

## **Plato and Aristotle in Romanian Publications Quantitative Study: 1900–1948\***

*Daniela MACI  
University of Oradea,  
Department of Sociology,  
Philosophy and Social Work*

**Keywords:** Plato, Aristotle, Romanian publications, Romanian philosophy, classical studies, quantitative.

**Abstract.** The purpose of this paper is to attempt to quantify the Romanian publications on Plato and Aristotle in the period 1900–1948. I will consider the translations of their works, the books and the studies in journals. Beyond quantifying these publications (trying to follow the thematic preference of publications in the era), the overall aim of this study is to see who were the translators of that period, who are the ones who wrote books or studies; and, not least, the possibility to compare quantitatively the Platonic and Aristotelian publications.

**E-mail:** elimaci@yahoo.com

\*

### **Introduction**

The existence of a gap – more or less acknowledged and discussed – between Western studies and translations and Romanian ones have made the latter remain almost unexplored. Western publications are, at least in appearance, more accessible to Romanian researchers. The recovery and systematization of these publications gains thus relevance.

Any quantitative study requires quantification and standardization of the issues investigated. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to organize Romanian publications on Plato and Aristotle in the first half of the twentieth century. I will consider the translations of their works, the books (monographs, exegeses or thematic publications), and studies in journals (the main journals investigated being *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* (The Royal Foundations' Journal) and *Revista de Filosofie* (The Journal of Philosophy)).

The main reasons for choosing the period between 1900 and 1948 are as follows:

1. The quasi-impossibility of carrying out a quantitative study before 1900 due to the lack of publications on Plato and Aristotle or translations of their works (even if the first translations appeared at the end of the nineteenth century– though still fragmentary).
2. The first debates in the press about the importance of classical studies appear in this period, there is an awareness of the lack of a coherent programme for translations; there

---

\* This article was supported by PN II IDEI, contract 879/19.01.2009.

are discussions about the criteria and the foundations for training Romanian classicists (polemics on this subject were quite vehement and intense at the time).

3. The first publications appear (first translations – fragmented in the beginning, then full; the first studies and books).

4. The year 1948 diverted the course of classical studies so that a part of future publications became heavily ideological. Romanian Communist-era publications on the work of the two philosophers deserve a separate study.

The present study is structured according to the specificities mentioned above. The necessity to place these publications in a historical–cultural context is required by the very period that we have chosen – a moment when we can actually start talking about the beginning of a practical possibility of quantifying Platonic and Aristotelian publications in Romania. In the first part of this paper I shall try to outline the existence of traces of Romanian classical studies and institutional interest, in its early stage, on the works of Plato and Aristotle. Only the second part will be devoted to the actual quantitative study. For both Plato and Aristotle publications will be grouped as follows: A. translations of their works and reviews on these translations (Text 1, 2 and 3); B. books (thematic, monographs, anthologies) and their reviews (Text 4 and 5); C. studies published in journals and other publications (Text 6, 7 and 8); D. their quantification (Table 9).

Beyond quantifying these publications (trying to follow the thematic preference of publications in the era), the overall aim of this study is to see who were the translators of that period, who were the ones who wrote books or studies; and, not least, the possibility to compare quantitatively the Platonic and Aristotelian publications.

### **Is there a tradition of classical studies?**

To answer this question, we shall refer for a start to one of Simion's texts,<sup>1</sup> which, through the questions it formulates and the suggestions it offers, is close to what interests us. How well was Platonism or Aristotelianism known in the Romanian territory before the twentieth century? "Addressing the problem of the influence of Italian Aristotelianism on the culture of Wallachia and Moldavia, which then belonged to Byzantine culture, one can naturally raise the question: why the influence of Aristotelianism and not Platonism? How do you explain that Byzantine Europe offered Platonism to the West, early in the fifteenth century, and received, in the seventeenth century, Aristotelianism?"<sup>2</sup> The following paragraphs are nothing more than a summary of the arguments offered by Simion<sup>3</sup>. By the seventeenth century, when in the two regions there began to appear early influences of Paduan neo-Aristotelianism, emphasis was placed on the patristic philosophy of neo-Platonic origin. The explanations put forward by the author are: the existing schools on the Romanian territory during this period were created and functioned only around monasteries or churches. "For a century, Byzantine culture could be maintained only in religious schools allowed by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ghiță Simion, "Influența aristotelismului Padovan în Țările Române" (The influence of Paduan Aristotelianism in the Romanian Countries), *Revista de Filozofie* 5-6 (1996): 393–403.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 393.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 393–403.

Turks. (...) The penetration of Paduan Aristotelianism marked a new stage, the second, in post-Byzantine culture, which replaced the first one, based philosophically on the patristic thought.”<sup>1</sup>



**Teodora Cosman**, *Running from the Shadow 1/20*,  
from the series „Photograms”, 50 x 70 cm, acrylic on synthetic tissue, 2006

We might also add that, in terms of religious politics and court ceremony, the Romanian Countries had belonged since the beginning to the Byzantine “Commonwealth”, and from the point of view of the rituals and administrative language they belonged to the Slavic world. Romanian Orthodoxy was (and remains) midway between Greek speculative Orthodoxy and the mystical Russian one. Romanian territory developed in the late Middle Ages (16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> centuries) an ascetic life with its connotations around several major monastic centres such as Poiana Mărului or Neamț Monastery. Adding the centring on the texts of the Church Fathers (canonical writers of the 2<sup>nd</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> centuries) and the subsequent lack of communication with Western culture (which had already been developing into another civilizing paradigm) we have a clear picture of what the Romanian culture inherited (partially) from the very beginning from the Middle Ages. Languages (in all secular and religious institutions) remain multiple, and the movement and impact of the written works are very limited. For the period between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, Georgiu<sup>2</sup> observes the fact that both the “humanist movement” and the “Enlightenment movement” are characterized by “the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., 393, 395.

<sup>2</sup> Grigore Georgiu, *Istoria culturii române moderne* (The History of Modern Romanian Culture) (Bucharest: Comunicare.ro, 2002).

cultural dualism” between “an official and religious culture, written in the Slavonic language, and a popular culture, unwritten, with its traditional forms”.<sup>1</sup> During all this period theological manuscripts (especially patristic literature) had a relative spread, restricted however to certain environments; there appeared – by the intercession of scholars who have studied in Poland – the first translations of contemporary texts, and a series of works with a general content (in the long shadow of ancient models) were published, which were gradually addressed to a rising stratum of laity.

Also, the influence of Theophilus Corydaleus, a student of the University of Padua and later head of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople where Cantemir and Miclescu were students, is consistent. “Corydaleus's lectures were the philosophical basis for the Royal Academies in Bucharest and Iași”.<sup>2</sup> “In the two royal academies seven courses of Aristotelian philosophy are taught: logic, rhetoric, physics, the study of the sky, of generation and corruption, of the soul and also metaphysics, all of which are Corydaleus's comments or his disciples”.<sup>3</sup> Also rhetoric and logic were taught at the Greek and Latin School founded by Matei Basarab in Târgoviște in 1646, and at the Vasilian College of Iași founded in 1640 by Vasile Lupu. Here, on the other hand, a scholastic Aristotelianism was taught. “In the second half of the eighteenth century, however, Aristotelianism begins to be replaced by the Enlightenment, philosophy related to modern science”.<sup>4</sup>

Of course we cannot state the existence of a tradition of Aristotelianism or Platonism – in the classical sense of the word (the existence of Romanian schools which would practice these studies consistently, a lively debate on the thinking of the two philosophers, and also the formation of Romanian scholars in the long shadow of classical thought). But we also cannot deny concerns – more or less intense and original – which have become fruitful, only much later.

All these, perhaps, made Comarnescu<sup>5</sup> say at the beginning of the twentieth century that “(...) the ignorance concerning Plato, Aristotle and the Bible even by students of Philosophy, the lack of translations from ancient classics – with some honourable exceptions, but with a sporadic visibility – the absence from the Romanian scene of Aeschylus and even Euripides, finally the lack of a philosophy, criticism and literature to flourish on these capital works for the human race – all these explain to a great extent the spiritual crisis of the contemporary Romanian intellectual and spiritual literate. Having been formed in the Romantic period and then in that of scientific materialism, Romanian culture was missing exactly the humanism, the classical culture, moving from patriarchalism straight to Romanticism and materialism, from naturism to a kind of archaic individualism”.<sup>6</sup>

Despite all the public debates on the problems inherent in classical studies, the status of translations and studies, it is worth noting that the people present on the scene

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., 41–44.

<sup>2</sup> Ghiță Simion, *Influența aristotelismului Padovan în Țările Române*, 394.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 398.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 399.

<sup>5</sup> Petru Comarnescu, “Lucrări de filosofie românească” (Papers on Romanian philosophy), *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 9 (1943): 631–633.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 631–632.

of Platonic and Aristotelian studies of the time are connected to the Western publications of their time. Some examples: Claudian<sup>1</sup> cites Zeller, Gomperz, Pöhlmanand, or Ritter, and Săndulescu quotes or refers to Rostagni, Werner Jaeger, Burckhardt and Mommsen (claiming that they have demonstrated the need for an “interpretation according to the particular circumstances of the time”).<sup>2</sup>

In this context it is not surprising that the first translations of Plato’s and Aristotle’s works take place only in the last decade of the nineteenth century (to these are added translations of the classics of literature and theology, often fragmentary). The results of a coherent programme of translations can be seen much later after some early debates, taking place mostly between the wars.

### Organizing and grouping the publications

As mentioned in the introduction, the works will be grouped as follows: translations, studies, books; they will be presented in the texts (where the number is higher); each text will specify other criteria according to which we shall perform the distinctions. At the end of each text, we present reviews and after each type of work, we try to draw some conclusions.

The general criterion for presenting the works is the chronological one, the exception being the translations of Plato. Also, there will be separate texts for each of the two thinkers and for each type of work. We shall refer only to those studies or books with direct reference to Plato or Aristotle and we shall not take account of the books or more general studies in which one could find mentions of the two thinkers. That does not mean they do not exist (e.g. Constantin Noica, “Aristotel sau politeismul cunoașterii” (Aristotle or the polytheism of knowledge) in *Schițe pentru istoria lui Cum e cu puțină ceva nou*, Bucharest: Bucovina, I.E. Torouțiu, 1940, 104–116) but for the present paper we consider strictly the translations of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and studies and books referring to the two. Still, it is worth mentioning Emile Bréhier’s study, “Reflections on Platonism”, written specifically for *The Royal Foundations’ Journal* and published in no.12 (1938), 493–509.

#### A. Translations:

For presenting the translations of Plato I gave up chronological order and I opted for the order in which they have appeared in *Opere (Works)*, edited by Petru Creția and Constantin Noica, Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1975–1993.

#### Text 1(translations of Plato’s works):

##### 1. *Apologia lui Socrate/Apărarea lui Socrate* (Apology)

a) translation from the original by I.E. Torouțiu:

– Cluj: Carmen Printing House, Petru P. Barițiu, 1911, 102p.

b) translation from Ancient Greek by Vasile Grecu:

– Bucharest: Universala Leon Alcalay, 1916, 111p;

– Bucharest: Alcalay, 1920, 111p.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexandru Claudian, “Statul lui Platon și clasa socială cu rol economic” (Plato’s State and the social class with an economic role), *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 7 (1936): 111–120.

<sup>2</sup> Constantin Săndulescu, “Problema cunoașterii la Platon” (The problem of knowledge in Plato), *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 6 (1942): 535.

- c) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri* (Dialogues ) (*Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor*), collection edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.
- d) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
– Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare (and “Crito”), 1919, 71 p;  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Apology, Crito, Phaedo*), with an introduction and two clichés, Bucharest: România Nouă, 1923;  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Apology, Euthyphro, Crito*), vol. I, with an introductory study, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930;  
– (37b–42), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 30–35;  
– (37b–42), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 28–33.
- 2. Criton / Kriton (Crito)**
- a) No translator is mentioned:  
– in *Revista Școalelor* (Schools’ Review), year I, 1902–1903, chapter 1–7, pp. 24–26; pp. 40–41; pp. 73–74; pp. 91–92; pp. 108–109; pp. 147–148.
- b) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
– fragment in *Convorbiri literare* (Literary Conversations), XLIX, 1915, pp. 1180–1194;  
– Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare, (and *Apology*), 1919, 71 p;  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Apology, Crito, Phaedo*), Bucharest: Română Nouă Tipografia, 1923 ;  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Apology, Euthyphro, Crito*), vol. I, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930;  
– (48b–54e), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 22–29;  
– (48b–54e), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 21–28.
- c) translation by Vasile Grecu:  
– preface and translation from Ancient Greek, Bucharest: Universala Leon Alcalay, 1916, 80 p;  
– Bucharest: Alcalay, 1920, 80p.
- d) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor*), collection edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.
- 3. Alcibiade (Alcibiades)**
- a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, 81 p;  
– Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944.
- 4. Charmides/Harmide**
- a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri* (*Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor*), collection edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.

- b) translation by G. Popa–Lisseanu:  
– in *Dacia în autorii clasici. II. Autorii greci și bizantini* (Dacia in classical authors. II. Greek and Byzantine Authors), Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial and Imprimeriile Statului. Imprimeria Națională (The Romanian Academy, Studies and Research), 1943, pp. 25–26.
- 5. Laches/Lahes**  
a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri (Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor)*, collection edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.
- 6. Gorgias/Georgias**  
a) translation by Theofil Simenschy:  
– Iași: Schoenfeld “Modern”, 1920, 148 p.  
b) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
– 481b–506c; 521d– 527e, in *Revista Clasică* (The Classical Review), IV–V, 1932–1933, pp. 211–257;  
– 481b–506c; 521d–527e, in *Sofiștii în antichitatea greacă* (The Sophists in Greek Antiquity), Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1934, 71 p., pp. 25–71;  
– 483 a–484b, in Iuliu Valaori, Cezar Papacostea, Gheorghe Popa–Lisseanu. *Istoria literaturii eline în lecturi. Pentru clasa a VIII–a de liceu. Perioada elenică și clasică* (The History of Greek Literature in Readings. For the 8<sup>th</sup> grade of highschool. The hellenistic and classical period), Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1935;  
– in *Dialoguri*, vol. 3 (*Gorgias, Meno*), Bucharest: Author’s Publishing, 1935.
- 7. Protagoras**  
a) translation by George Cârlan:  
– Suceava: Schools’ Bookshop, 1925, 64p.  
b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1941.
- 8. Hippias Minor**  
a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri (Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor)*, edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.
- 9. Hippias Maior (Hippias Major)**  
a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943, 36 p.
- 10. Ion**  
a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– in *Dialoguri (Crito, Apology, Laches, Ion, Charmides, Hippias Minor)*, edited by V. Pârvan, Bucharest: Cultura Națională, 1922, 250 p.
- 11. Lysis**  
a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1941, 36 p.
- 12. Euthyphron (Euthyphro)**  
a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:  
– in *Dialoguri (Apology, Euthyphro, Crito)*, vol. I, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930.  
b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:  
– Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

**13. Menexenos/ Menexen (Menexenus)**

- a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
  - Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

**14. Menon (Meno)**

- a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
  - in *Dialoguri (Gorgias, Menon)*, vol. 3. Bucharest: Author's Publishing, 1935.
- b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
  - in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943.
  - Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

**15. Euthydemus (Euthydemus)**

- a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
  - Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943.

**16. Phaidon (Phaedo)**

- a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
  - 114b– end, in *Convorbiri literare*, 1914, pp. 1247–1253;
  - Bucharest: Convorbiri Literare Press, 1919, 119p;
  - in *Dialoguri (Apology, Crito, Phaedo)*, vol.1, Bucharest: Noua Presă Românească, 1923;
  - 72d–77, in the journal *Orpheus*, I, 1924–1925, pp. 184–191;
  - in *Dialoguri (Banchetul, Phaidon)*, vol. 2, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1931, pp. 123–235;
  - 115a–118a, in Iuliu Valaori, Cezar Papacostea, Gheorghe Popa–Lisseanu. *Istoria literaturii eline în lecturi. Pentru clasa a VIII–a de liceu. Perioada elenică și clasică* (The history of Greek literature in readings. The period of Hellenism and the Classics) Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1935, pp. 140–156;
  - 57–61b, 63b–63d, 64c–67d; 72e–77, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 39–48; pp. 58–64;
  - 57–61b, 63b–63d, 64c–67d; 72e–77, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 37–45; pp. 54–60.

**17. Phaidros/Fedru (Phaedrus)**

- a) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
  - 249c–250c, in *Orpheus*, IV, 1928, pp.37–38.
- b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
  - Aninoasa–Gorj: RAM, 1939, 125p.
- c) no translator is mentioned:
  - 249c–250e, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 64–65.
  - 249c–250e, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 60–61.

**18. Republica/Statul (Republic)**

- a) translation by Vasile Bichigean:
  - vol. 1 (books I–V), Bucharest: Dim. C. Ionescu Professional Press, 1923, 250p.;



- vol. II (books VI to X), Bistrița: Tipografia Națională, 1926, 147p;
- 343d–345a, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 77–85.
- b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
  - 410a–412a; 403c–404e, in *Sportul la eleni* (Sport with the Greeks) Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930, pp. 49–55.
- c) translation by Theofil Simenschy:
  - 514a–517c, in *Cuget Moldovenesc* X, no. 4–5, 1941, pp. 79–82.
- d) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
  - VII, 514a–518d, in *Revista Clasică* (The Classical Review), II, 1930, pp. 175–180;
  - VII, 514a–518d, in Iuliu Valaori, Cezar Papacostea, Gheorghe Popa Lisseanu. *Istoria literaturii eline în lecturi. Pentru clasa a VIII–a de liceu. Perioada elenică și clasică*, Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1935;
  - 514a–517c, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 52–58;
  - 514a–517c, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini*, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 49–54.
- 19. Parmenide (Parmenide)**
  - a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
    - Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1943, 130p.
- 20. Theaetetus (Theaitetos / Teetet)**
  - a) translation by Constantin Săndulescu:
    - Bucharest: Societatea Română de Filosofie, 1942, 127p;
    - “Știința nu este percepție” (Science is not perception) (151–152; 153–154; 158–160; 161–164; 165; 168–171), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 66–67.
    - “Știința nu este percepție” (Science is not perception) (151–152; 153–154; 158–160; 161–164; 165; 168–171), in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 77–88.
- 21. Sofistul (Sophistes)**
  - a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
    - Sibiu: Cartea Românească din Cluj, 1945, 121 p.
- 22. Banchetul/Symposion**
  - a) translation by A. Luca:
    - 194e–212, Bucharest: Lumen Library, nr. 149, 1910, 31p.
  - b) translation by Vasile Grecu:
    - *Ospățul sau discuțiuni asupra iubirii* (The Banquet or discussions on love), Bucharest: Alcalay, 1920, 172p.
  - c) translation by Panait Mușoiu:
    - “Despre amor” (About love), in *Banchetul sau despre amor de Platon și Banchetul de Xenophon* (The Banquet or about love by Plato and the Banquet by Xenophon), Bucharest: Biblioteca Revistei Ideei, 1922, pp. 43–128.
  - d) translation by Cezar Papacostea:
    - 172–180h, in *Revista Clasică*, I, 1929, pp. 387–399;

- 180c–188e, *Revista Clasică*, II, 1930, pp. 55–66;
  - in *Dialoguri*, (*Banchetul*, *Phaidon*), vol. 2, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1931, pp. 5–89;
  - 215a–d, in Iuliu Valaori, Cezar Papacostea, Gheorghe Popa Lisseanu. *Istoria literaturii eline în lecturi. Pentru clasa a VIII–a de liceu. Perioada elenică și clasică*, Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1935;
  - 207–208b; 209–209c; 210–212, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp.48–52.
  - 207–208b; 209–209c; 210–212, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed, 1943, pp. 45–49.
  - e) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:
    - cap. 27–29, 208c–212c in *Symposion*, I., no. 1, 1938, pp. 8–11;
    - cap. 22–26, 201d–208h, in *Symposion*, nr. 7, 1943, pp. 87–94;
    - Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală “Regele Mihai I” (King Michael I Royal Cultural Foundation), 1944, 156 p.
- 23. Legile (Laws)**
- a) translation by Elefterie Bezdechi:
    - 788a–807d; 813b–817a; 829d–831b; 832d–834d in Șt. Bezdechi. *Sportul la eleni* Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930, pp. 55–78.
  - b) translation by Constantin Săndulescu:
    - I, 626c, 631bd, 643b, 644b; II, 653ab, III, 689dc; 701a b; IV, 713e, 714a. in *Kalende*, II, no. 10–11, 1943, pp. 53–54;
    - V 728a,b; VI 762e; II 659c,d; VI 756z, 757a; III 689a,b; III691c; III692d, 693b; VI 765e; X903c, in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, year XI, no. 2, 1944, pp. 319–323.

Of the dialogues contained in the edition mentioned above there have not been translated: *Politicus*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*. The dialogues with the most variants of translations (complete or fragmentary) are *Symposion* (with twelve appearances), *Apology*, *Crito*, *Republic* (with nine appearances), *Phaedo* (with eight appearances), *Gorgias*, *Phaedrus* (with five appearances), *Meno*, *Theaetetus*, *Laws* (with three appearances), *Charmides*, *Protagoras*, *Euthyphro* (with two appearances) and the rest with one variant of translation.

Of the twenty–three dialogues, eighteen were translated by Bezdechi – the most prolific translator of the period, followed by Papacostea with nine dialogues translated. But as measured by the publications (whole and fragmented), the ratio is changing: Papacostea has thirty–seven appearances, and Bezdechi twenty–three appearances. Grecu follows with three, Simenschy and Sandulescu with two each, and others with one: Torouțiu, Popa–Lisseanu, Cârlan, Bichigean, Luca, Mușoiu, Elefterie Bezdechi.

## **Text 2 (reviews of translations of Plato): the order being a chronological one**

1. Petru P. Barițiu, “Platon–Apologia lui Socrate”, (translation from the original by I.E. Torouțiu, Cluj: Carmen Press, 1911), in *Țara Noastră*, year I, 1911–1912, p. 431.
2. No name is mentioned, “Phaidon sau despre suflet”, (a critical study and translation by Cezar Papacostea, Bucharest, Literary Conversations Press, 1919), in *Convorbiri literare*, year LII, 1920, pp. 54–55.

3. No name is mentioned, “Georgias (sic!) Gorgias”, (translation by Theofil Simenschy, Iași: Schoenfeld Modern, 1920), in *Convorbiri literare* LIII, 1921, p. 173.
4. Ionescu Nae, “Platon: Apărarea lui Socrate, Kriton, Phaidon”, in *Ideea europeană*, no. 129, 1923, p. 4.
5. Ștefan Zeletin, “Platon: Apărarea lui Socrate, Kriton (Datoria cetățeanului) și Phaidon (Despre suflet)”, (in Romanian by Cezar Papacostea, Bucharest, Casa Școalelor, 270 p), in *Revista de Filozofie*, no. 3–4, 1923–1924, pp. 224–227.
6. N.I. Herescu, *Opere I*, (translation and an introductory study by prof. Cezar Papacostea, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930–1931, vol I: *Apologia, Euthyphron, Kriton*, with two reproductions besides the text), in *Revista Clasică*, II, 1930, p. 215.
7. C.N. Burileanu, *Opere II*, (translation and an introductory study by prof. Cezar Papacostea, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930, vol. II: *Banchetul, Phaidon*), in *Revista Clasică*, III, 1931, pp. 88–89.
8. Șt. Bezdechi, *Opere I*, (translation and an introductory study by prof. Cezar Papacostea, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930–1931, vol I: “Apology, Euthyphro, Crito”, with two reproductions beside the text), in *Societatea de Mîine*), VIII, 1931, pp. 56–57.
9. N. Bagdasar, “Apărarea lui Socrate, Eutyphron, Kriton, traducere, precedată de o lungă introducere de Cezar Papacostea” (Apology, Euthyphro, Crito, translation preceded by a long introduction by Cezar Papacostea), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1930, in *Revista de Filozofie* nr. 3–4/1931, p. 366.
10. No name is mentioned, “Statul (Republica) lui Plato”, (translation from Greek with an introduction and explanatory notes by V. Bichigean, vol. II, Bistrița: National Printing House, 1926, contains books VI to X), in *Hyperion*, III, 1934, p. 27.
11. Al. Claudian, “Cezar Papacostea: Plato III Gorgias, Meno”, (196 p., Bucharest, 1935), in *Revista de Filozofie*, no. 3, 1937, pp. 210–212.
12. I.I. Rusu, “Fedru”, (translation and introduction by Șt. Bezdechi, Aninoasa–Gorj: RAM, 1939), in *Pagini literare*, VI, 1939, pp. 235–237.
13. A. Frenkian, *Teetet*, (from Greek by C. Săndulescu, Bucharest: The Romanian Society for Philosophy, f.a., 1942), in *Revista Clasică*, XV, 1943, pp. 114–115.
14. R. Vulcănescu, “Hippias Maior”, (translated by Șt. Bezdechi, Sibiu: Cartea Românească of Cluj Press, 1943), in *Symposion*, III, 1943, pp. 118–119.
15. Gh. Bulgăr, “Alcibiade I and II”, (translated by Șt. Bezdechi, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, no. 3, March 1944, pp. 693–694.

The most reviewed translator is Papacostea with seven reviewers, and the most reviewed dialogue is *Apology*.

### **Text 3 (translations of Aristotle): translations from Aristotle are presented in the chronological order of their appearance**

#### **1. *De anima***

- a) translation by Mihail Negru:
  - Bucharest: Lumen, 1911, 32 p.

#### **2. *Politica* (Politics)**

- a) translation by Elefterie Bezdechi:
  - introduction by Ștefan Bezdechi, Bucharest: National Culture, 1924, 335p, edited by D. Gusti;
  - III,4,5; IV,15,1; IV,15,2; IV,15,5; IV,15,6; V,3,3; V,3,4; V,3,5; V,3,6; V,3,7; VI,1,1 in Șt. Bezdechi, *Sportul la eleni* (Sport at the Greeks), Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930, 223p, pp. 79–85.

b) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

– *Statul atenian* (The Athenian State), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944, 108p.

**3. *Etica Nicomahică* (Nicomachean Ethics)**

a) translation by Ștefan Bezdechi:

– “Imn către virtute (pean). Fortuna”, in *Antologia Liricilor Greci* (The Anthology of Greek Poets), Cluj: Life Graphic Art Institute, 1927, 151p, pp. 114–115.

b) No name is mentioned:

– I, 5 (3), 1–5; 13; II, 1 (6), 15–16; 7, 2–13; 9, 1–5; VII, 1, 1–3; X, 7, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă, *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology. Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1943, pp. 97–105;

– *ibid.*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 1943, pp. 100–107 and 109–110; I, 2, 5–8; 3, 1–2; II, 22; II, 3, 2–4; pp. 99–100 and 108; pp. 107–108.

c) translation by Traian Brăileanu:

– translation from Greek with a foreword, a short presentation of the life and work of Aristotle and an introduction in the ethical theory of Aristotle by Traian Brăileanu, Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944, 365 p.

**4. *Poetica* (Poetics)**

a) translation by D.M. Pippidi:

– with an introduction and commentary by D.M. Pippidi, Bucharest: The Latin Studies Institute. Translations. Greek Authors, collection edited by D.M. Pippidi, 1940, 175p.

**5. *Metafizica* (Metaphysics)**

a) No name is mentioned:

– AI, cap. 3–5; AI, cap. 1–2, par. 1–10; I, 1013; II, 1036; III, 1046 b; VII, 1028 b, in Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Nărlă. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology. Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1943, pp. 6–10; pp. 89–97.

– *ibid.*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 1943, pp. 4–7; 92–96.

It is noted that of Plato's translators, only Ștefan Bezdechi and Elefterie Bezdechi deal also with Aristotle. Regarding reviews, I have found only one: P.C. (P. Comarnescu), “Traducerea *Poeticii* lui Aristotel de D.M. Pippidi” (The translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* by D.M. Pippidi), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, no.4, 1940, pp.236–237.

**B. Books (about Plato and Aristotle) and their reviews.**

We have chosen only thematic books on Plato and Aristotle, without mentioning the various philosophical anthologies or histories of philosophy which devote more or less space to Platonic and Aristotelian themes (some of which are presented in Texts 7 and 8). Their presentation will be chronological.

**Text 4 (books on Plato)**

**1.** Cezar Papacostea, *Platon: viața, opera, filozofia* (Plato: the life, the work, the philosophy), Bucharest: Ion C. Văcărescu, 1931, 96p.

**2.** Grigore Tăușan, *Filozofia lui Platon (Caracterizarea filozofiei lui Platon. Metoda mistică. Localizarea istorică a misticismului lui Platon)* (Plato's Philosophy: The

characterization of Plato's Philosophy. The mystical method. The historical localization of Plato's mysticism), Bucharest: Bucovina, 1931.

3. Alexandru Claudian, *Colectivismul în filosofia lui Platon* (Collectivism in Plato's Philosophy), Iași: Alexandru Terek Concessionary Press, 1936, 107p.

4. Constantin Săndulescu–Godeni, *Das verhältnis von Rationalität und Irrationalität in der philosophie Platons* (The relationship between rationality and irrationality in Plato's Philosophy), Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1938, 338p.

5. Aram M. Frenkian, *La méthode hippocratique dans le Phèdre de Platon. Note sur le sens primordial du mot katholou (a propos des idées de Nicolai Hartmann)* (The Hippocratic Method in Plato's Phaedrus. Note on the primordial sense of the word katholou, surrounding the ideas of Nicolai Hartmann), Bucharest: Presa Națională, 1941, 47p.

During this period we have the first two monographs (although the term appears perhaps too generous) of Plato (Papacostea, Tăușan), the other four being more or less restrictive in terms of topics treated. At a first glance it seems that only Claudian's book had any echo in the period. Reviews of this work: Petre Botezatu, "Alexandru Claudian: Collectivism in the philosophy of Plato" (Iasi, 1936), in *Revista de Filosofie*, no.3/1936, pp. 317–319; the following review refers to the studies of Al. Claudian dedicated to Platonic thought: Petru Comarnescu, "Some objections to the Platonic studies of Mr. Al. Claudian", in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, year. III, no. 3, March 1936, pp.705–710.

### **Text 5 (books on Aristotle)**

1. Dan Bădăraș, *L'individuel chez Aristote* (The Individual at Aristotle)", Paris: Boivin, 1936, 156 p.

2. Raul Teodorescu, *Aristotel ca teoretician estetic* (Aristotle as an aesthetic theoretician), Bucharest: Graphic Art's Institute, 1938, 164p.

There is a review for each book on Aristotle: Gr. Teodoru, "Dan A. Badareu: L'individuel chez Aristote (Boivin, Paris, 1936)" in *Revista de Filosofie*, no.2/1938, pp.193–195 and C. D. Fortunescu, "Aristotle as an aesthetic theoretician by Raul Teodorescu, University Press, Bucharest, 1938", in *Arhivele Olteniei*, no. 104–106 / 1939, p.505.

There also are the following books (not included in the tables since they refer either to both Plato and Aristotle, or they are translations): Aram M. Frenkian, *Mimesis si muzică: O contribuțiune la estetica lui Platon și Aristotel* (Mimesis and music: A contribution to the aesthetics of Plato and Aristotle), Cernăuți: The Institute of Graphic Arts and Glasul Bucovinei, 1932, 72p; Adriana Camariano–Cioran, *Catehismul lui Platon* (The Catechism of Plato), translated in Greek and Romanian by Adriana Camariano–Cioran, Bucharest: The Church Books, 1942; Marsilio Ficino, *Asupra iubirii sau Banchetul lui Platon* (On love or Plato's Symposium), translated from Italian, with an introduction and notes by Sorin Ionescu, Bucharest: The Italian Institute for Philosophy, The Romanian Society for Philosophy, 1942, 186p; the latter with a review from Edgar Papu published in *Revista de Filosofie*, no.3–4/1945, pp. 351–352.

### **C. Studies on Plato and Aristotle**

In the following text we have mentioned only the studies published in *Revista de Filosofie* (The Philosophy Review) and *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* (The Royal

Foundations' Journal), taking into account only those papers which explicitly treat Plato or Aristotle.

**Text 6 (studies in *Revista de Filosofie* and *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*)**

1. Ștefan Bezdechi, "Cinci dialoguri platonice: Alcibiade, Protagoras, Euthyphron, Lysis și Symposium" (Five Platonic Dialogues: Alcibiade, Protagoras, Euthyphro, Lysis and Symposium), Preface to vol. II of translations of Plato's Work, in *Revista de filosofie* 3–4 (1923–1924): 176–187.
2. Ștefan Zeletin, "Platon în românește" (Plato in Romanian language), in *Revista de Filosofie* 2 (1931): 180–190.
3. Ștefan Bezdechi, "Euforia din Fedon: XVIII" (The Euphoria from Phaedo XVIII), in *Revista de Filosofie* 3–4 (1933): 406–409.
4. Alexandru Claudian, "Statul lui Platon și clasa socială cu rol economic" (Plato's State and the Social Class with an Economic Role), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 7 (1936): 111–120.
5. Alexandru Claudian, "Controversă asupra Ideilor lui Platon" (Controversy on Plato's Ideas), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 11 (1936): 389–397.
6. D.M. Pippidi, "Problema literaturii la Platon" (The Problem of Literature in Plato), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 2 (1939): 352–370.
7. Constantin Săndulescu, "Problema cunoașterii la Platon" (The Problem of Knowledge in Plato), in *Revista fundațiilor Regale* 6 (1942): 535–552.
8. D.M. Pippidi, "Mimesis în Poetica lui Aristotel" (Mimesis in Aristotle's Poetics), in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 2 (1945): 335–343.

Bezdechi and Claudian are those who wrote a large number of studies on Plato in these journals. Mr. Claudian – directly interested in the understanding of Plato's work and not by his work as a translator – can be found also in the table dedicated to books. As one can observe, there is a single study dedicated to Aristotle in *Revista Fundațiilor Regale*, this kind of study missing from *Revista de Filosofie*.

**Text 7 (Studies in other journals or publications [without the claim of a complete list])**

1. Dissescu, "Concepția lui Platon despre Stat" (Plato's Thoughts on the State), "Statul în concepția lui Aristotel" (The State in the conception of Aristotle), in *Drept Constituțional* (Constitutional Law), Bucharest: n.p., 1915, pp. 90–97; 97–108.
2. Ștefan Bezdechi, "Politica lui Aristotel" (Aristotle's Politics), in *Arhiva pentru Știință și Reformă Socială* (The Archive for Science and Social Reform), no. 4–5, 1923, pp. 484–497.
3. Ștefan George, "Platon", in *Însemnări filosofice și literare* (Philosophical and literary notes), Bucharest: Ion C. Văcărescu, 1926, pp. 35–52.
4. Cora Valescu, "Poetica lui Aristotel" (Aristotle's Poetics), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1928, pp. 5–16.
5. Emil Faguet, "Platon", in *Inițiere în filosofie* (Initiation in philosophy), Cetatea-Albă, 1934, pp. 18–24.
6. Alexandru Claudian, "Definiția dreptății în Republica lui Platon; Platon și Auguste Comte" (The definition of justice in Plato's Republic. Plato and Auguste Comte), in *Cercetări filozofice și sociologice* (Sociological and philosophical research), Iași, 1935, pp. 109–137; pp. 27–108.

7. Nae Ionescu, “Logica lui Platon” (Plato’s Logic); “Logica lui Aristotel: conceptual și judecata” (Aristotle’s Logic: the concept and the thought); ”Logica aristotelică: teoria raționamentului” (Aristotelian Logic: the theory of reasoning), in *Istoria logicei—al doilea curs—1929–1930* (The history of logic: the second lecture 1929–1930), Bucharest: The Official Monitor and the State Press, 229p, 1941, pp. 88–100, pp. 101–110, pp. 111–120.
8. Ștefan Bezdechi, “Raportul dintre cuvânt și idee la Platon” (The relationship between word and idea in Plato), with a summary: Le rapport entre mot et idée chez Platon, in *Camenae*, no.1–2, 1943–1944, pp.12–20; pp. 115–116.
9. Ștefan Bezdechi, “Platon și teoria lui despre Stat” (Plato and his theory on the State), in *Transilvania*, no. 6, 1943, pp. 413–426.
10. D.M. Pippidi, “Platon și problema poeziei; despre Poetica de Aristotel” (Plato and the problem of poetry; on Aristotle’s Poetics), in *Formarea ideilor literare în Antichitate* (The Formation of literary ideas in Antiquity), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1944, 176p.
11. Charles Rappaport, “Platon”, in *Din istoria socialismului* (From the history of socialism), I, Bucharest: P.S.D., 1945, pp. 27–46.

And last but not least, all those general treatises on the history of philosophy, books or other courses, anthologies that include studies with references to/from Plato and Aristotle, displayed chronologically (without the claim of an exhaustive list).

#### **Text 8 (Other publications that include studies or references about Plato and Aristotle).**

1. Dimitrie Gusti, *Introducere la cursul de istoria filosofiei grecești, etică și sociologie* (Introduction to the course of the History of Greek Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology), Bucharest: The Carol Göbl Graphic Art Institute, 1910.
2. Mircea Florian, *Îndrumare în filozofie* (Guide to Philosophy), Bucharest: Socec, 1922.
3. Ștefan Bezdechi, *Gânduri și chipuri din Grecia veche* (Thoughts and Faces from Ancient Greece), Cluj–Napoca: “Life” Graphic Art Institute, 1927.
4. Ioan Gh. Savin, *Filozofia și istoria ei* (Philosophy and its history), Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Carol, 1927, 84 p.
5. Ștefan Bezdechi, *Sportul la eleni* (Sport in Greeks), Cluj–Napoca: Cartea Românească, 1930.
6. Mircea Florian, *Introducere în filozofie: curs ținut studenților din anul preparator seria 1930–1931* (Introduction to philosophy: a course for the students in the prep year, 1930–1931 series), Bucharest, (s.n.), 1931, 424 p., multigr.
7. Iuliu Valaori, Cezar Papacostea, Gheorghe Popa–Lisseanu. *Istoria literaturii eline în lecturi. Pentru clasa a VIII–a de liceu. Perioada elenică și clasică* (The History of Greek Literature in Readings: for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade of high school)), Bucharest: Cartea Românească, s.a., 1935, 286 p.
8. Alexandru Posescu, *Introducere în filozofie –pentru uzul studenților* (Introduction in philosophy – for the use of the students), Bucharest, (s.n.), IV, 1939, 390p (reedited in 1944).
9. Aram M. Frenkian, *La méthode hippocratique dans le Phèdre de Platon. Note sur le sens primordial du mot katholou (a propos des idées de Nicolai Hartmann)* (The Hippocratic Method in Plato's Phaedrus. Note on the primordial sense of the word

katholou – following the ideas of Nicolai Hartmann), Bucharest, Presa Națională, 1941, 47p.

10. Vasile Marghescu, *Funcțiunea economică a științei contemporane* (The economic function of contemporary science), Bucharest, 1941.

11. Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. “Plato”, “Aristotle”, in *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, pp. 36–86; pp. 86–106.

12. Nicolae Bagdasar, Virgil Bogdan, C. Narly. *Antologie Filosofică. Filosofi străini* (Philosophical Anthology: Foreign Philosophers), Bucharest: Casa Școalelor, 1943, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, revised and completed.

13. Aram M. Frenkian, *Les origines de la théologie négative de Parménide à Plotin* (The Origins of the Negative Theology from Parmenides to Plotinos), Bucharest: The Official Monitor – State Press, 1943, 50 p.

14. H. Mihăescu, *Autorii greci în românește* (Greek Authors in Romanian), Iași, 1943.

15. Nicolae Terchilă, “Plato”, “Aristotle”, in *Istoria filozofiei* (The History of Philosophy), Sibiu: The Arhidiecezan Press, edition revised and completed, 1943, pp. 35–46; pp. 46–55.

16. Emilian Vasilescu, *Lecții introductive ținute studenților în teologie* (Introductory Lessons for students of theology), Bucharest: Cugetarea, 1943, 88p.

17. Alexandru Posescu, *Introducere în filozofie – pentru uzul studenților* (Introduction in philosophy – for the use of the students), Bucharest: Cugetarea, 1944, 369p.

18. xxx, *Izvoare de filozofie: culegere de studii și texte* (Springs of Philosophy: a collection of studies and texts), edited by Constantin Floru, Constantin Noica and Mircea Vulcănescu, Bucharest: Bucovina, 1944.

19. Aram M. Frenkian, *L'Orient et les origines de l'idéalisme subjectif dans la pensée européenne* (The Orient and the origins of the subjective idealism in European Thought), Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1946.

20. Mircea Florian, *Dialectica: sistem și metodă de la Platon la Lenin* (Dialectics: system and method from Plato to Lenin), Bucharest: School Press, 1947, 231 p.

The preference for Plato is to be noted once more, although the balance will shift significantly after 1948.

## Conclusions

Our conclusions are based on the data presented in texts 1 to 8 and on the conclusions inserted between them. Regarding the comparative frequency of writing, we have grouped them by years as follows: for years I used a division by decades, for translations I have quantified including the fragments adding where it was appropriate the number of reviews (this also for avoiding the inequality of the writings of the two authors – Plato and Aristotle). In quantifying the books we took into account only those presented in texts 4 and 5, and regarding the studies they are quantified according to texts 6, 7 and 8.



**D. Table 9**

Year	Number of translations from Plato's work	Number of translations from Aristotle's work	Thematic books on Plato	Thematic books on Aristotle	Studies on Plato	Studies on Aristotle	Total
1900 – 1910	2	–	–	–	1	1	4
1911 – 1920	13 (2 reviews)	1	–	–	1	1	18
1921 – 1930	23 (3 reviews)	3	–	–	5	5	39
1931 – 1940	12 (6 reviews)	1 (1 review)	4	2	11	3	39
1941 – 1948	36 (3 reviews)	5	2	–	17	12	75
Total	86 (14 reviews)	9 (1 review)	6	2	35	22	175

Since in this period (1900–1948) Platonic and Aristotelian studies are in the pioneering stage and since there is no institutionalization of these able to provide a common direction and continuity, we stand in the impossibility of making a coherent thematic classification. If we are to grasp a preference for a particular theme in the translations of Plato, this is represented by *Symposion* with five different versions of translations including fragmentary publications (Bezdechi, Grecu, Luca, Muşoiu, Papacostea), followed by the *Apology*, *Crito* and *Republic* with four translators. We will not seek an explanation of these preferences, given the nature of our text. We add only that in the period 1945–1961 there is no other translation of Plato being made (only in 1955 were there some excerpts reprinted, translated from *The Law*, in *Crestomație pentru studiul istoriei statului și dreptului în R.P.R.* (The Reader For Studying the State History and Law in the PRR), edited by Vladimir Hanga, Bucharest: Editura pentru Literatură Economică și Juridică, 1955, pp. 66–68, 83). Unlike Plato, who would fall into obscurity, the translation of Aristotle continued in the 1950s thanks to Frenkian, even if fragmentary, in *Texte alese* (Chosen Texts) (an introductory study and selection of texts by C.I. Gulian, Bucharest: Editura de Stat, 1951).

If in what concerns Aristotle the interest is too low in this period to talk about full critical editions or translations, regarding Plato we have two names well recognized in this period, whose translations have been reedited after 1990. Thus, in 1922, Bezdechi

was first to bring together some dialogues (*Crito*, *Apology*, *Laches*, *Ion*, *Charmides*, *Hippias Minor*) in a volume (*Dialogues*), while Papacostea started (even if they were in an early stage and incomplete) a critical edition of Plato published between 1931 and 1935 in three volumes.

A steady increase in the number of writings can be observed, and also the significant difference in the preference for the philosophy of Plato at the expense of the Aristotelian one. Of the 175 titles, 141 are devoted to Plato, and only 34 to Aristotelian thought.

The interest for Plato dominating Romanian culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century marks the humanist phase of this culture. In a culture which – especially in its theological branch – claims itself from Platonism, the latter never gets to be a thematic issue. As it is known, orthodoxy (the right belief) is constituted as a spiritual and political reality after the schism of 1054 and especially after the Byzantine refusal of any contact with Rome after the traumatic Fourth Crusade. The Great Schism divided the Eastern and Western Church – which now evolved on different political and cultural coordinates. However, Eastern Christianity appears in 1054 very different than the Western one: more sensitive to the Platonic substrate of Christianity, and as such, more mystical, with a hieratism of the forms of worship reminiscent of the court ceremony of Roman Basileia (but in Greek!), with the famous "symphony" between temporal and religious power which makes the authority of the Church, seriously threatened in the temporal, to take refuge in the spiritual, a defensive move already visible (all the Eastern Empire at the time – 1054 – being already occupied by Islam). If we add the centring on the texts of the Church Fathers and the subsequent lack of communication with Western culture (which is already developing into another civilizing paradigm) we have a picture of what the Romanian Orthodoxy inherits from the formation of medieval states. Instead, Aristotelianism taught in royal schools (extremely prolific in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) is a school Aristotelianism (Scholastic – but not in the Western sense of the term). The interest for Aristotle only becomes visible when the Romanian culture is entering the stage of scientific concerns and, implicitly, concerns for the technologisation of a retarded world.

When Romania meets Modernity, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Modernity does not meet any resistance from Platonism, nor from Aristotelianism and as such is not defined critically in relation to them. Here, modernity has an exclusively constructive dimension and what modernity criticizes is a state of social retardation rather than acultural pattern. It is not about a cultural continuity (in the sense that we are dealing with a tradition which creates its modernity), but it's about the quasi mechanic juxtaposition of some moments of influence. On one side we have a Plato–Christianus retrieved, thanks to Patristic, via the religious route, on the other we have an Aristotle of the commentaries which is a bauble of Greek schools and, finally, on the third side, we have a Plato which has become a symbol of the ideality toward which the humanist culture aims and a methodological Aristotle, especially on the line of the dialectics, promoted by the higher education in the interwar period and, after that, in the communist era.

That is why Plato and Aristotle are returned to academic discourse without going through the critical analysis of their role in pre–modern Romanian culture.