

## PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES – THE PARALLAX PHILOSOPHY-PSYCHOLOGY-THEOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

Viorella MANOLACHE

**Abstract.** The present intervention proposes (in a volitionally non-positioned over flight in/on the fertile soil of exegeses dedicated to C. Rădulescu-Motru and the continuous/continued destiny of the *Philosophical Review*) to underline three hard nodes of prime substance (the *Philosophical Studies*) already reacting, in a “chemically-cultural” way, with the “European values panel”: the first banks approaches a *laboratorium europaeus* – of reconciliation between traditionalism and modernism, in an offensive solution; the second confirms the (always actual) idea that the European cultural model sustains a correct measure of local forces/energies filtered by the *intelligentsia* (both philosopher and scientist); the third re-calibrates the philosophy-psychology-theology as a formula for allotment, catching-in-the-middle, recessive account. Whereas the first two reflexes greet the section already allotted to the *Philosophical Review* anniversary number, the third answers our already-announced relationship, leaving behind both open channels and saving recaptures (also delivered by the *Philosophical Studies/ Philosophical Review* publication).

**Keywords:** Philosophical Studies, Philosophical Review, Philosophy- Psychology-Theology

(Trans)posed inside the musical score of calculated transitive [in the sense of being maintained inside a certain mode/type of thinking (with particularizing notes) but also of controlled selections in rhythmical suggestions from the Western tide of ideas, as they would be reclaimed by the *Philosophical Studies* laboratory<sup>2</sup>] the *Philosophical Review*, refractory to any conformist form/

---

<sup>1</sup> The title *Philosophical Studies – the Parallax Philosophy-Psychology-Theology* translates the initial intention of the present intervention to accept the *parallax* of the relationship as a perspective for the unifying angle of points with the extremities of a basis for observing/repositioning, an effect guided by the careful eye of the observer.

<sup>2</sup> Ovidiu Pecican amended in *Lecturi pretextuale [Pre-textual Lectures] (Idei în dialog [Ideas in Dialogue]*, no. 11 / November 2006) the (pre/re)loading of the 1919 year as a landmark for the transformation of *Philosophical Studies* into the *Philosophy Magazine* (a generational change accepted and dated 1923).

As such, the volume *Omagiu profesorului Constantin Rădulescu Motru* [“Homage to Professor Constantin Rădulescu Motru”] (*Revista de filosofie*, vol. XVII, 1933), mentions (not only once!) through G. Vlădescu Răcoasa, the years 1897- 1916 as temporal coordinates for *Philosophical*

formulation, withdrawal or opportunistic imitation, took upon itself, from equidistant positions, the evaluation (*measuring*) of its own *originality quotient*, while still assuming its own genuinely Romanian predisposition for philosophy but also its appetite for an integration into the value idea system of Western philosophy (“all renowned European philosophers have been read, commented upon and discussed” within the pages of the Review<sup>3</sup>)

Nevertheless, in resonance with what Călinescu would have considered to be (re)cognizable within an “air of specificity”, by consequently maintaining a line which would be unobstructed by *artificial propaganda*, *subventions* or *official protection*, the *Philosophical Review* will still affirm its *construct of a philosophical conscience (wide horizon necessary for thinking’s original creation, culture’s only enduring foundation)*, a synthesizing mixture of *philosophical solutions* able to bring *contentment to one’s soul*, of *enquiring intelligence* and of *durable reasons for social collaboration*.

Without registering any syncopation, the magazine’s competent approach tried to locate, recognize and understand hard/central models (through contacting the ebb and tide of European philosophical ideas) and repositioning them inside the circuitry through a correct dosage and a fusion-empathy rapport between them and the Romanian philosophical nucleus.<sup>4</sup>

The unblocking repercussions of doctoral perspectives offered for psychology and theology can manifestly be found in the mileage sheet of the *Philosophical Studies*, always interested in offering due attention to any direct proportionality between them and philosophy.

In the case of psychology, its own musical score, seen as an appendix of C. Rădulescu-Motru’s *psychology lectures* at the University of Bucharest (some of which could be faithfully reproduced, while others would just be brief notes on

*Studies*, decreeing that starting from 1919 the *Philosophy Magazine* continues *Philosophical Studies* (p. 65). The same volume reappraises the profile of Motru as *editor-director* of the *New Romanian Review*, published between 1900 and 19196, of *Philosophical Studies* (with approximately the same interval, 1898-1918), of the *Philosophy Review* (since 1919) and of the *European Idea* (1920- 1927).

<sup>3</sup> *Prefață [Preface]*, in *Revista de Filosofie [Philosophical Review]*, vol. IX, no.1, April-May-June 1923.

<sup>4</sup> We will find in *Philosophical Studies* and later in the *Philosophy Review*, the formula through which *high forms* and *extreme forms* become confluent, starting from the Society’s Committee 1910-1913 (G. G. Antonescu, University Reader; C. Antoniadă, Doctor of Philosophy; I. F. Buricescu, Secondary Professor; D. Drăghicescu, University Lecturer; Dr. Dușcian, publicist; E. Porn, publicist; Rădulescu-Motru, University Professor – see the *Statute of the Philosophical Studies Society*, in *Philosophical Studies*, Vol V, file 1, 1910), until I. Petrovici, P.P. Negulescu, D. Gusti, T. Vianu, M. Florian, Nae Ionescu, N. Bagdasar or C. Giorgiade (for more details see Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, *Psihologia Poporului Român și alte studii de psihologie socială [Psychology of the Romanian People and Other Studies on Social Psychology]*, edition by Alexandru Boboc, Paideia Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999).

spoken lectures) coincides with the *formula of their publication in a periodical philosophy magazine which acknowledged as its main programmatic aim the assertion and abbreviation of the experimental psychology seminar's entire activity; psychology studies which can be applied to the sciences of the law, to pedagogy and sociology alike.*<sup>5</sup>

A (re)lecture in the key of pragmatically-didactic exigencies of (*ex cathedra* – we note) promotions for reactive-emancipator models (*we address ourselves, outside of University circles, first of all to lawyers, magistrates, professors and people who deal in social problems* – Romanian notabilities, we note) of particular *Philosophical Studies* objectives advocate the involvement of philosophy, as a guaranteed factor for compensation/progress, between faith and science's researching spirit.<sup>6</sup>

After the principle of communicating vessels (i.e. of the *pyramidal model*) the architecture of research takes as its foundation – with presumptuous assertions and intransigence – the mass of those who turn science into a practical profession, who constantly express faith in traditional beliefs and are guided by imitation/natural curiosity; the immediately superior stratum comprises, with all its common sympathies or antipathies, an exit from *anonymity* and a connection with new ethical-moral climates (in the sense of both attitude and atmosphere), for tracing and avoiding contradictions; next come the *professional agitators* – marked by impatience and stirred by noise, a powerfully dissolving force unable to con/in-duce progress; towards the top of the pyramid, *a new plethora of enthusiastic, eager-to-work researchers* is projected, willing to keep their distance from vulgar temptations in an elevated continuum, inside a rarefied, broad-horizon environment.<sup>7</sup>

The projected construct hints not so much at the immediate blueprint of “higher philosophy” - *philosophia militantis* - (see in this sense the incompletely-measured adaptive spirit Motru himself showed towards his political *saeculum*) but rather at a neo-“Junimist”<sup>8</sup> profile with an accent upon specific developments

<sup>5</sup> *Studii Filosofice (Philosophical Studies)* especially: *Revistă pentru cercetările de psihologie teoretice și aplicate la știința dreptului, pedagogie și sociologie, sub direcțiunea D-lui C. Rădulescu-Motru, Profesor la Universitatea din București* [Review for psychological research-theoretical and applied to the science of law, pedagogy and sociology, under the direction of Mr C. Rădulescu-Motru, Professor at Bucharest University] vol. 1, 1907.

<sup>6</sup> *Rolul social al filosofiei [The Social Role of Philosophy]*, in *Philosophical Studies* vol. 1, 1907, pp. 145-167.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>8</sup> *Junimea* was a Romanian literary society founded in Iași in 1863, through the initiative of several foreign-educated individuals led by Titu Maiorescu, Petre P. Carp, Vasile Pogor, Theodor Rosetti and Iacob Negruzzi. The foremost personality and mentor of the society was Maiorescu, who, through the means of scientific papers and essays, helped establish the basis of the

and necessary segmentation; if philosophical writings are more prone to criticism than other types of scientific paper, their research imperative implies an overtaking of unprincipled situations through *good understanding*, peaceful exchanges of opinions, collaboration and avoiding preconceived conclusions and systematization.

In an anticipatory way, the endeavor approximates the (co)presence relationship of philosophical texts/sources or, in a Barthesian sense, a statute of the (knowledgeable!) reader present “in fabula” and who participates in production and actualization of the sense. Thus the reader applies the criterion used/utilized by philosophical writing authors when discussing concepts of their time – which they borrow, and sacrificing the foundation of their thought in order to keep the intended message, or to allow systematization through an empowerment of (the reader transformed into critic!) any argument the author of the original idea might offer; because any primordial idea includes associated shades from other writings, forming a system/basis for it.<sup>9</sup>

The filtered philosophical approaches of the *Philosophical Studies* are characterized by originality, a Maiorescian<sup>10</sup> reappraisal of the relationship between *form* (here, a way of systematization for our affirmations) and *background* (not allowing diversity and control) with *well-dosed paradoxes* (an *intelligent expedient* by which an author, banking upon a diversity of form, can hide his fundamental assertions’ lack of originality) thorough objectivity and seriousness.

Not at all aleatory, the *Philosophical Studies* launch and reinforce the argumentative model in which philosophy cannot be separated from psychology and/or theology, in the generous context of an era which favored an affirmation of philosophers (who were also scientists – Wilhelm Wundt, Wilhelm Ostwald, Ernest Mach, William James, Henri Poincaré, Ernest Haeckel).

If there is just a controlled *barrier* between philosophy and science, with clear intentions [a p(l)acing of problems unsolvable by philosophy] then the scientist becomes a philosopher when he resorts to unusual, outside-the-norm methods, and the philosopher becomes a scientist when a scientific problem demands methods used only inside a special science.

---

modern Romanian culture. Junimea was the most influential intellectual and political association in Romania in the 19th century.

<sup>9</sup> C. Rădulescu Motru, *Puterea sufletească* [Soul Power], Studii Filosofice Publishing House, Bucharest, Pasagiul Român, no. 22, 1908.

<sup>10</sup> Titu Liviu Maiorescu (15 February 1840 – 18 June 1917) was a Romanian literary critic and politician, founder of the *Junimea* Society. As a literary critic, he was instrumental in the development of Romanian culture in the second half of the 19th century

---

Hence, philosophy's opening [offensive<sup>11</sup>] towards psychology (psychology's problems are of a philosophical nature/essence but, through experience and observation, they become scientific, moral and esthetic problems) and maintaining a middle ground particular to philosophy itself, which includes theological problems.

The melange between philosophy-theology-psychology ensures that all three research domains have their allotted circulatory places/spaces (philosophical problems thus passing into the special scientific domain and vice-versa) but also maintains a soil equally irrigated by philosophy, psychology and sociology, called *soul power*. This definitively states an interference between the already-mentioned elements through; an account between modern science tendencies and the moral ideals of Christian religion (with an impact upon differentiating notes between modern culture and other types of culture); establishing a postulate for the phenomena of the soul, on which their causality could be based; the value of psychic causal laws and of spiritual determinism.

The perspective does not offer an absolute novelty, but recalculates the distance between *dimension - philosophical formula*, as it was defined in an associative sense by the (*dictionary*) Voltairean method. In the same note, the philosopher has a well-tempered enthusiasm, does not pose as a prophet, does not acknowledge imposture, is not a vulgar person but a preacher of useful virtues.

On the other hand the theologian, by bringing order to ignored knowledge, (self)positions himself much closer to science.<sup>12</sup>

Still maintaining the pyramid model, *Philosophical studies/ The Philosophical Review* banks upon the *formulation* philosophy-psychology-theology, in the sense of *graft*, of *examination-prone whole*, and offers arguments to the effect that *philosophical papers (studies, we note)* are only conceived and written for philosophers.<sup>13</sup>

Technically accepted even today, placed *near to* (and not between) psychology and theology, philosophy demands a double inclusion/allotment, without any further debate on prescriptive formulations which could definitively sediment the domain to which it belongs.

It is worth mentioning that psychology and theology must be accepted as domains privileging philosophy, offering, though intersection, problems seemingly belonging to their own research domains (for psychology, the problem

---

<sup>11</sup>See in this sense the (polemic) concept of *offensive* (detached from any metaphorical, mysterious or mystical connotations) not limited by a simple antagonism between philosophers; but fueled by a certain rivalry of incompatibility between the scientific spirit and the Romanian soul (C. Rădulescu-Motru, "Ofensiva contra filosofiei științifice" ["The Offensive Against Scientific Philosophy"], in *Filosofie și națiune [Philosophy and Nation]*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003).

<sup>12</sup>Voltaire, *Dicționar filosofic [Dictionnaire philosophique]*, Polirom Publishing House, Jassy.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibidem*, p. 16.

of personal character - what is the individual's soul power and how it is formed within his practical life; for sociology - the problem of social energy, of soul power on which different peoples' cultures are based) and operating within an *alternating mixture*.

In a Maioresean sense, as appraised from the position of an established correlation, philosophy can (in)duce an impression of *passivity, without weakness*, with all controlled distinctions that Marius Lazar (re)posts inside the sphere of an „institutional phenomenon”, a *legitimizing discourse for any given domain, caught in the middle, inside a ratio of forces, between the scientific and the literary domains*.<sup>14</sup>

In Jean Fr. Lyotard's opinion, scientific and technical knowledge are cumulative formulas, with scientific knowledge excessively overtaking the whole domain of knowledge, to the detriment of narrative knowledge. Legitimacy can be accepted just as a concept pertaining to the role of authority, in the sense in which a legislator, invested with the constructive techniques of scientific discourse, is thus authorized to decide upon all internal existence conditions and experimental verifications/evaluations, in order for an assertion to be validated by the scientific community.

Such notes retroactively certify that the *institutional phenomena* can claim and carry out their cultural competences as long as they practice narration, in the sense of re-writing, within the perimeter of knowledge institutions (*being caught in the middle*)<sup>15</sup>.

One cannot omit the reflections Sorin Alexandrescu placed under the incidence of the simultaneity paradox<sup>16</sup> but also cannot avoid the Lyotardian formulation already anticipated by *Philosophical Studies*, materialized in tri-phased coordinates - *diachronic temporality, a memory and a project*, found again in the file/collection of/by the magazine offered for sale; *Volume I* belongs entirely to C. Radulescu-Motru (*The value of syllogism. Problems of Psychology. The rational structure of universities. Witness psychology. Industrialist psychology. Science and energy*); *Volume II* was based on contributions from C. Rădulescu-Motru, D. Drăghicescu, C. Antoniadă, G. G. Antonescu, I. Petrovici, Eugen Porn, F. Buricescu, I. Ghibănescu (*Revolutionary psychology. Social determinism: Bergson's philosophy. Esthetical criticism. Philosophical Atomism. Pedagogical importance of individualities*); *Volume III* was written entirely by C. Radulescu-Motru (*An affirmation of personality in important cultural moments. The law of*

---

<sup>14</sup> Marius Lazăr, *Paradoxuri ale modernizării. Elemente pentru o sociologie a elitelor culturale românești* [*Paradoxes of Modernization. Elements of a Sociology of Romanian Cultural Elites*], Limes Publishing House, Cluj- Napoca, 2002.

<sup>15</sup> Jean François Lyotard, *La Condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit, 1979.

<sup>16</sup> Sorin Alexandrescu, *Paradoxul român* [*Romanian Paradox*], Univers Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998.

---

*conservation of soul unity. Person and environment. Soul Power, Parts I- III; Volume IV* is entirely edited by C. Rădulescu-Motru (*Mechanics of volitional acts. Character. Social powers. Culture ( Soul Power, Parts IV- V); Volume V*, written in collaboration with I. Petrovici, Marin N. Ștefănescu, Șt. Antim, Marcel T. Djuvara, G. Antonescu, I. Bucoviceanu (*A new inductive method. Logic and metaphysical problems. The economic under-layer of family life. Notion theory*); *Volume VI* was finished with the collaboration of Vladimir Ghidionescu, Marin N. Ștefănescu, G. G. Antonescu, Nisipeanu (*Scientific pedagogy and the new school reforms. The crisis of logic. The magazine of magazines. Elements of metaphysics*); *Volume VII*, entirely written by C. Rădulescu-Motru, contains the *Elements of metaphysics*.<sup>17</sup>

The magazine's mileage sheet confirms both an affirmation of a *community of destinies* (as an identification through professional association and rational conditioning) marked by the vocation of openness<sup>18</sup>; and the existence, inside the cultural morphology of offensive *modernity*<sup>19</sup>, of multiply intersecting layers subjected, in a Lovinescian manner, to reciprocal conversions, under the burning lights of the *ex occidente lux dictum!*

<sup>17</sup>*Studii Filosofice [Philosophical Studies]*, vol. VI, 1912-1913. See also, Gh.Al. Cazan, "Reluarea unei tradiții" ["Revival of a Tradition"], in *Analele Universității „Spiru Haret” [Annals of Spiru Haret University]*, year 1, no. 1, 199

<sup>18</sup>In order for a culture to be open it has to respect three conditions; borrowing should be free, conscious and selective; the borrowed element has to be translated into the host-culture's idioms; and metamorphosed through a hermeneutical act into a cultural place/space (see in this sense Mona Mamulea, *Dialectica închiderii și deschiderii în cultura românească modernă [The Closing-Opening Dialectics of the Romanian Modern Culture]*, Academia Română Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007).

<sup>19</sup>The concept is sustained mainly by/through a "constructive" involvement (taking the initiative) in (re)viewing whatever is generally accepted as a *cultural project* seen as the ability to replace in its own function ("in attack") of the "general synthesis", not eluding a decreeing of modernity as an unfinished project, as immanent countercurrent/ counterdiscourse (in a Habermasian key) of modernity itself; or in a Lyotardian mode of reloading articulations coming from/ in continuity with a project of exhausted modernity; or, why not, of modernity as a Wallersteinian product of jumps (*cultural*, we note; i.e. of the *strategy of modernization through culture*) in moments of tension within the *saeculum* (see in this sense Viorella Manolache, *Modernități alternative [Alternative Modernities]*, review, *Revista de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale*, no. 2/2013). One has to note in this sense the reaction of Romanian space towards an acceptance of unique-universal modernity, with equal stages to traverse. The transition between imitative and offensive with the sole purpose of defining new objectives/victories and strategic repositioning within the tide of European thinking can be summarized by Rădulescu-Motru's observation that philosophy, in its modern acceptance of an accord between dogmatic belief and scientific truth, between contrary tendencies created by modern man's intellectual activity, did not exist inside Romanian tradition (lacking an institutional spirit) in the sense of a past which did not imply the intervention of the philosopher – even in the presence of modernistic crises, these would have been smothered by Byzantine formalism (Rădulescu-Motru, C., "Rolul social al filosofiei" (restituiri) ["The Social Role of Philosophy" (restitutions)], in *Revista de filosofie [Philosophical Review]*, 2/1992).

**GENERAL (SELECTIVE) BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

- Alexandrescu, Sorin, *Paradoxul român [Romanian Paradox]*, Univers Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998;
- Diaconu, Marin, C. *Rădulescu-Motru. Biobibliografie [C. Rădulescu-Motru. Bio-bibliography]*, Institutul de Teorie Socială Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000;
- Lazăr, Marius, *Paradoxuri ale modernizării. Elemente pentru o sociologie a elitelor culturale românești [Paradoxes of Modernization. Elements of a Sociology of Romanian Cultural Elites]*, Limes Publishing House, Cluj - Napoca, 2002;
- Manolache, Viorella, *Dinamica modelului european asupra localismului creator în epoca "modernismului ofensiv" (prima jumătate a secolului XX) [The Dynamics of the European Model Regarding Creative Localism within Offensive Modernism (During the First Half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century)]* TechnoMedia Publishing House, Sibiu, 2011;
- Neagoe, Stelian, *Oameni politici români [Romanian Political Men]*, Machiavelli Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007;
- Schifirneț, Constantin, C. *Rădulescu-Motru. Viața și faptele sale [C. Rădulescu-Motru: His Life and Works]*, vol. I–III, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest 2003–2005;
- Vlăduțescu, Gh., *Neconvențional despre filosofie românească [Unconventional, on Romanian Philosophy]*, Paideia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002.

**SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

- Rădulescu-Motru, Constantin, *Psihologia Poporului Român și alte studii de psihologie socială [Psychology of the Romanian People and Other Studies on Social Psychology]*, Edition by Alexandru Boboc, Paideia Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999;
- Rădulescu-Motru, C., "Rolul social al filosofiei" (restituiți) ["The Social Role of Philosophy" (restitutions)], in *Revista de filosofie [Philosophical Review]*, 2/1992;
- Rădulescu-Motru, C., "Ofensiva contra filosofiei științifice" ["The Offensive against Scientific Philosophy"], in *Filosofie și națiune [Philosophy and Nation]*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003;
- Rădulescu-Motru, C., *Puterea sufletească [Soul Power]*, Studii Filosofice Publishing House, Bucharest, Pasagiul Român, no.22, 1908;
- "Omagiu profesorului Constantin Rădulescu Motru" ["Homage to Professor Constantin Rădulescu Motru"], *Revista de filosofie [Philosophical Review]*, vol. XVII, 1933;
- "Studii filosofice" ["Philosophical Studies"], Vol.1-8, 1907-1915;  
<http://dspace.bcucluj.ro/handle/>

## **INTERVIEW**

