

## **A PRACTICAL SECOND-ORDER DISCOURSE**

**Ștefan VLĂDUȚESCU**

Professor, PhD, CCSCMOP, University of Craiova, Romania

### **Abstract**

This study is a reflection on the history of discourse and an emphasis on philosophy as a second-order practical discourse. On the one hand, meta-analytically is the idea that literature is canonical scriptural discourse: Literary discourse is a special creation in the report with the discourses from which it comes; as aesthetic discourse, literature has an inaugural character, it comes from many practical discourses. On the other hand, philosophy builds on the literary discourse. Philosophy has a strong, decisive modeling reinforcement; philosophy is a practice of streamlining the practice of everyday life. Philosophy builds up as a second-order practice (literature comes from life, from first-order practice, philosophy is founded as a special literary discourse and returns to life's practice, becoming a second-order discourse). Life has shaped literature, and literature has shaped philosophy.

Key-words: practice, literature, philosophy, seconde order discourse

### **1. Introduction**

The beginning of philosophy is the recognition of the philosophical consciousness delays in relation to philosophical practice. Philosophy is inaugurated with the introduction of philosophy. Before setting it up as a type of

discourse, philosophical discourse produced effects within the literary discourse. The place where the literary becomes philosophical is Plato's dialogues. The late stage of the separation of the *mythos* *logos*, dialogues concentrate the rational substance of the *logos* to the detriment of the verbal substance. Platonic opera is the first enterprise where the literary is rationally (even logically) modeled towards philosophy. The *logos* of dialogues establish as a rule of discursive function reason, intellect. For Plato it is important to be and to think. His post-parmenidism emphasizes that being and thinking does not have to be interpreted one by the other. The *Logos* must incorporate the two terms within a new confounding thinking, of strict rationality. This strictness only means "somewhat stricter," that is, merely benefiting from the Parmenian logical principle of identity and the principle introduced by Plato of non-contradiction. When the Platonic dialogue is said to contradict, he changes his course of natural reasoning.

Therefore, until Plato, the literary discourse of philosophical consecration and consecration had no obligation but to the principle of identity. This principle, which will be mastered with philosophy, with all Western thinking, shows that one thing is identical to itself and two things identical to themselves can be identical to each other. Thinking can not work productively but within the identity. The principle can therefore be considered "the highest law of thought" (Heidegger, 1991, p. 9). In order to remain valid, when it comes to a thing, when it is called upon by it, or it follows it, thinking must keep in mind that it does not turn its course. She must keep the thing as himself. With each cogitation and language entry it is necessary that the thing remains the same. The principle anaesizes the loss of consistency. It highlights the repeatability in itself of the existing being. This belongs to her identity, to her unity with herself. The principle expresses the fact that unity of identity within the multiple is realized as a characteristic of the existence of anything. He asks that everywhere where thinking is done leaves himself led by identity (Clitan & Barbu-Kleitsch, 2018). Without identity, there would be no accumulation. Anything would become

anything. The fictional, literary make up the field of unlimited metamorphosis. Philosophical is a literally restricted first and first on the principle of identity. The main criterion of identity controls the possibility of producing thinking to reproduce cogitatively. Without identity, one could not take place in the multiple, and the multiple would not find the way to wrap in one (Abrudan & Fofiu, 2017). Wherever self-knowledge thinking speaks the principle of identity. It can only be controlled by putting aside its identities and not letting go of the existence course of existence.

Parmenides formulates the reality of the identity principle: “it is one thing to think and be” (Greek philosophy until Plato, 1979, vol. I, p. 232). The same is to think of being. Gnoziacal and ontic are one. The principle stems from the fact that the two leading words (think, be) not only cogitate language, but multiply it in one and the same.

At Palton, the principle of identity is involved in the discursive construction. He has the role of a trainer that the repetition entrusts him with. Put into the instrumental circuit of thought by Parmenides, with Plato, he becomes the modeling tool of productive thought other than poem-literary. Literally evoked, the principle, will be taken with lucidity. It will thus contribute to the segregation of literary philosophy.

The literature before Plato exploits literary themes, philosophies that history has held to belong to philosophy. Thus, the authors of the “philosopher” - became philosophers post-factum. Of course Parmenide was and was a poet. Undoubtedly he knew himself wise (sofos). With the installation of philosophy as an ex-literary discourse, Parmenide became a philosopher. I mean, Parmenides did not have a philosopher for himself.

Plato consistently uses the principle of identity, and in the “Sophist” (254-d) he also recalls: “This means that each one is different from the other two but the same as himself” (Plato, 1989, p. 366). The work remains identical, but in order to ratify the same, it must be the same whenever it can be found in another.

We recall without insisting that Platon introduced the rigor of the principle of non-contradiction in the construction and establishment of the concept expanded as a “Philosophy” discipline. Then Aristotle theorized the two, adding to them the excluded third principle and thus building a “Logic”. Later, Leibniz will put together with the three, a fourth principle: that of sufficient reason.

So, Parmenide writes a literary poem. It develops it with the consciousness of literature. The internal movement of producing thought is literary. The theme of the writing is outside the literature's relevance chart at the time of Plato-Aristotle. But they do not find the Parmenidian discourse as anything other than literature. However, the writing carries a message with non-literary appearances. At the time, the real and decisive criterion of literature is rhyme. Parmenide's poem is righteous and rhythmic. The poem is naturally “used” as literature. The philosophical message is sacrificed in favor of literature in the gain of the literary message. This is what we say today when language always takes us forward (Radu, 2015; Harun & Hassan, 2018). At the time, Plato will use Parmenide in one of his few pure, direct and undeniable philosophical dialogues: Parmenide.

## **2. Plato and Aristotle bring a new discourse**

Plato and Aristotle take on themes from Thales, Parmenide, Anaximandru and Anaximene, lead them to abstraction and generalization and develop a type of discourse in contradiction with the literary discourse. Obviously what is opposed is something else (Arhip & Arhip, 2017; Lutaaya, 2018; Roşca, 2018). The new type of discourse is something other than literature, the new discourse is philosophy. If we were let down by Plato and Aristotle, we would say that Parmenide and Anaximander did not do philosophy. Essentially, they lack the basis and concept to realize that they are doing philosophy. They had no way to buy it because the base and the conceptual organel that the base will develop will come later. The basis of philosophy thinking as philosophy, this

discipline quality will acquire through Plato and Aristotle. As wise men, Parmenides, Anaximander and Anaximenes know that they philosophize, but they do not know that they do philosophy. By denying them, Plato and Aristotle create a history for the concept of a science the basis of which they lay.

Our postulate is as follows: when the writings of the presocrats tell Plato and Aristotle differently from the literary, they separate the new type of discourse and paradigmatically it as philosophy as a second order discourse.

The presocratic message becomes therefore incomprehensible as literature for Plato and Aristotle. Discourse communicates more than what literary literature means. By continuing and transforming the message of the presocratic wisdom, Plato and Aristotle establish philosophy. When literary writing brings to the stage of intelligibility other sets of meanings than mythical-fictional, then that literature is seen as something other than literature. That literature is given a name other than literature. Philosophy therefore appears in the beginning as an out of literature. It will forever remain unmerited to literature. Moreover, the literary inaugural event will shape any production and any language consumption that would be set up in any other kind of discourse (Coman & Coman, 2017). Each discourse bears a literary mark. The pseudo-literary Platonician-Aristotelian word pours itself out as a new type of discourse.

In philosophy, the philosophical message first appears, and then the philosophical discourse. If they come too late to contribute decisively to the construction of the world, communication and the philosophical message of philosophy come, at any rate, too late to develop a philosophical modeling of receptive thinking. Philosophical reception is derived. First, we understand the discourse literally, and only when the literary is insufficient to explain the ongoing discourse as literary, we only think that the discourse would not be literary. Any non-literary discourse misses the primordial chance of being literary.

The philosophical discourse is the lack of remorse of the literary discourse. Literary is besides philosophical, as well as language besides thinking: a kind of general testability criterion. The literary is an obstacle. Language gives shape and at the same time prevents thinking. First, the literary produces the philosophical, then proclaims it. Literary thinking precedes any idea that a discourse can be anything else.

Philosophy is a literary incapacity. He shows that the literary knows no limits. But “philosophicalism” results from the excess of the literary and conscious of the limit that, surpassing it, the literary becomes something else, the philosophical surpluses the consciousness of its discursive weakness: cogitative and linguistic (Lorenc, Michnej & Szkoda, 2016; Busu & Busu, 2018; Negrea & Voinea, 2018; Tudor, Clitan & Grilo, 2018). Philosophy is thinking beyond the boundaries of literature. It knows the boundaries of literature, for it is on one side of them. But beyond, philosophy becomes powerless to become aware of its own limits (Boureau, 2012; Adinugraha, 2018; Negrea, 2018). Should there be an ex-philosophical horizon beyond the philosophical circle? Or the philosophy will also deal with its own limits.

At first philosophy will handle boundaries. She knows that logic precedes any idea that one thing is so or different, whether or not there is a limit or not. Therefore: philosophy is a late literature. Philosophy is an excess. She leaves the literature, taking with her the main tools of literature. When it was as if literature was perfect, it became philosophy. “To excel in your art is to get out of it” Boileau said.

Incapable of understanding Parmenide and Anaximander, unable to bear their understanding, Plato and Aristotle gave their own work of distance-taking the name of philosophy. Part of the presocratic literature no longer spoke to them, and then they called it philosophy. Philosophy seems literature (Codoban, 1992).

When a discourse of a new language and bearing an “abnormal” cogitation was installed in Greek reflection, it had to be de-anonymized and

edified, individualized. When in the meditative perimeter of Greek culture in the horizon of the 6th, 5th centuries and in the fourth century BC, a new type of message was put in place, Plato and Aristotle gave him the name of philosophy. When this strange literature managed to communicate in a useful way a new type of message, this message was proclaimed philosophy: a wise message (Roșca & Partenie, 2018; Danielsson, 2019). By doing so, they have produced a rupture within Greek culture and thinking. They left poorer literature, but they enriched the theoretical reflection in a capital and decisive way for the destiny of discursive thinking. Platon and Aristotle thus constituted one of the fatalities of literature. Another fatality will be noticed when philosophy will delimit its domains: ontology, gnoseology, ethics, logic etc. Also, another when psychology, hermeneutics, etc. will be detached from the so-called philosophy.

Philosophy began when the self-conscious being and the surrounding world began to think about things without a direct, immediate, direct interest. It began when the theorein of the cognitive spirit, crossing the practice and the contingency, became the self-extinguishing theorein. Then “man to humanitarian” had something to say, something to show, something to convey. This “said” (as Heidegger calls it), this “said” (as Marin Sorescu calls it) is the message. The beginning and the criterion of philosophy is said to be a message: the philosophical message. Philosophy was not present at the birth of the world: it was not absent, but it was delayed. This is the synthesizing thesis for the five theses: the delay of philosophy.

### **3. Conclusion**

Defining the beginning of philosophy can be accomplished by knotting, by constituting the following ideas:

- a new type of message: the philosophical message;
- a new object of reflection: the cosmos in its entirety;
- a new conceptual language register;

- a cogitative instrumentation;
- a cogitative approach to the limit of strictness;
- Plato's proto-logical principles are identity (taken from Parmenide) and non-contradiction: the loss of identity leads to contradiction, and what is contradictory is null;
- Aristotle establishes the logic and principles of identity, noncontradiction and exclusion (later Leibniz will add the principle of sufficient reason);
- a moral reflection: ethics;
- a meditation on the possibilities and ways of knowing: gneseology;
- a theory of being - ontology;
- all these STAU's in the MESSAGE made in the discourse formulation;
- conceptual philosophical language, "logicoid" - logical, specialized - technical;
- From this point of view philosophy is a literature with a special theme, with a strict flow, producing conclusions to be retained as moral, lessons, general level implications.

## REFERENCES

\*\*\* (1979). *Filosofia greacă până la Platon. vol.I*, București: Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Abrudan, E., & Fofiu, A. (2017). Media Coverage of the EU Regional Policy Funds: Insights into Communicating Sustainability. *Transylvanian Review*, 26.

Adinugraha, H. H. (2018). The Rationalization of Abu Yusuf Economic Thought (An Analysis of the Islamic Public Finances). In *The Name of Allah, The most Beneficent, The most Merciful*, 39.

Arhip, C., & Arhip, O. (2017). Psychoanalytic aspects in Camil Petrescu's work. *Studii de Știință și Cultură*, 13(4).

Boureanu, A. (2012). A study about the performing arts determinations. *Revert*, 16(2), 105-111.

Busu, A. D., & Busu, O. V. (2018). Exploring The Impact Of Cmc On Social Relationships-International Students At The University Of Essex, UK. *Annals of the University of Craiova, Series Psychology, Pedagogy*, 37(1), 175-184.

Clitan, G., & Barbu-Kleitsch, O. (2018). La manipulation du comportement électoral par le biais des symboles religieux. *Politique et religion au défi de la communication numérique*, 165.

Codoban, A. (1992). *Filosofia ca gen literar*. Cluj: Dacia.

Coman, I. A., & Coman, M. (2017). Religion, popular culture and social media: the construction of a religious leader image on Facebook. *ESSACHESS—Journal for Communication Studies*, 10(2 (20)), 129-143.

Danielsson, C. B. (2019). The School of Architecture, The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden. *Context: The Effects of Environment on Product Design and Evaluation*, 431.

Harun, H., & Hassan, R. (2018). Effective Organizational Communication and Its Roles in Mitigating Shariah Non-Compliance Risks for Malaysian Takaful Operators (TOs). *Journal of Islamic Banking & Finance*, 35(4).

Heidegger, M. (1991). *Principiul identității*. București: Crater.

Lorenc, A., Michnej, M., & Szkoda, M. (2016). Information system aiding the logistics processes of loading and securing in railway transport. *International Journal of Shipping and Transport Logistics*, 8(5), 568-589.

Lutaaya, A. E. (2018). Organisational communication and performance of statutory corporations in Uganda. A case study of the Uganda Printing and Publishing Corporation (UPPC) (Doctoral dissertation, Nkumba University).

Negrea, X. (2018). Narcissism And The New Free Market Segment. About The New Narrative Identities. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 4(1), 122-128.

Negrea, X., & Voinea, D. V. (2018). Metonymy And The Cult Of Intensity In Media Discourse. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 5(1), 203-209.

Platon (1978). *Opere, III*, București: Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Platon (1989). Opere, VI, București: Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Radu, R. N. Protejarea vieții private. In vol. Deontologia comunicării publice, RN Radu (coord.), Polirom, Iași, 2015

Roșca, V. (2018). Read all about it! How mobile phone web access elevates online news consumption. Jurnalul Practicilor Comunitare Pozitive, 18(1), 47-58.

Roșca, V. I., & Partenie, C. V. (2018). A Theoretical Overview On Understanding Customer-Based Brand Equity. Journal of Community Positive Practices, 18(4), 19-28.

Tudor, M. A., Clitan, G., & Grilo, M. M. (2018). Politique et religion au défi de la communication numérique.. L'Harmattan.