the *expression*, seen as privileged means of the conscience to dialogue with the universe, in a permanent effort to accede to the light of knowledge, fact which was observed, among others, by Ștefania Mincu. In this way, the metaphor of the light, which is fundamental for Nichita Stănescu's poetry, may be equaled to the hypostasis of the poetic verb, because, just as light is simultaneously wave and corpuscle, thus

having a dual reality, in which antinomies conciliate and the poetic word is simultaneously object and subject, it represents transitivity and reflexivity, incorporating the Sign, the Meaning and the Referent in its ineffable structure as an organic whole. Birth of conscience and eulogy of knowledge, invocation of the essentiality of the word but also evocation of sacrality of the world, the poem *O călărire în zori* has all the mitopoetic data of an archetypal space, in which the harmony between the I and the world is beyond dispute and the imagistic exultance is nothing but the expression of vital frenzy which troubles the shapes of things and beings, rendering them subjective, impregnating the affective energy of the poetic I on them; this fact somehow explains that “sensorial perception of the world, visually exaggerated, shining and aerial” which Petru Poantă mentions.

The ascension to the light presupposed by knowledge, the birth of conscience as sum and assumption of the limits and possibilities granted to the human being to transgress them appear in clear lines, in which the pregnancy of the well-delimited images is combined with the dynamism of the transparent and equally dense vision: “Soarele rupe orizontul în două./ Tăria își năruie nesfârșitele-i carcere./ Sulițe-albastre, fără întoarcere./ privirile mi le-azvârl, pe-amândouă,/ să-l întâmpine fericite și grave./ Calul meu saltă pe două potcoave./ Ave maree-a luminilor, ave!”

The feeling of vital plenitude, of the *look* at the objects and of the harmonious integration of the lyrical I in a space with positive connotations is especially generated by the activation of the erotic sentiment, with the purpose of preserving the identity of the I with the self and of maintaining communication with the *other*. The Eros thus re-dimensions the elements of the universe and, through a centripetal movement, places them around the lyrical subject which on the one hand perceives the universe as a coherent, harmonious whole and, on the other hand, distinguishes the world under the spectrum of a paradigmatic approach to things: “Măinile mele sunt îndrăgostite,/ și, iată, m-am trezit/ că lucrurile sunt atât de aproape de mine,/ încât abia pot merge printre ele/ fără să mă rănesc(...)” (*Vârsta de aur a dragostei*). This ethics and poetics of the I’s participation to the essentiality of the world through the erotically subjective perception of the things, through the fascination of the creating Eros, but also through the sensorial jubilation of the subject facing its first contact with the world

ultimately leads to the theme of the word, which is an extremely fertile theme in Nichita Stănescu's poetry.

If in Nichita Stănescu's former volumes the *word* as instrument of poetic communication, but also as an expression of the communication with the world was perceived from the perspective of its identity and identification with the things and with the knowing I, as a consequence of the non-mediated assumption of the vitalist, sensorial impulse, starting with the volume *11 Elegies* the poet uses his lyrics for a deeper and deeper mirroring of the word's aporias, of its states of crisis, in a meditation on the fundamental difference and rupture between the internal and external dimensions of the logos. Thus, the *Elegies* expose, in the order of a mythologization of the poetic word, the tragic feeling of censorship between the I and the world, which is a sentiment announced by the painful revelation of dissolving time in the the volume *Dreptul la timp* and by the discovery of alterity, of gnoseological and ontological distance between the subject and the object. As a metter of fact, the antinomy I / universe is also instated by the inevitable alienation of the human being, who perceives the word as a cognitive simulacrum, as Stefania Mincu observes: "The word is an absence which precariously compensates alterity, the distance between the I and its other, a distance which is essentially caused by time. The definition of time becomes harder and harder to conceive; one discovers its unicity perceived as closeness, as impossibility of revelation to the outside, as it is margined by the abyss of time, which is different from the time of the conscience".

Defining, within the conceptual and manierist framework of the the *Elegies*, the tragedy of the I caused by the being's alteration under the impulse of time, but also the dramatically perceived distance between interiority and exteriority, the poet defines the word as a monolithical, eleatic, self-sufficient reality which does not inscribe itself within the flow of History, being the expression of perfect introversion, similar to the Hegelian Idea. The suggestion of the word's ideality is not entirely absent in the *Elegies*, but they transpose the arbitrary and tragic character of the words, which name and betray things, define and de-signify them, impregnating world objectiveness with a human touch and thus falsifying it. As a matter of fact, in *Cartea de recitare* the poet himself observes that "poetry, in its essence, is not about words. The essence of poetry is not to be sought after in language... Language for poetry is nothing else but a

vehicle. But it, poetry, makes itself felt through the language, because, of all the body parts, it is speaking which least resembles its roots, its body, just as the leaf least resembles the root of the tree". On the other hand, if in the first elegy the theme of identity is transposed in terms of its introversion, in an eleatic vision and perception, which sees the Being as self-sufficient and the object as not yet dislocated from objectivity ("El este înlăuntrul desăvârșit,/ interiorul punctului, mai înghesuit/ în sine decât însuși punctul"), *The Second Elegy, Getica* insinuates more and more persistently the idea of alterity, of the distance between the subject and the object and, implicitly, the alienation of the being.

Nicolae Manolescu notes that the semantic nucleus of the elegies is "the same doubt regarding the power of the senses, the crisis of the real-thirsty spirit, a balance between the self which cannot escape itself and the world which only exists in this dramatic contemplative act". This is precisely why the insertion of alterity, the absence and the void place Nichita Stănescu's creation following the volume *Dreptul la timp* under the sign of an ontological tragism and a gnoseological skepticism, to the extent that the existential crisis undergone by the poet is reflected, with relative accuracy, into a crisis of the poetic communication which is caused, as Marian Papahagi observes, by the "search for the idea to the ultimate signification of this search, the idea of the word". The schism produced inside the language is only significant for the loss of the unity of the self, under the disintegrating impulse of time, oh historicism, of the confrontation between identity and alterity, in a game inscribed in the register of existential gravity, of the *sign* in search of the *meaning* which defines a certain poetic vision.

Nichita Stănescu's lyrics delimits in its most defining lines a space of complementarity, in which identity and alterity, the image of the self and the hypostases of the other are the terms of an existential and gnoseological equation, whose solution might be given by the poetics of the *non-words*, by means of which the antinomy object / subject can find relative conciliation, a beneficial integration in the referentiality of the world perceived as a harmonious and coherent whole and, not least, as a rediscovery and reconstruction of the self.

The volume *11 Elegies* is therefore the proof of a mutation of sensitivity and the poetic document of a schism of the lyric I, who lucidly assumes a distance between the body and soul, between spirit and

affectivity, in a recoil movement into the interiority of its own being and a fundamental knowledge of the world endowed with gnoseological authenticity. Cristian Moraru observes that with this volume “we remain in the empire of identity and and of the full, of the integrating impulse, but the poetic I experiences a first schism, that between the body and the soul. Between the irrationality of viscosity and the sensibility of a spirit which, though functioning by *Seele's* logic, still emits claims to the idea of *creating*. Of building, of opposing a new ‘reason’, a new ‘common sense’ of poetic essence to a routine, trivial, Euclidian state of fact, to a narrow ‘copernicianism’”.

*The First Elegy* provides a lyrical transcript of a meditation on the phenomenology of conscience. The self conscience configures an itinerary of knowledge with the dominance of a dual type of movement, of expansion and retraction into itself, of exteriorization and interiorization. In a first moment of its evolution, the spirit is characterized by absolute purity, it is self-sufficient, has no margins and no transcending finality. It is equal to itself, autotelic, reduced to its self-imposed limits, reluctant to any attempt of alienation: “El începe cu sine și sfârșește/ cu sine./ Nu-l vestește nici o aură, nu-/ urmează nici o coadă de cometă.// Din el nu străbate-n afară/ nimic; de aceea nu are chip/ și nici formă. Ar semăna întrucâtva/ cu sfera/ care are cel mai mult trup/ învelit cu cea mai strâmtă piele/ cu puțință. Dar el nu are nici măcar/ atâta piele cât sfera.// El este înlăuntrul – desăvârșit,/ și,/ deși fără margini, e profund/ limitat.// Dar de văzut nu se vede.// Nu-l urmează istoria/ propriilor lui mișcări, așa/ cum semnul potcoavei urmează/ cu credință/ caii...”.

In such a hypostasis, the spirit is not only outside the laws of the common space, of absolute immateriality, but it also transcends the limits of time. In this assertion, it is in a perfect state of atemporality. For it, time is suspended, its dynamics is frozen and its stature is elevated. Furthermore, the spirit in this state of perfect virtuality, of absolute interiorization does not communicate in any way with the exterior, with the manifestations of the other elements of the universe.

It is similar to a leibnizian monad, self-sufficient, carrier of full meaning, with no ‘windows’ open to the surrounding world. it does not mirror anything to the outside, on the contrary, it only reflects itself, it projects its substance-lacking, immaterial, aerial face onto its own abysses: „Nu are nici măcar prezent,/ deși e greu de închipuit/ cum anume nu-l are.//

El este înlăuntrul desăvârșit,/ interiorul punctului, mai înghesuit/ în sine decât însuși punctul.// El nu se lovește de nimeni/ și de nimic, pentru că/ n-are nimic dăruit în afară/ prin care s-ar putea lovi”.

The poet perceives existence under the sign of the paradox and of some irreconcilable antinomies; the one and the multiple, the spiritual and the corporeal, the dynamic and the static are duplicitous and, at the same time, complementary to the existence which does not cease to exert its fascination on the poet, to make him experience the perpetual stupor of being. That is why the relation of the I with the universe can only be paradoxical, of fundamental ambiguity. Affirmation and negation are equally consubstantial to the state of being, just like essence and phenomenality are found together, combined on the balance of conscience („Aici dorm eu, înconjurat de el.// Totul este inversul totului./ Dar nu i se opune, și/ cu atât mai puțin îl neagă.// Spune Nu doar acela/ care-l știe pe Da./ Însă el, care știe totul,/ la Nu și la Da are foile rupte.// Și nu dorm numai eu aici,/ ci și întregul șir de bărbați/ al căror nume-l port.// Șirul de bărbați îmi populează/ un umăr. Șirul de femei/ alt umăr.// Și nici n-au loc. Ei sunt/ penele care nu se văd./ Bat din aripi și dorm -/ aici,/ înlăuntrul desăvârșit,/ care începe cu sine/ și se sfârșește cu sine,/ nevestit de nici o aură,/ neurnat de nici o coadă/ de cometă”).

As Mircea Martin observes, the poet's fundamental obsession seems to be “that of an exemplary, organic and cosmic unity”. The poet believes in finding an archetypal form, a primordial model beyond the multiplicity of things and beings, a form which should confer the universe its coherence, harmony and unity. In *The First Elegy*, Nichita Stănescu imagines in a lyrical form the Hegelian itinerary of the idea, in its state of non-manifestation, of self-sufficiency, of pure virtuality.

The lines of the poem have a gnomic shape, they are clear and precise, with an esoteric sound and an almost hermetic imagistic cipher.

The fifth elegy, entitled *The Temptation of the Real* instates a state of crisis, of the subject facing the multiplicity of the universe in front of the alterity of the world. The lyrical I witnesses a ‘trial’ initiated by the cosmos elements, precisely in the name of their irreducible alterity, in the name of the knowing subject's inability of deciphering the world in another way than in rational, human language which is therefore fundamentally falsifying and alienating (“N-am fost niciodată supărat pe mere/ că sunt mere, pe frunze că sunt frunze,/ pe umbră că e umbră, pe păsări că sunt

păsări/ Dar merele, frunzele, umbrele, păsările/ s-au supărat deodată pe mine./ Iată-mă dus la tribunalul umbrelor, merelor, păsărilor,/ tribunale rotunde, tribunale aeriene/ tribunale subțiri, răcoroase”).

The “ignorance” with which the lyrical I is charged is born out of the absence of a plenary agreement with the intimate being of the universe. The I solely perceives appearances, the surfaces of things, which is superficial, without having access to primordially, to the ultimate essence, to the vital impulse which confers significance to the world: “Iată-mă condamnat pentru neștiință,/ pentru plictiseală, pentru neliniște,/ Pentru nemișcare./ Sentințe scrise în limba sâmburilor./ Acte de acuzare parafate/ cu măruntaie de pasăre,/ răcoroase penitențe gri, hotărâte mic”.

The stupor experienced by the I is the result of the confrontation between the individual conscience and the multiplicity of the universe. The proteic faces of the real refuse to let themselves deciphered in their inner being and only display their appearance, their exteriority, thus reducing to nil the possibility of the subject to assimilate the ultimate secret of things and living creatures: “stau în picioare cu capul descoperit,/ încerc să descifrez ceea ce mi se cuvine/ pentru ignoranță.../ și nu pot, nu pot să descifrez/ nimic,/ și-această stare de spirit, ea însăși/ se supără pe mine/ și mă condamnă, indescifrabil,/ la o perpetuă așteptare,/ la o încordare a înțeleșurilor în ele însele/ până iau forma merelor, frunzelor,/ umbrelor,/ păsărilor”.

In this way, the adequate understanding of the world, in its authentic meaning, as well as the transposition of this meaning into words have a utopian character. The rupture between the I and the world dominated by multiplicity is perceived as guilt, and so is the dichotomous relation between the word and objects, or between the conscience and the words which it is given in order to express reality.

To decipher, to understand, to figure, to represent – these are exponential verbs in Nichita Stănescu’s lyrical vision in *The Fifth Elegy*, these are key-words which try to transpose the tense relationship between the inquisitive conscience and the universe which does not let itself be perceived in its irreducible intimate structure.

The temptation of the real is, in fact, a refusal of the superficial, incomplete understanding of the world, a temptation of the limits of knowledge and a challenge that elements pose to the conscience. The guilt of the lyrical I is a beatifying one, to the extent to which the meaning



emerging from objects and beings is prolonged by the poet's inquisitive conscience and modeled according to the fragile shape of the word.

Eugen Simion is right in his observation that "the theme of the *Elegies* is suffering from division, yearning for unity at a cosmic level [...]. The obsession of the rupture immediately triggers the idea of guilt, in this fecund and twisted dialectics. The reconstruction of primordial unity is not possible until the poet knows the language of kernels, the language of grass".

The poetic ideal in *The Fifth Elegy* is therefore circumscribed by the desire of harmonizing conscience and things, of communion between the one and the multiple, of reconstructing the balance and the primordial unity between the I and the world.

Stylistically, the poem stands out by the same abstract vision, characteristic for Nichita Stănescu's lyrics, in which the fervor of the idea is modeled in terms of the extreme vitality of the poetic language. This is also observed, among others, by Alex. Ștefănescu: "Nichita Stănescu is, more than other poets of ours, a lover of abstractions. A simple statistic operation proves that frequency of the abstractions in his poems is similar to the frequency of diminutives in Vasile Alecsandri's poems. Figures and letters, long infinitives, geometrical shapes, notions from various sciences currently enter, as transparent webs, the texture of his poems. To this are added many other common words, devoid of any concreteness – bird, leaf, horse, goat, cloud, flower – as if they had been kept in alcohol before being used".

Giving a plastic shape to the eternal confrontation between the subject and the object, the conscience and the world and its pluralistic manifestations and forms, Nichita Stănescu voices a poetics which is illustrative of a crisis of human knowledge, of a poetics of the encoded meaning and of a random dynamics of words. The intellectualized language, the gnomic turn of the lyrical discourse, the abstract phrase are to be found in *The Tenth Elegy* as well, with an edifying subtitle (*I am*), subtitle which shades light to the miracle of individual existence \m that corporeal and affective unit which induces the idea of identity between the I and the self.

The assumption of his own being as well as the annexation of the external world, in its essential data, are perceived by the author as a malady, a malady of the being who becomes alienated from its self as it

perceives the outside world. Knowledge means guilty distancing from its own self, it means alienation by rapport to something else, a reduction of the self to something which is not part of its essence: „Sunt bolnav. Mă doare o rană/ călcată-n copite de cai fugind./ Invizibilul organ,/ cel fără nume fiind/ neauzul, nevăzul/ nemirosul, negustul, nepipăitul/ cel dintre ochi și timpan,/ cel dintre deget și limbă, -/ cu seara mi-a dispărut simultan./ Vine vederea, mai întâi, apoi pauză,/ nu există ochi pentru ce vine;/ vine mirosul, apoi liniște,/ nu există nări pentru ce vine;/ apoi gustul, vibrația umedă,/ apoi iarăși lipsă,/ apoi timpanele, pentru leneșele/ mișcări de eclipsă;/ apoi pipăitul, mângâiatul, alunecare/ pe o undulă întinsă,/ iarnă-nghetată-a mișcărilor/ mereu cu suprafața ninsă”.

The disease that the poetic I claims to have is a gnoseologic one, it has to do with the register of knowledge, of the perception of the world. The poet suggests that senses are nothing else but imperfect instruments of assimilating shapes, forms and colors of the real, but the way the representations of things are formed in the conscience of the poetic self differs fundamentally from the perceptive and sensorial images offered by the senses.

The poet is sick because of the need of total and subtle knowledge, which should reflect with a maximum of authenticity the reflexes of the universe, its unstable, perpetually fluctuant rhythms („Dar eu sunt bolnav. Sunt bolnav/ de ceva între auz și vedere,/ de un fel de ochi, un fel de ureche/ neinventată de ere./ Trupul ramură fără frunze,/ trupul cerbos/ rărindu-se-n spațiul liber/ după legile numai de os,/ neapărate mi-a lăsat/ suave organele sferei/ între văz și auz, între gust și miros/ întinzând ziduri ale tăcerii./ Sunt bolnav de zid, de zid dărâmat/ de ochi-timpan, de papilă-mirositoare./ M-au călcat aerian/ abstractele animale,/ fugind speriate de abstracți vânători/ speriați de o foame asbractă,/ burțile lor țipând i-au stârnit/ dintr-o foame abstractă./ Și au trecut peste organul ne-nveșmântat/ în carne și nervi, în timpan și retină/ și la voia vidului cosmic lăsat/ și la voia divină”).

The inability of plenary expression of the rhythms of the universe triggers the morbidity of this gnoseological dissatisfaction, of this renewed nostalgia of the absolute, forever claimed but never to be satisfied („Organ pieziș, organ întins,/ organ ascuns în idei, ca razele umile/ în sferă, ca osul numit/ calcanu în călcăiul al lui Achile/ lovit de-o săgeată mortală; organ/ fluturat în afară/ de trupul strict marmorean/ și obișnuit doar să moară./

Iată-mă, îmbolnăvit de-o rană/ închipuită între Steaua Polară/ Și steaua Canopus și steaua Arcturus/ și Casiopeea din cerul de seară./ Mor de-o rană ce n-a încăput/ în trupul meu apt pentru răni/ cheltuite-n cuvinte, dând vamă de raze/ la vămi”).

The state of being is thus equaled to suffering, to disease, to purifying nostalgia, to yearning for the world of ideal essences. The lyrical I becomes so much identified with the universe, in its most diverse manifestations, that suffering and the malfunctioning of things and beings are perceived as its own suffering, as manifestations of a desire for empathy, for consonance with the rhythms of nature. The identification of the lyrical subject in the surrounding cosmos is an expression of the desire for communion, for essential identity which binds together the human being and the elements of the world. The reflection of the human face in the mirrors of nature is founded precisely on this type of secret correspondence, on this type of harmonious balance.

The poetic I suffers from “the entire universe”, as the echoes of the universe are perceived by his conscience so sensitive to what is surrounding it: „Iată-mă, stau întins peste pietre și gem,/ organele-s sfărâmate, maestrul./ ah, e nebun, căci el suferă/ de-ntreg universul./ Mă doare că mărul e măr./ sunt bolnav de sâmburi și de pietre./ de patru roți, de ploaia mărunță/ de meteoriți, de corturi, de pete./ Organul numit iarbă mi-a fost păscut de cai./ organul numit taur mi-a fost înjunghiat/ de fulgerul toreador și zигurat/ pe care tu arenă-l ai/ Organul Nor mi s-a topit/ în ploi torențiale, repezi./ și de organul Iarnă, întregindu-te./ mereu te lepezi./ Mă doare diavolul și verbul./ mă doare cuprul, aliorul./ mă doare câinele, și iepurele, cerbul./ copacul, scândura, decorul./ Centrul atomului mă doare./ și coasta cea care mă ține/ îndepărtat prin limita trupească/ de trupurile celelalte și divine./ Sunt bolnav. Mă doare o rană/ pe care mi-o port pe tavă/ ca pe sfârșitul Sfântului Ioan/ într-un dans de aprigă slavă”.

For Nichita Stănescu the external world has its reason of being only to the extent to which it is mirrored into the conscience of the lyrical I, to the extent to which it is prolonged in the poet's self with its deepest and most legitimate resonance and significances. In this respect, this is what Ion Pop observes: “One may say that the world of objects exists for the poet to the extent to which it is capable of challenging, of emitting vibrations or reflexes, or of prolonging their transfiguring dynamic effect. The aspect of

his imaginary is dominated by figures of *transparency* and *reflection*, by matter which denies its opacity, letting itself pierced by luminous waves”.

The end of the poem configures the structure of a scenario of knowledge in which empathic nostalgia is conjugated with an ambivalent impulse of relation to the one, to the eleatic unity of the world and, at the same time, of propulsion towards multiplicity: „Nu sufăr ceea ce nu se vede,/ ceea ce nu se aude, nu se gustă,/ ceea ce nu se miroase, ceea ce nu încape/ în încreierarea îngustă,/ scheletică a insului meu,/ pus la vederile lumii cei simple/ nerăbdând alte morți decât morțile/ inventate de ea, să se ntâmpale./ Sunt bolnav nu de cântece,/ ci de ferestrele sparte,/ de numărul unu sunt bolnav,/ că nu se mai poate împarte/ la două fâțe, la două sprâncene,/ la două urechi, la două călcâie/ la două picioare în alergare/ neputând să rămâie./ Că nu se poate împarte la doi ochi,/ la doi rătăcitori, la doi struguri,/ la doi lei răgind, și la doi/ martiri odihnindu-se pe ruguri”.

*11 Elegies* is an expression of the fundamental attitude of Nichita Stănescu's lyrical I of aspiration to the essence, of assumption of the world by identification with its rhythms, in a consonant reaction with the elements of nature.