

## **L'ARCHÉTYPE DU DIVIN – ÉLÉMENT DANS LA STRUCTURE DE LA CONSCIENCE**

**Anca Daniela LOVIN**  
**Collège National « Dinicu Golescu », Cîmpulung Muscel**

**Résumé :** *Analysant le monde de l'archétype, les profondeurs du Soi, on peut comprendre mieux le comportement humain. En cherchant les sources de l'archétype on découvre les clés de l'équilibre intérieur qui sont parsemées dans nous-mêmes. En fait, le grand péché c'est l'oubli de la perfection des commencements et de l'erreur essentiel qui a provoqué la chute de Paradis, la rupture de l'absolu. En conséquence, la mémoire a un rôle essentiel pour garder l'équilibre de l'être humain.*

**Mots-clés :** *mythe, archétype, symbole.*

Le rapport de l'homme à son environnement peut se caractériser par un processus de symbolisation, qui permet à la fois une meilleure compréhension et une plus grande efficacité. L'élaboration humaine des symboles, mythiques, linguistiques, artistiques ou scientifiques, peut-être très importante pour analysée les méandres et les crises de la pensée de l'homme contemporaine.

L'homme a une pensée symbolique et cette affirmation, soutenue par Ernst Cassirer, vise l'actualité, spécialement par l'intermède du monde virtuel de l'Internet qui fonctionne par une multitude de symboles. L'apparition du terme de *cybernumineux*, par analogie avec l'œuvre de Rudolf Otto, pour désigner l'expérience *étrange*, un tellement *mysterium tremendum*, qui gagne l'individu qui vient en contact avec les nouvelles technologies, en particulier d'Internet et du Web, démontre que l'homme moderne a aussi besoin de symboles.

Parce que l'esprit humain est le produit des représentations, des formes objectives de l'esprit qui constituent la culture humaine, l'homme a besoin de comprendre les symboles pour décoder les messages du Soi. Le langage, le mythe, mais également les sciences sont des élaborations de l'esprit humain, qui lui permettent de mieux comprendre le monde et d'agir sur lui. Le symbole produit par l'esprit permet à l'être humain de toujours mieux connaître le monde qui l'entoure. Les profondeurs du Soi réussissent envoyer des signes vers le monde du conscient, mais les symboles doivent être interprétée.

Il est essentiel de comprendre les mythes et les symboles pour comprendre l'esprit moderne dissocié et confus, car « laïcisés, dégradés, camouflé, les mythes et les images mythiques se rencontrent partout : il n'est que de les reconnaître. »<sup>1</sup>

Pour les sociétés appelées archaïques le mythe représente le fondement de la vie sociale et de la culture. Il exprime une vérité absolue parce qu'il raconte une histoire sacrée, une histoire exemplaire qui s'est passé au Grand Temps, *in illo tempore*. Ces histoires sacrées ont deux aspects essentiels, la Cosmogonie et la chute. Quelque chose s'est passé *in illo tempore* qui a interrompu la communion entre l'être humain et l'Être

---

<sup>1</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Mythes, rêves et mystères*, Gallimard, Paris, 2008, p.33

absolu. Par cette rupture l'homme devient mortel et terrifié de cette menace permanente qui révèle la faiblesse de sa condition. Mais cette angoisse est étroitement liée avec le problème du *temps*.

Dans son œuvre, *Mythes, rêves et mystères*, Mircea Eliade met en évidence la capacité de l'homme archaïque et aussi de l'homme religieux, de valoriser le temps par la régénération rituelle. «Un mythe est une histoire vraie qui s'est passée au commencement du Temps et qui sert de modèle aux comportements des humains. En imitant les actes exemplaires d'un dieu ou d'un héros mythique, ou simplement en racontant leurs aventures, l'homme des sociétés archaïques se détache du temps profane et rejoint magiquement le Grand Temps, le temps sacré.»<sup>1</sup>

L'humanité garde le souvenir d'un temps mythique quand l'homme était parfait et heureux. Pour l'homme archaïque et aussi pour l'homme moderne, la perfection était *au commencement*, mais la différence est que l'homme archaïque n'oublie pas cette chose. Par l'intermède du mythe et du rite il remémore périodiquement les événements qui l'ont apporté dans cet état, d'homme *déchu*. Par ces remémorations, par le retour *ab origine*, il régénère périodiquement le temps, car, par l'intermède du mythe, l'homme retourne à la perfection des *commencements*, il sort de la durée profane et se retourne *in illo tempore*, dans un Temps Sacré.

Pour l'homme archaïque il existe deux catégories « d'évènements, s'inscrivant dans deux espèces de Temps qualitativement irréductibles : d'une part, les événements mythiques, qui ont eu lieu *ab origine*, et qui ont constitué : la cosmogonie, l'anthropogonie, les mythes d'origine (institution, civilisation, culture) et *il lui faut se remémorer tout cela*. D'autre part, les événements sans modèle exemplaire, les faits qui se sont simplement passés, et qui, pour lui, ne présentent pas d'intérêt : il les oublie, il *brûle* leur souvenir. »<sup>2</sup>

Périodiquement, les plus importants événements mythiques étaient réactualisés, et donc revécus et ainsi l'homme sort de la durée profane et pénètre dans le Temps Sacré des origines. A lieu, ainsi, une régénération du *temps* et de *l'être* car l'homme réapprend à valoriser le présent par cette redécouverte du présent éternel.

Pour les peuples archaïques la remémoration des événements mythiques avait une grande importance. Cette importance accordée à la mémoire est essentielle, car elle se trouve, sous une forme ou autre présente dans la religion et dans la spiritualité humaine. C'est toujours nécessaire de commémorer et de remémorer l'événement primordial qui a fondé l'actuelle condition humaine. « On doit bien se garder d'oublier ce qui s'est passé *in illo tempore*. Le vrai péché c'est l'oubli. »<sup>3</sup>

Cette régénération temporelle a lieu aussi pendant la liturgie chrétienne. « le mythe représente un certain mode d'être dans le monde, et le christianisme, *du fait même qu'il est une religion*, a dû conserver au moins un comportement mythique : le temps liturgique, c'est-à-dire le refus du temps profane et le recouvrement périodique du Grand Temps, de *l'illud tempus* des commencements. [...] Car le temps liturgique dans lequel vit le chrétien pendant le service religieux n'est plus la durée profane, mais bien le temps sacré par excellence, le temps où Dieu s'est fait chair, *l'illud tempus* des Evangiles. Un chrétien n'assiste pas à une commémoration de la Passion du Christ [...] Il ne commémore pas un événement, il réactualise un mystère. Pour un chrétien, Jésus

---

<sup>1</sup> Idem, p. 22

<sup>2</sup> Idem, p.46

<sup>3</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Mythes, rêves et mystères*, Gallimard, Paris, 2008, p. 46

meurt et ressuscite devant lui, *hic* et *nunc*. Par le mystère de la Passion et de la Résurrection, le chrétien abolit le temps profane et il est intégré dans le temps sacré primordial. [...] Pour le chrétien, comme pour l'homme des sociétés archaïques, le temps n'est pas homogène ; il comporte des ruptures périodiques, qui le divisent en une durée profane et un temps sacré ; ce dernier est indéfiniment réversible, entendez qui se répète à l'infini sans cesser d'être le même. »<sup>1</sup> *L'illud tempus* christologique ne sera pas aboli par le fin de l'Histoire, seulement la *durée profane*, l'Histoire, sera finie.

De la même sortie de la durée profane il s'agit aussi dans le hindouisme. Dans la philosophie hindoue, le but suprême est celui de déchirer les voiles de Mâyâ, l'illusion cosmique et de se réintégrer dans l'absolu. En revivant ses vies passés, le hindou, *brûle* ses péchés et *comprend* en même temps l'existence. Il « arrive au commencement du Temps et il rejoint le Non-Temps, l'éternel présent qui a précédé l'expérience temporelle fondée par la première existence humaine déchue. »<sup>2</sup> Ce fait, quitter Mâyâ et obtenir l'intégration dans l'absolu, d'avant la naissance du temps, est possible parce que le macrocosme est reflété dans microcosme et l'esprit universel, *Brahman*, n'existe pas sans *âtman*, le Soi. « On découvre que la Grande Illusion, la Mâyâ, était nourrie par notre ignorance, par notre fausse et absurde identification avec le devenir cosmique et avec l'historicité. En réalité, notre véritable Soi – notre *âtman*, notre *purusha* – n'a rien à voir avec les multiples situations de notre historicité. Le Soi participe à l'Être ; *âtman* est identique à *Brahman*. »<sup>3</sup> Pour le philosophe hindou la découverte de l'illusion cosmique n'a pas de sens si elle n'est pas suivie par la recherche de l'Être absolu. En déchirant le voile de Mâyâ, l'homme se trouve devant l'Être absolu, devant la réalité ultime.

En conclusion, analysant ces trois situations de sortie de la durée et de régénération du *temps* et de l'*être*, découvrons que, l'angoisse de l'homme moderne, qui se découvre non seulement mortel, « mais mourant, en train de mourir, en tant qu'implacablement dévoré par le Temps »<sup>4</sup> a comme principale cause l'oubli des origines et de la réalité significative. En fait, le grand péché c'est l'oubli de la perfection des commencements et de l'erreur essentiel qui a provoqué la chute de Paradis, la rupture de l'absolu. En conséquence, la mémoire a un rôle essentiel pour garder l'équilibre de l'être humain.

Les philosophies, les mystiques, les techniques ascétiques indiennes, chrétiennes et le comportement mythique de l'homme archaïque ont le même but « guérir l'homme de la douleur de l'existence dans le Temps. »<sup>5</sup>

Bien que les mythes semblent avoir été effacés de l'existence de l'homme moderne, si profondément déchu dans l'historicité, dans la durée profane, les mythes existent encore, camouflées dans la réalité quotidienne, car ils sont occultés dans les profondeurs de l'esprit humaine, dans l'inconscient. C.G. Jung appelle cette partie de l'être humain, qui est inaccessible pour le conscient, *l'inconscient collectif*. Cette partie représente l'héritage de l'humanité et est gouvernée par l'archétype. Mais parce que cet héritage est si profondément caché dans les eaux du Soi, il ne peut sortir à la lumière du conscient que reflété dans les manifestations artistiques, dans des rêves ou en transe.

---

<sup>1</sup> Idem, pp. 30-31

<sup>2</sup> Idem, p.53

<sup>3</sup> Mircea Eliade, *Mythes, rêves et mystères*, Gallimard, Paris, 2008, p. 71

<sup>4</sup> Idem

<sup>5</sup> Idem, p. 52

Jung affirmait que le plus important but de la vie est de valoriser la totalité des potentialités. En analysant les messages de l'inconscient, l'individu doit aspirer à l'homme complet. Mais pour obtenir ce modèle de l'homme complet, le Soi, c'est nécessaire seulement une intégration des contenus de l'inconscient. Ce fait est présent dans la spiritualité universelle et je mentionnerai seulement deux exemples : l'idée de *l'homme intérieur* de Saint Augustin, qui dans sa vision est Jésus Christ, la voix qui nous dirige des profondeurs, et le célèbre monde des idées de Platon. Le philosophe grec soutenait qu'il existe un monde parfait des idées et notre monde n'est qu'une réplique imparfaite de celui-ci. Comme néoplatonicien et père de l'église, Saint Augustin, soutenait que l'image de ce monde parfait qui subsiste en nous, n'est que l'image de la perfection que l'homme a connue, mais qu'il a perdue par sa chute.

En analysant les messages de l'inconscient, l'individu doit aspirer à l'homme complet. Mais pour obtenir ce modèle de l'homme complet, le Soi, il est nécessaire seulement d'intégrer ces contenus de l'inconscient. Cette aspiration peut être accomplie en analysant les structures de l'archétype. Un élément significatif pour tous les individus de l'espèce et pour toujours, se sédimentera et formera un archétype. Celui ne peut pas être l'élément qui l'a généré, parce que cet élément se peut manifester dans une multitude des formes. L'archétype représente la structure, l'essence, la matrice de cet élément significatif. Le but de l'homme de réaliser une harmonie entre le conscient et l'inconscient est atteint par le processus d'individuation, une expérience vivante en général exprimée également par des symboles. L'individuation, concept fondamentale dans l'œuvre de C. G. Jung, indique le processus par lequel une personne devient une unité ou un tout psychologique ayant comme support le conflit entre les deux aspects psychiques fondamentaux, le conscient et l'inconscient. Par l'analyse de l'inconscient ou le processus d'individuation les processus préconscients passent peu à peu dans le conscient par l'intermédiaire des rêves ou de l'imagination active.

Pour découvrir la source des symboles, l'homme doit se tourner vers l'inconscient. La recherche de l'inconscient est très difficile parce qu'elle implique la confrontation avec l'*ombre* - la nature cachée de l'homme, avec *l'anima/animus* - le sexe opposé caché en tout individu, et avec l'archétype du sens.

Dans l'œuvre de Jung toutes les instances psychiques sont en étroites relations les unes avec les autres: le conscient, l'inconscient personnel et collectif. L'âme est comme un iceberg qui a le sommet à la surface – *le conscient* - et l'énorme corps caché en abîme – *l'inconscient*. L'inconscient collectif est constitué de formes de pensée préexistantes, nommées archétypes, donnant forme à un certain matériel psychique qui pénètre alors le conscient. L'archétype représente le mode d'expression de l'inconscient collectif. Ce dernier se manifeste par des images archaïques et universelles qui se manifestent dans les rêves, les croyances religieuses, les mythes et les contes. En tant qu'expérience psychique spontanée, les archétypes apparaissent parfois sous leurs formes les plus primitives et les plus naïves, dans les rêves, ou sous une forme plus complexe due à une élaboration consciente, dans les mythes. Dans l'analyse des rêves, la présence chez les individus de mythologèmes caractéristiques amène à conclure que les éléments structuraux formateurs du mythe doivent être présents dans la psyché inconsciente.

L'archétype, *pattern of behaviour*, comment l'appelle Jung, c'est une matrice, une préforme vide qui se remplit avec le matériel de l'expérience. Il est l'unité structurelle qui compose l'inconscient collectif, qui représente l'héritage culturel de l'humanité.

Le concept d'archétype est décrit comme un concept né de l'expérience de l'humanité, expérience qui ne se manifestent pas conscient, mais par les symboles qui animent les phénomènes mythiques, religieux et littéraires. Les archétypes sont des images primordiales, produits spontanés, présents en tout homme, qui ont dans la structure psychique le rôle de représenter ou personnifier certaines données instinctives de l'inconscient.

La thème de l'attraction des contraires, *coincidentia oppositorum*, est étroitement lié de concept jungienne de *anima/animus* et aussi du symbole de l'*androgynie*. Le mythe de l'androgynie et ce de l'œuf cosmique sont présentes dans toutes les cosmogonies, car dans les points Alpha et Omega du monde et de la vie se situe la plénitude fondamentale où les contraires s'unifient. L'homme aspire permanent vers l'âge d'or du commencement, et cette harmonie est possible par l'union des contraires. Ce symbole de l'androgynie, depuis la mythologie païenne jusqu'à la tradition chrétienne, tire son identité d'une image primordiale universelle. A la lumière du développement récent de la psychologie, la projection du personnage de l'hermaphrodite est considérée comme la symbolisation de l'idéal psychique de l'autoréalisation : elle unifie la psyché qui est en elle-même bisexuelle, composée d'un sexe dominant et de son opposé inconscient, *anima/animus*. Dans l'œuvre de Mircea Eliade, *Méphistophélès et l'androgynie*, le mythe de l'androgynie symbolise la perfection paradisiaque, l'unité des contraires.

Dans son œuvre, *Le Banquet*, Platon, par la voix d'Aristophane, parle d'une troisième espèce humaine, l'androgynie. « L'espèce androgynie avait la forme et le nom de deux autres, mâle et femelle, dont elle était formée; aujourd'hui elle n'existe plus, ce n'est plus qu'un nom décrié. [...] ils étaient aussi d'une force et d'une vigueur extraordinaires, et comme ils avaient de grands courages, ils attaquèrent les dieux, et [...] ils tentèrent d'escalader le ciel pour combattre les dieux. Zeus délibéra avec les autres dieux [et décida de couper l'homme en deux. Mais par cette coupure les hommes deviennent plus faibles.]

Or, quand le corps eut été ainsi divisé, chacun, regrettant sa moitié, allait à elle ; et, s'embrassant et s'enlaçant les uns les autres avec le désir de se fondre ensemble, les hommes mouraient de faim et d'inaction, parce qu'il ne voulaient rien faire les uns sans les autres. [...] Alors Zeus, touché de pitié, imagine un autre expédient : il transpose les organes de la génération sur le devant [...] Il plaça donc les organes sur le devant et par là fit que les hommes engendrèrent les uns dans les autres, c'est-à-dire le mâle dans la femelle. [...] L'amour recompose l'antique nature, s'efforce de fondre deux êtres en un seul, et de guérir la nature humaine. »<sup>1</sup>

Heinrich Zimmer, mentionne aussi une superbe image de l'androgynie. L'indianiste parle d'un temps immémorial, quand les époux et les épouses s'étaient nés ensemble comme jumeaux. Donc l'androgynie n'est qu'une image de l'homme complet qui, dans l'Age d'or, pouvait valoriser toutes ses potentialités. Pour comprendre bien le concept c'est nécessaire de regarder l'univers comme le résultat d'une tension des contraires. Le secret de Mâyâ réside dans l'identité des contraires. Mâyâ est une manifestation simultanée et successive d'énergies qui s'annulent réciproque. Dans la mythologie hindoue, Shiva, divinité androgynie, est représenté embrassant Shakti, l'épouse et sa puissance, en même temps. Quand le deux principes se séparent, de Shakti se naît Maya, l'illusion cosmique, la création étant une désunion des

---

<sup>1</sup> Platon, *Le Banquet*, Flammarion, Paris, 1992, pp. 55-56

contraires. L'image de Shiva qui embrasse Shakti, les représentants de la paire divine du panthéon hindou, est l'image de l'identité refaite des contraires. *L'homme* représente l'aspect passif, l'Éternité, et *la femme* est l'énergie active et en même temps le dynamisme du Temps. Les deux principes sont apparemment contraires, mais en essence, ils représentent une unité, l'union des contraires, *mysterium conjunctionis*. Shakti est la *Puissance* de l'univers. Elle vit en chaque femme et Shiva, l'Éternité, en chaque homme. Il y a dans cette image mythique le paradoxe de l'éternité et du temps, *coincidentia oppositorum* qui est le fondement du monde.

Le mythe représente l'héritage de l'humanité qui se sédimente à l'aide de l'archétype et se manifeste par les rêves significatives ou dans les œuvres artistiques. Les rêves, les mythes et l'art, font la liaison entre le conscient et l'inconscient. La même clé est utilisée pour interpréter les signes de l'inconscient. Analysant le monde de l'archétype, les profondeurs du Soi, on peut comprendre mieux le comportement humain. En cherchant les sources de l'archétype on découvre les clés de l'équilibre intérieur qui sont parsemées dans nous-mêmes.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHIE**

- Saint Augustin, *Les confessions*, Livre X, trad. P. de Labriolle, vol.2  
Ernst Cassirer, *Trois essais sur le symbolique*, Les Edition du Cerf, Paris, 1997  
Jean Chevalier, Alain Gheerbrant, *Dictionnaire des symboles : mythes, rêves, coutumes, gestes, formes, figures, couleurs, nombres*, R. Laffont : Jupiter, Paris, 1992  
Mircea Eliade, *Aspects du mythe*, Gallimard, Paris, 2007  
Mircea Eliade, *La nostalgie des origines*, Gallimard, Paris, 1978  
Mircea Eliade, *Le mythe de l'éternel retour : archétype et répétition*, Gallimard, Paris, 1985  
Mircea Eliade, *Le Sacré et le Profane*, Gallimard, Paris, 2009  
Mircea Eliade, *Méphistophélès et l'androgynie*, Gallimard, Paris, 1962  
Mircea Eliade, *Mythes, rêves et mystères*, Gallimard, Paris, 2008  
Jolana Jacobi, *La psychologie de C.G. Jung*, Delachaux et Niestlé, S.A., Neuchâtel, Suisse, 1950  
C. G. Jung, *L'Âme et la vie*, Buchet/Chastel, Paris, 2009  
C. G. Jung, *Dialectique du Moi et de l'inconscient*, Gallimard, 2008  
Rudolf Otto, *Le Sacré : élément non rationnel dans l'idée du divin et sa relation avec le rationnel*, Payot & Rivages, Paris, 1994  
Platon, *Le Banquet*, Flammarion, Paris, 1992  
Heinrich Zimmer, *Maya ou le rêve cosmique dans la mythologie hindoue*, Fayard, 1987

## THE MYSTERY OF FIRE IN LUCIAN BLAGA'S POETRY

Andreea MACIU  
University of Pitești

*Abstract:* The present paper is aimed at commenting on the mystery of fire in Lucian Blaga's poetry, with special attention laid on the relationship between the cult of fire and the spiritual nature of light.

*Key words:* fire, light, mystery.

By means of the mystery of love the lyrical character becomes fire, condensed light (i.e. "văpaia") and the beloved, though perishable, conformable to the mundane world ("n prăpastia din tine"), receives sacred attributes in the poet's eyes, embraced by "raze de lumină". Thus, light triggers the sanctification of the being under the signet of love. The redeemer, elative love, the powerful, immense, ardent love, the love – light, the love – Divinity. The mystery of light is therefore transposed into the mystery of fire, another stage that the being accesses in the Great Passage.

In what regards the mystery of fire, Ivan Evseev remarks: "It is one of the fundamental elements in all the cosmogonic systems and natural philosophies, manifested in the shape of flame, warmth or light. It symbolizes life, creative power, passion, love, sublimation as well as destructive power. (...) It is the opposite of water, being the embodiment of the active masculine principle, whereas water is a feminine element" (EVSEEV, I., 1999: 166).

We encounter with Blaga the complete devourance by passion and power of love; the signet of fire is everywhere in *Noi și pământul*: "scânteii", "să-l aprindă", "arde", "flăcările", "rug", "limbi de foc", "mistui", "aprinde", "scrumul", "cenușă". The ardent, devouring love means not only internal struggle, it can lead, by its intensity, in the way the poet finally desires it, to the entire evanescence of the being, as a result of external and immanent combustion: "În noaptea asta-n care cad/ atâtea stele, tânărul tău trup/ de vrăjitoare-mi arde-n brațe/ ca-n flăcările unui rug./ Nebun,/ Ca niște limbi de foc eu brațele-mi întind,/ ca să-ți topesc zăpada umerilor goi,/ și ca să-ți sorb, flămând să-ți mistui/ puterea, sângele, mândria, primăvara, totul./ În zori când ziua va aprinde noaptea,/ când scrumul nopții o să piară dus/ de-un vânt spre-apus,/ în zori de zi aș vrea să fim și noi/ cenușă,/ noi și – pământul."

Thus, one desires a gentle, total extinction. A dissipation into the nothingness of the self and of the surrounding world. Everything should disappear, as a mist, in the inviting warmth of love. And, maybe, the poet does not specify it, he only lets us imagine it, one expects a regeneration, a total rebirth of the being and of the universe, under an even better star, alike the Phoenix bird. Condensed, holy light, the fire conveys the mortal world into sacrality by the great power of love.

The cult of fire obviously derives from the spiritual nature of light. It dates from prehistory and has a polyvalent symbolism. Eversince archaic times man invested fire with metaphysical symbols in the sphere of sublime, to the metaphorisation of supreme powers: purification and regeneration, initiating burning and rebirth on a

superior level of being, spiritual transubstantiation, mystical, ecstatic combustion, primordiality, the divine as such or the divine mystery.

As Luc Benoist notices “In order to perceive its coherence within its variety, one can have as an example the Hindu deities that represent its different facets: Agni, that is illumination of intelligence; Indra, that throws the arrows of lightning and of his powers; Surya, the sun that warms the world. As regards Agni, he is not only the spirit that gives light, but also the conquering will, the harsh warrior that destroys, thus being at the same time generator, purificator and destroyer.” (BENOIST, L., 1995: 70)

This polyvalent symbolism comprised by fire is clearly brought forward in Lucian Blaga’s poetry. One can notice it in the poem *Dorul*, too, where the fire is the sign of the closeness between the two lovers. Their world, separated from the ordinary universe – “parc-aș fi/ pribeag pe-un alt pământ” – is under the signet of fire, marked by the intense combustion that separates from the ordinary and that, by sacralization of time and place, triggers the wonders of other universes: “Setos îți beau mireasma și-ți cuprind obrazii/ cu palmele-amândouă, cum cuprinzi/ în suflet o minune./ Ne arde-apropierea, ochi în ochi cum stăm./ Și totuși tu-mi șoptești: «Mi-așa de dor de tine!»/ Așa de tainic tu mi-o spui și dornic, parc-aș fi/ pribeag pe-un alt pământ.”

Since, under the sign of fire, just like under the one of light, everything becomes privy, everything rounds by mystery and sanctity and the two lovers make their world eternal by the immense power of love: “Femeie,/ ce mare porți în inimă și cine ești?/ Mai cântă-mi înc-o dată dorul tău,/ să te ascult/ și clipele să-mi pară niște muguri plini,/ din care înfloresc aieva – veșnicii.” (*Dorul*)

The closeness burns, destroys, purifies, regenerates, in the way Luc Benoist remarks; the being of the two lovers waits for the complete merger on another existential level, since they are now beyond the earthly universe, the fire of love has purified them, separating them from the thicket of ordinary world and propulsating them in full mystery, where everything has permuted into eternity.

One desires a destruction and a regeneration by means of fire – “cosmice vâltori”, “avânt de flăcări”, “mă arde” – also in the poem *Pustnicul*, where the Spirit of Earth expresses his wish to be equally earth and star, to surpass the margins of the natural and to merge with the sky: “Cu nourii grei de păcură m-am învălit/ și cu-n potop de fulgere topit-am asprele verigi/ în care ferecat păzeam adâncul lumii./ De-acum îmi sunt stăpân / Și pribegind prin cosmice vâltori/ într-un avânt de flăcări voi înfrânge / stavila ce mă desparte de tărie./ Din veci mă arde-același gând:/ să fii pământ – și totuși să lucești ca o stea!/ Mă bate-n piept al mării val, / s-apropie izbânda mea.”

Therefore, one traces the outlines of a new world that is regenerated by the passion of fire, the same world gradated by the aura of mystery, where the natural and the prosaic are annihilated and anything can be possible anytime.

Living within mystery by means of the fire that bears new existential dimensions turns out to be a constant of Blaga’s lyrics and that is why one can place, without error, the mystery of fire next to the mystery of light, one deriving from the other one and thus, prolonging its significations.

God Himself disappears into the fire, closing Himself within the sky “ca-ntr-un coșciug” and thus, letting the human being “numai tină și rană”: “Apoi sălbăția mi-a crescut/ cântările mi-au pierit,/ și fără să-mi fi fost vreodată aproape/ te-am pierdut pentru totdeauna/ în țărână, în foc, în văzduh și pe ape.” (*Psalm*)

Fire makes the transition from one existential dimension to another: God burns Himself in fire, like in the above-mentioned poem, and the worker has “gălețile de foc” – he changes the matter, gives birth to beautiful, tangible things, thus assuming

divine valences; he creates the earthly world into the natural order of the day, whereas The Great Anonymous preserves it through the waves of mystery by which He mantles the face of the earth: “Din fântâni sfredelite-n osia planetei/ îți scoți gălețile de foc./ Nu te cunosc, nu mă cunoști./ dar o lumină alunecă/ de pe fața ta pe fața mea,/ fără să vreau m-alătur bunei tale vestiri/ și-o strig în sfintele vânturi.” (*Lucrătorul*) Therefore, fire proves to be the generator of matter on the level of earth, the catalyst of earthly order.

The sign of fire appears in the poem *Pe ape*, too, but here it is a closed sign: “(...) Pe vatra corăbiei/ inima mi-o-ngrop subț spuză/ să-și țină jăratecul. Paserea focului/ nu-mi mai fâlfâie peste pereți. / Dăinuie veșnic potopul. / Niciodată nu voi ajunge/ s-aduc jertfă subț semnul înalt/al curcubeului magic.”

Fire signifies incandescent light, the spirit thirsty for the absolute, being frequently evoked by Lucian Blaga. He waits with “floarea de foc în mâni” the heavenly hour of the poetic speech. Thus, *Cîntecul focului* is a multiple metaphor of love: “În fabula verde și caldă-a naturii/ tu crengi ai, iubito, nu brațe./ și muguri îmbii, cu mlădițele prinzi./ Descinzi dintr-un basm vegetal, al răsării?/ Ia seama să nu te aprinzi/ cum se-ntâmplă adesea cu lemnul pădurii. / În chipuri atâtea, flacăra-ntâmpină pasul / oricărei făpturi pământene, / și drumul i-aține, și ceasul.”

The burning realizes a universal metaphorical exchange and it is everywhere; the fire, under its various manifestations takes into possession the sensible universe, effusing even over the celestial in an acme of condensed, sacred light. Everything means transformation, passage in such a universe where the ardour and the passion generate unimaginable spiritual extensions that can explode up to the sky.

The combustion of the lovers that burn each other passionately finds an echo in the fire that caught the Deity, this time without a complete burning.

Fire salutes the human being everywhere; sooner or later each of us goes through the mystics of burning, so that one reaches the point when love is exhaled from the earth, diffusing itself in the sky, where the Great Anonymous burns alone into eternity, sparing and caressing the thorns.

Fire constitutes the metaphor of the mystical experience that triggers an ecstatic vision. Fire means adoration, radiant power of love. It is the final, the supreme cosmic energy that unifies with God. Fire is a universal heart that reunites all the things in a pantheism resembling somewhat that of Spinoza's, the flame becoming the energy of final purification, dissolving of everything and self-dissolving – self-losing within itself.

The spring of this concentrated light remains buried within mystery, since fire represents a passage, a harsh itinerary that leads out of darkness into aureoles of pure sanctity. The mystery of fire joins the mystery of light, propulsating the latter on a superior level – light receives vibrations, it burns, it becomes tangible and it becomes flame, fire.

In an apothotic universe, the damned poet cannot reach the joy of transfiguration by fire; no help from anywhere, no earthly calling; the sign of fire cannot bless him by washing his impurities and anxieties – like in the poem *Cuvântul din urmă*: “Viața cu sânge și cu povești/ din mâni mi-a scăpat./ Cine mă-ndrumă pe apă?/ Cine mă trece prin foc?/ De paseri cine mă apără?”

In *Paradis în destrămare* one encounters the same atmosphere of downgrade, of metaphysical sadness, inutility and desolation: “Portarul înaripat mai ține întins/ un cotor de spadă fără de flăcări. / Nu se luptă cu nimeni,/ dar se simte învins.”

Once again, fire becomes a silent sign, the flame is hidden, the passage remains a heavy story, the paradise in decay representing the world itself that has lost its

sanctity. Sadness and desolation are determined by the feeling of recession of the divine from the world, by the surety of separation from the cosmic.

Tired with searching, the poet, identified with the winged porter who has lost his feeling of affiliation to cosmic, feels he has reached the limit of the great passage, his star has set. Divested of the gift of fire, the lyrical character leads an empty existence. The sword of blazing flames in the Bible now becomes “cotor de spadă”, triggering the image of a modern world of sins, a world in decay, in which the divine and the sanctity are entirely lacking.

The light concentrated into fire in the poem *Vrajă și blestem* burns here the matter in a demonic effervescence (“Duhul răului tot vine”) and in *Trenul morților* the burning symbolized by light is extended far beyond the sky, as a definite sign of extinction: “Colo numai dintre spini/ pân’ la stelele-n vecini/ licuricii dau lumini.// Licuricii cu lampașe/ semne verzi dau spre orașe/ pentr-un tren care va trece/ prin văzduhul mare, rece./ Pentr-un tren care-a veni,/ nimeni nu-l va auzi.”

Therefore, one can notice that the fire appears not only in its hypostasis as a generator and purificator, but also as a destroyer, a pendule of the other world, of the world that silently interferes in the sky with ours, without our knowing it. Its mystery is slowly dissipated into the nature’s configuration and it is never entirely revealed. In reality, this is the true beauty of the mystery that weaves this world – the half-revelation.

Fire can do and undo worlds, tearing apart and recreating universal structures under the everlasting aura of mystery. But its spring remains buried within mystery since “Bucură-te, floare ca ghiocul,/ și dumirește-te! / Nu trebuie fiecare / să știm cine-adeuce și-mprăstie focul.” (*Bunăvestire pentru floarea mărilor*)

Thus, the mystery of fire must be preserved and cherished with all the other universal wonders with a view to express the same luciferical attitude.

Astral fires, concentrated in just as many hearts, in consonance with man’s destiny on earth are also presented in the poem *Pleiadă*, where by means of this celestial fire comprised of the total amount of each astral flame, one witnesses a merger between the sky and the earth, since this incandescence belongs not only to the sky, but also to the rolling land: “Joc de focuri, joc de inimi – / Ostenescu-mă să număr/ înc-o dată aștri minimi./ Focuri mari și focuri line – / Câte văd, atâtea inimi/ bat în spații pentru mine./ Ard în văi și pe coline/ inimi mari și inimi line.”

In another poem, the poet’s heart itself is burning silently in the flames of fire, on the background of the same crepuscular scenery, in which The Great Anonymous does not show, does not speak with the man, and the light remains just a story: “Stelele, ce-i drept, mai sunt deasupra, toate,/ dar Dumnezeu ne trece sub tăcere./ Tenebrele n-au capăt, lumina n-are înviere. / Inima mea – e-o carte care arde,/ un bocet/ în mijlocul Patriei.” (*Inima mea în anul...*)

By this immanent combustion within a dark universe from which the light has disappeared, the lyrical character lives not only the story of his life, but the whole country’s story, thus assuming it, as such.

A solitary combustion among foreign lands is also noted in the poem *Lângă vatră*: “Chem spre miazăzi și noapte, n-am răspuns./ Să ard singur, orice zare să mă-nfrângă/ ursitoarele-nceputului m-au uns (...)”

There it is the creator’s destiny – the wakefulness (“În străinătate-mi, pământean în lacrimi,/ stau de veghe lângă vatra mea de patimi.”), the restless burning under the eternal star of unfulfilled searching: “Cat în preajmă, pretutindeni, printro-

rană./ Iscodesc prin văi, prin larga-mpărăție, (...)” The flame’s anxiety is prolonged into the poet’s soul in a complete fusion.

On the other hand, in *Nu sunt singur* the universe is responding, the poet’s call is fulfilled, the earth and the sky join him in the Great Passage, curing his solitudes: “Jaruri sfinte, nor fierbinte/ trec pe cer, să nu ard singur./ Inimi bat, se spun cuvinte,/ pe pământ să nu cânt singur. (...)// Focuri sunt și e credință./ Acest gând cât mai palpită/ schimbă moartea-n biruință:/ nu sunt singur, nu sunt singur.”

As one can notice, in *Nu sunt singur* the universe is distressed and it offers a charitable hand to the poet in his way to fulfill his creative destiny. The poet’s immanent combustion has as a correspondent the celestial combustion – “jaruri sfinte, nor fierbinte” – the sacred fire burning the creator’s soul as well as the infinity in an effusion of faith, and this faith transforms death in an unwritten page, indubitably beating it.

One witnesses, like in *Noi și pământul*, the total collapse of the being into fire, in the poem *Ardere*, too: “Ființă tu – găsi-voi cândva cuvenitul/ sunet de-argint, de foc, și ritul/ unei rostiri egale/ în veci arderii tale?// Cuvântul unde-i – care leagă/ de nimicire pas și gând?/ Mă-ncredințez acestui an, tu floare mie,/ ca să sfârșesc arzând.”

It is a wanted burning, in the way the conservation of the flame is wanted, too. By “truda din vatră”, by means of the flame, one reaches a communion sky-earth, thus the sky becoming the earth’s mirror. In this respect Blaga advises – conservation of the fire becomes primordial in a universe of humans in which everything is perishable, ephemeral: “Ți-am spus uneori: ia sfatul vestalelor, dacă/ flacăra vrei s-o-ntreții./ Ți-am zis alte dăți: vezi tu jeraticul, truda în vatră?/ Din fumul albastru ce iese/ mereu cerul se țese.” (*Ceas*)

It is as if the fire, in its hypostasis as a generator, gave birth to the celestial world, thus the sky becoming the fruit of the sacred ardour of burning. The cinder itself has sacred attributes, replacing wine in an obvious ritual of purification: “Pentru ca vinul lăsat printre cele rămase/ nimeni să-l bea,/ toarnă cenușă-n ulcior.”

Talking about significance, Blaga educes – the flame’s significance is not the smoke, it may be the combustion itself, in all the splendour of its flounder between agony and life, the poet does not clearly assess that. He lets everyone of us recompose the flame’s way from spark to ash and find meaning to the mystery that veils it: “Tâlcul florilor nu-i rodul/ tâlcul morții nu e glodul./ Tâlcul flăcării nu-i fumul,/ tâlcul vetrei nu e scrumul.” (*Tâlcuri*) It is not the finality that is primordial here, but the road in the light, the Great Passage that ascends and descends, the song of the seconds, the smile and the silence.

Once again, fire accompanies and guides the saints, crowning them, without their knowing it, with aureoles, so that, full of light and fire, they attract the flight of the night butterflies that are thus transformed into cinders: “Și umblă zvon că noaptea câteodată/ când stă pe întuneric în chilie/ văpaie i s-aprinde pe la tâmplă./ Nu bănuiește sfânta ce se-ntâmplă./ Nu bănuiește aureola vie/ ce-n jurul capului îi luminează./ zvâcnind și înteiindu-se-n visare./ Ea simte numai și se miră trează/ cum fluturii de noapte-o cercetează./ cum sfârâind prin păr ca-n lumânare/ îi cad pe rând, cenușă, la picioare.” There is no cure for the almighty fire that embosoms the sacred hearts.

One iterates the concept that fire burns the entire nature. Life itself develops under the signet of fire, with its hot summers “cu grele poame” and with “sfintele toamne”: “Linia vieții mele,/ printre morminte șerpuiind,/ mi-o dibuiesc, mi-o tâlcuiesc/ pe jos – din flori, pe sus – din stele./ Nu-n palma mea, / ci-n palma ta/ e scrisă,

Doamne, / linia vieții mele. / Ea trece șerpuind/ prin veri de foc cu grele poame, / prin ani-dumineci, sfinte toamne.” (*Linia*)

The idea that life is made up of fire is also presented in the poem *Drumul lor*: “Toți morții se duc/ undeva, fiecare/ în urmă lăsând/ foc, vatră și greier,/ prag, treaptă și nuc.”

The solstice proves to be in another poem the season of treasures full of light and fire; from the other world, the solstice descends upon us in tireless veils of flames. We develop ourselves by fire, our road through spikes and fire is not superfluous, but one that heals us, purging us from ardour and suffering, strengthening our spirit and elevating us, since fire embraces us from everywhere, purifying us: “E ceasul când tinerii șerpi/ cămașa și-o dezbracă-n spini./ Comori la rădăcini se-aprind./ se spală-n flăcări de rugini.// Privind la hora flăcării/ întâmpinăm solstițiul cald./ ce se revarsă peste noi/ de pe tărâmul celălalt.// Ne pierdem ca să ne-mplinim./ Mergând în foc, mergând în spini./ ca aurul ne rotunjim/ și ca ispita prin grădini.” (*Solstițiul grădinilor*)

By living within light, within fire and love, we live within mystery. Our coordinates disappear and we are enfolded by the thrills of some other kind of worlds, since nothing is certain here and nothing has well-defined outlines. Everything is nuance and saving virtuality.

Under the ardour of love, life becomes tireless fire for the couple, a fire that burns and elevates the spirit to unknown skies. Thus, fire gives birth to a new world inhabited only by the two lovers. The beloved continues the fire’s acting, appearing in its colours, as if dreamy-like in the eyes of her lover.

In another poem, the woman’s body is of Tanagra clay and it burns in the arms of love. Therefore, the fire’s story remains just the same – the stake of passion burns in the flame of love into resurrection: “Când îți ghicesc arzândul lut/ cum altul de Tanagra nu-i, / din miazănoapte până-n sud/ mai e nevoie de statui?” (*Strofe de-a lungul anilor*)

In *Vara Sfântului Mihai (8 noiembrie)* the sign of the beloved is a sign of fire – the woman lends solar significance to the things in nature and brings the fire’s thrills and quiver into the poet’s soul: “Iubito, -mbogățește-ți cântărețul,/ mută-mi cu mâna ta în suflet lacul,/ și ce mai vezi, vâpaia și înghețul,/ dumbera, cerbii, trestia și veacul./ Cum stăm în fața toamnei, muți, / sporește-mi inima c-o ardere, c-un gând. / Solar e tâlcul ce tu știi oricând / atâtor lucruri să-mprumuți.”

One can notice the fact that with Blaga not only the human being, but the entire nature aspires for transfiguration and transcendence under the benevolent signet of the purifying flame – *Cerbul, Cântecul spicelor*.

Made up of fire, thus acquiring all its attributes, the woman remains an eternal wonder: “M-am oprit lângă tine,/ descoperind că părul tău e o flăcără/ pe care vântul n-o stinge./ și lângă minunea cea mai simplă/ am stat cum se cuvine.” (*M-am oprit lângă tine*)

The time of love elevates the restless combustion to a supreme rank. The couple is shown in a simple contingency, sitting on a bench “tâmplă fierbinte lângă tâmplă”. Their immanent fire adds up the fire of the surrounding nature that effervescently continues the love story on another level, enriching it with new significations. To love’s combustion and ardour, nature is responding with a thrill: “De pe stamine de alun,/ din plopii albi, se cerne jarul./ Orice-nceput se vrea fecund,/ risipei se dedă Florarul.” (*Risipei se dedă Florarul*) The love story seems to be about to begin, this being also suggested by the acting of the nature that is sifting embers – incipient state of fire – “De pe stamine de alun,/din plopii albi”.

Ivan Evseev specifies in this respect: the embers of a fire are “a symbol of occult energy, of the hidden, dull fire, whenever about to be reignited with a natural flame. They represent the image of the fire (masculine principle) in the earth’s captivity (feminine principle). On a psychical level, they signify latent force, secret, hidden passion. The unlit, cold and black cinder is a product of fire and a new potential fire. It is considered a purifying agent and it is used in the evil eye spells and other acts of popular magic.” (EVSEEV, I., *op. cit.*: 228)

At the antipode one can find ashes, cinders. The mirage, the mystery of flight, of beauty and love is the ash – “praful”, the mysterious dust that elevates: “Frumusețea ca și zborul și iubirea/ de cenușe-ți leagă firea./ De-i ștergi fluturului praful, nici o boare –/ nici o vrajă nu-l vor face să mai zboare.” (*Lângă un fluture*)

The ash, as Ivan Evseev specifies, “is a residual element of burning, a product of fire, whence its presence in some purifying rites, rites of penitence and expiation. The monks blend the ash in their food. But the ash can also cover a dull fire that might be reignited. (...) The magical properties attributed to the ash of the bakestone can also be explained by the rite of cremation.” (*ibidem*, p. 90)

Jean Chevalier and Alain Gheerbrant bring new significations to the symbol of the ash: “The symbolism of the ash initially results from the fact that it is by excellence a residual value: what remains after the extinction of the fire, so from an anthropocentric point of view, the corpse, residue of the body after the fire of life was extinguished.

From a spiritual point of view, the value of this residue is zero. Therefore, in any eschatological vision, the ash will symbolize the lack of value, nullity in connection with human life because of its precarity.” (CHEVALIER, J., GHEERBRANT, A., 1993 : 283)

One can find in *Zodia Cumpenei (în metru safic)* this value of the ash – it suggests exactly the precarity of the human being mentioned by Chevalier and Gheerbrant. Everything is flowing, is slowly being decanted, everything is change and burden. Our way into light represents the assuming of the difficulties and suffering as a sine qua non state, because the outage of humans is an immanent condition of life.

However, the positive values of the ash are as well taken into account in Chevalier and Gheerbrant’s interpretation: “Nowadays the Chortis tribes, descendent from Maya, make an ashy cross in order to protect the maize fields against the evil spirits and blend the ash with the seed to protect from putrefaction, rust or any other danger that threatens the bead.” (*ibidem*, p. 283)

Here it is with Blaga the body and soul’s resurrection by ash: “Iată că părul meu se face/ Ca o cenușă ce-a înflorit./ În curând fi-va pace, pace./ și pe pământ un sfârșit.” (*9 mai*), a resurrection that waits for everyone of us to experience it.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Benoist, L., *Semne, simboluri și mituri*, București, Humanitas, 1995  
Chevalier, J., Gheerbrant, A., *Dicționar de simboluri*, volumul 2, București, Artemis, 1993  
Evseev, I., *Enciclopedia semnelor și simbolurilor culturale*, Timișoara, Amarcord, 1999.

## **TWO (POST)MODERN TYPES: BAUMAN'S WANDERER VS. DOINAȘ' DRIFTER**

**Viorella MANOLACHE**  
**Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations,**  
**The Romanian Academy, Bucharest**

***Abstract:** The study approaches in the mirror, Bauman's wanderer and Doinaș' drifter, as marginal hypostases for the dyhotomy *communitas* vs. *societas* - a singular approach, having in view that, if Ștefan Aug. Doinaș's article ("The Last Vagabond: Panait Istrati" published in *Luceafărul*) had proposed in the Romanian scene of 1943, a journey (as Doinaș confessed) initially undetermined and without the concrete knowledge of its analytical itinerary, Bauman has become familiar with the Romanian scene (unaware of Doinaș's initial theory!) only in 2000 (through the publication of *Postmodern Ethics*, at Timișoara, Amarcord Publishing House). While Bauman proposes two postmodern types the vagabond vs. the tourist or, in an early lexical version, the pair *aliens* vs. *locals*, *sedentary* vs. *nomads*, Doinaș places in the same analytical equation the adventurous vs. the vagabond. Seemingly the same versus formula is used by Bauman as well, in order to separate the vagabond from the tourist's profile. A *communitas* in which the rambler is simultaneously accepted as screenwriter and director (Bauman), the vagabonds being the beaters who gather together and drop down exhausted, singing praise hymns to existence (Doinaș) – a spectacle to which willingly or unwillingly we are present!*

***Key words:** *communitas, societas, wanderer, drifter.**

### **The Theoretic Part of the Post Modern's Types in a Slightly-Bounded Territory**

Any debate about policy concerning the postmodernism concept (which Umberto Eco used to consider "good at all things") is generally reclaimed from a possible political-economic or social-cultural rebuff derived from the latter's effects, resented from the end of modern time towards postmodernity. The world of objects manipulated and measured by the technical-science became a world of wares/merchandise, of images, the utopian world of mass-media and all this by a concentrating manipulation, by deeper and deeper interference of all these directions of rationing the existence through a kind of inner logic.

According to some skeptic viewers, the postmodern system would circulate fallacious in a contort context, with confusion and manipulations keeping the suspicion according to which, it would actually be about one of the uncountable "modern fashion" or about one of the many overtaking. They would be exclusively sustained by being in present time, newer devices from the modernity, as Gianni Vattimo remarks (VATTIMO, 1994).

Without booking/enrolling on the coordinates of a vernacular line like this (through which we can confer to the postmodernism, a dimension of protochronism focusing in a day to day climate or, on the opposite, disassembling it through a marginal overuse), we would better sustain Andrei Pleșu's invitation of escaping in a territory loose from the mirage of modernity. We gave up the idea of a profound and compulsory innovation and we took delay of a no false innocence regarding after almost one hundred years of utopia, tough, blind, forward looking, not exactly reward as Andrei

Pleşu carried away, but *aside* (PLEŞU, 2004). All that is due not to founding of another center in an option like this, but making use of mild wiliness, translated in a recessive guidance in a delayed strategy useful to a digressive change of a forward movement.

Therefore, a choice that appeals to the “indirect movement” through which it is unable to block its confined avant-garde dimension to the modernism, but an alternative capable to change its physiognomy in a conclusive way. It explores the relations and the changing types from a lot of shades and making use of a blue satisfaction reveals the decay, vanishing of any main structures and hegemonic demands.

In an inexorable manner, the progress, the advanced step in this world seems to be entropic, a viable thing for the “natural evolution” and for “the cosmological development” as for the social-historical increase. Any propagation seems to be accompanied by a lessening of substance, by an abolishment of latency and by a blockage of options. The laying of an entropic silence is delayed by the power of a reactionary nature of the second effects and by the stubborn regression of the reality, confirmed by the reaction of some communitarian gestures.

“The distrust in imaginary stories”, the collapse in the lapsing of the narrating appliance is the diagnostic proposed by Lyotard (LYOTARD, 2003). Fredric Jameson’s reply is that the lack of short stories demands itself a theoretic narration even though the one “impure and imperfect”, sometimes an hesitated one, obviously a flawed one comparatively to another systems (especially for the modern one) whose values and residual /vestigial are automatically assumed and confess that the postmodern epoch is not a radical and new -formed one, but (according to Raymond Williams’ term) a centered structure of feeling (JAMESON, 1991).

It seems we are involved, after *The Postmodern Ethics*’ writer, in a new worldwide disorder or, otherwise, in a reorganization game. It’s applied the rule of political puzzle- where there is a potential of dissent and of nonconformance between spaces (moral, political, outnumbered, sexual) - a puzzle which is never totally stopped, but appears in all light. Bauman’s creed resumes that there’s not at all an efficient and main control, which can deliver a natural appearance to an unsure space. Otherwise in Foucault’s well-sustained credibility, the fight for the power and the incessantly war are the unique base of an organized habitat.

Bauman’s remembrance of postmodern divorce is recognized in the fact that the polity doesn’t reclaim the capacity, the need and the desire of supremacy, on purpose or involuntary, getting rid of the anti structural forces of society.

According to Bauman, these are the result of prevalence, in the power of settlement and coercive order of day by day life won by the state through the mixture of supremacy over the fellow’s crucial dimensions. That’s way the economic part of the governments generally diminishes at keeping some attractive local conditions, after Bauman’s appreciations: controlled work, little dues/charges, good hotels, exciting night-life. It is not allowed even the credibility in a posthumous myth to the cultural sovereignty due to the conveniences of the cultural industry and that of cultures’ makers imposed by the traditional boundaries of the state.

### **Bauman’s Wanderer vs. Doinaş’ Drifter Postmodern Patterns: Z. Bauman’s Wanderer/Drifter and Tourist**

The main character of the new socio-political story is not the contemporary worker anymore, like Bauman used to emphasize, but the consumer. As it is understood

by Bauman, Vattimo, Fukuyama, etc. the postmodern moral, as leading principle, seems contrary to modern moral (main metaphysics), which is based on *development, increase, progress, benevolence*, etc. for supreme value of “novum”.

Bauman uses the terms “flaneur” and “flaneurs” to designate the pattern of the beholder whose tireless curiosity, the wanderer’s freedom, accepted both as a script writer and a producer.

Such a conception of distinct fields (political and philosophical) launches the operational contrast between *communitas* and *societas*. Taking over such a dichotomy from Victor W. Turner, Bauman considers that it becomes functional only in a well structured society, every time an individual (or a group) turns to or is transferred from one organization to another, actually from one organization to an anti-organization/adverse/antithetical.

Supposing that *societas* is characterized by heterogeneousness, irregularity, differentiating the orders or nominal system; *communitas* is marked by homogeneity, equality, the absence of order, anonymity: “In other words, *communitas* melts down that what *societas* struggles to cast into shapes and to hammer out. Otherwise, *societas* shapes and solidifies all that in *communitas* is liquid and without mold” (BAUMAN, 2000: 129).

Adopting terms like “stranger” and “settled” from Norbert Elias, Bauman considers that this pair of words represents one kind of social structure in which two existing groups face one another within a conflict of border delimitation, and yet they are connected to each other through the mutual services that they do for the identity quest. Bauman applies these concepts to modernism with the consideration that the dichotomy “settled” and “strangers” has been grounded through “the asymmetry/disproportion of power like it was imposed in the administration of shaping the social area”, in striving to share the social field after “the cognitive map promoted by managers/administrators”. Like Bauman used to note, the powerful men were the first to express their need to maintain the borders, therefore, it’s reasonable to presume that the roots of separation must be sought in the issues of those in charged with the development of social field that is in the issues raised by the definitive uncertain process of creating the social field (BAUMAN, 2000: 260 - 261).

Unlike the *sedentary*, the *nomads* keep moving. They go around a well structured territory with firm and attributed bearing to each fragment. A trait that separates them from the *migrants* is that *nomads* don’t have a final destination to mark their itinerary beforehand, and no stopping is favored but all crossing places to be just halting points. They move from one place to another in a strictly normal sequence, following rather the order of things than inventing the order, dismantling it when they leave. Between *nomads* and *drifters/wanderers*, the latter conveys a suited metaphor for that what Bauman calls “humans belonging to the postmodern condition” (Bauman, 2000: 261).

*Drifters* require no destination; they are pushed ahead by an unfulfilled desire, hope, because “the drifter is a pilgrim without destination, a nomad with no itinerary. The drifter travels in a shapeless space, whereas every consecutive establishment is local, temporary, and episodic” (BAUMAN, 2000: 261-262).

Like the *drifter*, the *tourist* has its own biographical time and answers only to the flexible experience of space.

According to Bauman, exactly the tourist’s aesthetic capacity, the curiosity, the need of amusement, his desire and ability to live new experiences can be called an absolute freedom of organizing the space from the tourist’s world; the kind of freedom