

# CLASSIC AND MODERN IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE

**Professor Alexandru Boboc, Ph.D**  
*Member of the Romanian Academy*

**Abstract:** *The brief considerations highlighted bellow emphasize the significance of the most important moments in the historic evolution of the concept of style. The Modern contributions (mainly Classical and Romantic), which led gradually to a more in depth understanding of the style as a modality of union and harmonization of the human creation, should be center staged. Nevertheless, we consider that style developments under the insignia of "cultural style" brought into focus the core issues of a modern philosophy of culture.*

**Keywords:** *cultural style, classic, romantic, value, culture, creative being.*

1. The phrase "classical culture" relays us (through a conversion that gives a different horizon of meaning) to the understanding of the adjective "classical" (and of the noun "classicism") as an intentional, decisive factor in the configuration of the culture-phenomenon existing both universally (therefore value wise) and specifically (in stylistic coordinates) through its presence in an era of interconnecting ages of history.

In other words, the *sui generis* complementarity of the axiological and stylistic concepts seems nevertheless justified. From the background of ideas of modern thinking we can portray hereby the following reference formulas:

"Culture is the essence of possessions that we cherish for their value."<sup>1</sup>

"Culture is, above all, the unity of artistic style in all vital manifestations of a people." It is "eine Einheit des Stils."<sup>2</sup>

"Cultural creation is ... a fantastic creation of the human spirit ... of metaphysical nature and of revealing intentions and bears a stylistic insignia".<sup>3</sup>

It should be noted that style has gradually become a central concept, firstly in the philosophy of art and secondly in modern reconstruction of the philosophy of culture. "Style, like type, groups works of art by their similarity of structure", "type groups works of art around one art constituent moment or another, or around their totality. However, style groups them by their artistic agent, be it artistic individuality, an époque, a nation or even an entire cultural circle. For this reason one can speak of an individual style, such as the style of Dante or Shakespeare, an epochal style, such as Romantic or Gothic, French or German style, and modern or antique style."<sup>4</sup>

We should not forget the truth behind the famous expression: "Objects are outside the man, style is the man himself. Style can be neither excluded nor be moved, or altered: if elevated and sublime, the author will be equally admired at all times"...<sup>5</sup>

Even other contexts of the reflection ("classical") refer to man as a creative being: "Wer den Dichter Will verstehen, / Mussa in Dichters Lande gehen" ("If one wishes to

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Rickert, (1924), *Kant als Philosoph der modernen Kultur*, Tübingen, Mohr, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. Nietzsche, (1980), *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*, I, în: *Sämtliche Werke*, Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden, dtv,; Bd. 1, p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> L. Blaga, (1969), *Trilogia culturii*, E.L.U., Bucharest, p. 323.

<sup>4</sup> T. Vianu, (1975), *Studii de stilistică*, în: *Opere*, vol. 4, Bucharest, p. 10 – here the statement that: „Through style, Shakespeare’s drama is unique, through type, it belongs ... to the Baroque form of art.”

<sup>5</sup> B.-F.L. Buffon, (1753), *Discours à l’Académie Française*, in: *Pages choisies*, Librairie Larousse, p. 73.

understand the poet, he should travel in the poet's land") wrote J.W. Goethe<sup>6</sup>, marking the poet's calling through what he established to be "the poet's land (world)."

Beyond the (multiple) meanings throughout a long history - starting from the expression of a creator (musician, poet, painter, sculptor, etc.), the inner structure of the art of a certain era, "lifestyle", the main way of structuring the life and works of an era (Romantic, Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque, etc.), to the *essence* of all cultural creations, and culture as a whole, "cultural style."<sup>7</sup>

**2.** This renewal through "cultural style» was conditioned at first, by the exceeding of the classification of "styles" after "assessing or distancing from nature of such artistic creations and the "understanding of art as autonomous", because "in the process of the creation of art and the creation of artistic works, the main role is played by ... certain attitudes and values, both conscious and unconscious, through which the human spirit is guided out of any relationship with nature."<sup>8</sup>

The embracing of stylistic diversity in an exemplary unit: "cultural style", presents valences applicable to understanding the phenomena of artistic creation. In this vein, Nietzsche, for instance, looks for the reasoning behind the unity between myths, poetry and music, conceiving art as a "function of life", the expression of "a metaphysical sense of life", which gives culture creative force and unity.

The text from *The Birth of Tragedy Out of the Spirit of Music* (1872) is enlightening: "Tragedy absorbs the supreme, orgiastic qualities of music, so that in Greek culture, as in our own, it effectively brings music to fulfillment, but then allies it with the tragic myth and the tragic hero...Between the universal validity of its music and the receptive Dionysian auditory, tragedy places a sublime symbolic allegory – myth – and awakens in the listener the illusion that music is merely a supreme presentational device to enliven the plastic world of myth... Myth shields us from music, but it also grants music its supreme freedom for the first time. In return, music bestows on the tragic myth a moving and convincing metaphysical significance to which word and image alone, without that unique source of help, could never attain."<sup>9</sup>

Under the thrill of a "metaphysical feeling", creative beings give meaning to their own lives in ways of living integrated in an organic unity, associating them as a "Kulturstil." As previously observed, Nietzsche "seeks to establish 'the archetypal phenomenon' of a culture, just as Goethe sought it in botany or in the color theory. For the Greek culture Nietzsche detected in the core phenomenon the Apollonian and Dionysian twin principles... The conception implies a polarity of terms... which are mutually interdependent."<sup>10</sup>

The idea was further intercepted in the "morphology of culture", centered by a new understanding of the phenomenon - style ("cultural style"): "As an 'archetypal phenomenon' (Urphänomen) of any universal history", *culture* can be regarded as the 'habitus' of a plant, i.e. "its external appearance. I speak of the '*liabitus*' of ancient Indian and Egyptian cultures, its history or spirituality. An undefined sense of this *habitus* lies at the base of *the concept of style (Stilbegriff)*"; as "a determined length of life and a determined *tempo* of development" are also part of the *habitus* of a "group of organisms", these concepts "cannot be excluded from a structural determination of history. The tact of the ancient Greek existence was different than the Egyptian or Arab one. One may speak of

---

<sup>6</sup> J.W. Goethe, (1819), *Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West - östlichen Divan*.

<sup>7</sup> Al. Boboc, (2005), *Formă și valoare în orizontul filosofiei culturii*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 23.

<sup>8</sup> L. Blaga, (1968), *Zări și etape*, București, p. 58.

<sup>9</sup> Fr. Nietzsche, *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*, în: *Sämtliche Werke*, Bd. 1, p. 134.

<sup>10</sup> L. Blaga, *op. at.*, p. 188.

an *Andante* of Greco-Roman spirit and of *Allegro con brio* of Faustian spirit”, i.e. modern<sup>11</sup>.

3. Apparently “classic”, the debate on style has not lost its actuality. What is required before anything else is the understanding of style as a medium in which the humane comes as human (value wise) in multiple ways, which are forms of cultural creativity (language, myth, art, science, philosophy, etc.). Therefore, in each of these forms a variety of styles can be found, all as part of the possible unity called “cultural style”, which does not invalidate the specific (“styles”) nor the oppositions between the active styles in an era of culture, but sets them in an interaction that is significant for understanding the meaning of culture.

It was widely spoken about “stylistic inconsistency”: “Even in a model era, such as that of the Greek Classicism, Nietzsche himself discovers two completely opposite style configurations at the same time. If the Apollonian and the Dionysian present a style discrepancy between two distinct art genres, then many other artistic eras indicate a similar gap also within a unique artistic domain.<sup>12</sup>”

However, the irreducible diversity of styles within one and the same artistic period does not come against a convergence. It should be noted that a unique, attributive denomination contains “two distinct meanings, both the defined *current* and the broader *moment*, within which that specific current makes its way into, meaning style and super-style framework, which may incorporate unitarily several types of frames - for example: the term Romanticism or the Romantic style, the proper Romantic current and the whole Romantic era.

We must not forget, of course, the personal style that defines each artist. This style is identified by integrating the artist “in the configurative unit of a particular historical moment. We identify Shakespeare first as an exponent of the Renaissance or the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and only afterwards as a representative of the Baroque framework<sup>13</sup>.”

We must remember the determinative “style” is a permanent part of culture, which configures the expressions in the creation of cultural epochs “be they permanent (of any culture), or “regional “(in the sense of “the morphology of the draw well”, what Spengler called the “soul” of culture).

“Beyond the appearance of a *great style* from the essence of the macrocosm, from the *primary symbol* (Ursymbol) of a *great culture*”, we have to consider that: “the Renaissance style flourishes only in a Renaissance city, the Baroque style in a Baroque town, not to mention the great Corinthian columns, the Rococo ... The peasant and the peasant houses throughout the Western Europe remained in the Gothic style, up until today. Hellenistic *regions* and the Egyptian village retained the geometric style of the old Empire.<sup>14</sup>”

More so (apropos to “personal style” and “sub-style”): “The peoples of early cultures gradually became urban peoples, resulting therefore in cities having certain physiognomies such as Armenian or Syrian, Ionian or Etruscan, Germanic, French, or English. There's a city of Phidias, one of Rembrandt, one of Luther's”...<sup>15</sup>

Art historians have pointed out the “double origin of the style: “If we leave aside the constraints arising from submission to a common model, the divergence between the different *individual styles* appears to still be stronger. Botticelli and Lorenzo di Credi belong to the same era and to the same people: both are Florentines from the last part of

---

<sup>11</sup> O. Spengler, (1963), *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* Vollständige Ausgabe, München, p. 146, 147.

<sup>12</sup> E. Papu, (1974), *Arta și umanul*, Bucharest, p. 19-20.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 39.

<sup>14</sup> O. Spengler, *op. cit.*, p. 258, 664.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 665.

the Quattrocento” but “a huge variety of highly differentiated individual expressions was created with relatively limited elements.”<sup>16</sup>

*Mutatis mutandis*, this could also be justified through an analogy of the specific (and the definition) classical ideal of man, “although the fruit of an epoch in its history” is “an eternal structure, a permanent human model, capable of being restored and of directing human culture at any time ... because it represents a group of ethical trends so logically interconnected, that, by their own inner necessity, rise above any temporal determination.”<sup>17</sup>

Beginning with Goethe (whom Vianu considers to be a prototype of the interaction of the dimensions of rationality, in this respect: “Classical model”), “to educate a man is to harmoniously develop the power of nature within him, as he does with the objects that he creates. The idea of working on one’s own formation, just like an artist leaning over his materials, is a Goethean idea...”<sup>18</sup>

As a historian of culture, Vianu calls to other models (and not just any ones!): “Beethoven has bequeathed us one of the most magnificent monuments of art in the German culture in the era through which the 18<sup>th</sup> century ends and the next begins... It was the era of Goethe and Schiller, of Hegel, of Beethoven. The contribution of all these individuals, plus that of a large number of thinkers, poets and artists, in a time of great fertility, similar in worldwide importance with the Italian Renaissance, formed a new spiritual stage, so unitary, that the works of poetry, philosophy and music, which illustrate it, cannot be well understood if pulled out from their ensemble, if we deprive them of the light each one of them bestows upon the other. The results of the last three or four centuries of culture have gathered in works of art and profound thinking of this time, augmented by everything which contemporary times have added as their individual expression.”<sup>19</sup>

4. Actually, the answer to the question “What is a Classic?” is not so simple. “A delicate issue - Sainte-Beuve wrote - and which might deliver very different solutions, according to times and places”; “a true classic ... is an author that has enriched the human spirit, that has truly increased its treasure, forcing it to take a step further, that has revealed an unequivocal moral truth or captured an eternal passion in our hearts, where everything seemed to have been experienced and already explored; that expressed his thought, observation or invention, in whatever form, but in the same time broad and large, fine and common-sensical, healthy and beautiful; that addressed all in an *individual style* (subl. n) and which belongs also to the entire world, in a new style, without neologisms, new and old, slightly contemporary to all ages<sup>20</sup>.”

Therefore, we find here a significant characterization: a “Classic” (here in Literature) through what he is during his era and what he continues to be throughout his “contemporary” style during the eras to come. The definition of the concept of “classic” encompasses conditions as wisdom, moderation and rationality, harmony and color, taste and care to fit together “phrase and idea.” Perhaps there is something “classical” in the way in which the idea of art is configured (in general) and the idea of beauty, in particular. But this is beyond the “classical theory of art” and beyond the theory of ideas “in the sense of “normative” aesthetics”.<sup>21</sup>

The “Classic” (“Classicism”, “classical”) has (terminologically) a fluctuation of

---

<sup>16</sup> H. Wolfflin, (1968), *Principii fundamentale ale istoriei artei. Problema evoluției stilului în arta modernă*, Bucharest, p. 19, 20.

<sup>17</sup> T. Vianu, (1980), *Idealul clasic al omului*, în: *Opere*, vol. 9, Bucharest, Ed. Minerva, p. 100.

<sup>18</sup> T. Vianu, (1978), *Trei momente în istoria conștiinței estetice*, în: *Opere*, vol. 7, p. 495.

<sup>19</sup> *Beethoven în istoria culturii*, în: *Opere*, vol. 9, p. 700.

<sup>20</sup> *Portrete literare*, în *Clasicismul*. Antologie, vol. II, Bucharest, 1969, p. 343.

<sup>21</sup> E. Panovsky, (1975), *Ideea. Contribuții la istoria teoriei artei*, București, Ed. Univers, p. 65, 67.

meanings, particularly through coverage of the "classical" form, mostly used for literary movements: French Classicism in the XVIII Century, etc.

The word "Classicism" first appears in Aulus Gellius (second century Roman author AD) in his writing "Noctes Atticae": "classicus scriptis non proletarius": "... any of the poets and orators' old cohort, i.e. any first rank writer (classicus) and of good background (assiduus) and non-proletarian (proletarius).<sup>22</sup>

Thus, the origin of *classicus* refers to "first rank", "excellent", "superior": "It seems that during the Middle Ages the term was not used at all, and throughout the Renaissance, it reappears in the Latin language and soon thereafter in the vernacular languages. The current is first recorded in the French language in Sébillot Thomas' "*L'Art poétique*", and "it was not associated with classical antiquity, simply meaning "dedicated", "higher", "excellent".<sup>23</sup>

But "the decisive event for developing the concept of "Classicism" was - Wellek writes - after all, the great controversy between Classicism and Romanticism launched in Germany by the Schlegel brothers after which the „transformation of the word "classic" occurred, thus becoming a denominator for a trend or stylistic time period."

German literature comprises (in the 19th century) the terms "Klassik" and "klassisch" avoiding "Klassizismus" and especially "klassizistisch", and, as O. Harnack expresses (*Der Deutsche im Zeitalter Goethes Klassizismus*, Berlin, 1906), a distinction is made between "Klassizismus", imitation of antiquity, and "Klassik", referring to works of the great German classics, Goethe and Schiller.

In general, the German literary field makes a distinction between "Klassizismus" and "Klassik" (a current of ideas in the late 18th century and early 19th century), as opposed to "Romantik".

The term "classic" (Klassik) gradually acquired the significant meaning of "established", "model", a stylistic expression linked to ancient writers, thus overshadowed. "Looking back, said Wellek, we see clearly that the term "classicism" "belongs to the nineteenth century. It appears in 1818 in Italy ("classicismo"), in 1820 in Germany, in 1822 in France, in 1830 in Russia and in 1831 in England. In Germany, around the year 1887, the term "Klassik", invented by Friedrich Schlegel in 1797, replaced the term "Klassizismus." It is clear that the terms have something in common: they imply perfection, authority, and a bond with the antiquity", which does not exclude a "neoclassical" stage in which (German classicism, in particular) "it will reveal itself to us as Romantic".<sup>24</sup>

Applying the term "classic" to literary works must be differentiated, especially in the period described herein, as the formula "Klassik und Romantik" was already in trend. Even Fr. Schlegel expresses (as early as the year 1800) hope that Goethe will establish "the harmonization of the Classic with the Romantic".<sup>25</sup>

A.W. Schlegel achieved a characterization of Goethe's position in a similar manner: his theory reflected the "forms of antiquity separately", he rediscovered the romantic element in itself and made it possible for it to prevail in writings of indissoluble intent".<sup>26</sup>

**5.** Note that all said here will not support (or suggest, even!) that the permanence (value) in question (the "classic") would overshadow anything as a personal style of one creator (artist, poet, musician, etc.) to support through expression-forms established generally and absolutely by him, within the stylistic phenomenon of any cultural era.

---

<sup>22</sup> A. Gellius, (1965), *Noptile atice*, trad. de David Popescu, București, p. 483.

<sup>23</sup> R. Wellek, (1970), *Conceptele Criticii*, București, p. 384. v. *Ibidem*, p. 386.

<sup>24</sup> R. Wellek, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

<sup>25</sup> *Gespräche über die Poesie*, 1800, in: *Kritische Schriften*, München, 1956, p. 334.

<sup>26</sup> *Privire generală asupra literaturii germane*, în: A.W. și Fr. Schlegel, *Despre literatură*, București, Ed. Univers, 1983, p. 181.

In other words, “classic” is not to be viewed as a pattern to be followed, but as an appetite for organizing and positioning oneself under the sign of the universe. The eras of human creation (of arts, in this case) function not as a series enumerated logically, but as a circle- in circle, so that what has been established (as value) does not remain “behind” (in the genesis era), but is always present. In this “age” of establishments of works of art, it can be no longer a discussion of a relationship of succession but rather one of coexistence. Somehow, as Nietzsche said: “Es gibt kein Ende in der Zeit”.

The living in such a horizon aspires to an existence within expression. “We have sufficient reasons - Blaga wrote - to suppose that man, manifesting himself creatively, will not manage it in any other way, but under a stylistic framework. Indeed, a more exigent frequenting of cultural history, art history, ethnography, will leave one under the impression that in creative manifestations there is no such thing as a stylistic void. What seems as a lack in style is not in fact “lacking”, but rather a chaotic mixture of styles, an overlapping, an interference”<sup>27</sup>.

We must distinguish living in style (within a certain style) and its conscience in a theoretical context. “Generally- Blaga continues - it took a long time for men to notice that their lives revolved in a perpetual stylistic framework. The reason for this belated awakening is that, in the presence of style, especially in its deeper layers, occurs only in a particular place, for a particular time and it is somehow equal and continuous. Style is like a supreme yoke, we live for its servitude, but only rarely do we feel it as such.”...<sup>28</sup>

It requires taking a few steps back from the phenomenon of “style” (of culture) “in order to acquire the system of necessary benchmarks that describe and catalog this phenomenon ... we are constrained to move within a very narrow range, when talking about the style of a painting, but within a wider scope when we talk about an era or style of an entire culture. The concept of style actually remains just about the same, more or less, it just becomes more abstract or more concrete, and it is increasing or reducing the number of concretes which it subsumes.”<sup>29</sup>

6. The coverage under “stylistic angle” is not so easy in terms of diversity of creative works in a cultural era. “It is not easy to embrace, in the few characteristic notes, Rembrandt’s style, is paramount however to highlight, for instance, the stylistic unity, where all these elements are gathered, recomposing the colossal, but secret organism, dispersed Baroque extremities”<sup>30</sup>.

It becomes much more difficult when, apart from the works of art, that “works of metaphysical thought, or even institutions and social structures should be considered. One must have acquired some knowledge about flight and glide over details when it comes to sight coverage, within the same stylistic ensemble, such as the French classical tragedy, Leibniz’s metaphysics, infinitesimal mathematics and the absolutist state. But only from afar will these dominating attitude detect common stylistic notes of these different historical moments, of content however dispersed (such notes would be common: a thirst for perspective, the total of frantic passion, hierarchical spirit, excessive credit given to reason, etc.. From such notes should we recompose “the Baroque”).<sup>31</sup>

Among others, it should be noted, states E. Papu: “Baroque is still an uncertain notion (it is clearly about” Baroque “in the sense of inclusion as creations-n.n.), elastic, relative, a living cell, poetic (sublime. n), mischievous, which changes unexpectedly in shape and size and the place where I knew it last. It has the amoeba-like character of an unstable

---

<sup>27</sup> L. Blaga, (1969), *Orizont și stil*, în: *Trilogia culturii*, ELU, București, p. 3-4.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p.4.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*.

protoplasmic mass”.<sup>32</sup>

This is unlike “Classicism” that “through his known experience of balance, the measure, of temperance, shown to be penetrated by a *reductive* passion. It has the pleasure of the cleaning, the spinning, the continuous removal of matter, for an object to reach the polishing stage. The Classic senses the joy of reduction in all respects.<sup>33</sup>

Continuing the comparison framework, it is then said: “The Romantic and especially the Gothic develops an inclusive passion. It is an experience that finds its proper, adequate artistic expression in the broadest trend of all arts, the architecture”.<sup>34</sup>

Then it is followed by the statement: “living at the core of music is not of a reductive nor inclusive nature, but of a penetrating one. This art conquers not from afar, but from within, not reducing or containing and covering things, but penetrating into things ... Such a virtue is extended in Romanticism within all arts. Only then are they able to acquire their penetrating capacity of music.<sup>35</sup>

Starting from an idea that Jean Paul initiated (*Vorschule der Ästhetik*, Part II: “the Romantic is like the resonance of a string or a bell” that walks us through and sounds out from within us once silence has installed), the author believes that this “includes actually within it the definition of living the musical momentum. Unlike the deployment of a theatrical performance, musical resonance may still works within us, long after the silence replaces it. There is the distinction between the *Penetration* fact and that of *the Revelation*, which occurred in this case as a distinction between *Romanticism* and *Baroque*.<sup>36</sup>

Also in regard to the differentiation of styles: Baroque- Classical-Romantic: “Baroque devalues Classicism for its limited geometrical exposure, which would reduce and simplify, in a childish manner, the endless complexity of things. Romanticism, on the contrary, disregards it not for its geometry, but for its limited organicity which will outdatedly exclude its tremendous views on the nature of living life. In fact, neither of these two incriminations, both non-convergent, do not correspond to classical frameworks. Baroque sees it as a type of infantile abstractionism, and views Romanticism as dead Formalism. In fact, the two styles do not define Classicism, but define themselves through negation, by what they are not and do not wish to be”<sup>37</sup>.

Opposing both the “classical closed form”, the Baroque and Romanticism”, they set apart from the completely separate registers however, where each of their open forms react. <sup>38</sup>”

It is however important to remember the specifics of Romanticism: “in artistic creations everywhere, Romanticism has been mentioned as style just once: in its historical moment. Only then had mankind first tried full and absolute emancipation of all its mental functions. Hence the hive off and the unchaining of brilliant subjectivity, which, marking an unprecedented phenomenon, has created from itself an inner form and thus a style.<sup>39</sup>

However, much remains to be discussed (and even more to be understood): starting with the differentiating (and the unity) of the shapes of universality (meaning, style, value) to the elusiveness of creation and creative mystery of the creative work itself (of any kind) in the persistent charm of human comprehension. In this respect, the style is the designated form to be, as Goethe stressed, “the highest peak that art has reached and

---

<sup>32</sup> *Barocul ca tip de existență*, I, Ed. Minerva, București, 1977, p. 13.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 28.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 29.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 30.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 50.

<sup>37</sup> E. Papu, (1980), *Existența romantică. Schiță morfologică a romantismului*, București, p. 47-48.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 52.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem Opere*, vol. 9, p. 209.

will ever reach again.”

A presentation around what we call “classic” from the very beginning would require some clarification: a) “classic” has to be defined by “Classicism” (as a formula-type of significance of an epoch in the history of human creation, in history of literary art - such as French literary Classicism in the eighteenth century), b) “classic” emerges and occurs as a type of organization of works of art in terms of style and culture throughout history, and therefore, becoming defined only in an approach that brings together several disciplines: linguistics, literary theory, esthetics and, last but not least, the philosophy of culture.

“The moral ideal before which Goethe breaks to note is one of the most significant crossroads in the evolution of European culture ... The ideal Faustian ethics, is shaped after anyone's moral dimension ...”<sup>40</sup>

Without daring to believe that I provided the best characterization of the topic undertaken here, I hope that I have at least incentivized you to embrace a moment from the history of thinking, moment which is also a plenary affirmation of Romanian philosophical school. „*Dosis d' olige te phile te*” (Homer, Odyssey, VI, 208).

---

<sup>40</sup> T. Vianu, *Faust și civilizația modernă*, p. 179.