

THE COMMUNICATIONAL NUCLEUS OF PHILOSOPHICAL THINKING

Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU¹, Xenia NEGREA², Dan Valeriu VOINEA³

Abstract: The current research is a meta-analysis that circumscribes to Communication Philosophy. The inquiry is ranged among what is called the dynamics of reshaping the conceptual standard-matrix of Communication. It is aimed to be an explicit answer to a double question: i) what makes a communicational discourse to be „philosophy” and ii) what accurately individualizes the philosophical discourse, making from a text „a philosophical text”, a philosophical discourse, a philosophical message? We formulate an answer founded on two arguments. The first argument is that, as form of thinking, Philosophy presents three “main dimensions” [“language use”, “communication of beliefs (cognition)”, and “interaction in situations” - as a “standard principle” -Van Dijk, 1997)]; these dimensions are the dimensions of any discourse, so Philosophy is a specialized discourse, a philosophical discourse. The second argument is that, as a written language form of communication, Philosophy is a deep communicational cognition. Viewing Philosophy as discourse and as a deep cogitation communication, it follows that: 1. in philosophical communication, as well as in any other type of communicational discourse, the producer is not fundamental, but the nuclear message which he succeeds in transmitting and co-constructing meanings together with his recipient; 2. the discursive approach of philosophemes and „philosophematic” message is the distinctive feature of philosophical communication, of philosophical discourse, of the philosophical text as communication practice.

Keywords: communication, discourse, communicational philosophical discourse, philosopheme, philosophematic message.

1. Interrogation and search

We are now in a process of re-elaboration of the categorical standard-matrix of contemporary philosophy and of reshaping the standard-matrix of

¹ University of Craiova, Romania.

² University of Craiova, Romania.

³ University of Craiova, Romania.

discourse¹ and of communication². In response to this process we should seek to answer a double question: what makes a communication be "philosophy" and what individualizes the philosophical discourse, making a text a "philosophical text", a philosophical communication, a philosophical message? "Why would it be called «Philosophy» what we are doing here?" - asks L. Wittgenstein³. In response, it will be argued with conviction with a view to demonstrate the triple thesis that:

- a) in philosophical communication, as well as in any other type of communication, essential is not the producer, but the message that he manages to convey and to co-build with the consumer;
- b) the distinctive feature of communicational philosophical discourse, of the philosophical text as communication practice, is the systematic approach of philosophemes; the "philosophematic" message is specific to philosophical discourse;
- c) the philosophical message is a late message, a message of further reflection, a message of wisdom, being late-pensive; the philosophical message always comes after.

The logic of the argumentative approach is targeted by three research principles:

- selecting items of argument will be made with the awareness that "the problems are made and the data collected in the light of the theory"⁴ and that Pierre Duhem says that "today's facts have been built with yesterday's theories"⁵;
- coherence, cohesion and orientation of the approach will remain permanently in the range of epistemological intersection between the novelty idea in argument and the solidity of the theory which orders the choice of the facts on which it argues⁶;

¹ Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *The study of Discourse*. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed), *Interaction. Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies 1: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 1- 34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage, p. 2.

² Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119-161.

³ Wittgenstein, L. (1993). *Caietul albastru*. București: Editura Humanitas, p. 138.

⁴ Bunge, M. (1967). *Scientific Research*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Springer, p. 214.

⁵ Ducrot, O. (1984). *Logique, structure, enonciation*. Paris: Minuit, p. 5.

⁶ Smarandache, F. (2015). Neutrosophic Social Structures Specificities. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1).

- in order to integrate the real facts into argumentation as evidence, they will be suppressed within the limit of two criteria of limited rationality: verifiability and falsifiability¹, avoiding any possible investigative progress which common sense would suspect to be *petitio principii*.

2. Stakes and premises

First, the objective of the study is to outline the support of a concept of message. Subsequently, it is aimed at individualizing philosophical communication as philosophematic communication: discourse about philosophemes and in the irradiation of philosophemes.

The premise is that in both the philosophical meditation space, the one of the "Grounded Practical Theory"² and in the field of Grounded Practical Communication Application there is required a conceptualization of the message and of communication. No special training is required for a communicator to deliver a message. The mega-concept of message lies in the content of the idea of man. What we, first of all, recognize in communication is a human message. All people bring with them this fundamental existential message, that of belonging to humanity. This message is understandable by all. People as people recognize each other as bearers of an impressive message of humanity: a background message that makes us, like in communication, be and recognize each other as beings of the human world³.

On this stand called message of humanity are built, as two columns with different architectures, two types of messages: everyday, natural, innocent messages and specialized messages. The more our communicative competence develops and the message of humanity expands, the more it becomes necessary to rethink the joints of the message. There are three coordinates of any message: tension, function and purpose. Every message is triggered by a tension, every message has a function and it aims at a purpose.

¹ Popper, K. (2002). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 54-57.

² Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (1995). Grounded Practical Theory: The Case of Intellectual Discussion. *Communication Theory*, 5 (3), 248-272.

³ Smarandache, F., & Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2014). Towards a Practical Communication Intervention. *Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială*, (46), 243-254.

3. The concept of philosopheme

The one who introduced the concept of philosopheme in philosophical vocabulary is Aristotle. In "Topics" (2004)¹, "The Stagirite" establishes the status of reasoning as logos, as speech, as thought speech. Within this, from certain things, other things necessarily result, and these latter data are based directly on the given things. Aristotle realized, however, a taxonomy of reasoning as well. According to Aristotle, there are four forms of reasoning: "philosophema" (demonstrative reasoning), "epicherema" (dialectical reasoning), "sophism" (eristic reasoning) and "aporema" (dialectical reasoning based on contradiction).

In 1926, A. E. Taylor analyzes "Two Pythagorean Philosophemes"². J. Wolfers shows that "the philosopheme is a unit of knowledge within the structure of a system or a body of thought which functions and maintains its mystified power"³. In several of his works, Jacques Derrida discusses the problem of philosophemes marking the limits of Philosophy ("Margins of Philosophy"), philosopheme is "a limit"⁴ or by their untranslatability they undertake an ununiform philosophical language, consisting of philosophemes of several languages; even the concept of "metaphor", says Derrida, is a philosopheme⁵.

The second millennium ended with the ideational message that philosophy-as-history, or the history of philosophy, is written as an argument and explanation of assumptions. The third millennium begins, as said Professor Gheorghe Vlăduțescu, with the enrollment of the history of philosophy "as hermeneutics", the idea of a "conceptualizing history" where the "philosopheme is not a miteme"⁶ (see also the anthropological research of Professors Mihai Coman⁷, and Florica Iuhaș⁸).

¹ Aristotle (2004). *Topics*. Whitefish, MO: Kessinger Publishing.

² Taylor, A. E. (1926). Two Pythagorean Philosophemes. *The Classical Review*, 40(5), 149-151.

³ Wolfers, J. (1998). *Justifying the Unjustifiable*. In J. Derrida. *The Derrida Reader: Writing Performances* (pp. 1-49). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. 43.

⁴ Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. xv.

⁵ Derrida, J. (2004). *Dissemination*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

⁶ Vlăduțescu, G. (2007). *Istoria filosofiei ca hermeneutică*. București: Editura Academiei, p. 51.

⁷ Coman, M. (2003). *Mass-Media, mit și ritual*. Iași: Editura Polirom.

⁸ Iuhaș, F. (2012). *Univers ceremonial și mass-media*. București: Ars Docendi.

D. Worth defines the philosopheme as “systemic thinking that seeks to divide, unitize and systematize. This is distinguished from mythologeme, which has a universal validity and does not necessitate disputation”; the philosopheme, shows Worth, “creates need for disputation”¹. J. P. Galay seeks to clarify “the philosopheme of the reason’s cunning” and notices that “a philosopheme is not invented other way than only based on another”². Philosophy asks philosophematic questions. Moreover, H. De Vries considers that E. Levinas “turned into philosopheme (...) the French expression ‘adieu’”³. For D. Parodi, the philosopheme is the “construction of of a doctrine”⁴, for A. Preston, it is “a philosophical view”⁵, and for H. Ruin, Ruin, the philosopheme is “a linguistic invention (...) that is eventually recognized as philosophy”⁶.

On the other hand, a direction on which we agree is that of the philosopheme as unit of philosophical meaning. J. Bell shows that the philosopheme is “something philosophically meaningful”⁷; moreover, Stephen Gersh sees the philosopheme as “certain minimal units from which philosophical systems can be constructed”; Gersh investigates philosophemes in the writings of Augustine, Macrobius, and Boethius, and asserts that there are “other medieval authors who use philosophemes, Eriugena, William of Conches, Thierry of Chartres, Nicholas of Cusa”⁸.

Paul Ricoeur mentions *logos*, *eidos*, *theoria*, *epokhe* among “philosophemes”⁹. Professor Adriana Neacșu believes that “*eidos*” is the key

¹ Worth, D. (2003). *Magic, Will, and Discourse: Rhetoric as Technology. Integrative Explorations*, 7-8, 186-196.

² Galay, J. P. (1977). *Philosophie et invention textuelle*. Paris: Klincksieck, pp. 7-8.

³ De Vries, H. (1999). *Philosophy and the Turn of Religion*. JHU Press.

⁴ Parodi, D. (1940). Philosophy in France, 1938-1939. *The Philosophical Review*, 49(1), 1-24.

⁵ Preston, A. (2005). Conformism in analytic philosophy: On shaping philosophical boundaries and prejudices. *The Monist*, 88(2), 292-318.

⁶ Ruin, H. (2008). Belonging to the whole: Critical and ‘Heracritical’: Notes of the Ideal of Cosmopolitanism. *The Idea of Kosmopolis*, 31.

⁷ Bell, J. (2009). Charting the Road of Inquiry. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 44(3), 399.

⁸ Gersh, S. (2012). The First Principles of Latin Neoplatonism: Augustine, Macrobius, Boethius. *Vivarium*, 50(2), 113-138.

⁹ Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Metafora vie*. București: Editura Univers, p. 445.

concept of Platonism and notes that Plato's philosophy is a continuous meditation on "eidos"¹ (also A. Neacșu²).

Philosophemes are also "Dasein" imposed by Martin Heidegger³, "face" validated by E. Levinas⁴ (see also A. Pinchevski⁵), or Chinese "Dao". The object of a philosophical work is formed by philosophemes (see also Erwin Knies⁶). M. Papastephanou asserts that we can encounter philosophemes in all "three narratives": "Art, Science, and Philosophy"⁷. In "Tractatus logico-philosophicus" (4031, 4112), L. Wittgenstein states: "Philosophy is not a doctrine, but an activity. The purpose of philosophy is the logical clarification of thoughts ... whatever philosophy is a critique of the language"⁸. Philosophy is an activity of clarification of philosophemes. Yes, but it is, above all, a communicative activity. It is, first of all, communication.

4. The need for conceptualizing the significances, senses and meaning as a message

The fundamental fact of the modern world is the nuclear one of plurality of intelligibility. Accepting plurality is an indirect derivation of identity reflected in differences. Communication is the place of identity as difference and difference as identity. In its area, the message appears as a steady-tension point between uniqueness and plurality. The significance stored in the message and in communication has a central reference - namely the tension between the act and the deed: the act of significance and the deed of comprehension. How it will reach that comprehension is driven by the act which lets us understand or gives us a hint. The elements of "how" are events of the discursive-procedural rationality. On their way, the

¹ Neacșu, A. (2000). *Eidos și Genesis. Eseu asupra formelor platoniene*. București: Editura Științifică.

² Neacșu, A. (2006). *Arheologia și evoluția conceptelor filosofice*. Editura Universitaria.

³ Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*. New York: SUNY Press.

⁴ Levinas, E. (1999). *Totalitate și Infinit*. Iași: Editura Polirom.

⁵ Pinchevski, A. (2005). The Ethics of Interruption: Toward a Levinasian Philosophy of Communication. *Social Semiotics*, 15(2), 211-234.

⁶ Knies, E. (2013). *Das Philosophem*. Neubrandenburg: Spica Verlag.

⁷ Papastephanou, M. (2013). The Ethical Challenge of Multidisciplinarity: Reconciling "The Three Narratives" – Art, Science, and Philosophy. Internet source.

⁸ Wittgenstein, L. (1991). *Tratatus Logico-Philosophicus*. București: Editura Humanitas.

language-driven disenchantment of the world in the message and its desecration as communication occur. The category that fits them is the meaning. Any meaning is a polar star. It gathers values and trust. It dissolves the suspicion and develops the interpretation, as advancement to a new suspicion.

As far as the concept of message and the importance of philosophical message are concerned, Plato and Aristotle are not mentioned. Although every moment we build messages that touches people and their social reality, we rarely acknowledge the role of the message. We produce discourses through which we aim at the being. Anti-terrorism initiatives are developed. The president of the UN and the Pope address messages to the world with the idea of attracting teleological implementation strategies. Organizations send notices to their members. Children give news to their parents. Mass-media broadcast news. Humanitarian organizations are calling. Unions introduce calls in the circuit of communication (to strike, solidarity, etc.). Humanitarian organizations prepare proclamations. Individuals give hints. Literary and philosophical productions propagate meanings. All that exists wears, maintains and gains significance. All these situations of interpersonal meetings are characterized by addressing. The internal support on which the address-discourse is based is called message. Therefore, we live in a world of messages¹.

Any message leads to a practice². Communication is practical. What individualizes the philosophical message is that it leads, induces, produces and performs spiritual practices³. The aim of philosophical message is spiritual transformation through mental, intellectual, cogitative and language-based practices. Philosophy is a transformative spiritual practice. The philosophical message consists of transformative ideation.

5. Philosophematic structuring questions

The whole process of communication is a dynamic and open system of messages. During the communicative flows significant messages circulate.

¹ Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2013). Considerations on Voice as a Fundamental Element in Oral Communication. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Lingvistică*, (1-2), 355-363.

² Danculescu, D., & Colhon, M. (2014). Splitting the structured paths in stratified graphs. Application in Natural Language Generation. *Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Ovidius Constanta-Seria Matematica*, 22(2), 57-67.

³ Grabara, I. (2014). The Innovative Methods Of Future Professional Staff Education. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1), 32-44.

The system data analysis can determine whether these processes have their own existence and characteristics. Communication is manifested in the system when its behavior cannot be explained by one of its parts in isolation. Communication always involves a coding grid of a form of communication in other form of communication, such as transforming a mental image into a verbal message.

On the other hand, the significance and the relationship are at the centre of the message. If there is no relationship, it should rightly be held that there is no message. Beyond the relationship, what is seen, what signifies does not belong to the message. If there is a relationship, we must conclude that this simple fact is already significant and that there is a message and communication. Axiomatically, Martin Buber shows that "At the beginning there is the relationship", and that one can speak of "the originating character of the relationship need", that "relationship events" occur between people and that "man accesses to You by I"¹.

Regarding the significances as such, they can be of two kinds: assigned or found. Any category they would belong to, they always depend on a person and a situation. Constantin Noica shows that "the foundation question of knowledge" is "if understanding means to find or to put meanings"². He chose the thesis of putting meanings. Just as demonstrated by Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer³, any comprehension is necessarily preceded by a pre-comprehension, so before any message a pre-message is recorded consisting of a uni- or bilateral investment of intentionality. More precisely, there is no message without any intention trace. The message is generated by a uni-or bilateral intention. It bears an irrepressibly intentional inscription: either "pre"-intended (for the intended) or "pre"-recipient (for the recipient), or bilateral. The intention of signification is its distinguishing mark, the mark of individualization. On the other hand, as a constitutive element of consciousness that lives only as consciousness of something, like consciousness towards something, the intention inertly takes up the teleological directivity from it, the orientation, the trend towards, with a Greek word that impregnates "orexis": orientation. The intention proves to be teleological, it contains an influence project.

¹ Buber, M. (1992). *Eu și Tu*. București: Editura Humanitas, p. 44, p. 53, p. 54 and p. 55.

² Noica, C. (1993). *De caelo*. București: Editura Humanitas, p. 51.

³ Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *EPZ Truth and Method*. (2nd ed.) Continuum International Publishing Group.

Coordinating the ideas, one can infer that every message has a teleological character¹ (also D. V. Voinea²; X. Negrea and B. Teodorescu³).

Communication is communion of language and transfer-pooling of significances, senses, meanings, assumptions and nuances of meaning. The essence of any communication is not so much the meaning, but the final question posed. Yes, question. In any claim or wonder one can identify a ground implicit question. To understand a communicational discourse, firstly, one must understand the questions which mobilize and articulate it. There is a process of communication which answers questions such as:

- a) " Why is there *Being* at all, and *not* much *rather Nothing*?" - question by M. Heidegger "primordial", "original", "of the most extensive coverage"⁴;
- b) "Philosophy begins with a question: What is it?"- K. Jaspers⁵;
- c) "What can I know?", "What should I do?", "What am I allowed to hope?", "What is man?"⁶. Immanuel Kant appreciates that the area of philosophy is bounded by these four philosophical questions. If "the answer must come from the same sources from which the question comes"⁷, then the nature of responses will be a philosophical one;
- d) "What does it mean?" – J. P. Sartre⁸ (Part 3, Chapter 1, Paragraph 4);
- e) "What else is philosophy than this great story of the world?" - Alexandru Surdu⁹.

There is a school of question that starts from Socrates' maieutics. We can remember that Aristotle's categories (2004)¹⁰ irradiated from the questions. The questions are "more essential than the answers," says Karl

¹ Budică, I., Busu, O. V., Dumitru, A., & Purcaru, M.-L. (2015). Waste management as commitment and duty of citizens. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1).

² Voinea, D. V. (2014). A demographic portrait of Romanian immigrants in California. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 63-70.

³ Negrea, X., & Teodorescu, B. (2015). An extended review for a remarkable book, *Systemic Approaches to Strategic Management: Examples from the Automotive Industry* (2015). *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1).

⁴ Heidegger, M. (1988). *Repere pe drumul gândirii*. București: Editura Politică, p. 51.

⁵ Jaspers, K. (1986). *Texte filosofice*. București: Editura Politică, p. 15.

⁶ Kant, I. (1970). *Logica*. București: Editura Științifică, p. 78.

⁷ Kant, I. (1994). *Critica rațiunii pure*. București: Editura IRI, p. 409.

⁸ Sartre, J.-P. (1969). *L'Être et le Neant*. Paris: Gallimard.

⁹ Surdu, A. (2009). *Comentarii la rostirea filosofică*. Brașov: Editura Kron-Art, p. 85.

¹⁰ Aristotle (2004). *The Categories*. Whitefish, MO: Kessinger Publishing.

Jaspers (1986); Philosophy is the search for the truth and means "to be about to". This communication is a philosophical communication and has two features: to be knowledge and to be enlightenment (Kant even wrote a study "What is Enlightenment?"). J.-F. Lyotard¹ shows: "Every behavior, every human phenomenon in general – as it is shown - is faced with the question: What does it mean?" What theoretical significance can be drawn from the examination of philosophical texts? The text, the written discourse, appears as the manifestation of a behavior which, specifies the same Lyotard, if it is behavior indeed, it really "makes sense" and the "obvious and immediate" perception "of meaning is comprehension."

The field of reflective activity, the interrogation horizon and the perimeter of philosophical thinking constitute the essence of the world, the meaning of life, man's place in the community, his relationship with the others and with the universe. Knowledge is reaching the enlightenment.

Plato's wonder road and Descartes' doubt road, Hegel's Absolute Idea transformation, living limit-situations with Jaspers, the ratio I-You with Martin Buber or "the face" with Emmanuel Levinas fall all on a communication coordinate of having a philosophical area and on a philosophical dimension of being communication.

Karl Jaspers perceived this at a level of "trend" and not that of the law: "any philosophy tends towards communication, seeking to express itself, to make itself understood; its essence lies in communicability. The purpose of Philosophy is achieved only by communication, a purpose which gives meaning to all other purposes, the perception of the being, the enlightenment through love, the acquisition of serenity" (Jaspers, 1986, p. 14).

Philosophy is a thinking activity. Hegel² sees it as one "of the greatest greatest acts of thinking", "a thought of the world". It is "conceptual knowledge", it is science (the Spirit that is known as spirit is Science - Hegel), a rigorous science (E. Husserl).

The only means of philosophical communication is the linguistic code³. We can say that Philosophy is a "linguistic" speech, an activity of verbal production with an essential philosophical theme, a discourse on philosophemes. Communication, knowledge and enlightenment,

¹ Lyotard, J.-F. (1997). *Fenomenologie*. București: Editura Humanitas, p. 73.

² Hegel, G. W. F. (1996). *Principiile filosofiei dreptului*. București: Editura IRI, p. 20.

³ Olivier, B. (2009). *Philosophy and Communication*. Bern: Peter Lang.

philosophical statement, Philosophy is, basically, communication; it is a "super-message"¹.

6. Philosophematic message

As it is shown by Jeanine Czubaroff, we must not forget the fundamental "importance of dialogue"² (see also V. Tonoiu³; N. R. Stan⁴; N. R. Stan⁵). On the other hand, Professor Johan Siebers creates an argument that helps to bring philosophy into the world of communication and communication into the field of philosophy⁶. It supports us in the approach to approximate and then specify the content of their relationship. Siebers shows i) that "communication is firstly and mostly dialogue", and then that ii) "dialogue is philosophy"⁷. The two assertions are based on the copula "is" and create compulsory equivalents or identities⁸. There is Paul Ricoeur's point of view that the essence of metaphor would be "to be" or "is". "Metaphor" comes from ancient Greek and means transformation⁹, ¹⁰. Ricoeur says that metaphor as a whole is transformation and transformation realizes the obligation induced by "is", the verb "to be" (Ricoeur, 2003). If "communication is (...) firstly and mostly dialogue" and "dialogue is philosophy", then it follows what we call Siebers's inference: "communication is firstly and mostly philosophy". In other words, most of

¹ Lotman, I. (1975). *Studii de tipologie a culturii*. București: Editura Univers, p. 86.

² Czubaroff, J. (2012). Dialogue and the Prospect of Rhetoric. *Review of Communication*, 12(1), 44-65, p. 44.

³ Tonoiu, V. (1995). *Omul dialogal: un concept răsăritie*. București: Editura FCR.

⁴ Stan, N. R. (2008). *The relation between human dignity and human rights in the Orthodox perspective*. Institut oecuménique.

⁵ Stan, N. R. (2010). Intercorelația dintre Sfânta Scriptură și Sfânta Liturghie în viața Bisericii și a credincioșilor. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai-Theologia Orthodoxa*, (1), 139-152.

⁶ Dumitru, Mircea (2010). Despre toleranță, pluralism și recunoașterea celorlalți/On Tolerance, Pluralism and the Recognition of Others. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 4(10), 12-18.

⁷ Siebers, J. (2010). *Notes for a research project: communication and the phenomenological reduction*. Internet Source.

⁸ Kot S., Pigoń Ł., 2014, Effective Occupational Counselling for the Unemployed- *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1).

⁹ Bunăiașu, C. M. (2014). Early education-strategic field of the educational reform. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.

¹⁰ Gîfu, D., & Cioca, M. (2014). Detecting Emotions in Comments on Forums. *International Journal of Computers Communications & Control*, 9(6), 694-702.

the communication is philosophy. What does it mean? Is communication invaded by philosophy? In communication, is philosophy at home? Does communication usually secrete, produce, generate philosophy? Is communication an incomplete philosophy? Is the dialogue the place where communication is striving to become philosophy? Why should we tie communication to philosophy so closely? Is there communication without philosophy? Why is the idea of communication ever-present when we talk about philosophy? We believe that philosophy is a form of communication, a communicational discourse. There is not philosophy without communication¹. On the other hand, by understanding philosophy as an approach of philosophemes, we cannot leave aside the fact that even the concept of "philosophy" is a philosopheme. It follows that any dialogue, discussion, conversation about "philosophy" and other philosophemes impregnates a philosophical nature and, beyond any limit, it is even philosophical communication². To philosophize about philosophemes means to make philosophy, since philosophizing itself is a discourse. Discourses are living manifestations of language and manifest forms of communication. This implies that philosophizing integrates into the world of communication. Philosophizing is defined as the return to self-communication. Philosophizing may be intra-personal or inter-personal. (Incidentally, we do not see philosophizing as having biological origins, but we find Sanchez and Campos'³ communication thesis interesting "as a phenomenon with a biological origin. We argumentatively evoke that at the time of R. Descartes, Hegel says, all "human science was considered philosophizing"⁴. To communicate about communication is a self-centered reflection with philosophical connotations⁵. Let us remember one thing: dialogues, conversations, Hamletian monologues had existed before Pythagoras established the lexemic philosophy. First, people have communicated and then they have philosophized. So philosophy came, it came on the field of communication. Philosophy came as a visitor. For a long

¹ Țenescu, Alina (2014). The Organicist-Animist Metaphor in Italian Wine Media Discourse. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2.

² de Figueiredo, C. M. M. (2014). *Emotions and Recommender Systems: A Social Network Approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade do Porto).

³ Sanchez, L., & Campos, M. (2009). Content and sense. *Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication*, 1(1), 75-90.

⁴ Hegel, G. W. F. (1965). *Fenomenologia spiritului*. București: Editura Academiei.

⁵ Sandu, A. (2010). A Constructionist View on Truth in Sciences. *Analele Universității din Craiova, Seria Filosofie*, (26).

time Plato's dialogues have been read as literature. Being unprepared and innocent, after 6-7 years of school I read Plato's dialogues as literature¹. If philosophy seems a kind of literature, we should not worry: philosophy is infused, impregnated and irradiated by literature (cases such as Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre, Jacques Derrida are prototypical). We believe that philosophy and literature are found in communication. Literature is a literary communication, a communication where the language is the artistic material. Philosophy is turned toward itself, it is self-reflection, it is communicating about philosophemes, it is discourse about philosophemes, it is a philosophematic message. From this perspective, the demonstration "Literature as communication" seems justified².

The philosophical activity, appearing as discourse, consists of philosophical elements, thinking exercises on some philosophemes: the being, the meaning of life, the existence coordinates (space, time, matter), the good, beauty, truth, language, etc: "philosopheme of matter and of place"³. Some of the philosophemes have even become a subject of some autonomous trend branches of Philosophy: Philosophy of language, Philosophy of law, Philosophy of logic, and so on.

In an interesting analysis of some aspects of the creation of S. Kierkegaard, Erik Garrett notes that "Kierkegaard employed a method of indirect communication"⁴. But the whole philosophy is it not an indirect communication? It seems that it is. Being a thoughtful discourse⁵ about philosophemes, philosophy is an indirect communication. In other of aspects of it as deep, calm and solitary reflection, philosophy approaches the

¹ O'Brien, J. (2014). Football and Spanish Cultural Life; Some contemporary perspectives and observations. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 36-43.

² Siebers, J., Meitz, T., Vandeenabele, B., Romania, V., Boon, V & Blok V. (2012). Literature as communication. *Empedocles: European journal for the Philosophy of Communication*, 2.

³ Duschinsky, R. (2011). Ideal and Usullied: Purity, Subjectivity and social power. *Subjectivity*, 4(2), 147-167.

⁴ Garrett, E. (2012). The Essential Secret of Indirect Communication. *Review of Communication*, 12(3), 331-345, p. 331.

⁵ Smarandache, F., Gîfu, D., & Teodorescu, M. (2015). Neutrosophic elements in discourse. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1).

"prayer" as "spiritual communication"¹. It remains clearly and undeniably a specific type of discourse communication.

We consider communication a systemic universe with 15 crossed fields, having different consequences and different levels of cohesion. Communication is an irregular and heterogeneous universe: multi-space and multi-structure. Each field crystallizes around an axis and looks like a space having a certain systemic location, a certain orientation and internal coherence of structure. The axis is situated in the middle of the field. The power of the axis is the power of the field. The field belongs to the axis, not the other way round. We think that the 15 component-branches should be considered axes, directions and theoretical constructive-cognitive-cogitative, as well as applicative-practical crystallization paths of communication. The axes are specialties of the discipline of communication. Our idea is that „dry branches” of Philosophy can become green again. Dry branches are grafted, they are transplanted to the new, living trunk of science². The philosophy-meditation lives its destiny as philosophy, but, subsidiarily, it becomes an internal part of science, of the scientific cogitative system or of the theoretical cogitative system (see G. P. Radford³; K. B. Jensen⁴; H. A. Şerban⁵; C. Lungu⁶). We consider the "axis" a polarizing internalized branch of specific knowledge. This is the preliminary reasoning on which we base our constructive-cognitive-cogitative approach. It is guided by the standard of the ordering axes: communication has 15 internal axes around which the synchronic and diachronic communicative knowledge is crystallized and which render it systemically and procedurally functional. The research has led us to the conclusion that we can talk about 4 hard axes: communication

¹ James Baesler, E. (2012). Prayer Research: Foundations, Review, and Agenda. *Review of Communication*, 12(2), 143-158, p. 143.

² Ślusarczyk, B., & Herbuś, A. Higher Education as a Crucial Factor of Staff Development. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(2), 216-224.

³ Radford, G. P. (2005). *On Philosophy of Communication*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

⁴ Jensen, K. B. (2008). *Communication theory and philosophy*. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. pp. 839-852). Oxford, UK, and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

⁵ Şerban, H. A. (2009). On the Paradigms of Difference in the Philosophy of Communication. *Annals of the Academy of Romanian Scientists. Series on Philosophy, Psychology and Theology*, 1, 101-113.

⁶ Lungu, C. (2014). Semantic equivalences in Romanian medical terminology. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 12-17.

ontology-A1, communication epistemology-A2, communication methodology-A3, communication axiology-A4. There are 11 soft axes, namely: communication history-A5, communication psychology-A6, communication sociology-A7, communication anthropology-A8, communication hermeneutics-A9, communication praxeology-A10, communication ethics-A11, communication logics-A12, communication ecology-A13, communication philosophy-A14, communication law-A15.

The philosophical discourse is wholly "saying", "spoken", "expression" since it is unimaginable to express philosophical thinking through mimicry, gestures, kinesis, proxemics, or any other language than language. The construction material specifically philosophical is the word, namely the concepts and categories that make up the philosophical meta-language. In philosophical communication, verbal language is used meta-linguistically. As thinking about thinking, Philosophy does not and cannot have its own language, independent and well-defined. It uses common language, philosophically sterilizing it.

Philosophy is a systemic and systematic reflection on philosophemes. It also emerges as the knowledge organizing the conceptual-categorematic reality¹ of the world, revealing the abstract structure of concrete building². As seen from this appositionally qualifying-ostensive definition³ philosophemes are nuclei of meanings condensed in philosophical concepts and categories⁴, in philosophical ideas. A philosopheme is impregnated with reflexive meanings and irradiates meditation about meanings. Practically, the philosophemes are concepts and may be compact reflexive ideas, problems or major themes. From Philosophy there were drawn, in turn, different sciences that claimed both separation and their own possession of concepts, categories, investigative techniques and procedures. So good to others, so generous in lending, Philosophy must delineate its new territory⁵. Our effort is aimed in this direction, now joining the coordinates

¹ Pârvu, I. (2000). *Filosofia comunicării*. SNSPA, București.

² Dima, I. C., Grabara J., & Vlăduțescu, S.(2014). Comparative Study On Online Education In Romania And Poland In Terms Of Current Globalization. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1), 7-18.

³ Grabara, J., & Dima, I. C. (2014). Logistics model for industrial waste treatment processes. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.

⁴ Strungă, A. C. (2014). Osgood's Semantic Differential: a Review of Romanian Social Sciences Literature. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2.

⁵ Grabara, J., & Man, M. (2014). Assessment of logistic outlays in industrial solid waste management. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(2), 11-21.

in the battle of the new philosophy, deepening the knowledge of ancient and fascinating Philosophy.

7. Conclusions

As discourse, Philosophy is an essential questioning communication. Philosophy is a discourse on philosophemes, it is communicational discourse about philosophemes. Philosophy is a discursive space of philosophemes. So, being communication, Philosophy has a message: the philosophical message is a philosophematic message. Its message is query, categorical, philosophematic; it is also a removed and delayed message, a) removed: that is, a message where things are looked at from far away and b) delayed: a self-examining, wise, delayed message, a message which is constructed after things have already happened. Philosophical communication is a double practice: it is a practical and systematic approach to philosophemes and a daily spiritual practice of reflective living. Philosophy is a detached communication after the disaster has caused havoc.

References

- Aristotle (2004). *The Categories*. Whitefish, MO: Kessinger Publishing.
- Aristotle (2004). *Topics*. Whitefish, MO: Kessinger Publishing.
- Bell, J. (2009). Charting the Road of Inquiry. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 44(3), 399.
- Buber, M. (1992). *Eu și Tu*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- Budică, I., Busu, O. V., Dumitru, A., & Purcaru, M.-L. (2015). Waste management as commitment and duty of citizens. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1).
- Bunăiașu, C. M. (2014). Early education-strategic field of the educational reform. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.
- Bunge, M. (1967). *Scientific Research*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Coman, M. (2003). *Mass-Media, mit și ritual*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119-161.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (1995). Grounded Practical Theory: The Case of Intellectual Discussion. *Communication Theory*, 5 (3), 248-272.
- Czubaroff, J. (2012). Dialogue and the Prospect of Rhetoric. *Review of Communication*, 12(1), 44-65.
- Danciulescu, D., & Colhon, M. (2014). Splitting the structured paths in stratified graphs. Application in Natural Language Generation. *Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Ovidius Constanta-Seria Matematica*, 22(2), 57-67.
-

- de Figueiredo, C. M. M. (2014). *Emotions and Recommender Systems: A Social Network Approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade do Porto).
- De Vries, H. (1999). *Philosophy and the Turn of Religion*. JHU Press.
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (2004). *Dissemination*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Dima, I. C., Grabara J., & Vlăduțescu, S.(2014). Comparative Study On Online Education In Romania And Poland In Terms Of Current Globalization. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1), 7-18.
- Ducrot, O. (1984). *Logique, structure, enonciation*. Paris: Minuit.
- Dumitru, Mircea (2010). Despre toleranță, pluralism si recunoasterea celorlalti/On Tolerance, Pluralism and the Recognition of Others. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 4(10), 12-18.
- Duschinsky, R. (2011). Ideal and Usullied: Purity, Subjectivity and social power. *Subjectivity*, 4(2), 147-167.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *EPZ Truth and Method*. (2nd ed.) Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Galay, J. P. (1977). *Philosophie et invention textuelle*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Garrett, E. (2012). The Essential Secret of Indirect Communication. *Review of Communication*, 12(3), 331-345. DOI: 10.1080/15358593.2011.683804
- Gersh, S. (2012). The First Principles of Latin Neoplatonism: Augustine, Macrobius, Boethius. *Vivarium*, 50(2), 113-138.
- Gîfu, D., & Cioca, M. (2014). Detecting Emotions in Comments on Forums. *International Journal of Computers Communications & Control*, 9(6), 694-702.
- Grabara, I. (2014). The Innovative Methods Of Future Professional Staff Education. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1), 32-44.
- Grabara, J., & Dima, I. C. (2014). Logistics model for industrial waste treatment processes. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.
- Grabara, J., & Man, M. (2014). Assessment of logistic outlays in industrial solid waste management. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(2), 11-21.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1965). *Fenomenologia spiritului*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1996). *Principiile filosofiei dreptului*. București: Editura IRI.
- Heidegger, M. (1988). *Repere pe drumul gândirii*. București: Editura Politică.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Iușă, F. (2012). *Univers ceremonial și mass-media*. București: Ars Docendi.
- James Baesler, E. (2012). Prayer Research: Foundations, Review, and Agenda. *Review of Communication*, 12(2), 143-158.
- Jaspers, K. (1986). *Texte filosofice*. București: Editura Politică.
- Jensen, K. B. (2008). *Communication theory and philosophy*. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. pp. 839-852). Oxford, UK, and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kant, I. (1970). *Logica*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Kant, I. (1994). *Critica rațiunii pure*. București: Editura IRI.
- Knies, E. (2013). *Das Philosophem*. Neubrandenburg: Spica Verlag.

- Kot S., Pigoń Ł., 2014, Effective Occupational Counselling for the Unemployed- *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(1).
- Levinas, E. (1999). *Totalitate și Infinit*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
- Lotman, I. (1975). *Studii de tipologie a culturii*. București: Editura Univers.
- Lungu, C. (2014). Semantic equivalences in Romanian medical terminology. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 12-17.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1997). *Fenomenologie*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- Neacșu, A. (2000). *Eidos și Genesis. Eseu asupra formelor platoniene*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Neacșu, A. (2006). *Arheologia și evoluția conceptelor filosofice*. Editura Universitaria.
- Negrea, X., & Teodorescu, B. (2015). An extended review for a remarkable book, Systemic Approaches to Strategic Management: Examples from the Automotive Industry (2015). *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 11(1).
- Noica, C. (1993). *De caelo*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- O'Brien, J. (2014). Football and Spanish Cultural Life; Some contemporary perspectives and observations. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 36-43.
- Olivier, B. (2009). *Philosophy and Communication*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Papastephanou, M. (2013). The Ethical Challenge of Multidisciplinarity: Reconciling "The Three Narratives" – Art, Science, and Philosophy. Internet source.
- Parodi, D. (1940). Philosophy in France, 1938-1939. *The Philosophical Review*, 49(1), 1-24.
- Pinchevski, A. (2005). The Ethics of Interruption: Toward a Levinasian Philosophy of Communication. *Social Semiotics*, 15(2), 211-234.
- Pârvu, I. (2000). *Filosofia comunicării*. SNSPA, București.
- Popper, K. (2002). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Preston, A. (2005). Conformism in analytic philosophy: On shaping philosophical boundaries and prejudices. *The Monist*, 88(2), 292-318.
- Radford, G. P. (2005). *On Philosophy of Communication*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Ricœur, P. (1984). *Metafora vie*. București: Editura Univers.
- Ricoeur, P. (2003). *The rule of metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*. London: Routledge.
- Ruin, H. (2008). Belonging to the whole: Critical and 'Heracritical': Notes of the Ideal of Cosmopolitanism. *The Idea of Kosmopolis*, 31.
- Sanchez, L., & Campos, M. (2009). Content and sense. *Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication*, 1(1), 75-90.
- Sandru, A. (2010). A Constructionist View on Truth in Sciences. *Analele Universității din Craiova, Seria Filosofie*, (26).
- Sartre, J.-P. (1969). *L'Être et le Néant*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Șerban, H. A. (2009). On the Paradigms of Difference in the Philosophy of Communication. *Annals of the Academy of Romanian Scientists. Series on Philosophy, Psychology and Theology*, 1, 101-113.

- Siebers, J. (2010). *Notes for a research project: communication and the phenomenological reduction*. Internet Source.
- Siebers, J., Meitz, T., Vandeenabele, B., Romania, V, Boon, V & Blok V. (2012). Literature as communication. *Empedocles: European journal for the Philosophy of Communication*, 2.
- Ślusarczyk, B., & Herbuś, A. Higher Education as a Crucial Factor of Staff Development. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10(2), 216-224.
- Smarandache, F., & Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2014). Towards a Practical Communication Intervention. *Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială*, (46), 243-254.
- Smarandache, F. (2015). Neutrosophic Social Structures Specificities. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1).
- Smarandache, F., Gîfu, D., & Teodorescu, M. (2015). Neutrosophic elements in discourse. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1).
- Surdu, A. (2009). *Comentarii la rostirea filosofică*. Brașov: Editura Kron-Art.
- Stan, N. R. (2008). *The relation between human dignity and human rights in the Orthodox perspective*. Institut oecuménique.
- Stan, N. R. (2010). Intercorelația dintre Sfânta Scriptură și Sfânta Liturghie în viața Bisericii și a credincioșilor. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai-Theologia Orthodoxa*, (1), 139-152.
- Strungă, A. C. (2014). Osgood's Semantic Differential: a Review of Romanian Social Sciences Literature. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2.
- Taylor, A. E. (1926). Two Pythagorean Philosophemes. *The Classical Review*, 40(5), 149-151.
- Tonoiu, V. (1995). *Omul dialogal: un concept răspîntie*. București: Editura FCR.
- Țenescu, Alina (2014). The Organicist-Animist Metaphor in Italian Wine Media Discourse. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *The study of Discourse*. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed), *Interaction. Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies 1: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 1-34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Vlăduțescu, G. (2007). *Istoria filosofiei ca hermeneutică*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2013). Considerations on Voice as a Fundamental Element in Oral Communication. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Științe Filologice. Lingvistică*, (1-2), 355-363.
- Voinea, D. V. (2014). A demographic portrait of Romanian immigrants in California. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1(1), 63-70.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1991). *Tratatus Logico-Philosophicus*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1993). *Caietul albastru*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- Wolfers, J. (1998). *Justifying the Unjustifiable*. In J. Derrida. *The Derrida Reader: Writing Performances* (pp. 1-49). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Worth, D. (2003). Magic, Will, and Discourse: Rhetoric as Technology. *Integrative Explorations*, 7-8, 186-196.