

THE APPROACH OF SPACE AND AN INTER-WAR ANTHROPOLOGICAL MODEL

Ana BAZAC¹

Abstract: *First of all, the anthropological approach of space is counter-posed to the objectivistic one. Then, by discussing a philosophical theory about space as a cultural construct and factor of style shaping the way of life and trajectory of a people, the paper intends to emphasise a philosophical solution in a time of world crisis. Indeed, the inter-war Lucian Blaga wrote his work in a time of phase crisis: the monopoly phase crisis of capitalism, already showed by the First World War and continuing until the constitution of state monopoly capitalism. Blaga's theory about space as the main factor of cultural style has sketched a solution where the culture rather separates humankind into cultural fragments framed by cultural styles and predestined by their cultural spaces: this solution may be viewed as a reflex of the real antagonisms within the world. In Blaga, the deep cause of the subjective feelings and faculty of creativity of the contemporary people lies within the immemorial collective unconscious that shapes the cultural style. The collective unconscious is the place where the expectations and patterns of behaviour of the immemorial ancestors were shaped just by the structure of space. These expectations and patterns constitute the unconscious spatial horizon, that which is trickling in every conscious creation and behaviour. The spatial horizon of the unconscious is a space-matrix, as that of the Romanians, described by Blaga's model of the "Ewe-space". And the cultural style is the memory of mental structures containing the ancient and continuous logic of natural determinism over man, transposed within his unconscious psychical world. The paper is concerned with the interweaving between the ideological subtext and the ingeniousness of creation in the framework of philosophical theory. It analyses the meanings of the focus on what is continuous and motionless and gives a sentiment of security, the cultural style, and the place of such a theory of culture in the ways of life of a people.*

Keywords: *space, epistemology of philosophical theories concerning space, unconscious, Lucian Blaga, inter-war Romania, cultural style.*

¹ Polytechnic University of Bucharest, Romania.

Warning

An *implicit* thesis here is that space was lesser important for the modern philosophers than time. Not as if the pre-modern thinkers would have focused too much on the problem of space. Why all of these? Just because the space seems to be much more/more directly a *social* concept – or it has much more social reverberations – than the time, and that an integration of the concept of space in the modern theory of movement and development would have guided the philosophers to a more concrete approach of the human being than this approach could take place as related only to the “external” time or to the length of the human life. But spatiality is as much crucial to anthropology as temporality is; or, if the anthropological standpoint – as in the modern philosophy from Kant and Hegel to Heidegger – is generative, it results that spatiality characterises the existence (namely, the essence) of man, as temporality does. Blaga’s theory illustrates this modern turn of philosophy, irrespective here of the content of this illustration.

The epistemological analysis of *man centred theories* – here, of Blaga’s *spatial horizon* and *cultural matrix/style* – emphasises that they are not neutral towards people. They are *ideological*. They reveal a *false consciousness* in both meanings of Marx: as conscience opposed to the objective, epistemological interest of a philosophical theory (and yes, a philosophical theory is, like a scientific theory, rationalist); and as conscience that reflects, consciously or not, the social positions the author shares. As ideological, Blaga’s theory has a nuance of *dogmatism*, since it does not question its own presuppositions. It subordinates the concepts developed by him to the function of instruments of the ideological ground it contains.

Introduction concerning the philosophical framework of the approach of space

The space was and is seen in two manners: as external, *objective datum* of reality in front of which man’s knowledge and understanding are but copies, perfect/perfectible and without any importance of the possible imprint of the human and particular view of the subject, or as *conceptual datum* that, obviously, reflects reality, but it does so through the translation/mediation of the human (psychological and cultural) historical experience.

Indeed, in their attempt to explain space (and time), the European thinkers have had to confront, first, with the psychological problem of the ways the idea or intuition of space appears. From this standpoint, a

significant part of the 17th and 18th centuries have illustrated the contradictory situation of having been, on the one hand, interested to demonstrate the antecedent of the *idea* of space towards the objective spatial situating of the objects – studied by physics – and, on the other hand, the difficulty to demonstrate this antecedent. This was the reason, *inter alia*, that Kant has called *ideas* the transcendent representations – i.e. that “cannot be projected in an image, something that can be intuited”¹ – arising from the procedural potentiality of reason. And this was the reason too of Kant’s supply and doubling of *ideas* with *intuitions*: immediate knowledge resulted from the conscious experience of man.

Anyway, the psychological explanation of the human representation of space cannot substitute the philosophical questioning of space. But this questioning itself has generated two patterns of conceiving of space: according to the *metaphysical* – or, as Kant called it, “transcendental realism” –, space is a “substantial” characteristic of the physical world, be this characteristic an existential dependent (Leibniz) or not (Newton) on the objects and their relations; in the *critical* pattern, inaugurated by Kant, space is a form of intuition, belonging to “the subjective constitution of our mind”², not to the unconscious representation but to the conscious and objective one. (Here and in order to distance from the objectivistic approach according to which space was an objective receptacle of things or a sum of differentials of distances between objects, Kant was the representative of the psychology-philosophy symbiosis).

But what does “objective” mean here? It means a cognition/cognisance that can be proved true empirically. And which are the differences between *intuitions* as conscious representations and *concepts* – conscious representations too? The differences stand mainly in the fact that an intuition no needs and does not uses any other representation – for this reason, it is an immediate awareness about a certain object, and in this way it is like a perception –, while a concept relates to other ones because it is the result of the searching for a *genus proximus* and a *differentia specifica* and defines a particular object through the agency of other concepts referring to different genus. And finally, since intuitions – as the concepts, moreover, because both intuitions and concepts are representations – could be empirical and *a priori*, space is an *a priori* intuition (an objective, individual

¹ Martin Heidegger, “On the Essence of Ground” (1929), *Pathmarks*, Edited and translated by William McNeill, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 117.

² Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn, Pennsylvania State University, 2010, p. 45,
<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/kant/critique-pure-reason6x9.pdf>.

and immediate representation, not a conceptual reflection of the outer space). And I could add that, if *psychologically* space is not *a priori* – since it is formed as a fusion of many tactile, visual and movement or kinaesthetic sensations and experiences (see Berkeley, Hume, Mill, leaving aside the psychological research from the last 60-70 years) –, *epistemologically* it is, since after the formation of the intuition of space, it is “the condition of the possibility of phenomena, and by no means as a determination dependent on them, and is a representation *a priori*, which necessarily supplies the basis for external phenomena”¹.

Consequently, this doesn’t mean at all that space is something absolutely subjective. Obviously, one can arrive to the concept of space and one can operate with it, but previously and at the level of the “translation” in mind of this concept, “an *a priori* intuition (which is not empirical) lies at the root of all our conceptions of space.”².

This rapid, inherently superficial, running over has the purpose to emphasise that, besides the *objectivistic* paradigm – containing the supposition that the concepts (mostly all of them being, in this paradigm, reflective) would be perfect copies of reality and not arousing any difficulty –, there was and is also another paradigm: that of the *dependence on man of all concepts about the existence* (or, as this paradigm was later formulated, *after* Kant and Hegel: the context-dependent, the *historical* character, thus the *relativity* of concepts). I call this paradigm an *anthropological* one, i.e. which puts man in the centre of the explanation of concepts.

I have to add that the objectivistic standpoint about space is both *substantialist* and, paradoxically, it contains the “anthropological” model of the human sensations concerning space; the objectivistic perspective is that of the *analogy* of the human senses related to space: thus that space is something empty but existing *in se* and filled up with objects. Contrary to this view was and is the *relational* one: that of the real anthropological standpoint manifested in both natural and human sciences. In the first, – it does not translate space subjectively the space, but increases the objective character of phenomena: the anthropological lens states that just through the instruments of measuring, namely not only through the human senses – since a ray of light is an instrument too –, in fact through the possibility and relativity of measuring, space appears as a relation, thus an objective object of science (and philosophy). In the second – space is a *cultural construct*. In other words, the concepts of science are theories, constructions, not simple

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 46.

² *Ibidem*.

generalisations and abstractions: thus in the objectivistic approach, space is homogenous, while in the relational and anthropological – both homogenous and heterogeneous. This last manner is also specific to the anthropological view in the human sciences: space is a structure of human relations and objects.

Leaving aside the pre-modern notes written in the anthropological key, in the 18th century – the last when thinkers could cherish in rational manner illusions regarding the modern system – this cultural paradigm was developed, with good reason, at an epistemological level. Inquiring the manners and human tools man proceeds and uses in order to know/understand reality, philosophers like Kant – but also Fichte, Schelling, Hegel – have arrived at the idea that the development of the human mind and knowledge is indestructibly related to the *critical standpoint* concerning both the human faculty of rationality and the social conditions where this faculty manifests. In fact, the critical standpoint has begun from a very philosophical interest: that of the truth value of the concepts¹. Many centuries, if not millennia, the thinkers have thought that if their inferences are logical, the content they gave to the concepts is absolutely correct and they can erect theories upon the presuppositions contained within the concepts: because these presuppositions would be perfect copies of the real phenomena.

But: a) the accumulation of one-sided theories based on the objectivistic approach, b) the philosophical debate related to these theories and c) the modern transformation of the real life, have determined the appearance and development of the *critical spirit* (from Bacon and Kant and further). And a specific form of this spirit was the *sociological* focus on the relationships between the mediation of concepts and the real life. It is noteworthy that Marx, who is the famous founding father of this sociological focus – see his concept of ideology –, has based just on the thinkers who have developed the “active side” of all concepts related to reality, namely, their dependence on the “sensuous human activity, practice”, though these

¹ In this respect, we should not forget the continuity between Descartes’ rational explanation of metaphysics and the emergence of criticism. (And Leibniz has continued the rationalistic approach: “The great principles of sufficient reason and the identity of indiscernibles change the status of metaphysics. They make metaphysics real and demonstrative, whereas before it didn’t amount to much more than empty words”, “Leibniz’s fourth paper”, 2 June 1716, in *Exchange of papers between Leibniz and Clarke* (1717), 2007, p. 16, <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/lecl1.pdf>.

thinkers have not arrived to the philosophical significance of the intertwining between the cognitive process and this practice¹.

Finally, objectivism was developed by sciences. If we consider the 17th and 18th centuries – see the Newton-Leibniz debate, where the former has thought space as absolutely independent from the objects and their relations² and the latter, promoter of *relationism* (opposite to Newton's *substantialism*), quite the contrary³ –, philosophy still was intertwined with physics; then, objectivism was continued only by sciences. Until, as in the 20th century, when just sciences have demonstrated that the cognisance of the objective world – for example, the particles and their motion, therefore even/including space, see quantum physics-is depending upon the observer.

But what does “objectivism” mean? It is a kind of *instrumentalism*, of transformation of the concepts and objects represented by them – here, space – into an instrument of the will of the thinker. I do not blame the old philosophy and physics of instrumentalism, but I certainly do so with the 20th century (not only) Romanian thinkers⁴ who, for example, considered space in the *geopolitical* key: in the last analysis, space was only the receptacle of the fragmented human struggle for survival and the bigger was to be this receptacle, the bigger was to be the victory of survivors who would be legitimate to use every means in order to conquer space.

The geopolitical key–continuing the old political tradition of the rulers having the full right to do everything in order to preserve their status, thus the *status quo* – was considered, however, as a quite ordinary standpoint by philosophers like Lucian Blaga⁵ who has promoted the theory

¹ Karl Marx, *Theses on Feuerbach*, I (1845), <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>.

² Isaac Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Londini, Jussu Societatis Regiae ac Typis Josephi Streater. Prostat apud plures Bibliopolas Anno MDCLXXXVII (1686), Scholium, II, III, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28233/28233-h/28233-h.htm>.

³ See Leibniz's third and forth paper, in *Exchange of papers between Leibniz and Clarke* (1717), 2007, esp. pp. 9-10, and 16-21, <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/lecl1.pdf>.

⁴ Simion Mehedinți (1868-1962), Ion Chelcea (1902-1991) have written between the two world wars and have considered the national space as intimately related to the people which has conquered it and, generally, has moved within (in “spatial movements” of “high tide and ebb tide”) until it has fitted the space to its size and will. The geopolitical writings were linked to the nationalistic standpoint advancing – without any sociological analysis of the interests, causes and results of – the idea of foreign aggression against the spaces of identity and opposing any integrative theories, calling them “imperialist”.

⁵ See Lucian Blaga, “Getica”, *Saeculum*, Revistă de filozofie, Sibiu, I, 4, 1943, pp. 3-24, with his indirect criticism against the instrumentalism of geopolitics through the a little euphemistic but sharp attack against the excessive nationalism of some traditionalists who linked the Dacian hypothesis of the specific of Romanians with orthodoxy as the true

of space as a conceptual datum and, more precisely, as a cultural or anthropological concept¹. This is the reason he called his book focusing on the problem of cultural style from the viewpoint of space, *The space of Mioritza*² or the “Ewe-space”.

The presumptions of Blaga

Mioritza was the name of a popular ballad telling about the favourite sheep (Mioritza³) belonging to a mythical Romanian shepherd who was to be assassinated by two neighbour shepherds and, knowing that, he told to *Mioritza* that he was not afraid but, on the contrary, he considered his death as a cosmic union with the whole nature. Why would the space of the shepherd – and, more, of all dwellers of Romania – been called the space of *Mioritza*? Because the main old occupation of these dwellers was the breeding of animals, carrying of their grazing and fitting their own lives to that of the seasons and needs of flocks, mostly of sheep.

monotheism promoted by the ancient Dacs. On the contrary, Blaga has represented the Dacs as polytheists and having as “stylistic determinants” in the “stylistic topography” of the Aryan peoples the idea of immortality after death as a result of the magic effectuated by the priests. Namely: Blaga has opposed to the “theologians” – the excessive traditionalist and spiritualist thinkers who considered the theses of orthodoxy as originated in the ancient religion of Dacs, i.e. who considered these presuppositions as already demonstrated – a philosophical standpoint (as in the note 181 from *The Mioritic space*, see infra, he especially has mentioned: that he has detached from the Christian orthodox metaphysics, *writing only from the perspective of the philosophy of culture*). In “Getica”, Lucian Blaga has opposed to the Dacian exaggeration as in 1921 did to the Latinist exaggeration (the pure and only Latin origin of the Romanians), see “Revolta fondului nostru nelatin”, *Gândirea*, 10, 1921 [The revolt of our non-Latin nature].

In his essay from 1943 (pointed out also as a reply to the historian Vasile Pârvan who have written in 1926 a book *Getica*, where he pictured the Dacs as monotheist), Blaga has shown his scientific earnestness – his philosophy was written in the rationalist/scientific key, not in that of “metaphysics”, and his first books intending to configure a comprising philosophical view have concerned with epistemology, see *The Dogmatic Aeon*, 1931; also Ana Bazac, “Lucian Blaga and Thomas Kuhn: The Dogmatic Aeon and the Essential Tension”, *Noesis*, XXXVII, 2012, pp. 23-36 –: he arrived to the above-mentioned conclusions following the analysis of and comparison with other Indo-European mythologies. Since all of them were polytheist and anthropomorphic, how could the old religion of Dacs be monotheistic?

¹ Capitalising on Kant, Blaga was, in the terms of the present epistemology, not an objectivist but “a constructivist”, while at the same time he was “metaphysically, a realist”, Michael S. Jones, *The Metaphysics of Religion: Lucian Blaga And Contemporary Philosophy*, Cranbury, Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp., 2006, p. 221.

² Literally: *The Mioritic space: Spațiul mioritic*, [The Mioritic/Ewe-Space], București, Cartea Românească, 1936.

³ Literally, in Romanian: little sheep.

But, and here is the irony, as we know, this occupation was common to at least a big part of the South-East European space. This is the reason that the motif of *Mioritza* is not only Romanian, but pertains to this South-East European space¹, though in the first Romanian version (Alecsandri), the locality of the three shepherds is within the three historical Romanian princedoms. Indeed, and even though this – as well as other – ballad/s was/were collected by the 19th century intellectuals including in order to legitimate the tradition of the Romanian nation and modern literature, *Mioritza* attests the *pastoral origin* of the people from this part of Europe² and

¹ Within the Romanian space, the first version of *Mioritza* was collected by Alecu Russo in 1842 in Vrancea county (not in Transylvania, but in Moldavia) and was transmitted to Vasile Alecsandri in order to be published in the progressive journal of the latter, *Propășirea* [The Prosperity] in 1844, but the journal was forbidden by the censorship and so, after the publication of ballad in 1850 by a Romanian journal from abroad, it entered in a general attention only from Alecsandri's collection of Romanian folklore in 1852, *Poesii populare. Balade (Cântece bătrânești) adunate și îndreptate...*, Iași, I / 1852, II / 1853 [Folklore. Ballads collected and corrected...]. (As we know, it was the tumultuous period of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, and the two modern Romanian intellectuals and poets remembered here were the representatives of the utopian liberalism, marked in their case with a Romantic image about folklore).

From that moment, two major standpoints have constituted the boundaries of the analysis of ballad: one was that of the Romanian origin and specificity of *Mioritza*; and the other – that of a larger, Balkan and South-East European, origin and spreading (Alexandru Odobescu, „Răsunete al Pindului în Carpați” [Echoes from the Pindus mountain to the Carpathian Mountains], *Revista Română*, București, 1861). Lucian Blaga was the promoter of the first viewpoint. But he certainly knew both Alexandru Odobescu's and B.P. Hajdeu's (see infra) demonstrations about the circulation of the ballad, and at least the most recent analysis, that of Ovid Densusianu, *Viața păstorească în poezia noastră populară*, București, vol. 1 – 1922, vol. 2 – 1923 [The pastoral life in our popular poetry], where the poem appeared as a transfiguration of the pastoral life – with the inherent rivalry between shepherds in their wanderings of transhumance –: and since the pastoral life was common (at least) to the entire South-East Europe, how could it be specific only to the Romanians?

It certainly was not; but the many versions within the space of the Romanian state and their aesthetical forms have justified in the eyes of Blaga and other supporters of the theory of the national source of *Mioritza* the thesis that this ballad may be assumed as the *emblematic creation of the Romanian folklore*: being a synthesis of the psychological features of this people.

² This pastoral origin was common at least to the Aromanians, or Vlachs (as the foreigners called them), who were Latin speaker tribes/Latinised by the Roman Empire in the north of Epirus, Macedonia and Thessaly and have spread in the present Albania, Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia. It's interesting that even in the present Albania, the Vlachs are known also as the *çobans*, i.e. shepherds (and *cioban* is the Romanian word for shepherd). The history of the Latin speaker tribes retired in mountains (both the Albanian and Romanian call the flock *turmë/turmă*, from the Latin *turma*,-ae, multitude/crowd/a great number of) and being country dwellers in movement through the agency of transhumance, has allowed both Odobescu's and Nicolae Iorga's theory – Iorga was the most important Romanian historian and a well-known polymath, *Balada populară românească, Originea și ciclurile ei* [The Romanian popular ballad. Its origin and cycles], Vălenii de Munte, Tipografia Neamul

could constitute a myth¹ or a mythical reference of the cultural conscience of Romanians (as this one was forged by the intellectuals). Blaga used *Mioritza* as the metaphor of this origin because:

1. according to the works of folklorists he knew, the Romanian version of the ballad was *the most elaborated, the most valuable*; in this respect, though the ballad could be found in the south of Danube river as well², it seemed to Blaga to be the most specific to the Romanian people, the singing of all its motifs expressed with a unique sweetness being related to the ancestral philosophy of life³ of the settlers of this area⁴;

Românesc, 1910, pp. 9-11 and 24-25 – about the circulation of the ballad and the common motifs in many folklores as the Scottish and Irish, the Spanish, the Serbian and Bulgarian, the Greek, and about the historical and social origin of the quarrel between shepherds. Iorga has told, following historical documents, that in the first half of the 18th century, the Transylvanian shepherds went in transhumance till Moldavia and then, to Dobruja, and the local shepherds tended to drive them away.

At the same time, Iorga (for example, *Albania și România*, lecție de deschidere..., Vălenii de Munte, “Neamul Românesc”, 1915, pp. 14-15, and *Histoire des Roumains de la Péninsule des Balkans (Albanie, Macédoine, Epire, Thessalie, etc.)*, București, Imprimeria Cultura neamului românesc, 1919) was one of the first Romanians (after Hajdeu) mentioning the Latin and the primitive Thracian-Illyrian origin of the Albanian language and the connections between the Romanian and the Albanian language on both the two versants: the Latin and the Thracian. (See also Alexandru Philippide, *Originea românilor - vol. II. Ce spun limbile română și albaneză* [Origin of the Romanians. What are the Romanian and Albanian languages telling], Iași, Tipografia „Viața Românească”, 1928).

¹ This idea was emphasised by George Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent* [History of the Romanian literature from the origin up to the present] (1941), București, Minerva, 1986, pp. 57-58, the greatest Romanian historian and critic of literature.

² “The folklore travels from language to language, but it is not translated: it transforms”, Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, one of the most important philologists and intellectuals of the 19th century modern Romania, wrote (*Cuvente den bătrâni, Limba română vorbită între 1550-1600*, vol. 2: Cărțile poporane ale românilor în secolul XVI [Words of yore, The spoken Romanian between 1550-1600, volume 2: The popular books of the Romanians in the 16th century], București, Noua Tipografie națională C.N. Rădulescu, 1879, p. XVIII).

³ Indeed, even by 1921 (*Zamolxe. Mister păgân* [Zalmoxis: Obscure Pagan, translated by Doris Planus-Runey, Iasi, RO, Oxford, GB, and Portland, USA: Center for Romanian Studies, 2000], Blaga went in for the traditionalist current that has extolled the Thracian and/or Dacian origin of Romanians, instead of their Latin source: but in a *philosophical* way, which is very important. Anyway, all the supporters of this current have mentioned the imagined characteristics of Thracians/Dacians, which would have been transmitted to the Romanians: *fatalism*, the “*nostalgia of death*” and *pantheism*. For the historical features of this problem, see Dan Dana, “Zamolxe de Lucian Blaga: între construcție și revoltă; un aspect al dezbaterii din jurul ‘specificului național’ în România interbelică” [Zalmoxis by Lucian Blaga: between construction and revolt; an aspect of the debate concerning the ‘national specific’ in the inter-war Romania], *Phantasma*, 12, 2007, pp. 334-353, <http://www.phantasma.ro/caiete/caiete/caiete12/30.html>.

⁴ Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, *ibidem*, p. XVII: the popular literature is “the work of an entire people, even of an entire nation, of the whole humankind”.

2. as originated from Transylvania¹ and because he considered this province as being from ancient times the core territory from where the flocks of sheep went on the ways of transhumance², Blaga has called, by generalising the cultural values of Transylvania, the entire Romanian territory as the *Mioritic space*;

3. this metaphorical *nomen loci* was the substitute of the Romanians' psychology, *as if* the space would frame and guide them to passivity and resignation which have only nature as a compensation. But here we may observe the banal intellectual manner to configure the object of analysis according to the presumptions consciously assumed, or not; i.e., the object is described in the manner the author presents *because its causes are just the presumptions* the author carries; the traditionalist intellectuals have considered the psychology of the Romanians in a pessimistic key (this was the presumption) and in order to justify this key, they searched for the origins of this psychology: namely, they have inversed this deduction, by asserting that just because of the immemorial pessimistic tradition of the

¹ In Adrian Fochi, *Miorița. Tipologie, circulație, geneză, texte*, București, Editura Academiei RPR, 1964 [Mioritza. Typology, circulation, genesis, texts], there were collected 930 variants of the ballad in the Romanian provinces – Transylvania – 329 variants, Banat – 14, Oltenia – 31, Muntenia – 67, Dobruja – 10, Moldavia – 51 –, as they were known from 1842 to 1964. But some of versions have already been collected before 1936, i.e. Blaga knew that Transylvania was the origin issuing the ballad.

² *Mioritza* includes some folkloric *strata* (manifested also as dirge and carol) and is related to an ancient occupation that has constituted probably the most important source of wealth and force of its promoters, just through the peregrinations occasioned by transhumance. At the same time, this occupation seems to not have led only to wealth and stability. This is the reason of the pessimism of the shepherd and its counter-balancing only by the presumptive harmony with nature.

Indeed, the emblematic ballads of the Romanians and sending to their most ancient existence seem – according to the horizon of the traditionalist Romanian intellectuals – to not have been those of the victorious conquer of space through agriculture, but those of the communion with the nature on which they did not act in any (Densușianu, *ibidem*, volume 1, p. 3 and 28, has mentioned the sometimes not too favourable image of the ordinary peasants about the “*dolce far niente*”-ism of the shepherds; this image would have resulted also because of the passion of shepherds to their activity, even until to forget love, p. 4; but generally the prestige of shepherds was big, see the entire chapter 1). There is, obviously, also the *legend of master Manole* that is considered too an emblem of the Romanian people, but it is a little bit later than *Mioritza* (Nicolae Iorga, *Balada populară...*). Anyway, however beautiful the verses of *Mioritza* were, the labelling of the ballad as the founding synthesis of the Romanian spirit and culture was an *intellectual construct of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century thinkers*: they did so in order to tune the representation of the Romanian spirit with their nationalistic image about the logic of history and the present specific of the Romanians. Namely: they did not consider the Romanian historical ballads – related to either the Middle Ages princes and their relationships with the boyars and ordinary people (Iorga, *ibidem*) or to the outlaws making justice and having dramatic destiny – as bearing metaphysical values. For them, only these values would have explained the Romanian soul.

Romanians – as it is shown in *Mioritza* – the pessimistic key one approaches the present trajectory of this people would be legitimate.

Indeed, the “*Mioritic*” attribute of the Romanian space was used by Blaga in two meanings: 1) to give the most comprising and unitary set of features of the psychology of the Romanians; 2) and, by legitimising the immemorial and unitary origin of the Romanians, to explain the whole historical trajectory and destiny of this people. Namely: the destiny would have been shaped by living within this space; consequently, this space itself is assumed and internalised as a destiny.

Therefore, Blaga used the metaphor of *Mioritza*: on the one hand, consciously, namely being aware of the metaphorical function of both the use and the motif; on the other hand, Blaga did not attribute any metaphorical meaning to the use of the motif: he was the follower of the nationalistic paradigm manifested through both the theory of the age of the Romanian people and of its endogenous cultural specific. This is the reason he did not relate his philosophical approach of the Romanian folklore to the scientific data of the historical and linguistic research: au fond, this was the reason he made philosophy of culture – indeed, already the use of the attribute “*Mioritic*” sends rather to metaphysics – and not science concerning the history and culture of the Romanians. Briefly, the nationalistic paradigm supposes the *exceptionality* of the status of a people and culture, always almost unique at least towards some peoples and cultures. My criticism of the nationalistic paradigm doesn’t mean that a culture – and thus every culture – would not be unique/would not have a specificity. It certainly is and has. But the above-mentioned paradigm supposes: that a certain culture would have only a single set of features; that a certain culture would be the *unique origin* of other cultures; and that it would have developed in an *isolated* manner.

As the researchers anterior to Blaga’s *Mioritic space* have shown, neither the Romanian people nor its folklore did develop in an isolated manner, nor the age of *Mioritza* was immemorial¹, although its motifs could be supposed to be so: but, keep attention, at the level of a larger space than

¹ Hasdeu, already quoted, was the only who considered, according to his analysis of historical linguistics, that *Mioritza* was created between 1350 and 1450: B. P. Hasdeu, *Istoria critică a românilor, Pământul Terrei Românești* [Critical history of the Romanians. The earth of the Romanian land], vol. I, București, 1875, pp. 56-57.

Odobescu marked the origin of *Mioritza* in the 15th century, and Nicolae Iorga – in the 18th.

that of the Romanian settlers within the Romanian state¹. However, Blaga was not interested in the examination of scientific theories concerning the age of the Romanian culture and the forging of his philosophy of culture in accordance with these theories. Why this?

A sociological analysis of Blaga's presumptions

I do not want to introduce in this paper the psychological elements clearing up Blaga's endeavour to construct a complete philosophical system, to be original and at the same time to not hurt too much the dominant philosophical frame. My aim is only to understand the ideological framework of his theory of style as metaphysical founding of the existence of man and, more specifically, of the Romanians.

Obviously, Blaga was influenced by the entire Romanian intellectual atmosphere – related inherently to the post-WWI European jolting –: with its dominant tradition of spiritualism and rejection of the social, and with its rapid adaptation to the European fashions of thinking. This atmosphere was also imbued with an assumed or unconscious complex: inferiority, of the complex of *tarde venientibus* at the table of the world thinkers². As we know, the complex of inferiority is covering under its nationalistic transfiguration: this was the reason that a permanent motif of the modern (from the second half of the 19th century on) Romanian intellectual debate was that of the ways of development fine-tuned with the heroic tradition and creativity of the people; subconsciously, the reason was to demonstrate to the European fellow intellectuals that the history and art of the ancient Romanians was so

¹ Dumitru Caracostea, „Miorița la aromâni”, *Omagiu lui Ion Bianu* [“Mioritza at the Aromanians” *Homage to Ion Bianu*], București, 1927, reprinted in *Poezia tradițională română* [Romanian traditional poetry], II, București, 1969, p. 210.

² This complex has belonged to the intellectuals from all the countries which did not constitute the capitalist Centre, or have felt that the victory of capitalism did not involve the assurance of the conditions and positions they have expected, or have been slapped by the evidence that the structural continuity seemed to be bigger than discontinuity and they have fine-tuned, according to the opportunistic specific of intellectuals, with this social turn. See, for example, Alexandre Koyré, *La philosophie et le problème national en Russie au début du XIXe siècle*, Paris, Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion, 1929, where the attitude of the Russian intellectuals towards the Western philosophy is described. But already in this philosophy, the substitution of the 18th century universalism with the nationalistic and idealist Romanticism has taken place. Anyway, the Russian answer consisted, first, of the aspiration to minimise the Russian backwardness (since there were but a difference of degree between the two civilisations) and after, of the confidence in the specific mission of Russia: that to develop a specific civilisation which was both to surpass and fulfil the Western civilisation and to realise the ideal of humanity.

exceptional that the future could but continue this trend¹ – after a period when, for reasons of survival, the dwellers of this space have *retired from history*/ they boycotted it, since history itself has boycotted the Romanians² –.

That meant that, firstly, the intellectuals had to inform their people and the foreign intellectuals about the language, culture and history of the Romanians: they had to work. And they did it, including through Blaga's beautiful writings as a young poet and playwright. But information without an explanatory theory binding so many features has no reason. Philosophy had to supplant this organic need of knowledge, and philosophy meant to go to the last principles – constituting unfortunately “metaphysics”/a “metaphysical” approach³ – and to explain through them the course of things.

Concretely, Blaga started from the present “minor”⁴ situation of Romania and its culture/European recognition of its culture. And he tried to find out more profound possible reasons of this situation, than the vulgar and so a-philosophical *relations of forces and domination* and their consequences, including at the level of people's feelings. He found these reasons in the a-historical concepts of *style* and *Mioritic space*. These concepts constituted for him the framework shaping the path the Romanians ought to follow: as a prefiguring forcing their destiny. This was so not as if man would not exist and develop in the pattern of a spontaneous reactivity and individual and unique creativity: but because these individual reactivity and creativity take place within the (obviously, unique) concrete national transposition of the concrete solutions and immemorial criteria of thinking and judging of specific human communities.

¹ Dumitru Caracostea's insistence, *ibidem*, p. 257.

² In Blaga, *history* meant a far-reaching dynamics where the individual facts integrate as specific creative endeavours leading to monumental results. In this respect, history is always “great/major”, *Orizont și stil* [Horizon and Style], București, Fundația pentru literatură și artă “Regele Carol II,” 1935.

He did not explain what the *organic* development of the “*Romanian spirit*” (*românism*) would consist in.

See also *Spațiul mioritic*, pp. 225-239.

³ I put this word between commas in order to emphasise that the metaphysical approach supposes the illustration of the last principles/tenets, and not the constitution of these principles as a consequence of the developments of analyses of facts and arguments.

⁴ In Blaga (*Orizont și stil*), the difference between the “major” and “minor” culture is not so much in quality, but in the provincial and somehow closed character of the popular culture: briefly, the inexistent or low European recognition and influence. In Blaga, a “minor” culture is not necessarily inferior, as was the case in Emil Cioran, *Schimbarea la față a României* [The Transfiguration of Romania], București, Vremea, 1936. Blaga's „minor” culture is related to the “childhood” of a people.

These criteria and landmarks of thinking were and are comprised in what Blaga called the *style*. But au fond the *Mioritic space* is no more than the synonym of the *Romanian style* or *unconsciously shaped manner of existence*. The concept of *Mioritic space* embraces this style and its concrete transfigurations. It is more than a spatial receptacle, a stretch of land where some people live on and where some objects lain. Namely: it is more than an objectivistic meaning of space. It is a manifestation of the subjective feelings and creativity of the Romanians, a metaphor of their entire existence and creation. From this standpoint, though the concept of *Mioritic space* seems to confiscate the identity of shepherds and the scattering of the pastoral and rural life (at least) in the whole South-East Europe¹, in fact it is not related to this enlarged space and it is not interested in historical accuracy. It is an *ideological metaphor*, serving only to legitimate at a metaphysical level the course of the Romanian fate. If we do not consider this concept in this way, we may use it in explaining the whole pastoral and rural life of at least the South-East of Europe: but if it would so, we would have to do with a historical metaphor. Or, this is not the case.

The *Mioritic space*: Blaga's meanings

Before Blaga, geography has shown – already in ancient Greece but also in the spirit of the 19th century positivism – that the behaviour of peoples would be forged by nature: the climate and relief would determine the exterior aspects and the psychical life, the rhythm of reasoning, the temperament and the habits². This geographical determinism was taken over by the entire tradition of the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries focusing on anthropology and psychology of peoples. Sociologically, this focus was fuelled by the imperialist relations and interests of the time, but the sociological – as any other kind of – explanation is correct only if we *relate it with other* ones, issuing from the logic of research and knowledge.

Two thinkers pertaining to such traditions – and important here because of the comparisons with Blaga, made by the interpreters – are the ethnologist Leo Frobenius and the historian and philosopher of history Oswald Spengler who have considered: the first, that every culture has a soul or style just because it has developed in a certain area (*Paideuma*, 1921);

¹ Mircea Muthu, “Homo balcanicus”, *Caietele Echinox*, 3, Teoria si practica imaginii. 2. Imaginar social, ediție Corin Braga, 2001, pp. 32-40.

² Élisée Reclus, *La Terre, description des phénomènes de la vie du globe*, Paris, Hachette, 2 vol., 1869 ; *Nouvelle Géographie universelle, la Terre et les hommes*, Paris, Hachette, volume 1, 1876, p. 30.

the second, that every culture, as an organism determined by its opportunities of environment, has not only a wave-form evolution, with progress followed by “winter time”, but also a morphology characterised by a cultural feature or spring to creativity; when this feature is accompanied with a critical turn, the culture becomes civilisation and its evolution too reproduces that of an organism (*The Decline of the West*, 1918, 1922, 1923).

But this approach was considered by Blaga in both *Horizon and Style*¹ and *The Mioritic space* as insufficient: not the sentiment of space generated by a landscape was for him that which would explain the brakes the Romanians feel confronting the existence, but something deeper than the sentiments as such. This deeper was for him the *unconscious*², more precisely the collective unconscious of a people, i.e. the expectations and patterns of behaviour of the immemorial ancestors, shaped just by the structure of space (“without its *pitoresque* content”³). The expectations and patterns shaped by the structure of space form or constitute the *unconscious spatial horizon*, that which is trickling in every conscious creation and behaviour. Namely: every state of mind comprises both a *conscious* moment/level and an *unconscious* one.

The spatial horizon of the unconscious is a *space-matrix*, and that of the Romanians is the *Mioritic space*⁴. The appearance of this space is the plateau, a high tableland formed as an infinite succession of hills and valleys – as Blaga has experienced Transylvania, where the dwellers, especially the shepherds, existed and moved in a tireless and monotone rhythm. To go uphill did not mean to arrive to the terminus of the expectations, since one had to go uphill again and again after one had to go down the valley again and again. For this reason, neither the horizon of the Romanian space-matrix is straight, but wavy, as if the hills and valleys would not be static forms allowing a sure point terminus: no, they transmit to the Romanians the monotone moving in an infinite alternating of enthusiasm and resignation⁵.

¹ Lucian Blaga, *Orizont și stil* [Horizon and Style], p. 43: if we deduce the spatial view of culture from the landscape, we fall down from philosophy to the theory of environment.

² Becoming doctor in philosophy at the University of Vienna in 1920 and returning in the Austrian capital as a diplomat in 1932 till 1937, Lucian Blaga has known not only the psychoanalytical debates shaking the general image about the human mind and soul, but he was from the beginning imbued by the spirit of a “*Gefühlkultur*” (Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-De-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (1980), New York, Vintage Book 1981, p. 7), of the search for something more than the rationalist explanation of man. And concretely, he borrowed the concept of *collective unconscious* from Jung.

³ Lucian Blaga, *The Mioritic space*, p. 121.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 124.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 255. This never ending advancement, interrupted with steps backward, is like the Romanian popular dance *hora*, name taken over from the ancient Greek χορεία, dance according to rules → dance in general, and chorus of dance, namely a band of dancers, a

This existential rhythm has generated the complex of *the spatial horizon of the unconscious* and *the sentiment of destiny*. It seems that the Romanians have taken over within their unconscious a certain fatalism doubled only by a prudent confidence, issued by the structure of space imprinted upon their deep down.

Thus not the landscape is important, said Blaga¹: in Transylvania lived not only Romanians but also Germans and Magyars; what is important is the spirituality where the unconscious demonstrates the immemorial spatial framing of a people and which manifests, though unconsciously, in songs, dreams, rural architecture and management of rural space, popular poetry.

This unconscious would manifest also in the intellectual constructs of the traditionalist second half 19th century and first decades of the 20th standpoint²: in the idea of the *organic* existence and development not only of the Romanian language and culture, but also of economy and social life³. Or: in the impression generated by the architectural styles of churches: that of the *transcendence which descends* upon the believers⁴ and which leads in its turn to a “Sophianic” sentiment of love and intuition of God, as in *Mioritza* where the death of shepherd becomes a beginning, the union with the whole nature, a genuine church⁵.

collective deed → order, class, rank, from the verb χορεύω, to dance. The present name of the popular dance in Greek is χορός.

To dance in a certain swinging rhythm seems to fit with the wavy horizon specific to the Romanian space of hills and valleys, could Blaga think (but he did not mention *hora* between the examples of the *Mioritic space*). However, the swinging rhythm, i.e. the dance, does not derive from the imprinting of nature in the mind of people. Rather it corresponds to their specific human relationships and answers to their environment. The ancient Greeks have suggested this standpoint: the action of dance was specific to the inhabited space or place, χώρα, or to the place where there are things, namely significant to humans. This word – different from τόπος, place – was used also as space/place, providing “a home for all created things” (Plato, *Timaeus*, 52a and b, <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/physis/plato-timaeus/space.asp?pg=4>), but just for this reason it has had more significances than that (as later on Jacques Derrida, *Khôra* (1987), Paris, Galilée, 1993, has shown). And one is the human space, or space with *human meanings*. These meanings appear and are created only within human communities, i.e. making space inhabited. And what could be a better sign of human community than the both melancholic and full of joy collective dance, separated somehow from the ordinary deeds?

¹ Blaga, *ibidem*, p. 128.

² Blaga has noted only this traditionalist standpoint which, though dominant in the Romanian culture of the time, was not the only one. But just this is “metaphysics”: to select examples in order to demonstrate the presumptions.

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 133-154.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 155-160.

⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 176-177.

Here, insisted Blaga, the sentiment of transcendence which descends is like a *space-receptacle* where the Romanian could but insert and adapt in a passive way: this kind of adaptation would be and leads to the idea of the *organic*¹ which is demonstrated by Blaga through the folkloric sacral themes assimilated unconsciously by the Romanian peasants².

The stylistic matrix is not so much a frame, but a creative *potentiality*³: it concerns not temporality but the traditional pattern of a people, “our only tradition”⁴, invisible and only metaphorically expressible⁵.

This creative potentiality engraved upon the unconscious is like the set of categories Kant forged for the conscious and knowledge. As knowledge needs and is provided with the *a priori* categories, as the “human spontaneity” needs and beneficiaries of an *a priori* manifested in the popular cultural style, situated in the unconscious⁶. And since the unconscious was shaped by and within the structure/the abstract model of space, it results that the *Mioritic space* is the origin of the stylistic *a priori*.

Therefore, where is the centre of the subjective feelings and faculty of creativity? It is in something different from the conscious life of the psyche; thus not in the feelings resulting from the clash between the subject and the exterior conditions, including the natural environment: these feelings are direct reactions, mostly conscious; the centre is within the *unconscious*. And what is this unconscious creating at the collective level of a people? The cultural popular style is the result of the unconscious. This style is comprised of the *metaphorically expressed values and meanings of life forged within the spatial horizon/space*. We can grasp the style in concrete facts of creation and by grasping it, we can observe the persistence of certain *axiological accents*, of certain *attitudes to life* – of “anabasic” dynamic conquer of space, of “catabasic” withdrawal in front of the spatial infinity, of neutral balance – and of certain *formative tendencies* of people living in a certain culture and generating manners to express their life in cultural creations (such as the “individualizing mode” in the German philosophy, see Leibniz’s monads, or the “typifying mode” of the classical periods, or the “elementary tendency” which the complex reduces to the elementary, as the Byzantine picture).

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 181.

² *Ibidem*, p. 188.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 223.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 224.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 256.

Together with the *spatial* and *temporal horizon*, these factors form the *stylistic matrix* and combine in many ways so as to form many matrices. The Romanian *Mioritic space* is thus not only a frame of the Romanian cultural matrix that would predestined in a pessimistic inexorable manner the trajectory of Romanians – as not only the other traditionalists, but also Blaga was tempted to think –, but, because of the *infinite possibilities* gone in for the Romanian stylistic matrix, this space opens up rather infinite ways of culture: “unlike Spengler who used to prepare us, in a pessimist way, for the death of the European culture, the Romanian Lucian Blaga brings a very optimistic note in the rather scarce and gloomy atmosphere of the morphology of culture: man’s creative destiny is as eternal as man himself is”¹.

The popular collective dance (see note 34) could be and is specific to many peoples, South-East European or not, but the stylistic matrix is the possible *combination of infinite elements*. Therefore, not an aspect or another – like the dance – is essential or could deny the uniqueness of a cultural matrix or style, but only the unique combination of the cultural features shaped within the deep down of the human psyche.

Methodological concepts and...

First of all, we should relate and detach the cultural manner to approach the space from the objectivistic one. Spinoza, with his distinction between *natura naturans* and *natura naturata* helps us. For the objectivistic approach – shared too by the shepherd from *Mioritza* – the surrounding nature is “that which is in itself, and is conceived through itself”², it is the active whole where man can but adapt, bear it (and conceive it according to “what it is”) and enter a communion when his death arrives: nature and space constitute *natura naturans*. Here, man is the result of the infinite chain of natural and super-natural causes – since, in the metaphorical understanding of both Spinoza and the shepherd from *Mioritza*, nature and God are the same –: in this respect, the shepherd is a part of *natura naturata*.

However, the *Mioritic space* of Blaga is not a form of *natura naturans*. Only if we take the *Mioritic space* in a naïve reflective meaning – that was not the intention of Blaga – can we assert that this space, a very natural one, is

¹ Horia Pătrașcu, “The Morphology of Culture in Romania. Lucian Blaga (1895-1965) – The Passage from Axiology to the Ontology of Culture”, *European Academic Research*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, April 2012, p. 13, <http://www.euacademic.org/UploadArticle/1.pdf>.

² Benedict de Spinoza, *The Ethics* (1677), Translated from the Latin by R. H. M. Elwes, I, prop. XXIX, Note, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm>.

an exterior environment having its cause in itself and positing in front of man as something huge, mostly inimical and non-understandable. In fact, for the Romanian peasant – and especially for the shepherd –, his conception being specific to the mythical thinking and to the primitive stage of man, nature was something *familiar* and significant where they felt to being part of, not only after death but in their entire life¹. Nature was considered the home² and thus it was very “human” (though it was not at all transformed/imprinted by the human), while the peasant was very “natural”. Therefore, even in the naïve reflective sense the *Mioritic space* is not so much an exterior *natura naturans*, but the *complex man-nature*, or the name of the permanent communion man-nature. For the Romanian peasants – at least in the mythical image about them – there was any difference between the forests with their entire wild thickness and the sites of civilisation: quite the contrary, the first were friendlier than the latter³: since

¹ The whole nature, with its cosmic and near-by elements and spaces, was familiar and not distant. In this sense, it was not “exotic”: namely, there was not an “ideal gap” between the far away and the near-by, not the need and “conscience of complementarity” between “we” and the strange or foreign. Briefly, the source of the exotic, “the feeling of alterity – with its reflection as a distance –”, has missed. See Mihai Nadin, “The exotic – an example of a diagonal category”, *Revue roumaine des sciences sociales – Philosophie et logique*, 20, 1, 1976, pp. 41-49 (45, 49).

² Blaga has noticed about the distance between houses in the Romanian villages as a manner to show peasants’ reciprocal integration man/civilisation and nature.

³ According to Jacques le Goff, “The Wilderness in the Medieval West” (1980), in Jacques le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination* (1985), Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, University of Chicago Press, 1998, pp. 56-57, in the Western medieval imagination, there was, on the contrary, an antagonism between nature and culture, or between that which is constructed or cultivated or dwelled and, on the other hand, the wilderness (as forest and sea).

We can reflect upon a common meaning concerning the *forest* and at the same time the *world* – which comprises both the wild and the civilised part – grasped in the primeval Indian thinking and the old peasant thinking specific to Romania: as Charles Malamoud has kept attention on (see the motivation of the Colloque international en l’honneur de Charles Malamoud, *Aux abords de la clairière*, Études indiennes et comparées, 2010, <http://ceias.ehess.fr/docannexe.php?id=1389>), in Sanskrit the *world* is *loka*, but if we relates this word with the Latin *lūcus*, -i, *forest*, *glade*, we could think to the world as both forest and glade (*Aloka* – light), i.e. unknown and familiar.

In fact, things are always more complicated, since they are an infinite complex whole making possible infinite points of view, we grasping it in a certain moment only through one or some of them. Obviously, the forest was also separated from and adverse to man: again in Sanskrit, *araNya* – forest, while *araNa* – foreigner and *aRati/ArAti*, enemy, *Ara* – multitude of enemies. But we know from the Latin that there was not much difference between the guest, the foreigner, the traveller (called with the same word, *hospēs*, *ītis*) and the enemy (*hostis*, *is*): see in Sanskrit, *gRhAcAra* – duties of a householder towards a guest.

Briefly, the attitude towards nature was always multivalent and the ancient human stages prove this: the unknown was considered as an inimical environment towards which man can but civilise himself, but also, and through the agency of its mythical, thus humanised,

not the natural forces have determined their troubles, but the human relationships, the problems of civilisation.

And Blaga's space is neither a form of *natura naturata*, since it is a cultural construct with explanatory valences and supposes a critical viewpoint towards both the concept of space as such and the cultural theories about the cultural specific of the peoples.

Another interesting concept related to Blaga's *Mioritic space* is that of Goethe's *Urphänomen*. This means an essential scheme of an object/of a whole but grasped in a sensorial manner, an essential image that can be grasped by the senses. Blaga was strongly influenced by Goethe¹, as moreover by the entire German thinking. But the meaning of *Urphänomen* is not quite original. For example, the Greek philosophy, especially Aristotle, has used the word σχήμα as the figure/form/shape of a thing and all the figures formed reality. In Aristotle, σχήμα was obviously understood in an objectivistic manner², but it was also the form man has in his mind, since the objective and subjective *logos* corresponds each other.

In Goethe, the *Urphänomen* is a model or an archetype of a whole series of objects – as animals/only mammals and plants –, an archetype which is not constructed in a rational manner by abstracting characteristics of the objects after researching them, thus it is not an intellectual archetype, but a “first” perception of things certainly helped by the *idea* that “*must govern the whole*”³, but still a *perception* grasped in and proved by n empirical

translation, nature was integrated within the human world. In this respect, the deep forest was considered a shelter, i.e. a home, by the outlaws who are great figures of the Romanian folklore, and not only; and as a part of his shelter, i.e. but this means too a home – by the Romanian peasant. Briefly and if I may paraphrase Heidegger, the ancient and pre-modern people felt in front of nature as being-at-home.

¹ See not only his translation into Romanian of Goethe's *Faust* (1955), but also, for example, the essay *Daimonion* (1926, 1930), where he described Goethe's interest on the concept of *demonic* as a *mythical thinking*, opposed to the *synthesis-image* produced by sciences. In Goethe's mythical thinking, the demonic supposes concreteness and a spring to a concrete realisation of the unconscious feelings of the genius. A preoccupation of that time at the crossroad of history, the genius was seen as demonic and this demonism manifested in the original creation of fine art was called by Kant, keep attention, “the faculty of presenting aesthetic ideas”: Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Aesthetic Judgement* (1790), Translated, with seven introductory essays, notes and analytical index by James Creed Meredith, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1911, §49, p. 175,

<http://archive.org/stream/critiquekantaest00kantuoft#page/n348/mode/1up>.

² See Αριστοτέλης, *Φυσικά*, (193a and b,

http://users.uoa.gr/~nektar/history/tributes/ancient_authors/Aristoteles/physica.htm, where for the sophist Antiphon matter (and space, I may add) were the same, as “without face”.

³ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Outline for a General Introduction to Comparative Anatomy* (1795), §II, <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/goethe.htm>.

observations. Consequently, the *Urphänomen* is a “pure phenomenon” which obviously doesn’t exist but which, at the same time, is doubling our concrete perceptions and is visible within them¹. Thus it is about a concept highlighting the intermediary moment between perceptions and the rational construction of concepts, or more – between perceptions and representations. Indeed, the *Urphänomen* stands as the abstract moment within representations, since these ones comprise both the scheme of the phenomenon and its concrete picture with some accidental traits. In this meaning, the *Urphänomen* is a primal or placed at the beginning (*ur*) of the imagination and understanding of phenomena.

So what would be the connection between Blaga’s *Mioritic space* and the *Urphänomen*? It is very clear: Blaga’s concept is obviously a consciously intellectual construction but, at the same time, it can be grasped with both the eyes of the mind and the eyes of the concrete human body confronting here with the hills and valleys of Transylvania. The same is with his concept of *horizon* corresponding to something which “could be rather shown with the finger than defined” and has an indefinite-intuitive character, adapting itself to the concrete spatial events².

Finally, the nearest concept to Blaga’s undertaking is the *archetype* of Carl Gustav Jung, covering a set of motifs or landmarks of the human thinking. Jung’s archetype is a cultural concept and describes patterns helping the human thinking and issuing from the *collective unconscious* of – keep attention to the first distinction between Blaga and Jung – the human being as such, and not of each people or community³. A link between them is the variety of archetypes (Jung’s archetypes of events, figures and motifs – as order) or, at Blaga, of cultural matrices. The *Mioritic space* is an archetype which shapes the cultural behaviour of the Romanian peasants but as we know, Blaga assumed he made a philosophy or morphology of culture, and not a psychological research of the human psyche. From this standpoint, though the domains are different, the analytical explanation is bigger at Jung than in Blaga: the latter only illustrates⁴ the influence of the unconsciously shaped spatial archetype, while the former tries to demonstrate how the

¹ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Experience and Science* (1798), *ibidem*.

² Lucian Blaga, *Orizont și stil* [Horizon and Style], pp. 40 and 41.

³ I am not interested here to discuss the concept of *unconscious* – coined by Schelling and cherished by Blaga including because of this classical German origin –, nor the two types of unconscious at Jung, the individual and universal.

⁴ I think that colours and the abstract motifs in the Romanian popular decorations (*Spațiul mioritic*, pp. 204-210) cannot explain the cultural specific, they can only illustrate it. Or, they can explain it only if they provoke our insight and climbing up to *other concepts* than the cultural specific.

unconscious and its universal elements manifest through and combine with the conscious forms of the human conscience.

The *Mioritic space* is, in Blaga, a pattern kept within the unconscious, transcending the concrete landscapes and shaping the behaviour of the Romanian peasants: *just as if it would be an objective frame of the human existence*. In Jung, space is not an archetype, because he was interested in explaining the behaviour as resulting from social relationships, or relating to other people in their social situation. This is the main difference between them.

...names of space and how is Blaga related to their historical and usual meanings

Why a *Mioritic space* if we have the Greek χώρος, and the universal *space*¹, *place*, *position*, *location*, *settlement* (all from τόπος), *situation*, *site*, *domain/lands/field* – with the core δε – the Sanskrite *dâ* – present in the verb *to link* (συνδέσσω)? The answer lies not only in Blaga's search for a national specific of culture, but just in the above-mentioned binding: if the human space is always human, if the human relationships configure the meanings of the environment, it results that a specific human community – specific in its search for understanding the world, thus for revealing the great *mystery* surrounding people – configures a specific cultural space. The *Mioritic space* is the “sum” of the cultural answers and reflexes the Romanian peasants experienced and, said Blaga, is kept in their unconscious. Like, I may add, the Greeks' strong internalisation of the surrounding sea which they have transfigured in their memory under the form of double wavy spirals and abstract square type waves as main decorative figures in their culture.

Blaga has forged a *cultural* and *anthropological* concept of space. This one had, obviously, a real geographical basis in the hills and valleys of Transylvania, but in fact not this basis lies in the unconscious that reverberates in all the popular Romanian cultural manifestations, but the *feelings people had by living in this space*. The essence of both these feelings and the space they confronted with is the *horizon*. This is also an *anthropological* concept in Blaga, the symbol of the *expectations* summarised just in the environmental forms people meet and clash with and the distance between the human expectations and their wavy ends. Thus the *Mioritic space* is only the Romanians' *horizon* that explains their complex existence characterised by both their wonderful folklore and their “retirement from history”. I think this is the real interpretation of Blaga's intention – or at least of Blaga's

¹ See also *realm*, *sphere*.

intention related to the explanation of the “Romanian soul” –, because if we refer to his focus on the human knowledge in general and “the living of man in the horizon of mystery” which he reveals through *revealing metaphors*¹ (as the *Mioritic space* is, I add), why and how would this horizon of mystery be explanatory for a cultural specific, if not by transposing into a concrete horizon related to the space where a community tries to understand the world?

The space of Blaga is only *spiritual*, one that transcends both the empirical landscapes and their abstract images and metaphors. It is neither a reflective scientific concept, nor a usual abstract result of the logical process. It is a conscious distancing from a usual abstract concept, since it is a negation of the real stretching of land and asserts that it is *only an imagination*. And third, it is not only an imagined world, but it is also expressed through a metaphor. But thus Blaga’s view is kindred with the concepts which clear up the concepts used as first (the reflective, empirical, mostly general, but also abstract concepts, as the space), the second (the imagined) and the third (the metaphorically expressed) level expressions of the cognitive intentions of man.

In other words, Blaga’s *Mioritic space* attests the constructivist, and not the objectivistic, approach. As well as it is a metaphor emphasising a cultural concept about the social space. Therefore, the concept is culturally constructed – it is not a neutral reflection of a supposed objective thing – and the object is abstract, twice: abstract as a concept that doesn’t reflect anything, it only gathers some abstract features, corresponding thus to an ideal thing; and abstract because it is metaphorically reproduced. The metaphor is a cultural construct and it further develops reality and makes it intelligible, since the reality itself is equivocal and may be revealed only through analogies².

But though cultural and even though related to a community, Blaga’s space is *not social*³, in two senses: it is only the model of *individual* positioning

¹ Lucian Blaga, *Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii* [The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture], București, Fundația pentru literatură și artă “Regele Carol II”, 1937, pp. 20-40.

² Lucian Blaga, *ibidem*.

And later – Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (1975), Translated by Robert Czerny with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello, S. J. (1977), London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2004, pp. 128-139, 306-329.

³ However, the conscience of the social character of the (inhabited) space was very powerful from the beginning of the human organised/political settlements. For example, the Romanians called *țară* – from the Latin *terra, ae*, land/earth – both a macro political

in front of the existential horizon and does not keep any memory of human construction. More: the *Mioritic space* is neutral to the individuals: they face joy or aggression from the fellow men, but they react only by moving up and down on the hills and valleys and, since the horizon is so wavy and so far from them, they finally are lost in the communion with nature.

A moment on style

In Blaga, the style is the transposition of mental structures containing an ancient and continuous logic of natural determinism over man, transposed within his unconscious psychical world; the style is thus a psychological universal, manifested through *n* creative and living processes; in this respect, it is an essence which precedes the everyday existence of people. Blaga was from this standpoint an *anti-existentialist*, an *essentialist* (thus pertaining to a pre-modern representation of the human *ontos*: where the ontological data/ideas prefigure and explain the real existence of the individual concrete man). For Blaga, this existence only strengthens the immemorial style framing the human – here, Romanian – life.

This essentialism is, perhaps paradoxically, bound up with the principle of *separation* within the human being: this one aims certainly its ends related to the very material needs of life, but these needs and the practice they involve seem to not generate too important habits and structures of behaviour, at least not fundamental ones: i.e. they do not transform themselves into important explaining factors of the human life. On the contrary, the everyday practice of people is, at the one hand, *separated* from the profoundness of their spirit, as if the real life would be (as in the image of Plato) a non-important, superficial and transitory state of man, and this profoundness would be the only constant of man, and as if the unconscious – its explaining factor; and on the other hand, the everyday practice is only an illustration of the grounding role of the shapes imprinted upon the unconscious.

Further, Blaga's emphasising of the role of style as explaining factor of the concrete man – the concrete first decades of 20th century Romanians living in villages and confronting the problems of modern and, at the same time, contradictory, social-economical-political and cultural conditions – denotes an *anti-modern conception on time*. The modern view on time supposes the concept of time as depending on man, or more precisely, on his historical experiences, therefore the (*idea of*) *time not being at all an objective*

organisation and a corresponding territory, irrespective of (from the 13th century on) its forms of relief.

datum preceding these experiences. Consequently, in the human conscience there is a constitutive dialectic of the antecedent and the present time, where these (cultural) moments do not annul each other (nor in the explanation of the human endeavour) but the latter is, inherently, stronger than the former. But Blaga has somehow dissolved the historical experience of time (and the always present time) into an a-historical receptacle signalled by the eternal national style. In Blaga, a certain cultural style – namely, even though there are infinite possibilities to combine the cultural elements and to constitute different styles – is concluded, once it is constituted. Although the elements of the cultural style were forged during a historical interval, once they were finished they will no more change, nor will they leave space for new possible elements.

[Later on, Mircea Eliade has continued this standpoint, by stating that the definition of the human consciousness – namely of an abstract concept, like man, spirit etc. – should contain not only the idea of the historically and culturally shaping of experiences, but also the idea of “transconscious” which would comprise the religious motifs/symbols and states of mind that, keep attention, would transcend the historical conditioning¹. Here is, in my opinion, an epistemological confusion: between the levels of conceptualisation (and from this point of view there obviously are *reflective and general*, but also *abstract* concepts) and, on the other hand, the means the concepts are constituted through. These means are always historical and social/relational and only by these means could people arrive to universal patterns of thinking. But these universals have a historical and concrete content. Yes, “man in his totality is aware of ...the state of dreaming, or of the waking dream, or of melancholy, or of detachment, or of aesthetic bliss, or of escape etc.,” but, contrary to Mircea Eliade’s opinion that “none of these states is historical, although they are as authentic and as important for the human existence as man’s historical existence is”², all these states were shaped in a historical experience of people and have a historical and concrete content. More: our ability to detach our states of mind from their concrete content, or the epistemological patterns of thinking from their historical content, does not annul the historical formation of the concepts and the human states of mind and their awareness].

At the same time, in Blaga there is a kind of *fix determinism* of style upon culture: according to him, not only the popular, but also the learned

¹ Mircea Eliade, *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism* (1952), Translated by Philip Mairet (1961), Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1991, pp. 16-17.

² *Ibidem*, p. 33.

creations – including poetry, philosophy and science – bear the national cultural style that forms somehow boundaries that are difficult to surpass.

Space as a factor of style

This is Blaga's important idea, since we can go forward and have in our view the care towards space. But Blaga did not think to this very contemporary idea, the care about; he considered, on the contrary, that the *Mioritic space* is fix, unalterable and shaped profoundly in the Romanian soul, so as it cannot be the object of transformation. Promoted by the unconscious in both the Romanian *πράξις* and *θεωρία*, the *Mioritic space* is *static* (but does the unconscious promote only the static?) and generates an "organic mentality" of static existence, ignorance of the possible development – thus opposition to the dynamism of urban civilisation – and reserve towards all inputs provoking change.

But this static representation of both space and unconscious is *ideological*. The *Mioritic space* is a mythical realm legitimising not only the past trajectory of Romanians and their culture, but also the traditionalist ideology dominating consciously in the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th. As Constantin Noica – who oscillated between the criticism of the traditionalist motifs and the alignment to the ideological nationalistic viewpoint – has shown in 1944, in this nationalistic approach, illustrated also by Blaga, Romania is an a-historical and a-social model, the Romanian immemorial peasant is an image-fetish, and the Romanian marked by the *Mioritic space* and the pity induced by Orthodoxy is exterior to both the rational knowledge and doubt and the rational ethics of the imperative¹. As I mentioned, not only Blaga but also Noica have in the end considered that the genuine peasant soul is more authentic than that of the modern citizen dwelling in civilised cities. But this is an error following from a substitution: indeed, the temporal anteriority of a fact is not the same with the qualitative anteriority of worth of an ideological image. In fact, we simply cannot make a worth hierarchy of folklore and learned creations: authenticity pertains to all the historical models of man. But the concept itself of *authenticity* is so problematic that philosophy should be precautionous to use it without demonstrating its peculiarities.

¹ Constantin Noica, *Pagini despre sufletul românesc* [Pages about the Romanian soul] (1944), Bucureşti, Humanitas, 1991.

Instead of conclusions

Philosophy is different from the description of a model of culture and its meanings and causes, however metaphorical or even conceptual. Philosophy questions and configures the *meanings of life*, and in this perspective it must discover them as a result of the criticism of reality in all the mediated meanings of this last word. Obviously, Blaga has criticised some theories and theoretical levels concerning culture and knowledge. But what is missing from his approach is the inquiry of the *Weltanschauung* he shared. Heidegger said that philosophy is more than the supply of a *Weltanschauung*: the search for Being¹. Certainly it is. But just in order to undertake this search, one needs to question all its conditions, including the worldviews philosophers share. I mean here by “worldview” the *ideological presuppositions* which function as boundaries, not only framing but also limiting the development of the philosophical thinking.

Not only Blaga with his intellectual concept of space, but nor the promoters of the objectivistic view on space did criticized their own presumptions. But they wrote some centuries ago. Obviously, even Blaga can be pardoned for this fault. But we, who are living in an era of crisis, have understood that we have to question all our tenets: “in order to come nearer to Being”.

I was not interested in this paper about the psychology of the philosophical creation; I was concerned with the *intertwining between the ideological subtext and the ingeniousness of creation in the framework of philosophical theory*.

In Blaga, a specific space is a factor of cultural style. It transposes through n forms or mediations within the popular and learned cultural creation. Space is not the single factor, but it is the most important, since it constitutes the matter of a separate book in the philosopher’s *Trilogy of culture*².

What is very valuable is that space combines with the other factors: but also, I’m continuing Blaga, with the forms or mediations through which the spatial matrix has realised over time.

¹ Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology, Introduction* (1927), <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/index.htm>.

² Lucian Blaga, *Orizont și stil* [Horizon and Style], 1935, *Spațiul mioritic* [The Mioritic/Ewe-Space] 1936, *Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii* [The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture] 1937. He conceived of this trilogy form from the beginning and later on the three books were published under the name *Trilogia culturii* [The trilogy of culture].

What do all of these mean? That space is very important. Therefore, A) it matters *how do we define* space. In Blaga, the *Mioritic space* is both an *intellectual concept* signifying the labelling of a certain cultural space and, since it is also a *cultural model* as a result of the cultural style, a “*real space*”. (Consequently, being determined by the space, the cultural style is objective, exterior and somehow implacable). But B) it also matters *to what we relate man in his creative process*. And C) it also matters *what from man’s creation is socially important*.

Blaga’s representation about the distinction between *culture* and *civilisation* correlates with these three aspects. We should understand that he has assimilated the usual definition made by intellectuals, or rather by intellectuals in humanities, concerning culture and civilisation: the first covering the spiritual domain, without exterior and utilitarian ends¹, while the second – the material artefacts and structures serving these ends. But this understanding and separation reflects the historical division between the physical and intellectual labour and its fixing into a cliché – an intellectual and a-historical legitimating of the intellectual privileges.

Since the revelation of mystery realises through culture and only the cultural creation is the means man reveals mystery through, and since this relationship of man with mystery generates a cultural style, it results that the style is related only to culture, civilisation bearing only “a reflex”, a trace, a “mimicry” of the cultural style. Briefly, not civilisation, but culture is the essence of man, has Blaga considered.

But here is, on the one hand, a very important significance of Blaga’s conception. It is about *the worth of nature/space* – and here nature and space are objective: the hills and valleys of Transylvania – *as against the devaluation of the created objects of civilisation*. As we know, at least the thinkers from the precedent decades or contemporary with Blaga’s poetical and philosophical writings have arrived to the conscience of the problematic role of technology in the human life. After a precedent spring of techno-optimism, they began to see (at least after the First World War) the alienating force of technology through the forms of both the machines and the created objects; but, at the same time, they saw the help technology gave in order to improve man’s

¹ „Blaga despre cultura românească” [Blaga about the Romanian culture], Mircea Eliade de vorbă cu Lucian Blaga, „*Vremea*”, Anul X, Nr. 501, 22 August 1937, p. 10-11, reproduced in *Profetism românesc*, România în eternitate [Romanian prophets. Eternal Romania], Bucureşti, Editura “Roza vânturilor”, 1990: synthesising the ideas from *The genesis of the metaphor*, culture is what responds to the human need of *revealing the mystery*, while civilization – to the need of *self-conservation and security*. Blaga insisted that culture has a metaphorical nature, because mystery cannot be revealed otherwise: but if so, it results that the essence of man is culture, not civilization.

life. By the way, in the eyes of these thinkers would this improvement have led to the liberation of man for creation? Already Hegel, remembering Aristotle, has said that the ancient slaves were necessary in order to allow the spare time of the learned men and their creation of spiritual culture. But most of the modern thinkers were tributary to the intellectualist and spiritualist clichés related to the ideology of separation and hierarchy of the physical and intellectual labour: so as, like Blaga, they did not link the improving of civilisation (through technology) with the spiritual creation, with “culture”.

The objects reveal the relationship of man with time, said Heidegger. But these objects constitute only the vulgar civilisation, considered Blaga, and thus not they are those which determine the specificity of man, but culture or the spiritual creations as folklore, philosophy, myths and religion. More, not the objects determine the specificity of a people, but the spiritual culture and the specific cultural style. And if the objects confirming the Romanian are given and almost unchangeable long time, it results that not time is the main factor which explains man, but space. And space is always specific to a community, its significances are those discovered and created by a community. The Romanian peasant's space was a natural one, nature being familiar to him: by prolonging the household to a large space necessary to the transhumance climbing up the hills.

Blaga has not focused on technology. But his reasoning could be the following: in this specific natural space, the objects are not the enemies of man, as they already were understood by the Western philosophy, but accompany him in his endeavour to live naturally, in communion with nature. Within nature and with his inherent necessary objects in order to survive, the Romanian peasant does not behave mechanically as the Westerners do by borrowing from technology an existence lacked of soul but, on the contrary, they live according to their immemorial stylistic matrix. This cultural style explains the authenticity of man and this style forbids the Romanian peasant to change.

Strongly related to nature, the ancient objects could reveal the authentic nature of the Romanian peasant; the modern technology cannot transmit to modern Romanians any authentic spirit. The ancient technology was not violent towards nature, but only uncovered its internal potentialities – as, I add, in Aristotle the substance already contained within it the forms: the marble stone and the form of the possible statue –. The ancient technology did not calculate, did not aim at productivity and efficiency as the modern machine is inserted in a “chrematistic” economy. It rather prolonged the tendencies of nature and thus, has Blaga thought, the

Romanian peasant had and has not an alienating life, not even in the first decades of the 20th century: he works just as much as he could survive and have a spare time when he sings, dances and tells beautiful myths¹. The ancient technology did not subordinate man, as the modern does, but allowed harmony between nature and the human life.

Thus, Blaga has opposed to the modern Western care about man's time and being, the pre-modern perspective of a motionless time removing the change which would lead to in-authenticity; the only way to resist and to live a human life was to integrate within nature and the cultural style generated, though in a mediated way, by the *Mioritic space*.

Technology and man-technology relations have metaphysical meanings, as Marx and Nietzsche have shown. But Blaga's spiritualism overlooked the impact of technology on the style², since this one was created only by the spiritual creation, by culture, not by civilisation. Only nature could involve an authentic life; the modern technology was only mystifying man. Blaga has thus provided an undeclared defence against technology. But his position does not suppose an inquiry of the conjectures this position is based on. Obviously, it is interesting to compare it with Heidegger's theory and to characterize an entire conservative or traditionalist pattern of thinking, but epistemologically it is *ideological*.

On the other hand, the insistence of the modern thinkers, including Blaga, on the specific role of culture as "revealing mystery" could be seen through *epistemological* lens. Here "culture" simply covers the fundamental moment of creation, the moment of *thinking and knowing*. And from this standpoint, every creation, not only the spiritual, is the manifestation of the profound process of understanding the world, of realisation of some "glades" in the ocean of mystery. Obviously, folklore and the spiritual creation, both poetry and science³, seem to realise these glades more directly

¹ Certainly, Blaga was not original at all. Contemporary to him was an interesting economist and sociologist, Mircea Vulcănescu, who has written in 1932 the study *Gospodăria țărănească și economia capitalistă* [The peasant household and the capitalist economy] counter-posing the idealised Romanian middle size household – where the family members would have worked only to the limit of an easy survival, this one being considered by them more advantageous than hard working in order to have money necessary to insert in a modern life – and the capitalist striving for profit.

² But later on, André Leroi-Gourhan has considered that the cultural style is the result of human practices involving both spiritual and material sides.

³ Including science. In *Eonul dogmatic* [The Dogmatic Aeon], București, Cartea Românească, 1931, and *Cunoașterea luciferică* [Lucifer-type Knowledge], Sibiu, Tiparul Institutului de arte grafice "Dacia Traiană," 1933, Blaga has shown, preceding somehow Thomas Kuhn's distinction between the "normal" science and the scientific revolution, what

than the material objects; why this? Because they are *articulated*, i.e. they *present* the means people grasp the existence and express its meanings; did Heidegger not say that language is the shelter of Being?

Yes, but science does not ‘corresponds’ to a specific national space, but to a larger one, that of the deciphering of mystery by man. The scientific style comprises other factors than space: or, it comprises the universal space of knowledge.

Consequently, science and the scientific style do not have the characteristics of a people: but, can we add, they influence its trajectory, especially when they happen in its middle. Therefore, a cultural model is sending to aspects un-included within its accidental problematic.

The epistemological key distinguishing culture helps us to separate from the fetish of the specific national space that frames the cultural endeavours. When the peoples become modern – au fond, gone in for universal spaces, as the one of knowledge, or of technology, or of the world relations –, the former particular cultural styles and spaces have a historical and limited influence upon the human creation. In fact, *all styles and spaces have this limited influence*. But this pushes us to scrutinize with a critical eye the various presumptions partisan of one or another cultural style and space – be they local and narrow, or universal and large –. Both the immemorial and the un-modern Romanian inter-war peasant have belonged to a particular cultural space and the latter practically was forbidden to enter larger spaces. Nowadays, the Romanian is and is not integrated within these spaces: from a standpoint, it is – and this appurtenance seems to dangerously decrease the cultural specific it was the bearer; is it not a pity the disappearance of folklore, as the disappearance of a species of living being is? From another standpoint, the Romanian is prevented from entering the space of universal economy and culture – as the peripheral countries are prevented, or, from a class viewpoint, as the world “superfluous” people to the capital are hindered from – and has the easy way to “retreat from history” in order to survive somehow: but he retreats by losing *at the same time* the cultural specific – and thus becoming poorer than it was – and by hiding himself within irrational nationalistic clichés which do not help him at all. Is philosophy not the *sine qua non* tool to uncover the epistemology of all these wanderings and changing situation of man and communities?

As we know, the *unconscious* is a difficult concept. But Blaga’s intermediary origin of man’s cultural stereotypes in his relationships with

differences are between the “paradise type science” and the “Lucifer’s revolt” science and their common and interdependent function to know and to understand.

nature draws attention on the idea of *permanence* within man's life and culture. Blaga has suggested that the permanence is possible only through the unconscious, but is this suggestion not a source of further (critical) reflections?

Lucian Blaga has constructed his theory of space and culture in a time of crisis¹. The focus on what is *continuous* and *motionless* gives a sentiment of security, and the persistent cultural style somehow predestining a certain system of boundaries surrounding man – who is infinitely creative, but only *within* this system, let us not forget Blaga's theory – estranges culture from the life problems of society. Culture remains the spring of the human creativity, but if it is made only by some ones, how could the others be creative? By using the cultural results said Blaga – like the inter-war Romanian peasants who copied and prolonged the old folklore, demonstrating in this way their pertaining to the *Mioritic space* and its unmistakable cultural shade. This would have been Blaga's reasoning if he would have posed this question. But he did not pose it.

But our present reasoning may contain it and may present variants of questions and answers concerning man-culture relationships and the dialectic of *continuity and permanence* and *discontinuous* creation. A theory is interesting only if, starting from it, we can develop our representation about the world: and Blaga's theory – just because of its limits and fragmentary approach of man – pushes us to think more efficiently to the problems of culture and human understanding.

¹ I do not think here to the Great Depression and its continuation, but to the *monopoly phase crisis of capitalism*, emphasized by the First World War and continuing until the constitution of *state monopoly capitalism*. The Great Depression was only a climax, as the Second World War was another.

REFERENCES

- Αριστοτέλης, *Φυσικά*, (193a and b),
http://users.uoa.gr/~nektar/history/tributes/ancient_authors/Aristoteles/physicsica.htm.
- Blaga, Lucian, *Zamolxe. Mister păgân*, 1921 [*Zalmoxis: Obscure Pagan*, translated by Doris Planus-Runey, Iasi, RO, Oxford, GB, and Portland, USA: Center for Romanian Studies, 2000].
- Blaga, Lucian, "Revolta fondului nostru nelatin", *Gândirea*, 10, 1921 [The revolt of our non-Latin nature].
- Blaga, Lucian, *Eonul dogmatic* [The Dogmatic Aeon], București, Cartea Românească, 1931.
- Blaga, Lucian, *Cunoașterea luciferică* [Lucifer-type Knowledge], Sibiu, Tiparul Institutului de arte grafice "Dacia Traiană," 1933.
- Blaga, Lucian, *Orizont și stil* [Horizon and Style] București, Fundația pentru literatură și artă "Regele Carol II," 1935.
- Blaga, Lucian, *Spațiul mioritic* [The Mioritic/Ewe-Space], București, Cartea Românească, 1936.
- Blaga, Lucian, *Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii* [The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture], București, Fundația pentru literatură și artă "Regele Carol II", 1937.
- „Blaga despre cultura românească” [Blaga about the Romanian culture], Mircea Eliade de vorbă cu Lucian Blaga, reproduced in *Profetism românesc*, România în eternitate [Romanian prophets. Eternal Romania], București, Editura "Roza vânturilor", 1990.
- Blaga, Lucian, "Getica", *Saeculum*, Revistă de filozofie, Sibiu, I, 4, 1943, pp. 3-24.
- Bazac, Ana, "Lucian Blaga and Thomas Kuhn: The Dogmatic Aeon and the Essential Tension", *Noesis*, XXXVII, 2012, pp. 23-36.
- Caracostea, Dumitru, „Miorița la aromâni”, *Omagiu lui Ion Bianu* ["Mioritza at the Aromanians" *Homage to Ion Bianu*], București, 1927, reprinted in *Poezia tradițională română* [Romanian traditional poetry], II, București, 1969.
- Călinescu, George, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent* [History of the Romanian literature from the origin up to the present] (1941), București, Minerva, 1986.
- Cioran, Emil, *Schimbarea la față a României* [The Transfiguration of Romania], București, Vremea, 1936.
- Dan Dana, "Zamolxe de Lucian Blaga: între construcție și revoltă; un aspect al dezbaterii din jurul 'specificului național' în România interbelică" [Zamolxe by Lucian Blaga: between construction and revolt; an aspect of the debate concerning the 'national specific' in the inter-war Romania], *Phantasma*, 12, 2007, pp. 334-353, <http://www.phantasma.ro/caiete/caiete/caiete12/30.html>.
- Derrida, Jacques, *Khôra* (1987), Paris, Galilée, 1993.
- Eliade, Mircea, , *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism* (1952), Translated by Philip Mairet (1961), Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1991.

Eliade, Mircea, *De Zalmoxis à Gengis-Khan. Études comparatives sur les religions et le folklore de la Dacie et de l'Europe Orientale*, Paris, 1970.

Fochi, Adrian, *Miorița. Tipologie, circulație, geneză, texte*, București, Editura Academiei RPR, 1964 [Mioritza. Typology, circulation, genesis, texts].

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, *Outline for a General Introduction to Comparative Anatomy* (1795), §II,

<http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/goethe.htm>.

Hajdeu, Bogdan Petriceicu, *Istoria critică a românilor, Pământul Terrei Românești* [Critical history of the Romanians. The earth of the Romanian land], vol. I, București, 1875.

Hajdeu, Bogdan Petriceicu, *Cuvente den bătrâni, Limba română vorbită între 1550-1600*, vol. 2: Cărțile poporane ale românilor în secolul XVI [Words of yore, The spoken Romanian between 1550-1600, volume 2: The popular books of the Romanians in the 16th century], București, Noua Tipografie națională C.N. Rădulescu, 1879.

Heidegger, Martin, "On the Essence of Ground" (1929), *Pathmarks*, Edited and translated by William McNeill, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Iorga, Nicolae, *Balada populară românească, Originea și ciclurile ei* [The Romanian popular ballad. Its origin and cycles], Vălenii de Munte, Tipografia Neamul Românesc, 1910.

Iorga, Nicolae, *Albania și România, lecție de deschidere...*, Vălenii de Munte, "Neamul Românesc", 1915.

Iorga, Nicolae, *Histoire des Roumains de la Péninsule des Balkans (Albanie, Macédoine, Epire, Thessalie, etc.)*, București, Imprimeria Cultura neamului românesc, 1919.

Jones, Michael S., *The Metaphysics of Religion: Lucian Blaga And Contemporary Philosophy*, Cranbury, Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp., 2006.

Kant, Immanuel, *The Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn, Pennsylvania State University, 2010,

<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/kant/critique-pure-reason6x9.pdf>.

Kant, Immanuel, *The Critique of Aesthetic Judgement* (1790), Translated, with seven introductory essays, notes and analytical index by James Creed Meredith, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1911,

<http://archive.org/stream/critiquekantaest00kantuoft#page/n348/mode/1up>.

Koyré, Alexandre, *La philosophie et le problème national en Russie au début du XIX^e siècle*, Paris, Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion, 1929.

Le Goff, Jacques, "The Wilderness in the Medieval West" (1980), in Jacques le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination* (1985), Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, University of Chicago Press, 1998.

"Leibniz's third paper", in *Exchange of papers between Leibniz and Clarke* (1717), 2007, <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/lecl1.pdf>.

"Leibniz's fourth paper", 2 June 1716, in *Exchange of papers between Leibniz and Clarke* (1717), 2007, <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/lecl1.pdf>.

Marx, Karl, *Theses on Feuerbach*, I (1845),

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>.

- Muthu, Mircea, "Homo balcanicus", *Caietele Echinox*, 3, Teoria și practica imaginii. 2. Imaginar social, ediție Corin Braga, 2001, pp. 32-40.
- Nadin, Mihai, "The exotic – an example of a diagonal category", *Revue roumaine des sciences sociales – Philosophie et logique*, 20, 1, 1976, pp. 41-49.
- Newton, Isaac, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Londini, Jussu Societatis Regiæ ac Typis Josephi Streater. Prostat apud plures Bibliopolas Anno MDCLXXXVII (1686), Scholium, II, III, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28233/28233-h/28233-h.htm>.
- Noica, Constantin, *Pagini despre sufletul românesc* [Pages about the Romanian soul] (1944), București, Humanitas, 1991.
- Pătrașcu, Horia, "The Morphology of Culture in Romania. Lucian Blaga (1895-1965) The Passage from Axiology to the Ontology of Culture", *European Academic Research*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, April 2012, <http://www.euacademic.org/UploadArticle/1.pdf>.
- Philippide, Alexandru, *Originea românilor - vol. II. Ce spun limbile română și albaneză* [Origin of the Romanians. What tell the Romanian and Albanian languages], Iași, Tipografia „Viața Românească”, 1928.
- Plato, *Timaeus*, 52a and b, <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/physis/plato-timaeus/space.asp?pg=4>.
- Reclus, Élisée, *La Terre, description des phénomènes de la vie du globe*, Paris, Hachette, 2 vol., 1869; *Nouvelle Géographie universelle, la Terre et les hommes*, Paris, Hachette, volume 1, 1876.
- Ricoeur, Paul, *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (1975), Translated by Robert Czerny with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello, S. J. (1977), London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2004.
- Schorske, Carl E., *Fin-De-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (1980), New York, Vintage Book 1981.
- Spinoza, Benedict de, *The Ethics* (1677), Translated from the Latin by R. H. M. Elwes, I, prop. XXIX, Note, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm>.