

M. Eminescu's Vision on *Human – God* Relation

Carmina COJOCARU

Cet ouvrage essaye de démontrer que la vision du poète Eminescu sur la relation de l'homme avec Dieu découle de la perception anthropogonique qui se trouve à la base de l'œuvre de cet écrivain. Dès l'étape de son adolescence le poète se pose des questions sur le sens de l'existence et de la Divinité, en marquant ainsi, dès sa jeunesse, l'objectif de sa création qui a comme fondement la définition de l'homme et de son rôle sur la terre, d'« apprendre à mourir », comme expérience fondamentale de l'âme dans le corps. En réalisant une création d'une si vaste complexité, Eminescu esquisse une vision intégrale, où il inclut tous les éléments de la vie, en étudiant l'essence humaine dans son parcours depuis la naissance jusqu'à la mort, rapportée toujours au cosmos et à la société.

Dans ce sens, on fait référence au caractère dual de l'être humaine. L'homme est matière, limité par le temps, par l'espace, par causalité, soumise aux peines existentielles. Mais, il est aussi esprit, lié à l'absolu par l'amour, capable d'enlever les limites de son être. Par conséquent, il y a ce besoin de l'homme de comprendre le sens réel de la vie et de la mort et de comprendre qui les dirige et qui le dirige.

Mots-clés: M. Eminescu , littérature roumaine, l'homme - Dieu relation, anthropogonie.

One of M. Eminescu's manuscripts, the one under number 2286, contains the following note:

„Nicio plăsmuire nu a trebuit să permită atâtea explicații ca omul. Egiptenii au numit omul animal vorbitor; Moise îl numește chipul lui Dumnezeu; Eschil, o făptură a zilei; Sofocle, o imagine; Socrate, un mic zeu; Pindar, visul unei umbre; Homer și Ossian, o frunză de copac ce cade; Shakespeare, umbra unui vis; Job, fiul pulberii, Philemon, pricina nenorocirii; Herodot, nenorocirea însăși; Schleiermacher, spiritul pământului; Jean Paul, un semizeu; Schiller, stăpânul naturii; Goethe – unicul zeu al lumii; Seume, contradicția în marele cerc; Cicero, animal rațional; Platon, unealta care ajută divinitatea; Paracelsus, modelul a tot ce e mai frumos, Darwin...”¹

¹ Engl.: “No fudge had to allow so many explanations as human did. Egyptians called human *speaking animal*; Moses called him *the image of God*; Aeschylus, *creature of the day*; Sophocles, *an image*; Socrates, *a small god*; Pindar, *the dream of a shade*; Homer and Ossian, *a falling leaf of a tree*; Shakespeare, *the shade of a dream*; Job, *the son of dust*, Philemon, *the reason of disaster*, Herodotus, *the disaster itself*; Schleiermacher, *the spirit of the earth*; Jean Paul, *demigod*; Schiller,

And in this point, the series of enumeration suddenly breaks up. George Munteanu, in “România literară” (1991), stated: „Rațiunea mai simplă a scrutării atributelor de «poet antropogonic» ale lui Eminescu o determină realitatea operei, evidențele acesteia.”², and promised, at the end, that he would develop the foreshadowed theory. But things had been meant to happen another way, as after 10 years of research, I was in a position to say: „Sensul cel mai adânc și mai statornic al existenței și creației eminesciene, așa cum se exprimă el în întreaga desfășurare a operei marelui poet, este omul și tot ce înseamnă sau ce devine el, de când a pornit să parcurgă traseul dintre naștere și moarte, singularitatea relațiilor sale cu lumea, cu universul. Creația eminesciană are la bază o complexă, obsesivă viziune artistică despre om, cu tot ceea ce înseamnă el, material și spiritual, un șir neîntrerupt de întrebări, despre ceea ce este el sub timp”³.

The antropogony in Eminescu’s vision had been brought to light by Călinescu, who talked about “the secret source” hidden in “the forest of his subconsciousness”, in, I would add, *the supraconsciousness of Eminescu*, connected through genius to *the effluvia* of the absolute.

Eminescu's interest in the human-being (as researchers such as Rosa del Conte, Constantin Noica, Svetlana Paleologu-Matta, George Munteanu, Theodor Codreanu, George Gană called it) and in his/her purpose and destiny developed out of an early inward ebullition to discover the truth beyond material.

Even from the early stages of his creation (1865-1869), the poet had been wondering about the meaning of the existence and of the Deity, thus outlining the object of its creation which had, as fundament, the defining of the human-being and his/her meaning on earth – “to learn out dying“. Stating from the very beginning his artistic grievance „Azi să ghicesc ce-i moartea?... Iată ce-mi rămâne” and adding, in *Amicului F.I.*: „Ce este omul? Ce-i omenirea? Ce-i adevărul? Dumnezeuirea?”, Eminescu was going to accomplish a very complex creation, to outline a holistic vision that includes all the fundamental components of life, having in view the essence of human from birth to death, continuously cosmically and socially reported, in another words, to materialize an antropogonic vision from the perspective of which would have outlined what critics such as G. Călinescu and Tudor Vianu called *cosmogony* and *sociogony*.

master of the nature; Goethe – the only god of the world; Seume, the contradiction in the large circle; Cicero, rational animal; Plato, the tool that helps the deity; Paracelsus, the pattern of everything beautiful, Darwin...” (t.n., C.C.).

² Engl: “The simpler ration of scanning the attributes of «antropogonic poet» of Eminescu is determined by the reality of his work, its evidence” (idem).

³ Carmina Cojocaru, *Antropogonia eminesciană*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 2012, p. 19. Engl: “The deepest and stable meaning of the existence and creation of Eminescu, as it appears in the entire literary work of the poet, is human and everything that he has become, since he began to travel through birth to death, the singularity of his relations with the world, with the universe. The creation has as basis a complex, obsessive artistic vision about human, with everything he means or what he is going to be, material and spiritual, a continuous row of questions, about what he is under time.”

Even if, at first, he puts the human-being under the sign of deity – „În tine vede-se că e în ceriuri/ Un Dumnezeu” - sub-ms. *Elena* – , at the end of *Mortua est!*, the poet affirms that: „Pe palida-ți frunte nu-i scris Dumnezeu”, compressing in this line the formula of the *despiritualized* human, a form that, without breath, remains “nothing but a form through which passes the dust”. Eminescu considers that this point represents the beginning of the attempt to understand the mystery of the human-being, to test the spiritual capacity of the human in order to recognize his/her origin, to know that the human-being is *a being that is being* throughout *Being*.

Who are you? – the question at the end of the poem *Memento mori!*, addressed to that *YOU (TU)* the source of all the things on earth:

“Tu, ce din câmpii de chaos semeni stele – sfânt și mare,/ Din ruinele gândiri-mi, o, răsari, clar ca un soare./ Rupe vălur’le d-imagini ce te-ascund ca pe-un fantom;/ Tu, ce scrii mai dinainte a istoriei gândire./ Ce ții bolțile tăriei să nu cadă-n risipire,/ Cine ești?... Să pot pricepe și icoana ta... pe om”,

is the confessed *ontological question* determined by the apparently shadowed *antropogonic interrogation* regarding *who am I – the human?* Human is likely the sacred image of the *whole-conceiving* principle, conditioned in “*thinking himself by thinking the other one*”. This “antropogonic thrill, always insinuating itself by interstices”, gives a superior “vibration” to Eminescu’s texts.⁴

The poet’s thought perceives the human in a continuous formation. He/she is not under the sign of disappearance, since in this way his/her existence would be meaningless. He/she is, first of all, an essence from two contradictory substances: material and spirit, *ontical* and *antropological*. Getting the consciousness of his infinity, the human-being in Eminescu’s vision comprehends that, even if he/she has to face his/her own tragic fate, “the antitheses are life”, in other words, the contrasts, the oppositions: the two fundamental opposite experiences, birth and death, mean life, that is *being into being*, and that he/she has the eternity printed in his/her fate, not in the common-human meaning, but as it is proper for “a partition” of “a whole”.

By this essential quality of *partition of a whole*, the human-being could “ordain himself/herself his/her way”, as Pico della Mirandola writes in *Despre demnitatea omului*, enhancing the human duality:

„Te-am pus în centrul lumii pentru a privi cu ușurință în jurul tău și pentru a înțelege ce se petrece în ea. Nu te-am făcut nici ceresc, nici pământesc, nici muritor, nici nemuritor, pentru ca să poți deveni, cu deplină libertate și cinste, propriul sculptor și poet al formei pe

⁴ George Munteanu, *Eminescu și antinomiile posterității*, București, Editura Albatros, 1998, p. 26-30.

care ai vrea să ți-o dai. Ai putea degenera în rândul ființelor inferioare și brute sau poți să te înalți în lumea superioară, după singura hotărâre a spiritului tău”⁵.

In other words, by getting conscious of his/her antropological side – that he/she is alive, sensitive, subjective – and of his/her ontical side, he/she could relate, although in flesh, to the ethereal substances.

As long as he/she lives, the human-being is related to the ethereal, to the energy of his/her guardian star, with whom he/she forms an indestructible unit (Ms. 2257); thus, the human-being, although mortal, is eternal. Without resigning to the laws of formation, and by rejecting the continuous fear of perisability and death, he/she will see himself/herself in relation to what Heidegger called “Being”. To those, even few and rare „Dumnezeu în lume le ține loc de tată/ Și pune pe-a lor frunte gândirea lui bogată”, or, as the young prince is told in *Povestea magului călător în stele*: „A pus în tine Domnul nemargini de gândire”.

Why the specification *even few and rare*, since the human-being is a *partition of a whole*? Because the antropological, that is the material, generates the will of *living*, not of *being*. This is proved by the epic unfolding in *Luceafărul*. Although, at the beginning, *the very beautiful daughter* of the emperor breaks the limits of her being, and her imagination – related to the ethereal – lets her imerge into a superior comprehension, eventually she slips back into incomprehension, not because she is anchored to the limitation, but because she is afraid of the infinity. This duality is compressed in her personality. She is the only daughter of her parents – „una la părinți”, she has noble relatives – „din rude mari împărătești”, as the Virgin Mother among saints – „Cum e Fecioara între sfinți”, as the moon among the stars – „Și luna între stele”. Everything places her outside “the narrow circle”! There is no hint here, at the beginning, of the future Cătălina. What she is going to be is simply her election. Out of the infinit universe, taken out of the chaotic condition of sead and put in the nestle of death, she could have get the absolute which had been printed printed in her own datum at the beginning of the universe, by love. Possessing, by its substance, a high form of comprehension, love breaks out the limits of being, pushing her – against the genetic, the neuro-physiological limits – towards the absolute, towards the unseen, towards the pure substance, outside the form, showing her what a human-being could and is supposed to be.

The last stanza of the poem reveals what the superior human-being understands: that the ordinary human-being is powerless in front of the data of his/her condition:

⁵ Pico della Mirandola, *Despre demnitatea omului*, în Ovidiu Drimba, *Istoria literaturii universale*, I, București, Editura Saeculum I.O. și Vestala, 2001, p. 209 (Engl: “I put you in the center of the world to easily look all around you and to understand what is inside it. I have made you neither terrestrial nor mortal or immortal, in order to become in complete freedom and honesty, your own sculpture and poet of the form that you would like to give to yourself. You could degenerate into inferior being or beast or you could raise up to the superior world, following the only decision of your spirit.”, t.n., C.C.).

time, space, causality. As a matter of fact, from this perspective, it should be considered the final declaration. Analyzing „Trăind în cercul vostru strâmt/ Norocul vă petrece./ Ci eu în lumea mea mă simt/ Nemuritor și rece” in relation with these three concepts – *time*, *space*, *causality*, dimensions of our conscious oneself – we will find the following: the first two lines are grouped exclusively according to their human meaning, that is *in the time of “living”* (în *timp-ul lui* „trăind”), synonym with *being*, in the space restrained to “the narrow circle”, being aware of the dimension of the real, of the material, and in **causality**, according to its moving („vă petrece norocul”).

In the next two, the three dimensions – *time*, *space*, *causality* – are perceived through the consciousness of being, by the ontical. The space of the circle becomes infinit, being “world”, in the meaning of an hyperionic hero, the temporal perspective moves from the concrete sense of “living” („trăind”) of beings *with few days and so many faults* („mici de zile, mari de patimi”), on “I feel myself” („mă simt”), that is on a continuous sight inside oneself and towards the thinking of oneself, Luceafărul posing himself outside his antithesis, by mentioning „I feel myself” („mă simt”). From here, it also results the comprehension of the fact that without being determined in a sensorial way, Luceafărul does not *feel*, but *feels himself*, thus love is not *lived*, but *overlived* into being.

In other words, perceived as an experience beyond the sensorial dimension, outside the material, love, as a superior expression of life, could become seed itself passed through all the beings up to Archæus, as an unseen thread of connection, as a bridge that connects being to being. We could say that love means immortality. This is the idea of the opposition of the two groups of lines in the final stanza. In the concentration of humans in two temporal aspects: one of living, of being, and another one *in of feeling oneself inward oneself*, while, under the empire of a comprehension like this, everything expands, gets infinity, “the narrow circle” becoming “my world”, and the result of the report time – space becomes null. This is not the case for Luceafărul. Marked by immortality and objectivity, he becomes *infinity into infinity*, boundless energy created by *That One Untouchable* (“*Cel nepătruns*”), by *The Unlimited One* (*Nelimită*). The suggested conclusion? Even subdued to “The First One” („Celui dintâi”), to the “Holly Father” („Tatălui”), by will and devine decision, this kind of “partition” could get, as an assembly, the main trait of the “whole” - eternity. That is why we consider that the poetry of love is the poetry of “thinking death”, of the relation with the transcendent and with “the remembering” that life is the nestle of death, death is the seed of the new life” („viața-i cuibul morții, moartea e sămânța vieții noi”). In the vision of Eminescu, love and the insinuated death as a cold thrill open the windows of thought towards the meaning of life – and, thus, to the revelation of the infinity from the limitation.

*

This is the foremost target which the whole lyric, epic and dramatic, even journalistic unfolding goes to: of “guessing what death is”. This is an interior goal that guides Eminescu in his complex research and studies up to the last moment, when, “learning to die”, he gets access to the most-wanted “eternal peace”. We see, in his whole work, many interpretations that bring to light a long-lasting and deep meditation of what it is the other essence of “the antithesis”, death. To an assertion made when he was 18: “Life is the nestle of death – death is the seed of a new life” („Viața-i cuibul morții – moartea e sămânța vieții nouă”) another one, with the same meaning is added, discovered some pages further of the project *Genaiia* „Doamnă a vremurilor lunge – a Veciei împărăteasă Moarte!” (Ms.2257, f. 188), and one more is added, as well, in the notes of the courses in Berlin from the period 1872-1873: „Căci Moartea-i laboratorul unei vieți eterne” (Ms. 2276, f. 63). In *Epigonii*, life and death are arranged cyclically: „Moartea succede vieții, viața succede la moarte/Alt sens n-are lumea asta, n-are alt scop, alte soarte.”, and in *Decebal*, Dochia utters, in the moment of the final breakdown of Dacia, a thought proper to the vision of Eminescu: „Umbre ce sunt: viața și nemurirea”, and in another utterance: „Umbre ce sunt: moartea și nemurirea”, with the idea that „Timpul e moarte – spațiul e luptă”.

We should stop only at these examples in order to search the meaning of the “voluptuousness” of death. As life, in the vision of Eminescu, does not mean only the pulse of the heart, but should also be considered the essence of being, death does not mean getting out of the limit. That is why we are not, as we could show, in front of an universe half-circled, having birth and death as the only two possible horizons, as Călinescu thought, but in front of a continuous circle, of “a curve into the infinity of the universe”, as Eminescu says. Another variant of *Luceafărul* brings into discussion the spiral forming: „Pentru că ei sunt trecători/ Sunt toate trecătoare –/ Au nu sunt toate-nvelitori/ Ființei ce nu moare?”. At the end of the sequence we find: „Să piară timpul înneecat/ În văi de întuneric/ El s-ar renaște luminat/ Ca să se-nvârtă sferic.” Thus, life, at Eminescu, is „onticul actualizat într-un tărâm al său ori în altul, intrând, pentru durate anumite, în starea cosmotică, datorită energiilor complementar-antinomice care i-s inerente; moartea e onticul rămas în unele zone de-ale lui și pentru răstimpuri variabile în starea de nediferențiere, haotică, aceea în care materia și energiile-i inalienabile sunt în detentă”⁶.

As a result, for Eminescu death is out of its general accepted meanings, becoming a return to the real being: „Din a morții sfântă mare curg izvoarele vieții/ Spre-a se-ntoarce iar într-înșă.”

⁶ George Munteanu, *Istoria literaturii române, Epoca marilor clasici*, Galați, Editura Porto-Franco, 1994, p. 207 (Engl.: “the ontical actualized from one land to another, entering for certain durations in a cosmical state, due to the complementary - antinomical energies that are inherent; death is the ontical that remained in some areas and for variant duration in the state of *undifferentiability*, chaotic, that where the material and the inalienable energies are in expansion”, t.n., C.C.).

Without being a physiological process, *thinking of death* becomes a way of comprehending life, its most complete experience. This is the deepest meaning of human existence and the comprehension of all “uncomprehensible” depends on the fulfillment of its meaning.

Having such a perspective, Eminescu gets to the highest level of comprehending life as an essence from a long row of essences, making, in *Odă (în metru antic)*, the most complex confession: „Nu credeam să-nvăț a muri vreodată”. *Learning to die* unavoidable includes the idea of learning to live; *learning to die* means being in the hypostasis of consciousness pulled out of the Great Universal Consciousness, of terrestrial part torn of the eternal whole, that one has already chosen the way of being, that one has already understood that he is being in a body and beyond! We consider that *this* is the clue for getting the idea of the poet's utterances, that hence on the underground sources of the thought of Eminescu towards the ocean of his hidden being reveal. "The heart rending pain" („Suferința”, „dureros de dulce”), synonym to the asceticism, with the torment of the human sins, the salvation of the mental from the contingent creates the suitable inward combustion as in a living fire of the thought. The embodiment of death in living the spirit generates an internal revolution and such a complex change of the perspectives as it overpasses all the other experiences. Only then the being is prepared for the resurrection towards the light of the beginnings.

Looking for the meaning of the world and time, birth and death, Eminescu also tries, in the fever of “the antropogonic obsession”, to find out who stands behind “the closed door” („poarta închisă”) where „deasupra ei, în triumphi, era un ochi de foc, deasupra ochiului un proverb cu litere strâmbe ale întunecatei Arabii” (*Sărmanul Dionis*); „Oare viața omenirii nu te caută pe tine?” (*Andrei Mureșan*). Even if he thinks that „în van se luptă firea-mi să-nțealegă a ta fire”, in the manuscript number 2267, we find an answer to the question:

„Cine ești?... Dumnezeu. El are predicabiile câtor trele categorii ale gândirii noastre. El e pretutindeni – are spațiul; el e etern – are timpul; el e atotputernic, dispune de întreaga energie a Universului. Omul e după asemănarea lui; Omul reflectă în mintea lui – in ortum – căteșitrele calitățile lui. De aceea la-nceput era Verbul și Verbul era la Dumnezeu, și Dumnezeu era Verbul”⁷.

And in *Rugăciune, Răsai asupra mea, Învierea* the attention is focused on the moment when Jesus Christ raise from the dead:

⁷ Engl.: “Who are you? ... God. He is the predictables of our thought. He is everywhere. He has the space; He is eternal. He has the time; He is almighty, He has all the energy of the universe at His disposal. Human is His resemblance; Human reflects in His mind – *in ortum* – all His numberless qualities. That is why at the beginning there was the Verb and the Verb was kept by God, and the Verb was God” (t.n., C.C.).

„Un clopot lung de glasurivui de bucurie.../ Colo-n altar se uită și preoți și popor./ Cum din mormânt răsare Christos învingător,/Iar inimile toate s-unesc în armonie:// (...)// Christos a înviat din morți,/ Cu cetele sfinte./ Cu moarteapre moarte călcând-o,/ Lumina ducând-o/ Celor din morminte!”.

The same idea appears in an article written with the same occasion:

„...credem că a înviat pentru cei dreپți și buni, al căror număr mic este; dar pentru acea neagră mulțime, cu pretexte mari și scopuri mici, cu cuvânt dulce pe gură și cu ură în inimă el nu a înviat niciodată”.

There is here the same high conception of the divine sacrifice that transfigures death into life. There is the confession that human, created according to the image and resemblance of God, apparently situated between two unknown entities, could finally step on death by death, that by this triumph confesses himself as a partition of a whole. And in order to reach *time without moments* (*vremea fără timp*) the human should pass over the border of *moments without time* (*timpului fără vreme*).

Bibliography

- Eminescu, Mihai *Opere*. Volumul I, 1939, București, Editura Fundației pentru Literatură și Artă Regele Carol; II, 1939; III, 1944; IV-VI, 1952-1963;VII-XVI, 1977-1989, București, Editura Academiei
- Călinescu, G. 1934-1936. *Opera lui Eminescu*, I-V, București, Editura Fundației pentru Literatură și Artă „Regele Carol II”
- Munteanu, G. 1973, *Hyperion. Viața lui Eminescu*, București, Editura Minerva
- Munteanu, George 1994, *Istoria literaturii române. Epoca marilor clasici*, Galați, Editura Porto-Franco
- Cojocar, Carmina 2012, *Antropogonia eminesciană*, Iași, Editura Junimea