

P. P. NEGULESCU - THE PHILOSOFER TEACHER, "STYLE AND MEASURE GIVER"

GABRIELA POHOAȚĂ*

The teacher P.P. Negulescu had a single ideal that was also his method: the research without prejudices of truth, respect and teaching truth. Being faithful to himself, he was faithful to all great ideals of human being.

*Camil Petrescu***

Abstract: *We start from the premise that the philosopher P.P. Negulescu did not create a philosophical system, even if he wrote „Destinul omenirii” („The Human Destiny”) and „Geneza formelor culturii” („The Genesis of the culture forms”). The article proposes to illustrate, on the basis of genuine texts, the personality of the „creator of style” philosophy professor. P.P. Negulescu was an encyclopaedic mind that made an interdisciplinary research in consonance with the contemporary trends in science and philosophy.*

Keywords: *Philosophy, science, culture, style, philosophical system.*

There are few known things about the Romanian philosopher P.P. Negulescu as a teacher, and this justifies and honours our demarche. Romanian philosophical pedagogy would be incomplete without the research and analysis of the role of this personality in Romanian educational system. When we say the name of P.P. Negulescu, our mind heads towards the greatness of his works like: **Filosofia Renașterii**, **Destinul omenirii**, **Geneza formelor culturii** and other remarkable works of philosophical historiography that are indisputable contribution in the history of Romanian thinking. *Maiorescu was his model by excellence, the absolute model.*

* Senior lecturer Ph.D, - "Dimitrie Cantemir" Christian University, Bucharest.

** Petrescu C., *Profesorul și gânditorul P.P. Negulescu*, în *Teze și antiteze*, Bucharest, 1936.

1. P.P. Negulescu is known as being one of the exponents of Maiorescu's ideas. He was one of the young persons selected by the teacher and was going to become one of the most brilliant disciples of Titu Maiorescu. He was, in 1891, when he caught the attention of his teacher, only 19 years old (he was born in Ploiesti in October 14/27, 1872). His meeting with the great professor was going to change his destiny. After graduating high school, the young Negulescu, not aspiring towards philosophical thinking, went to the faculty of sciences from the University of Bucharest. His chance was determined by the recommendations of a colleague that advised him to go to a class of history of philosophy held by Maiorescu. It happened in that class (where it was, as usual, a numerous public - not only students), that the teacher started to comment about the classification of sciences in the work of August Comte. P.P. Negulescu was so absorbed by the quality of the lecture and of the interrogations of philosophy that he decided to abandon positive sciences for philosophy. He went in that year to all lectures of Maiorescu with a great delight that was more than the discovery of a new horizon. It was a real revelation. **The revelation of the real vocation.** In the following year, maybe 1891, he became student at the Faculty of letters, getting pretty fast in the area of interest of the teacher. Just the way that he was going to confess later, in 1938, that meeting with the one that was going to become his spiritual teacher was "a significant event - I would say essential - from my intellectual life"¹. He wasn't just part of the audience in the class of Maiorescu, but also an active attendant of the seminary of the teacher, being remarked by the teacher. Maybe the moment when the teacher selected him was caused by the presentation, during the seminary, of an "uncommonly large" work about Spencer. The work, remembers the ex-student, "enjoyed the special attention of Maiorescu.

He said some words of encouragement (at the University) and invited me for a longer conversation at home, where, for my surprise, also invited me to lunch"².

The conversation and the invitation to lunch had the significance of cooptation, part of the ceremonial of the host. From that inaugural moment, Negulescu participated to the main meetings (the ones of *Junimea*) and to smaller ones (with the group of young students). Of course, both held in the well-known house from Mercury Street. Since

¹ P.P. Negulescu, *Ceva despre Maiorescu*, in *Convorbiri literare*, 1938, p.74.

² *Ibidem*, p.75.

university years, young Negulescu became collaborator of the Journal *Convorbiri literare*. It is important to highlight that, even if he was only 20 years old, P.P. Negulescu debuted in this publication with the study called *Psihologia stilului (The psychology of style)*, that appeared in three numbers of the journal (no. 2, 3 and 4 from 1892), required, if not imposed by his teacher Titu Maiorescu because he realised that he can make from his disciple a redoubtable adversary in the polemic with Gherea. This was an attempt to prove that modernity in aesthetics is not the exclusive privilege of Gherea; because it is known the fact that Romanian cultural life was dominated, in that period, by the polemic Gherea- Junimea³.

Negulescu graduated the faculty in 1892 with a bachelor degree theme about *Critica apriorismului și a empirismului (The criticism of the apriorism and empiricism)*, probing the sure vocation for philosophy. Almost three quarters of a year he remains in Ploiesti, waiting for a happy solution for his career. Hardly, in April 1894- with the insistence of Maiorescu - the Ministry of Instructions and Cults gave him a subvention for a study trip in France and Germany. He carefully researches libraries and museums from the capital of France and then the ones from Berlin and other German cities. He reads a lot and to advantage, he writes his useful aesthetic works for *Convorbiri*, gets used to the atmosphere of academic life in famous European centres.

In October 1894, after returning in Romania, he takes - with the help of Maiorescu - the place of lecturer in philosophy at the University from Iasi. After two years, in 1896, the job of lecturer of Negulescu is converted into teacher, being the titular (the official grade of titular being given in 1899)- of the chair on history of modern philosophy and logics. He became, at only 24 years old, teacher of philosophy, without doctorate. And this, thanks to the protection of his teacher. But didn't Titu Maiorescu become, some decades before, having a doctorate in philosophy from Giessen, philosophy teacher at 21 years old and rector at 24? Negulescu, his most trusty disciple, was rewriting the case of his great teacher. Let us add that in 1910, after the retirement of Maiorescu, Negulescu transfers at the University of Bucharest, having the title of titular at the history and encyclopaedia of philosophy desk, staying in here till retirement (1940).

His teaching career was on stable pillars since 1896. He became a personality of scientific and public life (as an important member, till 1914, of the Conservator Party). His notoriety was growing on all levels, both in

³P.P. Negulescu, *Ceva despre Junimea, Convorbiri literare*, 1937, p.55.

academic and scientific domain and in public life. Or, both as teacher, author of history of philosophy studies (in 1910 he published his first volume, very well received in the *Filosofia Renașterii* (*The philosophy of Renaissance*)) and first exponent of public life (he was minister at Cults and Public Instruction twice – in 1920-1921 and 1926-, in the governing of the People Party, whose member he was since the beginning). After the apparition in 1914 of the second volume of *Filosofia Renașterii*, he is chosen, in 1915, correspondent member of the Romanian Academy. Till the '30, the great esteem that he had was unanimous in public conscience. He is sure that “laic monarchism that kept him away from the world and its wounds” (Anton Dumitriu), “the supreme intellectual fairness imposed till ascetic” (Camil Petrescu), the rationalism, evolutionism and the great European orientation of P.P. Negulescu could have been less accepted by an expansive and explosive generation that preferred to approach, with good faith and without a dissimulated initial admiration, to all that meant in that moment of crisis, a philosophy of mystery, of abyss, an orthodox and ethnic orientation as the one illustrated by Nae Ionescu and Nechifor Crainic. Even if he was combated with vehemence, Negulescu carried on with his scientific concerns and the works that he publishes were – sometimes – savant answers to the ideology and philosophy propagated by antagonist groups. *Geneza formelor culturii* from 1934, *Destinul omenirii* (first four volumes appear between 1938- 1944 and *postum*, in 1971 it is published the fifth volume). Finally, between 1941 and 1944 he writes the five volumes from *Istoria filosofiei contemporane*. Almost all of these works, like others, that appeared *postum*, (*Problema cunoașterii*, 1969, *Problema ontologică*, *Istoria filosofiei moderne*, 1972, *Problema cosmologică*, 1977), were academic courses, held with equal voice in classes and not really attractive. But despite the handicap, these courses were interesting and gathered disciples. In 1941, as a titular member of the Romanian Academy, he pronounced a memorable reception discourse: *Conflictul generațiilor și factorii progresului*⁴. Here – or also here – was his implicit answer to the many and often assaults of those who denied the rationalist meanings of philosophical meditation.

2. P.P. Negulescu belonged to another intellectual typology, marked by the spirit of the 19th century, without depreciating the earnings of the

⁴ P.P. Negulescu, *Conflictul generațiilor și factorii progresului* (extras), Bucharest, 1941, p.29.

20th century. We can say that, somehow, the almost one thousand three hundred edited pages of the *Filosofiei Renașterii*⁵- in the version revised by the author after finishing the last war – trustily resumes his personality of teacher, thinker and cultivated person. This humanist informed in so many and various domains of nature and culture – he had impressive knowledge of chemistry, physics, mathematics, anthropology (so obvious in *Geneza formelor culturii*⁶) – was by definition a great teacher that expressed objective information, that never used to shape, in his classes, his opinions, but only thesis, systems, doctrines and ideologies of others, of thinkers that were part of the long row on the history of philosophy.⁷ We were able to notice already⁸ that in his descriptive pages, Negulescu was less personal. The fact is obvious for those that read the books of the teacher, emanating from his academic courses where Negulescu “made from an excessive prudence the norm of his philosophical attitude”⁹. Being trusty to the model of Maiorescu, P.P. Negulescu said by all means in one of his philosophy lectures: “This habit of saying in a smooth way some else’s system, without filling it with our own opinions is of a great importance”.¹⁰ The key-phrase for understanding the teaching and philosophic demarche of Maiorescu could stay above the work of teacher and thinker of P.P. Negulescu. Not accidentally, Nicolae Iorga – the most brilliant exponent of the generation of P.P. Negulescu – had the opinion that “the fine philosophic thinker is an icon of his master, Maiorescu, till the smallest gesture, but more personal in ideas and more stylistic in shape”¹¹. In the same manner, G. Călinescu – the great critic spirit of the Romanian literature, exemplary in portraits and fine psychologist, in a plastic and precise characterization from those that abound in his “Istoria” – notices that “P.P. Negulescu inherits the rigid orientation of his master, but in more spectacular forms. Like a basalt Ramses, he talks monotonous

⁵ P.P. Negulescu, *Filosofia Renașterii*, Bucharest, Ed. Eminescu, 1986

⁶ P.P. Negulescu, *Geneza formelor culturii*, Bucharest, Ed. Eminescu, 1984.

⁷ R. Teodorescu, Prefața la *Filosofia Renașterii*, *op.cit.*, p. VIII.

⁸ Z. Ornea, *Introducere la Geneza formelor culturii*, *op.cit.*, p.49

⁹ N. Bagdasar, T. Herseni, S.S. Bărsanescu, *Istoria filosofiei moderne*, vol. V: *Filosofia românească de la origini și până azi*, Bucharest, 1941, p.122

¹⁰ Titu Maiorescu și prima generație de maioreșceni. *Correspondența*, ed. Z. Ornea, f. Mihai, R. Bichis, Bucharest, 1978, p.4

¹¹ My horizons. *O viața de om așa cum a fost*, ed. Valeriu Râpeanu and Sanda Râpeanu, Bucharest, 1984, p.480.

and still, with an enigmatic smile in the corner of his mouth, with his hands left on a knee”¹².

Student of the one called, in posterity, “Socrates of Romanian philosophy”¹³, P.P. Negulescu never forgot the moral duty towards Maiorescu (I, at least, got from you the prod that gave to my life the shape that it has today, wrote him to the magister after few years of finishing university studies), neither the lesson of a strict professionalism, of solid information, contrary to any type of dilettantism later evoked, in 1927, in the jubilee number of „Convorbirilor literare”¹⁴.

The destiny wanted Negulescu to repeat, in other proportions, the career of Maiorescu; so, he succeeded in 1910, for three decades, as titular of the course of history of philosophy (actually, of “history and encyclopaedia of philosophy”), in the University of Bucharest.

Both in Bucharest and Iasi, P.P. Negulescu was the teacher of many generations of intellectuals of the period before and after the First World War.

We bring in discussion the testimony of his disciples, that we consider essential in our demarche of making the *authentic pedagogic portrait of P.P. Negulescu*. Lessons, with phrases “build and systematized impeccably” evoked by Eugeniu Sperantia¹⁵ were, also in the period of Iasi, just the way that Dimitrie Gusti also remembered, his ex-student – from 1898, dedicated to philosophers that combined Middle Ages and modernism.

Not very far from these lessons of youth – lessons that also included the philosophy of Renaissance, treated for the first time systematically – are the ones from Bucharest, when in the fourth class of the old location of the university his most trusty disciple, Camil Petrescu, listened to him. His testimony is maybe the most eloquent proof of the admiration towards his magister, from those that remained about the ex – junimist, “**the most preoccupied person on style, teacher and human from this country**”; “Svelte and calm, without the most insignificant negligence on clothing, with familiarity in his gestures, took his place in the exact time, with a

¹² G. Calinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, ed. A II-a, reviewed and addendum, Bucharest, 1982, p.407.

¹³ Gr. T. Pop in introduction to: T. Maiorescu, *Prelegeri de filosofie*, ed. Gr. T. Pop, Al. Surdu, Craiova, 1980, p. XLV.5 *Figuri universitare*, Bucharest, 1967.

¹⁴ *Ceva despre Junimea*, in *Convorbiri literare*, 1-5, 1937, p. 63. 5. *Figuri universitare*, Bucharest, 1967, p.48

¹⁵ C. Petrescu, *Profesorul și gânditorul P.P. Negulescu*, in *Teze și antiteze*, Bucharest, (1936), p.150-151.

desired pedantry, the place from the armchair of his desk. He started with a diminished voice that in the still silence of the hall of the amphitheatre, filled, gathered the power of a suggestive whisper, the lesson of the week. The rhythm of his speech was unchanged; the gesture was with intention monotone in order to avoid exterior flashiness, and the game and stunts to be only in the thinking showed with devotion”.

There were voices – and not among the less listened – that brought reproaches to the teacher of history of philosophy that succeeded to Maiorescu, the lack of a special personality, the lack of an involvement with personal opinions, an academism that seemed to the younger generation an obsolete.

For Lovinescu, researching the critic posterity of Maiorescu, Negulescu was an “academic spirit..., of philosophical culture, of pondered expression, of an abstract style, overflowed in waters, plain, without polemic “mordant” and keeping himself in a strict ideological plan”¹⁶, that could happily lengthen in the interwar years, one of the characteristics of junimism.

We could not overlook the confessions of the disciples; of Mircea Eliade that sustained his licence with a commission that was presided by P.P. Negulescu, with a thesis dedicated to renaissance thinking, maybe influenced by the author of „Filosofiei Renaşterii”, even if the great historian of religions does not cite and like the style: “He was, without doubt, a competent and honest teacher, but his teaching never left me the impression of corresponding to a inner necessity. His erudition, far from being left to suspect a Faustian thirst of knowledge, was rather the fruit of a slow and patience work of a human that searches, of course, to inform itself but only because his functions obliged his to do so”.¹⁷

Also, for the author of “Maitreyi”, the remember of passing through the seminary of Negulescu was condensing in an intervention of the student Eliade, not appreciated by the teacher, in a register that was “passionate, voluble, disorderly, sometimes stammering”, in a well known incoherence, whose substrate was the metaphysic anxiety of a young searcher of truth. The aversion of Eliade towards Negulescu goes to the point where he sustains that the source of Negulescu’s inspiration was in books of popularization, because he didn’t read monographies or articles

¹⁶ Titu Maiorescu și posteritatea lui critica, Bucharest, 1943, p.74.

¹⁷ Mircea Eliade, *Memoire I*, 1907-1937. *Les promesses de l’equinoxe*, Paris, 1980, p.145-146.

from the area of interest, but only send offs and synthesis for laity. Those are the affirmations of Mircea Eliade that other disciples of the philosophy historian – themselves readers with notoriety – not only that are not confirmed but also are fully contradicted. The ex-assistant of Negulescu – it is about the logician Anton Dumitriu, though that his master was “the first philosophy historian that this people gave” and remembered, contrariwise, that “he was... of an excessive scientific carefulness, on to all scientific and philosophic theories of those times¹⁸ from a direct source, what is obvious for who reads even a book with hard to find sources like „Filosofia Renaşterii””. It was said about „Filosofia Renaşterii” that is the best book of P.P. Negulescu¹⁹, that is somehow true, even if not this book, but „Destinul omenirii” or „Geneza formelor culturii” are the ones that brought him notoriety. Even if he meditated and wrote all essential things of philosophy (ontology, cosmology, gnosiology, theory of culture) it would be hard – if not impossible – to say that Negulescu built a philosophical system. Otherwise, the time of philosophical systems were almost to the end, in the same time with the 19th century, and Negulescu, knowing pretty well those things, didn’t even try such a construction. There were authorized opinions that considered the fact that we can talk about a philosophical system of Negulescu. To this effect, it is symptomatic the hypothesis of Dimitrie Gusti from 1941 in the respond speech to the reception academic speech of Negulescu: “Even if you can find that a philosophical system could be part of the collection of premature assumptions, just the way you’ve said it in the programmatic speech held with the occasion of celebrating 60 years of life, you do have a system”. And he invoked, to support what he had to say the systematic series of philosophy in five volumes, later consecrated to cosmological and ontological problems, to burning philosophical problems raised by contemporary sciences.²⁰

It is very true that P.P. Negulescu meditated to all great philosophical problems of his time, proposing coherent interpretations, but we do not join the position of D. Gusti because in our opinion the philosophical system claims construction and creation. Or, P.P. Negulescu is not a creator

¹⁸ Ion Corbea, N.Florescu, *Biografii posibile*, seria a III-a, Bucharest, 1984, p.62, p.72.

¹⁹ Z.Ornea, *Introducere la P.P. Negulescu, Geneza formelor culturii. Priviri critice asupra factorilor ei determinanţi*, Bucharest, 1984, p.49.

²⁰ Conflictul generaţiilor şi factorii progresului, Discurs rostit la 25 mai 1941 în şedinţa solemnă de P.P. Negulescu, cu răspunsul lui Dimitrie Gusti, Imprimeria naţională, 1941, p.36.

of philosophical terms (in terms of V. Conta, C. Radulescu Motru, L. Blaga, M. Florian, C. Noica), "because the profession of teacher, and most of all of historian of philosophy, solicited him to expose and explain – how he insisted to say – doctrines of others, from Thales to Descartes and to Hegel or neokantians. And he did it in a specific didactic form, clear, coherent, by presenting the etymology and the content of concepts to a philosopher or to other, of terminology or conceptual shades". Great knower of the work of fundamental philosophers and especially to those from modern and contemporary era, Negulescu evaluated it with a perfect objectivity. But always from the perspective of his own conception. The binding from the work of Negulescu is, without doubt, the effort of creating – from the perspective of a conceptual attitude – fundamental elements offered by science. The philosophy of Negulescu cannot be understood in substance and its authentic spirit outside the connection with science. It is a trial of generalization and integration of results to scientific knowledge. It is for sure that his tendencies since youth for science gave him the access towards a literature of strict "positive" speciality that usually give fears to the philosopher. But for Negulescu, we can consider he has a perfect accommodation. That is why everything that he says – after harsh processes of filtration – is rigorous and trusty. In no work, not even where it is contested the truth of a point of view in an area of science far from philosophy, we cannot detect dilettante tremble. All has a high rigour, built on deep studies.

The lectures of his courses keep the same character, while the majority of the works published were, in their origins, university courses. It is not only about the philosophical investigation from scientific perspective but also about the methodology mostly expositive of analytic discourse. Maybe that manner was right from didactic reasons, in order to make it easy to students to understand the work of some philosophers.

His course of history of philosophy, taught several years, had an indubitable exegetic quality. It was obvious the real honesty of the exposure, for 50 minutes, of a theory and in the next ten "the whole theory was dissected and destroyed under an analytic dirk". The unaware student that, following the expositive exam of the teacher was conquered by the presented theory of conception lived at the end of the lecture an effective shock when he had the demonstration, cold and breaking, of its great faults and defects.

We bring again into discussion the confession of his most trusty disciple, Camil Petrescu: "All signs of critic spirit and logic exercise that I

am capable of, come from that thin game in rare areas of thinking. From now on, the extreme prudence towards the mellow “genius”, the determination of permanent exam, the preoccupation about the vulnerable point, the concern of a continuous lucidity”²¹. Such an appreciation from such a spirit is worthy to be remembered. It essentially modifies the judgement about the didactic apostolate of Negulescu.

Also, it is known and we must highlight that in his academic courses, Negulescu didn't limit to problems asked by the programme, but tried to develop present subjects in order to contribute to the guidance of youth in a rationalist, humanist and democratic spirit in a moment in which the representatives of right were trying to pull them towards political adventurism. So, in his works that consecrated him as one of the notorious teachers from the Romanian philosophical background, we can find that he didn't limit to sending some learned knowledge but also gave value to philosophical knowledge through a work of great encyclopaedic proportions, contributing to the development of Romanian philosophy.²²

3. The distinctive part of this thinker is that in all of his writings, published during an activity that covered more than half of century, P.P. Negulescu *saw philosophy in connection to science*, aspect that we took into consideration before. **What we must show in this context is that this connection between philosophy and science became a principle with fundamental methodological value, applied in all his works.** The reason of his approach is the assurance that only through this method *philosophy can accomplish its duty of giving a general explanation of the universe, as a whole*. According to this conclusion, P.P. Negulescu didn't adhere to the idea of a closed system; science, he wrote, began to play an important role in the life of human being only for some centuries, what means that we are at the beginning of the process of methodical exploration of the surrounding world.

Going on that path, of connecting philosophy and science, P.P. Negulescu programmatically refused to arrange the results of his activity in final philosophical writings that could risk to become

²¹ Camil Petrescu, *op.cit.*, p. 151-152.

²² P.P. Negulescu, *Scrieri inedite*, I, Ed. Academiei, Bucharest, 1969 (edition by Al.Poseescu); idem, *Scrieri inedite*, II. *Destinul omenirii*, vol. V, Ed. Academiei, Bucharest, 1971; *Scrieri inedite* III, *Istoria filosofiei moderne. Problema ontologica*, Ed. Academiei, Bucharest, 1972; *Scrieri inedite*, IV. *Problema cosmologica*, Ed. Academiei, Bucharest, 1977, (editions by N. Gogoneața).

“premature assumptions”, he refused to close himself in “final formulas”. But, according to the mission given to philosophy, he tried to make a unitary painting of the world, guiding himself after the data of contemporary science and to anticipate the following evolution of human society, starting from the analysis of contemporary social structures.²³

P.P. Negulescu was preoccupied by the genesis and evolution of philosophical conceptions, of making and surprising the apparition of basic elements of some philosophies. Using the historical-critic method, the Romanian thinker approaches philosophical problems spread in historical periods, defining his own position by the adhesion to some theories, where he stops only after deep critic analysis. The concept of philosophy is analyzed by Negulescu from the perspective of his realist philosophy. 1) Philosophy as metaphysics; 2) philosophy as study or research of phenomenon from the area of sensible experience and 3) philosophy as analysis of the first principles and synthesis of the last results of science.

The integration of data of contemporary science became the method frequently used by Negulescu in his writings about ontological, cosmological, knowledge problem or culture theory. Negulescu was influenced in his conceptions by the evolutionist philosophy of Spencer that he caught especially in its scientist meaning.

The adhesion to a philosophy land-linked to science, the evolutionism, trust in the force of ration, humanism, the progress attitude, all are the constants that offer unity to the thinking and activity of Negulescu.

Even if he is considered by his adversary to be in lack of originality, we consider it as being a feature of his personal way of approaching a problem, the great deploy of ideas and arguments, on large spaces of culture and of wide historical periods. This large coverage of the problem is determined by the fact that the author often defines his own position through the adhesion to some theories, stopping only after detailed critical analysis and long incursions into the history of knowledge.

Historical perspective can also be discovered in several works of him. The thinker is preoccupied by the genesis and evolution of theories, by the building of logic in the process of his historical development, he is in search of finding the apparition of basic elements of a conception, in a

²³ P.P. Negulescu, *Destinul omenirii*, vol. IV, 1944, p.117, apud. *Istoria filosofiei românești*, Ed. Academiei, 1980, p. 256

necessary trap pursuant to the progresses of intelligence and of refining human sensibility, of the development of society in its fight for better.

Even if he didn't build a philosophical system, P.P. Negulescu was an encyclopaedic spirit incarnated in a work for which he laboured for his people, but that is less known and appreciated to its right value.

He was a remarkable teacher because he manages, like no other, to make a philosophical synthesis, passing in review both traditional solutions given by human thinking in time and newer solutions issued from the research of natural science. He carries on an interdisciplinary research in the spirit of contemporary tendencies from science and philosophy, avoiding the path of speculations broken by facts and the positivist empiricism.²⁴

Such as it results from all above, one of fundamental coordinates of his philosophy, used as axis of argumentation for all courses, is the development of a philosophical spirit in extension to the scientific one, what actually means the overtaking, in a superior theoretic synthesis, of the latter. Because Negulescu doesn't make science for science, he appeals to sciences in order to get from their data what they cannot give, in the virtue of their specific statute. In all of his courses, that later became referential works for Romanian philosophy, he subordinates scientific data to some philosophical synthesis; so, he manages to establish analogies and to intercept structures of the objective reality, that particular sciences can at most tend to, but that they cannot realise. It is worthy to point out that by this junction of scientific and philosophical spirit he managed to get to some methods and conclusions through what he anticipate, in some measure, procedures and conclusions of new disciplines, of border disciplines, from nowadays.

REFERENCES

1. Bagdasar N., Herseni T., Bârsănescu S.S., (1941), *Istoria filosofiei moderne*, vol. V, *Filosofia românească de la origini și până azi*, Bucharest.
2. Călinescu G., (1982), *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, ed. A II-a, reviewed and addendum, Bucharest.
3. Corbea Ion, N. Florescu, (1984), *Biografii posibile*, 3rd series, Bucharest.

²⁴ Al. Posescu, *Concepția lui P.P. Negulescu asupra raportului dintre filosofie și știința*, în *Revista de filosofie*, nr.9/1965.

4. Eliade Mircea, (1980), *Memoire I. 1907-1937. Les promesses de l'equinoxe*, Paris.
5. Negulescu P.P., (1937), *Ceva despre Junimea, Convorbiri literare*.
6. Negulescu P.P., (1938), *Ceva despre Maiorescu, în Convorbiri literare*.
7. Negulescu P.P., (1941), *Conflictul generațiilor și factorii progresului* (extract), Bucharest.
8. Negulescu P.P., (1980), *Destinul omenirii*, vol. IV, 1944, p. 117, apud. *Istoria filosofiei românești*, Editura Academiei.
9. Negulescu P.P., (1986), *Filosofia Renașterii*, Bucharest, Editura Eminescu.
10. Negulescu P.P., (1984), *Geneza formelor culturii*, Bucharest, Editura Eminescu.
11. Negulescu P.P., *Scrieri inedite*, I, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1969 (edition by Al.Posescu); idem, *Scrieri inedite*, II. *Destinul omenirii*, vol. V, Edit. Academiei, Bucharest, 1971; *Scrieri inedite* III, *Istoria filosofia moderne. Problema ontologica*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1972; *Scrieri inedite*, IV. *Problema cosmologica*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1977, (editions by N. Gogoneața).
12. Ornea Z., (1984), *Introducere la P.P. Negulescu, Geneza formelor culturii. Priviri critice asupra factorilor ei determinanți*, Bucharest.
13. Petrescu C., (1936), *Profesorul și gânditorul P.P. Negulescu*, in *Teze și antiteze*, Bucharest.