

FIRST PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IASI: CONSTANTIN LEONARDESCU

*Ion IONESCU**

Abstract

In the first part of this article I took a look at some socio-human writings with great impact in Europe of the nineteenth century, towards Romanian scholars with their specificity, paradoxes and challenges, in order to frame Constantin Leonardescu within a context, where present, in many ways, a pioneer of our sociology. Most of the article is devoted to his ideas that animated the sociological concerns towards the late nineteenth century, when new institutions and knowledge that represent the origin of “socio-human science” today were also implemented in Romania.

Keywords. Sociology, sociology professor, university, society, Iasi

Résumé

Dans une première partie de l'article, l'auteur a pris un regard sur quelques écrits socio-humains avec impact dans l'Europe du XIXe siècle, ainsi sur les érudits roumains – avec leurs spécificités, paradoxes et défis, afin d'encadrer (dans une proposition de contexte) Constantin Leonardescu qui est, à bien des égards, un pionnier de la sociologie roumaine. La plupart de l'article est consacrée aux idées qui ont animé ses préoccupations sociologiques en fin du XIXe, quand chez nous-même ont été mis en place de nouvelles institutions et connaissances qui se trouvent à l'origine des «sciences socio-humaines» d'aujourd'hui.

Mots-clés. Sociologie, professeur de sociologie, université, société, Iași

Rezumat

În prima parte a acestui articol am aruncat o privire asupra unor scrieri socioumane cu impact în Europa secolului al XIX-lea, dar și spre cărturarii din țările române – cu specificul, paradoxurile și provocările lor, pentru a încadra într-o propunere de context pe Constantin Leonardescu, care este, în multe privințe, un pionier al sociologiei noastre. Cea mai mare parte a articolului este dedicată ideilor care i-au animat preocupările sociologice spre sfârșitul secolului al XIX-lea, când s-au implementat și la noi instituții și s-au produs cunoștințe aflate la originea “științelor socioumane” de astăzi.

Cuvinte cheie. Sociologie, profesor de sociologie, universitate, societate, Iași

1. While J. S. Mill demanded more debate over the intentions and practices of socialism and communism (*The Principles of Political Economy*, 1848; *On Liberty*, 1859; *A few words about nonintervention*, 1859; *Considerations on Representative*

* Professor PhD, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, Carol I 11, 700506, Iași, Romania; e-mail: ion@uaic.ro

Government, 1861 etc.), Marx and Engels published the *Communist Manifest* (1848) – a call to a revolution which occurred in Europe. In 1850, Herbert Spencer published the *Social Statics* in which he expounded his ideas on changing the social structure, being concerned of the rights of women and children. In 1856, Alexis de Tocqueville published *The Old Regime and the Revolution*, and Charles Darwin *The Origin of Species* (1859) – which represented impulses for research on natural and social evolution. In 1863, Lincoln gave the Proclamation through which the slaves in the United States would be free forever (the *13th Amendment to the US Constitution* which abolished slavery). During 1876-1896, Herbert Spencer published *The Principles of Sociology* (used for the first course of sociology in the United States), *The Study of Sociology* (1880), *The Man Versus the State* (1884), and *The Factors of Organic Evolution* (1887). In 1882, Fr. Nietzsche published the *Happy science* and announced that “God is dead” in 1887, Ferdinand Tönnies published *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, and in 1890, Gabriel Tarde debated the difference between imitation and invention (in *The Imitation Laws*). In 1893 Émile Durkheim published the *Social division of labor* and analyzed the evolution of society from “mechanical solidarity” to “organic solidarity”. Later, he developed his theory of “social fact”, he described the rules of the sociological method and wrote the treatise on *Suicide* (1897). In 1900, Sigmund Freud published *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and Georg Simmel *The Money philosophy*. In 1902, Charles H. Cooley published *The Human Nature and the Social Order*, Robert Park wrote about the *Crowds and public* (1904) and in 1907 William James published *Pragmatism* (which inspired the development of symbolic interactionism).

2. As shown in “the dust of chronicles” the solid “Romanian feudalism” meant concentrating on the house, “on the household”, on daily routines and induced specific “features” to the Romanians and their mentalities. No other documents show any significant increase in the social division of labor in our land, neither any radical transformation of the political and legal organization. Our cities have not played an important economic role, keeping for a long time their administrative roles (eventually military). In our rural space, the peasants remained enslaved until later times in the village communities remained vulnerable to all natural threats “preserving” feudal principles of agricultural organization, reproducing the “pre-industrial society”. The new “bourgeoisie” required / acquired in a difficult way privileges to the boyars, and even harder if it proposed ideas against the feudal and neighboring empires. In fact, our historians speak of the contribution of several Romanian families and personalities which lay at the origin of the “rupture from the old regime” and tracing the outline of a certain “capitalist modernity”. Most princes and boyars in our lands were more opened to the East, Byzantium, the Balkans... This is a “key” to understanding our evolution in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Other “keys” are: “the existence of overlapping classes”, maintaining the “joint property” village communities, persistence of

misconceptions, counterfeit of some “(re)forms without substance” etc., which caused “turbulences and struggles” between the Eastern orientation and Western orientation ... Revolutions, reforms have hardly “broken through” habits – customs – mores which “clung” to provide daily comfort (i.e. ontological security and daily routines). We did not lack of generous ideas, but the fact that most Romanian did not (re) know, accept and apply them; they had little impact on society.

Romanian society joined later on the “coordinates of the capitalist development” (Costea 1998). The “passion” of instrumental rationality was not great in the Romanian land. Moreover, the conditions here were always “unique”, “original” and analyzed in their continuity, thinking, ideas about society, community and individuals of Romanian sociologists have reproduced historical and national “features” trying stubbornly to become elements of “sociology of the nation” (Ionescu 1997).

The birth of Romanian sociology was “prepared” by “social reflections” on the events, phenomena, processes, relationships, interactions and institutions, but we can find ideas and concerns in the field of some scholars who have struggled to identify specific Romanian identity in order to set the foundations of a Romanian socio-culture and civilization. Thus, it was recognized the encyclopaedism of the “Transylvanian peregrine”, I. C. Drăgușanu (1835-1844), of the Romanian hikers in Palestine and Egypt (D. Bolintineanu 1856), in India, China, Ceylon, Japan, Indonesia (D. Xantus), in Argentina and Chile (I. Popper), Iran, Malaysia, Singapore (B. Asan), in Africa (N. Ghika-Comănești) etc. A reference book remained the one of Dimitrie Cantemir, *Descriptio Moldaviae*, in which the great scholar and ruler said that “Moldovan-Romanian-Vlachs” represented a real factor of balance between East and West. The Constitution of 1822 promoted ideas of the French Revolution, and “the bonjours” (Romanian young people who left to study in the West) tried to reduce the weight of the Orientalism of the Romanian socio-culture and to steer the Romanian society, towards the West, the “western area” of influence. Thus, the boyar Dinicu Golescu sent his son to study in the West because he considered necessary the “social reform” based on serious knowledge of the Romanian reality, and in the book *Notes on my journey* (1824) he even described practical principles and solutions of social reform: improving the situation of peasants (“correlated” with the austerity of the nobility’s life living in “luxury and laxity”), “westernization” of boyars, removing speculators and upstarts (which came to us barefoot and then arrived to build their palaces by exploiting poor Romanians)...

Ion Ionescu de la Brad (1818-1891) studied in France, traveled to European countries, returned to Moldova and worked to transform the society (he taught at the University, he published books and studies, participated in the 1848-1849 Romanian revolution). After the unification of Moldova with the Muntenia Country (1859) he made field studies, monographs of the areas. “Without a thorough understanding of social and national reality, without improving the status

of people, without increasing their culture and civilization, the freedom and modernization cannot be achieved here”, he said.

I. H. Rădulescu, V. Conta, N. Bălcescu, M. Kogălniceanu, P. S. Aurelian, I. C. Brătianu, A. D. Xenopol and many others have put diagnoses on Romanian society, they have identified real problems, proposed strategies for knowledge-explanation-understanding of Romanian society in order to raise awareness among leaders and the people and to attract the “international opinion” towards the “Romanian cause”. “Because we had always struggled against the machinations of all kinds, from inside and outside, our agriculture, industry and commerce did not develop,” wrote P. S. Aurelian in *How did we fund the industry in Romania* (1881). The National regeneration – I. H. Radulescu said – begins with the rediscovery of the past and reconstruction of the present. The “Creative elite” composed of indigenous risentrough their merits, should communicate with the people, in order to identify its needs, to defend its interests, he said. Nicolae Bălcescu (1819-1852) and other young Romanians made the plans of the Romanian revolution, that took place in 1848-1849, but was defeated by internal and external hostile forces. Mihail Kogălniceanu (1817-1891) actively participated in the most important moments in the history of Romanian society of the nineteenth century. Romanian countries can be modernized if we develop on the experience of the West, he said, while maintaining the psychological and cultural particularities. Mimicking without judgement can cause a brutal rupture with the past without founding the present. ”I was never against foreign ideas and civilization. On the contrary, I have lived most of my youth in countries ahead of Europe and I believe that no nation should be closed to the influences of time; it should not be limited to what it has, without borrowing from other civilizations. But we must distinguish between healthy civilization and false superficial civilization”, Kogălniceanu said.

Vasile Conta (1845-1882) spoke of “continuous and indefinite progress “, the criteria being “the degree of development of our knowledge and conscience.” Romanians must rely on their actions and knowledge and move towards the highest ideals. Individual and society are co-determined, therefore mutual sacrifices are necessary.

Mihai Eminescu (1850-1889), editor of the newspapers *Courier of Iasi* and *Time*, unmasked “the superposed social categories” made up of people in the country and from elsewhere, “who do not produce anything,” only consume and produce waste. ”Work is the living matter of a State”, he said.

George Barițiu, Simion Bărnuțiu, Al. Papiu Ilarian and others fought for “cultural democratization” to form an educated people, able to become happy in its own country.

Influenced by slave “populist movement”, Constantin Stere (1864-1936) proposed a “program for the Romanian people”: cooperation of social classes, solving the agrarian problem (given the fact that the peasantry was the majority), the development of agriculture-related professions etc.

The Romanian society must wake up from the “Oriental barbarism”, but not to borrow without judgment laws and institutions from other nations, because they will become “forms without substance”, said Titu Maiorescu (1840-1917) in his book *Against the present direction of the Romanian culture*. A country cannot “jump” steps made by other countries for centuries... Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea (1855-1920) assessed the state of development of the Romanian society in the second half of the nineteenth century and has legitimized in our country the “socialist movement”. Ștefan Zeletin (1882-1934) analyzed the transformations of the Romanian bourgeoisie and found out that, unfortunately, it does not act in a convergent way for the development of the national economy. Spiru Haret (1851-1912) was concerned about the people – main components of the social body – the goal being their education, achievement of internal civilization and moral binder. Noting with concern the decline of the native population and unprecedented multiplying of “wildlings” (a real danger for the nation, because they monopolized the industry, infiltrated in the media, culture and politics ...). A. C. Cuza (1857-1947), Traian Brăileanu (1882-1947) etc. asked of the “Romanian elite” to be nationalist, corporate, ascetic and charismatic. Virgil Bărbat (1879-1931), G. E. Marica (1904-1952) and others have contributed to the development of culture sociology and education sociology, Al. Claudiu (1858-1962) analyzed the connections between thinking systems and socio-political changes, Dumitru Drăghicescu (1875-1945) – student of E. Durkheim, analyzed the individual's role in social determinism (1904), the creative ideal, the evolution psycho-sociology. In this sequence, Petre Andrei (1891-1940) could become a promoter of “sociological integralism” and Dimitrie Gusti (1880-1955) founder of a true sociological system and of a Romanian “sociological school”.

3. In October 1860, the ruler Alexandru Ioan Cuza entrusted to the Rector the Founding reign order, the seal, the flag and the scepters, inaugurating in this way the University of Iasi.

At the Philosophical Faculty enrolled that academic year 14 students and the teachers were: S. Bărnăuțiu, V. Conta, T. Maiorescu and others. Documents found in the Archives of the University's Rector indicate that in 1878, the faculty had six departments (*Yearbook of University of Iasi...* 1896). By 1890 their number increased in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy (after the departments of philosophy and history of philosophy, Greek classical philology, Latin, universal history, Romanian history, history of modern literature, other departments were established: psychology, pedagogy, aesthetics, ethics, logic, sociology). In a reigning message, Al. I. Cuza established some of the higher education objectives (already included in the programs of the revolution of 1848), stressing the need to take into account the actual conditions of the country and the progress of other countries.

“Exclusive and servile imitation of the instruction of a state or another would deny even our very being”, said G. Costaforu (1860). It is preferable the experience

“even bounded, but gained by our country than compiling foreign laws” – T. Maiorescu argued in a Law draft of Public Instruction. “No school should exist just for its goals” – would later write N. Iorga (1981, p. 157) – “but to appear from the needs of society, needs which should be known in order to reach the form that school should incarnate and serve”.

In the period between “Little union” (1859) and “Great Union” (1918) numerous guidelines were confronted, trends regarding the social, cultural, educational reforming, regarding the organization of education. But event then (as in other eras ...) many “makers” have succeeded in the leadership of the Department of Public Instruction and Cults, which had actually negative repercussions on education policy (because structure modifications were not made in correlation with social becoming but only punctual changes, for example, only between 1862-1877, 28 people succeeded at the head of the Department of Public Instruction and Religious Affairs). In terms of affirmation of modern democratic society, teachers at that time – true loving country personalities – were able to prepare specialists with higher education (which, until then, were brought from outside the country) and to train citizens, true patriots – and as a proof of that is their behavior during the Independence war and the one of the reunification of the nation. Educations without moral foundation has no value, they said, and an education that does not properly prepare necessary officials for the independent state, qualified workers for the industry and trade development.

Here is outlined in a few lines a proposal of context in which enrolled his activity, Constantin Leonardescu – the first professor of sociology at the University of Iasi.

Constantin Leonardescu was born on December 3rd 1846 in Craiova, died on August 20th 1906, and was buried in *Eternitatea* cemetery from Iasi. An exceptional student in school, Constantin Leonardescu attended the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy in Bucharest (he obtained his bachelor's degree with the thesis *Methodulu in scientiele physico-naturale, essacte, morale și politice – Methods in physical natural, accurate, moral and political sciences*, held on 29th of September 1866 before a commission that was presided by A.T. Laurian), and continued his studies abroad, obtaining the Bachelor Degree in law in Paris (the thesis held at the Law School of Paris was entitled: “Du Mandat dans le droit civil français et des commissionnaires en général: art. 1984-3010, Code Nap.; le nouveaux art. 94 et 95 du Code de Comm. et la loi du 23 Mai 1863 qui modifie le titre 6 du I^{er} livre” – From the Mandate in French civil law and commissions in general: articles 1984-3010, Code Nap.; the new art. 94 and 95 of the Code of Commerce and the Act of 23rd of May 1863, amending the 6th Title 6 of the 1st Book) comprising numerous notes on articles from the Romanian code – according to States Archives, Iasi, file 251/1874) and the PhD title in philosophy and letters in Brussels. Returning home he became professor of philosophy at the University

of Iasi, replacing Titu Maiorescu (from the File 25/1867 Arch. St. Iasi, R.U.), we learn that he gave a contest for the vacant place on April 16, 1873 and was sworn on May 6, 1873). For a quarter of century, C. Leonardescu taught here social sciences of the time, along with great personalities of the Romanian culture, like V. Conta, I. Negruzzi, A. Fătu, P. Poni, A. D. Xenopol, A. Densușianu, D. Brânză, Gr. Cobălcescu, Șt. Micle who were also professors at the University of Iasi. He was a member of the Society *Junimea*, delegate in the General Board of Education (1883), contributor to the magazine *Convorbiri literare* (*Literary conversations*), *Revista contemporană* (*Contemporary magazine*) etc. He has published books and studies in the field (*Philosophy facing the progress of positive sciences*, 1876, *Experimental Psychology*, 1879, *The inductive moral or the science of human behavior*, 1885, *Principles of Psychology* 1892, *Principles of Literature and Art Philosophy*, 1898; “The ideal of the peoples in our century”, “The current crisis of morality” and others in the journal *Literary Conversations*).

As a teacher he has accumulated, systematized and interpreted information from philosophy, logic, aesthetics, psychology, sociology, being interested in news from physics, mathematics etc. In the current building of the University *Alexandru Ioan Cuza Iasi* – opened in October 1897 (the University had 350 rooms, one auditorium with 500 places, 17 amphitheatres, 9 laboratories, one library – according to “Contributions to the history of development of the University of Iasi, 1860-1960”, book I, Bucharest, 1960) – C. Leonardescu held the first sociology course.

Nicolae Iorga heard his courses, attended his seminars and in his book *A human life as it was* (1981, p. 157) he reminds with sympathy of “Mister Costachi Leonardescu”, whose head “focused in the fleshy mouth from which sprang the endless goodwill and a naive optimism”.

Ion Petrovici – which followed Leonardescu at the University (from the document no. 57634/11.09.1906 signed by the Minister D. Hurmuzescu, we find out that Ion Petrovici is appointed lecturer at the *Department of the history of ancient philosophy, ethics and sociology* instead of C. Leonardescu deceased, following his application from 17th September 1906) – characterized him as follows: “As a trained and ambitious young man, when he returned in the country from Paris, he could have worked quite differently from the way he worked. It is impossible that throughout his studies he did not keep in his heart some unsatisfying points of philosophical controversy that he thought he could still elucidate, he did not see how the proposed theories and explanations can be paired together [...]. He could seek to lead the thought of others further on, to write books with titles absolutely in Chinese for his countrymen at that time, he could forget where he was and what he wanted for his fellow people and less prepared than him in his field. He could have done all those things [...] but in fact, Leonardescu sought to spread in the Romanian country and in the Romanian language fundamentals of science which at that time were unknown in the region [...]. He was a teacher in the fullest sense of the word. He sought to create – with others motivated by the same

thoughts – the necessary atmosphere for a philosophical movement in our country. He said generally things known elsewhere, but foreign to us, without the fact that in his work – less bright when a heartless judge – his personal qualities and his thoughts disappear. We have now the possibility to appreciate him justly [...] (Petrovici 1984, p. 59). In a time when “everything had to be renewed in philosophy under the impact of discoveries of science”, his erudition and constant concern to sustain his knowledge on research, experimentation and the vigor of demonstration, have led Leonardescu to sociology (is one of the pillars of our national culture, if we accept the distinction made by M. Dogan and R. Pahre [1993], when we can consider him one of the “pioneers” who cross borders, arrive into “terra incognita” and fructify the conquered ground; Dimitrie Gusti recognizes this role to his predecessor).

Sociology – said Mihai Eminescu – “is based on a common axiom to all human knowledge, meaning that concrete events in the life of a person are subject to some fixed laws, working vigorously and inevitably ... No one except the ignorant mutt of journalists, cannot sustain that only free voting, the Parliament and meetings are the foundation of a state (...)” (*apud* Buzatu, Lemny and Saizu 1988). Politicians – said C. Leonardescu – “by artificial means, serving some abstract constitutional forms, desire to focus all our social conscience in their individual feeling and thinking” (Leonardescu 1900, p. 66). Or, the intelligence and feeling of our nation “has more value than their subjective assessments” (*Ibidem*, p. 67). At the same time, however, a nation exists in reality only when it realizes his existence, when “it realizes the extent of its territory, its language, its religion, finally, its aspirations” (*Ibidem*, p. 67). Unfortunately – shows Leonardescu – not all people are aware of their “social self”. Most of them have “social instincts”. “How many people know the geography, history, language and religion of their country? How many realize the rights and duties in relation to the constitutive powers of the state?” (*Ibidem*, p. 68) “Getting up in the morning, we should know what we have to work during the day. To always have a goal to follow... Each of us is seeking to improve the livelihood, but not everybody knows what to do for the society, as we must work in order to transform the institutions (...), few have full awareness of the organization and functioning of the social organism, no one can know and recall at any time all items in our laws” (*Ibidem*, p. 69) Everyone is more concerned with maintaining the ontological security, the fulfillment of daily routines.

The “sociologist” vision of Comte’s influence (“The individual cannot have other feeling, other cogitation than the one the social collectivity has”; “the origin of the social consciousness is not the individual but the environment in which the individual is living, with the social atmosphere in which he breathes” etc.) was nuanced by C. Leonardescu. Thus, he criticized the “organicism” and “contractualism” who claimed that “the government is aware of the entire social activity”. “The social encephalon” has no other life, no other power than the one received from the society in which it ruled, he said. “The movement started from

the top down is merely a reflection of the movement received from the bottom up. The more refined the nation is, the more it manifests its unity as a group [...] the more the impulse given to the government is more consistent“ (“Social life depends on what role each person is called to play in society, according to his ability, his specialty”; otherwise, one is conscious of its relations with others working the land, another serving science and / or art).

If I had not been accused of the “post-modernization” of C. Leonardescu’s theory through current sociologies, I would say it has a constructivist point of view when he avoids talking only regarding the “mass” of indistinct individuals and it reaches and social actors also (Leonardescu 1990, p. 70) in his acceptance, not just those concerned with “survival care”, by their own business or wealth administration”, but also those “able to forget themselves and their interests in order to lose the support and the meditation of society in which they belong” (*Ibidem*, p. 70). But people should be prepared for this condition through education, through the teaching of geography, history, language, civil, cultural, religious institutions of laws of the country, which they apply also. Nobody can be against political parties (as social actors) if they “unite people really motivated by the interests of society” not only by their own interests, “too few in then countries who are less advanced in culture”... A party, no matter how many members would include, remains a “small group” if it doesn’t have great men (*Ibidem*, p. 71). But, once elected, neither they “cannot impose to people than what the social body requires”. Beneficent law is what “systematizes good habits of the people” or one that “goes against its bad habits” (*Ibidem*, p. 71). “A whim, a fantasy of a political group may not ever become social will” – said C. Leonardescu – concluding with an urged impulse on education and culture of all people (contrary to Schopenhauer who said that intelligence cannot change the will “in nothing”, or contrary to Spencer who said that “the world is governed by feelings and transformed by feelings for which the ideas serve them only as guides”...), to continuous action for disciplining social life in which they could live worthy.

Of the progress of ideas, and knowledge hangs “the human happiness”, but also the transformation of the moral nature, characteristics of social relations etc. For this, however, we must know, research “the human behavior”, “individual morality”, “social morality” (Leonardescu 1885). Avoiding the classical antinomy, C. Leonardescu stated that “the science of the individual and the society are inseparable” (*Ibidem*, p. 5). Moral conduct of a man is “a combination of actions to an end that has knowledge and conscience”. His actions are as moral or immoral as they are or not consistent with “the principles of which was nurtured people’s consciousness” in which he belongs. In solitary confinement, no moral idea can occur in the human mind (*Ibidem*, p. 15). “Human being cannot live in isolation,” says C. Leonardescu (1868, p. 44). If people would live in isolation they would not distinguish themselves from other creatures. Society is needed for the development of people. “It is not a mere aggregate of individuals, but a meeting of intelligence

that flow towards the same goal". "Moral sense" of human being is influenced by its own physicality, climate, social means and education. Human moral behavior of a civilized society "does not resemble the one of the ignorant, the savage or the human grown into a society of thieves" in which "justice does not reign" but where "corruption dominates" (Leonardescu 1885, p. 27). Man's moral behavior is always affected, threatened, but he must always lie between "pure egoism" and "altruism exaggerated", which "does not correspond with social evolution of our time in a positive or scientific state" (*Ibidem*, p. 29).

It is necessary to "harmonize individual good with social good". Man "has a duty to work, not to commit suicide and to be temperate". The man has a moral duty to care for his physical body, to develop his intellect and sensitivity. The social order depends on "peace between individuals", "between individual and crowd" (*Ibidem*, p. 46) of "population" as the "development of the scientific spirit" of "public education" (*Ibidem*, p. 48). "The ultimate cause of stagnation of a people is ignorance [...], the mother of all social disorders, of all addictions and suffering" (*Ibidem*, p. 50). It is important to research "the state and trends of the people" to see if it complies with the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity (*Ibidem*, p. 52), debts relative to family life (mutual debts of spouses, of parents towards children, of children towards parents), debts in relation with public life (respect for property) – (C. Leonardescu is against "communism that created so many disorders without to no use", cf. *Ibidem*, p. 66), citizens debts, respect for the Constitution and other laws.

The sociological research method cannot be independent of the knowledge society's object (Leonardescu 1868). "A determined way," must be followed as "it doesn't work to investigate the truth by chance" (*Ibidem*, p. 11). The general method involves particular methods which include procedures (*Ibidem*, p. 12). Leonardescu comment on the claims of Descartes from *Discourse on Method* (we must not take as truth not even what appears obvious, in order to avoid precipitation, to share a difficulty in as many parts as necessary, to go from simple to composed, to make complete counting to assure ourselves that we haven't omitted anything etc.), by adding Bossuet's requirement "not to abandon the truths acquired, no matter the difficulty of reconciling with others", as Condillac's indication (analysis is the true secret of discoveries as it ascends to the origin of things). Observation, experimentation and generalization help go "from part to whole, from the individual to the world, from the world to God" (*Ibidem*, p. 17), says Leonardescu. We must respect "the rules of good observation," but "reason and imagination" complete the observation in order to learn "the determination of things." Precise attention and perception capture "the smallest nuances in resembling phenomena" as good comparison and analogy are good methods of obtaining true knowledge. The researcher must not let himself led by "the will of systematic prejudices" but work "disinterested" (*Ibidem*, p. 34). Of course you can

call upon the “opinions” of people, testimonies of our fellows (“the need to refer to foreign experience strikes us” (*Ibidem*, p. 45), but without considering them “a primary and irreducible factor” before we see on what they are based on, because, usually, opinions, testimonies, etc. are altered by interests, passions and beliefs. We cannot blindly obey to any “general consent” neither to the “yoke of authority” (*Ibidem*, p. 47). By observing and experiencing we can be led to generalities – because “one science must be invested with generality’s character” (*Ibidem*, p. 54) – but also in comprehension. We must not mistake induction with analogy – said Leonardescu – because they are “two distinct ways of arriving from particular to general” (*Ibidem*, p. 63). To proceed through “induction”, means to admit that the universe is governed by general and stable laws. The establishment of the laws “does not come from physics, but from metaphysics” by trying out a true understanding of the empirical-theoretical relation (“... the empirical method should be connected to the rational method, their separation is fatal to science and humanity” – *Ibidem*, p. 71). Senses and reason, induction and deduction are inseparables. “Not to take into account the experience means arriving to callousness, apathy, in the presence of our industry and materialized civilization, but saying that the experience satisfies the necessities of the reason, that the human has only senses and that he should only take care of the matter, it also represents a disregard in the presence of moral and religious aspirations” (*Ibidem*, p. 73). To the ideas included in quotes and proverbs we arrived after a long life experience (“Whole life is a series of inductions constraint by precautions and research” – *Ibidem*, p. 89). Definitions obtained through induction are yet temporary, like those obtained through analogy (What does it mean to say “Ancient times resemble modern times through the identity of human character?” Furthermore if the analogy starts from the exterior resemblances? – *Ibidem*, p. 131).

C. Leonardescu is against those who are “positive and materialistic” and propose in order to know the society and the human, the use of natural sciences methods. When we have to know the good, the truth, the beauty and God, we cannot disregard the fact that “besides opinions and schools there is the truth”, that beyond fact there are principles, that beyond actions there is duty, beyond religions there is God. In “moral and political sciences”, truths are not only the result of “observation, induction and analogy”, but also not just some “arbitrary creations of the spirit”. We cannot say that through experience we cannot find laws, shows Leonardescu, but without reason “observations do not led us on their own towards the truth”. Definitions are very important in order to “avoid the ambiguity of words and the vagueness of terms” (*Ibidem*, p. 154). After he reminds Leibniz’s affirmations (“people ask what they know and they do not know what they are asking...”) and Saint Augustine’s (“if I wouldn’t have asked what is space and time, I would have known, but I’ve asked and now I do not know anymore...”), the

author shows that “we cannot define everything”. We often give a name (through words, giving a distinct sign to an object in order to recognize it) and describe (by trying to outline an image of a fact, event). Definitions suppose a proximal gender and a specific difference, and when they are not contradicted by anybody and nothing, they become axioms (*Ibidem*, p. 161). In “moral and political sciences” definitions and axioms are few, but they exist, because otherwise “fatality would darken our intelligence”. We connect through reason, notions and sentences which are based on arguments and in this way we remove the known from the unknown. “God is beyond any negation, any determination, and any opposition” (*Ibidem*, p. 167). We do not know any other technics and instruments mentioned by C. Leonardescu, because we did not manage to find if his Sociology course existed or where it is. They can be deduced by taken into consideration the fact he was influenced by the French sociology, and also the fact that D. Gusti placed him “in the sociological Romanian tradition”, together with Ion Ionescu de Ia Brad, Spiru Haret and others. His sociology was placed in the service of the nation – if we take into account the fact that during his time, those who contributed to the unity of the nation in 1918 were educated and transformed the social-cultural field during the first decades of the 20th Century.

In 1895, C. Leonardescu published in *Convorbiri literare* magazine a study regarding the sociological novel (Leonardescu 1988) of Hugo, Balzac, Heine, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy and others, because “by analyzing them, we can find out information about the social environment, society, with its beliefs and customs as the tendencies of society in the fight for living”, he said. In these novels, “the sociological element is above the psychological element and produces emotions with social character” (*Ibidem*, p. 220). The Artist, the poet, regardless of their will, are influenced by “daily issues”. Of course that through their genius condition, they can rise “above social miseries and anomalies” (*Ibidem*, p. 223). We mustn’t believe that the sociological novel presents “completely and honestly, social life as it is”. Often it shows us “monstrosities, abnormal and exceptional diseases, it denaturizes, presents events and facts with social character that create passionate types until exaltation and this only for esthetic effect” (*Ibidem*, p. 224).

Without exaggerating C. Leonardescu’s contribution to the affirming of Romanian sociology, we can take into consideration Ion Petrovici’s words, who knew him better than all of us today. “In the cultural past of our country, his work meant something. With time, maybe we will not be able to see it anymore, the content of his books may be analyzed better in a more beautiful language [...]. No erudite of the country cannot surpass Leonardescu’s name without shaking the reputation of his erudition” (Petrovici 1984).

References

1. * * *, (1896). *Anuarul Universității Iași pe anul 1895-1896* [University of Iasi Yearbook 1895-1896], Iași.
2. * * *, (1860). *Studii asupra instrucțiunii publice în unele din statele mai înaintate ale Europei* [Studies of public instruction in some of the most advanced countries of Europe], București.
3. Buzatu, Gh., Lemny, Șt., Saizu, I. (eds.) (1988). *Mihai Eminescu, sens, timp și devenire istorică* [Mihai Eminescu, meaning, time and historic becoming], Editura Universității „Al.I. Cuza”, Iași.
4. Costea, St. (coord.) (1998). *Istoria sociologiei românești* [History of Romanian sociology], Editura Fundației România de Măine, București.
5. Dogan, M. and Pahre R. (1993). *Noile științe sociale Interpenetrarea disciplinelor* [New social sciences. Interpenetration of disciplines], Editura Academiei Române, București.
6. Ionescu, I. (1997). *Pasiunea “sociologiei națiunii”* [Passion of the “sociology of nation”], Editura Spiru Haret, Iași.
7. Iorga, N. (1981). *O viață de om așa cum a fost* [A lifetime as], Editura Minerva, București.
8. Leonardescu C. (1988). *Principii de filosofie a literaturii și artei* [Philosophy principles of literature and art], Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
9. Leonardescu C. (1900). ”Conștiința socială. Studiu sociologic” [Social conscience. Sociological study]. In *Omagiu lui Titu Maiorescu* [Homage to Titu Maiorescu], Editura SOCEC, București.
10. Leonardescu, C. (1868). *Methodulu in scientiele physico-naturale, essacte, morale și politice* [Methods in physical and natural, exact, moral and political sciences], Impri-meria statului, București.
11. Leonardescu, C. (1885). *Morala inductivă sau sciința conduitei omenesci* [Inductive moral or science of human behavior], Iași.
12. Petrovici, I. (1984). ”Activitatea filosofică a lui C. Leonardescu” [The philosophical activity of C. Leonardescu]. In *Aspecte din filosofia contemporană* [Aspects from contemporary philosophy], Editura Minerva, București.