Resetting Humanities on Interdisciplinary Grounds

Loredana Cuzmici
"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi

Camelia Gradinaru, Andreea Mironescu, Roxana Patras (eds.), *Perspectives in Humanities. Keys for Interdisciplinarity*, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Press, Iasi, 2015, 169 p.

Keywords: interdisciplinarity, humanities, language, Romanian culture, philology, philosophy

Perspectives in Humanities. Keys for Interdisciplinarity is a result of an international conference, held yearly at "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi. Among the conference's framework and objectives, the organizers listed the following: to bring together junior and senior researchers, to facilitate the transfer of good practices, methodologies, and bibliographies, to figure out a solution for the surpassing the conflict between mono-disciplinary and pluri-disciplinary standpoints, all in all, to bridge generations, fields, and levels of expertise. Edited by Camelia Grădinaru, Andreea Mironescu and Roxana Patraş, the volume comprises nine studies trying meet with the initial objectives of the conference as well as to test how the interdisciplinary frame works for different areas of humanities. In particular, the editors have been interested in re-pronouncing the original "marriage" between philosophy and philology, both of them being now called to enhance the need for collaboration practices and community awareness in these fields normally perceived as one man shows.

Stefan Afloroaei's article entitled *A Free Distinction: Sense and Nonsense* attempts at bringing together instruments and examples from cognitive psychology, philosophy of language, logic and even poetry. Thus, *sense* and *nonsense* become more than scholarly concepts, as the author is concerned with "the manner in which we identify sense initially and for the most

part" and with the "presupposition, sustained by our faith in bivalent logic, namely that sense is indicative of something positive, whereas nonsense points at something negative" (p. 11). Particularly it is the nonsense that comes into question because the dictate of "ordinarily accepted things" leads to the rejection of any mode of expression perceived as "free" (poetry, storytelling, sententious/visionary discourse, confession, the joy of playing, the aesthetic of gesture, the act of contemplating/ daydreaming and so forth). Passing through the common varieties of nonsense, Ştefan Afloroaei focuses his attention to the strange/ paradoxixal types, especially the cases generated by the use of poetic language. Yet, following Eugen Coşeriu's remarks on the two limits of language, that is, the ordinary and the poetic, the author notices that the specialized forms – the technical language, the philosophical language or the mythical language – are nothing but avatars of perfection, forms of "impure fulness". Not only poetry but also all sorts of linguistic specialization are, due to incompleteness, nonsensical. Through its nonsensical specialization, philosophy is opening again toward poetry.

Roxana Patraş gathers politics, literature and cultural memory in a survey on P. P. Carp's political oratory, tracking down Shakespearian *topoi* in his parliamentary speeches. Yet, the article aims to enhance *the stylization* of political behavior and discourse through the latent action of cultural memories. In a culture mostly indebted to France, the author identifies the first items of "Englishness", which become first-hand cultural references within the "Junimea" literary circle of Iaşi. Thus, Junimea's insistence on the strict observance of parliamentary rules, enhanced by P.P. Carp's reflections on tyranny, democracy, minorities, state-order and by his theory on self-consistency and ethical behavior in politics prove to be – through an all-encompassing passion for Shakespeare's works – English imports. Turning to UK political models seems to be a strategy of ideological differentiation (Junimea proposes a variety of neo-conservatism) as well as a way to coin a utopian horizon for the Romanians' expectations, always caught between the French democracy and Russian/ German caesarian autocracy. From a methodological point of view, the author tries to catch the invariable matrix – yet not the common set of rhetoric, but the common pre-conscious movements – from the volatile and

variable features of collective talking. Here politics is pulling out its wider cultural memories.

Studying communities, Ligia Tudurachi frames a challenging subject in *Superstitions littéraires. Une mystique des objets dans le cénacle de « Sburătorul »*: the literary superstition within literary circles (chiefly "Sburătorul"). This is illustrated through a set of writings related to the same "mystical" objects: a black statue of Buddha, two torsos of Victor Eftimiu and Mihai Eminescu, a feminine funerary mask, and a paper knife. Once turned into motifs, function like a metonymy of E. Lovinescu's authority and endorsement. Therefore, the author's aim is to read the master's portrait neither in his autobiographical writings (novels, memoirs and suchlike) nor in his mere criticism, but in the productions of his collaborators. Literature and especially the chemistry of literary circles is becoming a departure point for a broader reflection on how living together can be made possible in the alienating conditions of the modern world.

Oana Fotache Dubalaru's article entitled *Estranging the Self. Protocols of Objectivity in Literary Theory and Their Dismantling* (the case of Tzvetan Todorov) puts forward the dialectics of objectivity-subjectivity in literary theory, applying this equation on Tzvetan Todorov's work. Now, it is well known that his writing migrated from structuralism to the history of ideas, anthropology and hermeneutics, but the author does not aim at demonstrating Todorov's mixed methodology. As the thinker's major themes prove themselves connected with the core of "totalitarian" objectivity (also springing from totalitarianism as such), Oana Fotache Dubalaru tries to discover the strategies of legitimizing literary theory through the obliteration of the theorist's self. With the same interest in the specific historical context of Central and Eastern Europe, Magdalena Răduță's text *Du pareil au même? Sur le possibilités du comparatisme dans un modèle d'histoire littéraire du communisme dans l' Europe Centrale et de l'Est* debates the status of comparative literature and investigates the influence of communist ideology on the mechanisms of literary socialization in these specific geographic areas. While the approach to Todorov's inverted objectivity profits from the resources of psychology and its terminology, the overall image on South-Eastern literary history cannot be grasped but by resorting to sociological inquiry. It seems that, in

spite of its original principles and centrality, literary history should be considered a mirror of society changes and structures, a mere chapter of sociology.

In *Le journalisme et la condition d'une littérature mineure*, Adrian Tudurachi writes about the relationship between Romanian journalism and literature during the 19th century Romania. It is no novelty that the two expressions are imbricated as long as the press comes off the great literary bulk and literature goes on feeding the press. However, Romania's case has to draw attention because this is not a case of mutual determinism, but one of "subjectivization" of both of them. All in all, literature and press serve an abstract third, that is, the ideal of the national language, which is the great institution attended to by everyone.

Sociology and pedagogy are the main fields in Carmen Cozma's contribution, *Virtue Ethics' Challenges in Improving Professional Ethics*. Her study uses knowledge from moral philosophy in order to establish the imperative of professional ethics, not only normative, but also axiological; the concept of *virtue* is a key for understanding the subject and its features.

Laura Carmen Cuțitaru proposes an analysis of mental grammar, *Lapsus Linguae. A Psycholinguistic Approach*. The inventory of spontaneous errors of speech demonstrates how language functions at different levels, and how the defaults become creative tools. With an approach on corpus linguistics, Sorina Postolea's study takes into consideration the case of neonyms and borrowings, especially in the field of information and communication technology. Both articles offer openings to technical, quantitative tackling of natural language.

The volume *Perspectives in Humanities. Keys for Interdisciplinarity* proves to be a broad-enough platform for the contributors to reveal some real possibilities of research. Nevertheless, their "keys" to interdisciplinarity are not dogmatic proposals, but invitations to reset humanistic research, to ground it on a more collaborative basis.

Address:
Loredana Cuzmici
Faculty of Letters
"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi
Bd. Carol I no. 11, Iasi, Romania
E-mail: loricuzmici@gmail.com