

# BASARAB NICOLESCU AND TRANSDISCIPLINARITY<sup>1</sup>

Cristian Andreescu, PhD candidate

SCOSAAR, The Doctoral School of the Romanian Academy

Member of DLMFS of the Romanian Academy

**Abstract:** Basarab Nicolescu is presented as a physicist, mathematician and philosopher, using a language specific to all three disciplines, but integrating it into a transdisciplinary one. He started from the concept of the “included tertium”, or the “included middle”<sup>2</sup> launched by Stéphane Lupasco and based on this concept he constructed a complex image of an unlimited set of levels of Reality. He carefully separates the concepts of Real, Reality, Object, Subject, resistance and non-resistance, identity of the zones of non-resistance of Object and Subject, leading thus to an image of the physical Reality which can be seen at the same time as a physical description, and also as a psychological and philosophical representation. At the core of this representation stays the “hidden tertium” (or “the hidden middle”), a concept characterizing Nicolescu’s philosophy in a transdisciplinary and holistic way aiming at the unity of science.

**Keywords:** included middle, hidden middle, levels of Reality, Object, resistance.

Basarab Nicolescu gives the notion of resistance a fundamental value, because he bases the explanation given to the notion of reality on that of resistance, which means that the language used by Basarab Nicolescu has a particular connotation; it cannot be classified in the category of established philosophical language. The reason why we emphasize this aspect is that the author penetrated the field of philosophy from the field of science, namely it is an original penetration, from the position of the deep and integrative thinker, who is more concerned with the way in which he can formulate in his thoughts and through following in coherent sentences, their own intuitions, rather than referring to the established language of philosophical literature. Treating philosophical concepts also from the perspective of science, Albert Einstein also made a statement that fits in the same conceptual area as that of the notion of “resistance”: “Reality is only an illusion, although, admittedly, it is a very persistent one.”<sup>2</sup>

Nicolescu resorts to the notion of resistance to convey the meaning of the notion of reality is that his entire philosophical approach is centred around a new conception of reality, one originating from the newest visions of theoretical physics about the physical world. This conception is based on the idea of a reality stratified on different levels and following this aspect, he introduces the notion of *levels of reality*.

Being part of a paradigm of reality compatible with that studied by theoretical physics, it had to refer to a researchable and describable reality, explicable in the terms and theories of physics. This is the reason why the notion of reality seems to differ from Basarab Nicolescu, which is why it is used most frequently in philosophy. Nicolescu introduces the notion of real, having the same meaning as the reality that is beyond the human capacity to know, therefore, beyond the epistemological and ontological: in the metaphysical.

Therefore, the levels of reality will be part of what Basarab Nicolescu considers to be the describable reality, more precisely, *what does resist*, respectively, in our view, *what does not escape*, what does not come out of the possibility of mathematical representations:

„In quantum physics, mathematical formalism is inseparable from experience. In its own way, it resists, through the need for internal self-consistency and through the need to integrate experimental data without destroying this self-consistency. (...) We must understand by the level of Reality a set of systems, invariant to the action of a number of general laws: for example, quantum entities subject to quantum laws, which are radically different from the laws verified in the macrophysics’ world. This means that two levels of Reality are different if, passing from one to the other, there is a difference in laws and a difference in fundamental concepts (as it is, for example, causality).”<sup>3</sup>

It is natural to ask ourselves the question: what does self-consistency mean? Basarab Nicolescu does not define it, he probably assumes that the common meaning of this notion can be used in relation to it. Our education and experience with language indicate the following meanings: 1. Degree of density, strength, solidity of a body, of a matter, etc.; the resistance of a body or material to deformation or crushing. 2. Quality of an axiomatic system

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a fragment of our extended paper, titled "Basarab Nicolescu and Transdisciplinarity", under print in the collective volume *Conference Proceedings: Un-Bordering Disciplinarity. Trans-/Cross-/Post-Disciplinary Approaches to Humanities and Social Sciences*, Rediviva Press, Italy.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.scientia.ro/homo-humanus/49-note-si-adnotari-carti-celebre/1400-citate-de-albert-einstein.html>

<sup>3</sup> Basarab Nicolescu, 2011. *De la Isarlik la Valea Uimirii* [From *Isarlik to the Valley of Wonder*], Vol. II. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing, 12.

of not containing some formula at the same time as its negation. The dictionary might give as synonym coherence, which, philosophically is not the same thing. We find that these two notions, of resistance and self-consistency, respectively consistency, keep us within that conception of Reality that involves the possibility of knowledge, explanation, representation, etc. However, there is a passage, in which we can glimpse a breakthrough towards the other meaning of the concept of Reality, that which Niclescu calls the Real:

„Due to the notion of levels of Reality, Reality acquires a multidimensional and multidifferential structure. Also, the levels of Reality allow us to define useful notions, such as levels of language, levels of representation, levels of materiality or levels of complexity.”<sup>4</sup>

Capitalizing from an ontological perspective the concept of “discontinuity”, Niclescu shows:

“The discontinuity that was manifested in the quantum world is also manifested in the structure of the levels of Reality, through the coexistence of the macrophysics’ world and the microphysics’ world”<sup>5</sup>

The consequence of the above idea is the modeling of a multi-level reality. “According to my model, reality has a certain number of levels. Indeed, the preceding considerations regarding two levels of Reality can easily be generalized to a larger number of levels. The analysis that follows will not depend on whether this number is finite or infinite. For the sake of terminological clarity of exposition, I will assume that this number is infinite.”<sup>6</sup>

In such a situation, of an infinity of levels, we no longer have to deal with an explicable or representable Reality, this way of looking directs us to the domain of the other concept used by Niclescu, that of Real. And it also reminds us of the way in which Mihai Drăgănescu<sup>7</sup> refers to Heisenberg's statements and the increasingly accentuated distance from the concrete world:

“One of Heisenberg's basic ideas is that penetrating deeper and deeper layers of matter involves mental abstractions that move further and further away from immediate intuition. (...) According to Heisenberg, we will understand the depths of nature if we pass from abstraction to abstraction, in its mathematical form, based on the harmonies of the laws of symmetry. Through abstraction, Heisenberg sees finding the unity of the world (...)”<sup>8</sup>

Of course, there is no identity between the concepts, only kinship: what Drăgănescu says about Heisenberg implies “understanding the depths of nature”, and this places us somehow, according to Basarab Niclescu's terminology, between Reality and Real. We could use another concept to get out of this state of ambiguity and get much closer to the Real, with the help of the concepts of levels of abstraction and the set of all levels of abstraction<sup>9</sup>:

“This thinking is manifest at multiple levels of abstraction, respectively levels of concreteness. We will assign priority to the highest levels of abstraction when we analyse globally a multitude of such levels (...) This global, integrated ‘perception’ encompasses however many levels of abstraction. Precisely because they are implicit, nothing can be said about their number, not even whether it is limited or not. Wanting to place ourselves in as general a framework as possible, we prefer to state that their number is unlimited. This is exactly how Basarab Niclescu talks about the “number” of levels of reality. And to dwell a little longer on the differences and similarities between the levels of reality and the levels of abstraction we can say that the first can be observed and even exploited experimentally, while the others, when they are made explicit, cannot go beyond the hierarchy of logical systems. To return (...) to the hidden third introduced by Basarab Niclescu, we propose in this paper to include it in the same semantic region, if not to identify the hidden third with the implicit set of abstraction levels.”

In this way, we arrived at a new concept launched by Basarab Niclescu: that of the *hidden middle*, thought on the same line of reasoning as Ștefan Lupașcu's *included middle*. We will interpret more in depth these two notions, in the way in which they appeared and the way in which the first conceptualisation continues the one initiating the perspective. And we will have to bear in mind during this exposition that the philosophical language

---

<sup>4</sup> Basarab Niclescu, 2011. *De la Isarlık la Valea Uimirii* [From *Isarlık to the Valley of Wonder*], Vol. II. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing, 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>7</sup> Mihai Drăgănescu (1929 - 2010) Romanian engineer, informatician and philosopher.

<sup>8</sup> Mihai Drăgănescu, 1989. *Inelul Lumii Materiale* [The Ring of the Material World]. Bucharest: Scientific and Encyclopaedic Press, 47.

<sup>9</sup> Cristian Andreescu, 2013. *The Hidden Significance in the Works of Some Romanian Philosophers*, „European Journal of Science and Theology”, 9 (1), 3-17.

of Basarab Nicolescu differs from the well-established traditional philosophical language, as we found during the analysis of the concepts of Reality and Real, as defined and used by this author.

Ștefan Lupașcu's ideas are primarily manifested in logic, and the novelty of the notion of the included third party introduced by him has the greatest revolutionary force in this discipline, but obviously, this novelty cannot not have philosophical implications. In fact, it appeared in a philosophical context, and Ștefan Lupașcu's writings are actually philosophical: *Du devenir logique et de l'affectivité*, 1935, *L'expérience microphysique et la pensée humaine*, 1941, *Le principe d'antagonisme et la logique de l'énergie*, 1951, *Les trois matières*, 1960, *L'énergie et la matière psychique*, 1974.

Terminology and phrasing is very important in Nicolescu. He creatively opens “the door” to the entry of a technical and scientific vocabulary in an open-philosophy approach which is continued from Ștefan Lupașcu (see, for instance, the term “resistance”), a “move” that Nicolescu creatively continues in an original epistemological-ontological conception, within a philosophical vision of human interiority and in his studies in art philosophy.

We can ask ourselves in which philosophical category can Basarab Nicolescu's conception fit: is it metaphysical, ontological, or is it strictly epistemological or logical? It is difficult to frame this case so differently from the philosophical approaches considered classic. Basarab Nicolescu himself had a multidisciplinary evolution, and his concerns throughout his life and especially during his youth covered many fields, without him being able to stop clearly on one of them, as he himself declares in an autobiographical note:

“Mathematics was my first passion, but it seemed too abstract and too little connected to the world. I would then have wanted to be a literary critic, in fact I also debuted with a volume about Ion Barbu, (Ion Barbu, *Cosmologia “Jocului secund”*, Editura pentru literatură, Bucharest, 1968), but I was not interested in being a critic of realist literature socialists, as I had to become in those days. How could I not be a materialistic philosopher, God forbid! So, I chose physics - a realm of reconciliation, which has satisfied me to this day. Physics pushed me towards certain limits that can only be overcome by opening up to metaphysics, religion, philosophy”<sup>10</sup>.

Moreover, the concepts of “Reality/Real” and the “hidden middle” bring Nicolescu's conception of metaphysics closer, all the more so since the hidden third reminds us of Lucian Blaga's metaphysical conception.

After this brief foray into the details of Nicolescu's personal life and their effects on his work, let's return to the notion of the level of Reality.

The basis of this idea is the finding that two contradictory elements, be they statements, observations, states or representations, taken together, can only cancel each other out. The only solution to not generate this annulment is to accept the tension generated by the annihilation tendency and move the conflict to a higher plane, other than the one on which this “struggle of opposites” takes place. Practically, we can say that the acceptance of this tension creates the higher plane, thus generating the appearance of two levels of reality: the one where the contradiction occurs and the one that includes it as a new thing, seen from another perspective. Basarab Nicolescu states this findings as following: “One and the same level of reality can only generate antagonistic oppositions. It is, by its very nature, self-destructive if it is completely separated from all other levels of Reality.”<sup>11</sup>

From this acknowledgement to the infinite set of levels of Reality, no further reasoning steps are necessary, because if there are no arguments for this set to be finite, we can consider it infinite, exactly as Basarab Nicolescu argues in one of the statements quoted above.

In Basarab Nicolescu, the levels of Reality are also explained as disciplinary levels, each with specific laws and knowledge. Since the confinement of knowledge within the disciplinary borders would be absurd, the philosopher proposes a comprehensive vision that reunites conceptually knowledge via his integrative concept of *transdisciplinarity*. Transdisciplinarity crosses disciplines not simply overpassing them, but opening their conceptual borders.

To go further, toward Nicolescu's original concept of “the *hidden middle*”, we should return to the notion of “resistance”, respectively to that of “lack of resistance” (of potentialisation predominating over actualisation): “The zone between the different levels of Reality, like the zone beyond all levels of Reality, is basically a zone of non-resistance to our experiences, representations, descriptions, images or mathematical formalizations.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Basarab Nicolescu, 2011. *De la Isarlık la Valea Uimirii* [From *Isarlık to the Valley of Wonder*], Vol. I. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing.

<sup>11</sup> Basarab Nicolescu, 2002. *Noi, particula și lumea* [Us, the Particle and the World]. Iași: Polirom, 189.

<sup>12</sup> Basarab Nicolescu, 2011. *De la Isarlık la Valea Uimirii* [From *Isarlık to the Valley of Wonder*], Vol. II. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing, 16.

The sense in which Nicolescu uses the concepts of “resistance”, respectively, of “non-resistance”, is that of opposing, respectively not opposing the transformation following the interventions initiated by the searching being, and the inquisitive mind, characteristic of the Luciferic attitude, but, in Lucian Blaga’s understanding, not in the interpretation of the Harold Bloom. These interventions that seek an understanding, a deciphering of Lucian Blaga’s mystery, provoke a response from Reality which, by its way of manifesting itself, shows an opposition to the deciphering of the mystery. The international public which is more specialized with culture than epistemology might be familiar with Blaga’s poem titled *I will not crush the world’s corolla of wonders*<sup>13</sup> than with his epistemological work *The Spirit and the Mathematical Experiment*<sup>14</sup> or *The Trilogy of Knowledge*<sup>15</sup> which are a suitable philosophical background for understanding Nicolescu’s transdisciplinarity and complexity, too. Non-resistance is all around a disciplinary area of “resistance” and, on the contrary, “manifests” itself *as if* it does not exist, that is, the interventions of the searching rational mind are some “empty movements”, they do not touch anything, they do not obtain any kind of response. But let’s go back to the way Nicolescu makes use of these notions: In order to be able to use the notion of non-resistance to define the concept of “hidden third”, he still needs the introduction of two other notions which, in the established language of philosophy, have a different usage, but with Nicolescu, they acquire through these new definitions, deeper meanings. It is about “object” and “subject”. “The object is defined, in my theory, by the set of levels of Reality and its complementary zone of non-resistance.”<sup>16</sup>

Why is that? Why does the Object have to include several levels of reality and the complementary zone of non-resistance? The fact that the Object has to include several levels of reality is understandable in the possible multidisciplinary interest for one Object of study. For instance, the atom is studied both by chemistry and physics. The complementary zone of non-resistance is the area of unknowns in the respective disciplines and in-between them, where we do not have (yet) inter-disciplinary knowledge and also *beyond these* circumscribed areas of knowledge. When we gather all these aspects, we have a transdisciplinary approach of the Object and, in his philosophical view, *Basarab Nicolescu conceives the Object transdisciplinary, ab initio.*

Basarab Nicolescu also states that

“(…)the different levels of Reality are accessible to human knowledge due to the existence of different levels of perception (..) The coherence of the levels of perception presupposes, as in the case of the levels of Reality, a zone of non-resistance to perception. The ensemble of levels of perception and its complementary zone of non-resistance constituted, in our model, the Subject. The two non-resistance zones of the Object and the Subject must be identical so that the flow of information can circulate coherently between the Object and the Subject. This non-resistance zone corresponds to a third term, the term of Interaction between Subject and Object, which cannot be reduced to either the Object or the Subject and which I call the “Hidden Middle”<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> The poem goes like this: “*I will not crush the world’s corolla of wonders/ and I will not kill/ with reason/ the mysteries I meet along my way/ in flowers, eyes, lips, and graves./ The light of others/ drowns the deep magic hidden/ in the profound darkness./ I increase the world’s enigma/ with my light/ much as the moon with its white beams/does not diminish but increases/the shimmering mysteries of night —/ I enrich the darkening horizon/with chills of the great secret./All that is hard to know/becomes a greater riddle/under my very eyes/because I love alike/flowers, lips, eyes, and graves.*” Lucian Blaga, 1989. “I will not crush the world’s corolla of wonders”. In: *At the Courts of Yearning: Poems by Lucian Blaga*. Translated and with an introduction by Andrei Codrescu. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 3. We encounter this poem, *Io non schiaccio la corolla di prodigi del mondo* by Lucian Blaga, translated into Italian language, within the volume \*\*\*, 1996. *La poesia romena del Novecento*. Traduzione e a cura di Marco Cugno. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso: “Io non schiaccio la corolla di prodigi del mondo/e non uccido/con la mia mente i misteri che incontro/lungo il cammino/nei fiori, negli occhi, su labbra o tombe./La luce degli altri/estingue la malia dell’imperscrutabile/che in abissi di tenebra si cela,/mentre io,/io con la mia luce accresco il mistero del mondo –/e proprio come nel diffuso albore la luna/non riduce, ma col suo tremollo/amplifica il mistero della notte./così il buio orizzonte arricchisco anch’io/di effusi brividi di sacro mistero,/e tutto ciò che è inintelligibile,/si tramuta in enigmi ancor più grandi/sotto i miei occhi –/perché io amo/e fiori e occhi e labbra e sepolture.”

<sup>14</sup> See Lucian Blaga, 2017. *Das Experiment und der mathematische Geist*. Translation from Romanian into German by Rainer Schubert. Wien: New Academic Press.

<sup>15</sup> In English we have excerpts from Lucian Blaga, *The Trilogy of Knowledge* in Angela Botez, R.T. Allen, Henrieta Anișoara Șerban, 2018. “From *The Dogmatic Aeon* (1931)”, 37-43, “From *Transcendental Censorship* (1934)”, 63-70, and “From *Luciferian Knowledge* (1933)”, 71-82. In: *Lucian Blaga: Selected Philosophical Extracts*. Delaware: Vernon Press.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibidem*, 17.

The correlate of the different levels of Reality are accessible to human knowledge due to the existence of different levels of perception relates the epistemological and the phenomenological dimensions in a *process of knowledge creation*. Thus, we have a specific, processual view of knowledge and of Object, in Basarab Nicolescu. The history of the conceptualization of “objects” in philosophy is intricate and long.<sup>18</sup> However, in epistemology and science, the dichotomy Subject-Object is clear. The Subject is the knower who investigates the Object of knowledge, very well defined (and, thus, limited, resulting in circumscribed, limited knowledge). The objects of physics are in general more concrete, although in the case of microphysics and quantic physics they can be even abstract and even yet not proven to exist<sup>19</sup>.

There is a separation and a contrast between Subject and Object and this is meant by dichotomy. Charles Peirce defines in 1931 the sign and the object as following: “A sign stands for something to the idea which it produces, or modifies. Or, it is a vehicle conveying into the mind something from without. That for which it stands is called its Object...” Peirce<sup>20</sup>. In Peircean semiotics and logic the interpreter and the sign are part in a same process of significance. The Object is a signifier, but the Subject might be seen as a type of signifier in the necessary interpretation for the arrival at the signified and at meaning. In this sense, we may imply that the Object and the Subject are not in a relation of perfect dichotomy and we can comprehend Nicolescu’s (only) relative separation Subject-Object in this sense, too.

Epistemologically, the subject knows and the object is known. Ontologically, the objects and the subjects are part of the same ontology. The meaning that Nicolescu attributes to the pair of notions Object/Subject is rich, being central to classical and modern concerns in epistemology and phenomenology. Knowing the Object is more than representing it for in Nicolescu “representation” means less than the Real, because it also contains what cannot be represented, it also contains areas of non-resistance to representation, to use the “Nicolescian” terminology.

Finally, if Real “hides” an unrepresentable area, it is not surprising that Basarab Nicolescu called it “the hidden middle”. This unrepresentable area puts the “hidden middle” (something that is not A , not non-A, or sometimes something that is paradoxically both A and non-A), the one that forces and opens up classical logic of A vs. non-A, in correlation with the problem of God from the perspective of Basarab Nicolescu's model. The “supreme energy” is God; but it is also the initial constitutive contradiction of the creation of the world, because, creating, this supreme energy separates itself... This concept opens up additional valuing of the concept of “included tertium/middle” on which the concept of “hidden tertium” is based in the direction of the philosophy of art at Salvador Dali, André Breton, Gaston Bachelard (shadows and lights) etc. Between the two expressions, the word “tertium” naturally continues the “included third party” concept of Ștefan Lupașcu, the “hidden tertium” being an expansion in Real of the “included tertium”, the latter being the germ of the hidden one. The justification for this consideration is the fact that the included third party is born so that the opposites are not cancelled in their “struggle” spent in one and the same conceptual space. This “birth” results, as I have shown above, in the appearance of two planes, of two levels of Reality. But at the same time, what is between these two planes is also born, that state of non-resistance to representation (on the one hand, what is unrepresentable and, on the other hand, what is changeable) that Nicolescu talks about.

---

<sup>18</sup> As we cannot obviously quite cover it here, we’ll very succinctly refer to three important philosophical landmarks in the defining understanding of “objects” in order to offer a philosophical background for Basarab Nicolescu’s Subject-Object dichotomy (a relative dichotomy as he explains in his theory, where he proposed areas of common essentiality for the Subject and the Object as “ingredients” of Reality): Aristotle, in contrast with Plato and then the modern, clear and pragmatic view of “object” in Peirce, which is a possible good initial standpoint for comprehending Nicolescu’s view. In philosophy, “objects” are ontological categories. In Heraclitus everything changes, while in Parmenides and Zeno there is only what does not change. In Aristotle the prime cause are the unchanging objects of the metaphysics. The abstract objects of metaphysics are the universals, the numbers and the sentences. But there are also substances or the materials composing things. The universals are concepts about the essential qualities of the existing items, beings etc. For instance, there is an essential quality of existence that makes a table a table or a horse a horse among the numerous existing horses or tables. Aristotle does not consider that the universals could have been existed *ante res*, or, before the objects themselves. They exist in things (*in rebus*), because the attributes cannot exist separately from objects. Here Aristotle criticises Plato who saw the perfect forms, or, the universals, the essential attributes of anything and everything as separate and even more, as existing in another world whose copy our world is; a copy filled up with copies. In Aristotle, ontology studies the (unchanging) universals, the (changing) events and processes, taken together as changing objects, and the substances, in the physical objects.

<sup>19</sup> This was the case with “odderon”, a particle postulated by Basarab Nicolescu and Leszek Łukaszuk in 1973 and discovered at CERN in 2021.

<sup>20</sup> Charles Peirce, 1931. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, volume 1, Charles Hartshorne & Paul Weiss (eds), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, §339.

These statements are very abstract and, because during this work we touched on the field of abstractions, a generalized specific of philosophical notions and concepts, let's return to them to look at them also from the point of view of the object/subject couple.

There is a temptation to consider abstractions as subjective elements, because at the level of common perception, abstractions are ideas generated by the human mind in an effort to make classifications based on properties common to some of them, and properties are ways of perceiving different aspects of objects with which interact. But being notions accepted and understood as inter-subjective abstractions they rise to the epistemological level of objectivity.

At the same time, these aspects can be perceived as such and described exactly as they are received by the senses, or they can generate symbolic associations. Symbols, in turn, can have precise meanings, or they can indicate something that goes beyond the realm of the perceptible. This fact can lead us to think of the plasticizing and revealing metaphors introduced as a concept and treated by Lucian Blaga. Together with the revealing metaphors we enter the world of the mythical, where symbols also find their place. Blaga states that man is essentially living in the horizon of mystery and revelation, but about the plasticizing metaphor he states that it is "required by the disagreement between the concrete and the abstract".<sup>21</sup>

This means that Blaga places abstractions in the area "beyond mystery", in the area of the imaginable, in the area describable by ideas. We affirm, however, that there are abstractions that also go "beyond", that is, in the actual area of mystery. These are the objective abstractions that "live" regardless of whether they are perceived, imagined or thought by the human spirit. The symbols of revelatory metaphors are phenomenological symptoms: they are several indications to (and from) the non-resistance zone of the Object and the Subject, as defined by Basarab Nicolescu. These are not abstractions that essentialize and represent, but are layered ensembles of meanings increasingly distant from a distinct signified. For this reason, I have placed in the same area of the mystery the hidden third to be exploited in Basarab Nicolescu, and the above-mentioned implicit *Ensemble* of all levels of abstraction.

These considerations about Basarab Nicolescu's philosophical language cannot ignore the fact that the principle of the included third has echoes in symbolic thinking relevant to both quantum physics and anthropological phenomena. Gilbert Durand spoke of a plan of image classification, also governed by three principles, appreciating Stéphane Lupasco's particularly fertile concept, the included third, in a system of three-term logic. Thus, the concrete coherence (concrete isotopism) of the symbols in the dynamic centre of the constellations of images also reveals a dynamic system of antagonistic cohesive forces, which perpetuate the dynamics for which logics are nothing more than the formalization of a dialectical dynamism more complex than the Hegelian dialectic and which it is extremely important for understanding in a systemic and dynamic perspective the levels of reality.<sup>22</sup>

\*

Antagonistic dynamisms establish the overcoming of antagonisms through temporary, varied equilibria all leading to systems, each conceptualized as a type of energy structuring. This structuring of energy would be what "resists", creating the object reality that we perceive. Even Lupașcu believes that perception through the sense organs is only an appearance or an illusion. Lupasco has the theoretical conviction that all the objects that surround us have nothing material, "in the multi-millenary and instinctive sense of the notion of matter", all being only the manifestations and more or less resistant systematizations of energy...Microphysics claims in this sense, that we are an imperfect type of void<sup>23</sup>, but a "full vacuum", a quantum, energetic vacuum. Perceived reality represents the "relative resistance of systems of events" whose balance is relative and temporary leading to other "system geneses".<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Lucian Blaga, 1969. *Trilogia culturii [The Trilogy of Culture]*. *Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii [The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture]*, Bucharest: Universal Literature Press, 280. See, in English, Angela Botez, R. T. Allen and Henrieta Anișoara Șerban, 2018. *Lucian Blaga: Selected Philosophical Extracts*. Chapter 8: *From The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture*. Delaware: Vernon Press, 97-103.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Basarab Nicolescu, 2009. *What Is Reality?*, Iași: Junimea Press, 35 *sqq*, we call attention to the following works Gilbert Durand, 1984. *L'Imagination symbolique*. Paris: PUF, and Gilbert Durand, 1999. *L'anthropologie et les structures du complexe*. In: *Stéphane Lupasco, L'Homme et l'œuvre*. Editors: Horia Bădescu, Basarab Nicolescu. Paris: Editions du Rocher.

<sup>23</sup> Yet, cf. B. Nicolescu's *What Is Reality?* "The Void with the meaning of 'nothingness' [less poetically, 'vacuum' – our clarification] is incompatible with the logic of energetic antagonism". B. Nicolescu, 2009. *What Is Reality?*, Iași: Junimea Press, 36.

<sup>24</sup> Basarab Nicolescu, 2009. *What Is Reality?*, Iași: Junimea Press, 36-47.

Basarab Nicolescu's philosophical, ontological and epistemological language is based on Lupașcu's philosophy and is adequate to support a philosophical logic and a speculative philosophy of science based on a ternary vision of the ontological. Everything that exists, nothing is of absolute actuality (reality) and nothing is of absolute potentiality, leads to levels of reality. with consistency reality presents at any level the triple macrophysics', biological and quantum aspect. Nicolescu highlights the isomorphism indicated by Ștefan Lupașcu between the microphysical world and the psychic world, as postulated by Pauli and interpreted by Jung, without forcing a simplistic equivalence, but commenting on an interdisciplinary philosophical-scientific direction in which the microscopic world and the psychic world are understood as manifestations different aspects of the same three steps dialectic dynamism.

In Basarab Nicolescu's view, coexistence, relative coherence, systemic potentiality, are ensured by the continuous, irreducible presence of the T-state, the state of the included middle characterized by equilibrium between a contradiction's poles, or, between potential transformation and actualisation, in any of the three manifestations (macrophysics, biological and quantum). As shown, transdisciplinarity opens the conceptual borders of the scientific disciplines and approximates a wholeness of the concept of knowledge, as well as the aim at a richer corpus of knowledge with wider perspectives. The transdisciplinary references of Basarab Nicolescu's philosophical language represent both its great difficulty and its special value for future ontological and epistemological investigations of great originality.

## REFERENCES

- Andreescu, Cristian, 2013. *The Hidden Significance in the Works of Some Romanian Philosophers*, „European Journal of Science and Theology”, 9 (1), 3-17.
- Bagdasar, Nicolae, Herseni, Traian, Bârsănescu, S. S. (eds.), 1941. *History of Modern Romanian Philosophy. Homage to Professor Ion Petrovici*, Vol. 5. Bucharest: Romanian Society of Philosophy.
- Blaga, Lucian, 1969. *Trilogia culturii [The Trilogy of Culture]. Geneza metaforei și sensul culturii [The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture]*, Bucharest: Universal Literature Press.
- Blaga, Lucian, 2017. *Das Experiment und der mathematische Geist*. Translation from Romanian into German by Rainer Schubert. Wien: New Academic Press.
- Botez, Angela, Allen, R. T., Șerban, Henrieta Anișoara, 2018. *Lucian Blaga: Selected Philosophical Extracts. Chapter 8: From The Genesis of Metaphor and the Meaning of Culture*. Delaware: Vernon Press.
- Brenner, Joseph E., 2010. “The philosophical logic of Stéphane Lupasco (1900–1988)”, *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 19(3). DOI:[10.12775/LLP.2010.009](https://doi.org/10.12775/LLP.2010.009)
- Drăgănescu, Mihai, 1989. *Inelul Lumii Materiale [The Ring of the Material World]*. Bucharest: Scientific and Encyclopaedic Press.
- Durand, Gilbert, 1999. *L'anthropologie et les structures du complexe*. In: *Stéphane Lupasco, L'Homme et l'œuvre*. Editors : Horia Bădescu, Basarab Nicolescu. Paris: Editions du Rocher.
- Marcus, Solomon, 2014. “Transcendence as a Universal Paradigm”. *International Journal of Communication Research*. 4(2), 60-72.
- Nicolescu, Basarab, 2002. *Noi, particula și lumea [Us, the Particle and the World]*. Iași: Polirom, 189.
- Nicolescu, Basarab, 2009. *What Is Reality?*, Iași: Junimea Press.
- Nicolescu, Basarab, 2011. *De la Isarlîk la Valea Uimirii [From Isarlîk to the Valley of Wonder]*, Vols. I, II. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing.
- Peirce, Charles, 1931. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, volume 1, Charles Hartshorne & Paul Weiss (eds), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Surdu, Alexandru, 2011. “Tezaurul filosofic al limbii române” [“The Philosophical Thesaurus of the Romanian Language”]. In: *Izvoare de filosofie românească [Romanian Philosophy Sources]*, Bucharest: Renaissance Press.