

PN II-RU-TE-2014-4-2881, *The Ethico-Political Relevance of Thinking. An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Relation Between Thinking and Action*

FINAL RESEARCH REPORT
October 2015 - November 2017

The research project *The Ethico-Political Relevance of Thinking. An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Relation Between Thinking and Action* was carried out by the the five members of the project:

Assistant professor habil. Bogdan Mincă, PhD, project director

Ileana Borțun, PhD, postdoctoral researcher

PhD candidate Paul-Gabriel Sandu

PhD candidate Ionuț-Răzvan Ostroveanu (October 2015 - January 2017) / PhD candidate Raluca Bujor (February 2017 - November 2017)

The results of our research are the following:

Book:

—Bogdan Mincă, *Origin and Difference. Heidegger's Translative Thinking*, work in progress, soon to be submitted for publication to an important international publishing house

Papers:

6 papers in important journals or in volumes of proceedings (some already published, some submitted for publication, some to be sent for publication in the next future): Bogdan Mincă (2 papers, 1 following), Ileana Borțun (1 paper, 1 following), Paul Sandu (1 paper)

Articles in international databases (BDI):

1. Bogdan Mincă, "**Heidegger's Return to the Cave. The Interpretation of the Platonic Cave Allegory and Theaetetus as an Early Indication of Kehre and Ereignis**" in: *Heidegger Studies*, vol. 33 (2017), accepted for publication (journal is indexed ERIH INT 1)

2. Bogdan Mincă, „**Heidegger's Interpretation of the Aristotelian Poiesis and of its Importance for the Pre-eminence of sophia over phronesis**” (work in progress, to be sent for publication in 2018 in the journal *Human Studies*)

3. Ileana Borțun, “**The Existential Status of Friendship. A Phenomenological Perspective on Aristotle's Philia**” (work in progress, to be sent for publication in 2018 in the journal *Human Studies*)

Chapters published in volumes:

1. Bogdan Mincă, "**Dichtung und Politik bei Martin Heidegger**", in: Hans-Christian Günther (ed.), *Political Poetry Across the Centuries*, Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2016, pp. 15-26
2. Ileana Borțun, „**Authenticity and Plurality. From Heidegger’s ‘Anyone’ to Arendt’s ‘Common Sense’ and Back Again**”, in: Hans Bernhard Schmid & Gerhard Thonhauser (eds.), *From Conventionalism to Social Authenticity. Heidegger’s Anyone and Contemporary Social Theory*, Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 2017, pp. 133-156
3. Paul-Gabriel Sandu, „**Die Dynamik des Verfallens. Eine genetische Perspektive**”, in: Gerhard Thonhauser (ed.), *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*, Alber, Freiburg, 2017.

Papers published in a national context:

8 papers published in volumes of proceedings at important Romanian publishing houses: Bogdan Mincă (3 papers), Ileana Borțun (3 papers), Paul Sandu (1 paper), Raluca Bujor (1 paper)

1. Bogdan Mincă, „**Interpretarea dată de Heidegger arche-ului grec ca «salt originar» (Ur-sprung) în Originea operei de artă**”, in: Mădălina Diaconu & Christian Ferencz-Flatz (eds.), *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale*, Editura Universității A.I. Cuza din Iași, 2016
2. Bogdan Mincă, „**Gândirea acțiunii ca gândire a diferenței și identității la Heidegger**”, in: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018
3. Bogdan Mincă, „**«... esența acțiunii este aducerea la împlinire»**”, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018
4. Ileana Borțun, „**Locul subiectivității în înțelegerea operei de artă: Heidegger vs. Schapiro**”, in: Mădălina Diaconu & Christian Ferencz-Flatz (editori), *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 2016
5. Ileana Borțun, „**Identitatea lărgită. Exercițarea facultății de judecare ca ospitalitate**”, in: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018
6. Ileana Borțun, „**«Gândirea acționează în măsura în care gândește»**”, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018
7. Paul Sandu, „**Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană**”, in: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018
8. Raluca Bujor, „**«Ea [dominația -ismelor] se bazează, în special în epoca modernă, pe dictatura specifică a spațiului public»**”, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018

Edited volumes:

2 volumes edited and published at Romanian academic publishing houses: Bogdan Mincă (1 volume co-edited), Ileana Borțun (1 volume co-edited)

1. Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

2. Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

Co-organized international conference:

1. Bogdan Mincă was part of the scientific committee of the international conference *2400 Aristotle*, held 25-26 November 2016 at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest (task: reviewing the abstracts submitted for the panel "Aristotle and Phenomenology" and establishing the final programme of this panel).

Co-organized national conference:

1. Bogdan Mincă co-organized (with Cristian Ciocan and Paul Marinescu) the annual conference of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, in collaboration with the Institute of Philosophy "A. Dragomir" and the Inst. for Research in Humanities of the University of Bucharest (IRH), 16-17 November 2016, held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest. Conference Title: *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Perspective fenomenologice / Community - Identity - Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*

Co-organized colloquium:

—Bogdan Mincă co-organized (with Cristian Ciocan) the colloquium *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani / „Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ – 70 years after”*, held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

Presentations at conferences:

7 presentations at international conferences: Bogdan Mincă (3 presentations), Ileana Borțun (3 presentations), Paul Sandu (1 presentation)

1. Bogdan Mincă — international presentation: *Origin and Difference. Heidegger's Thinking of the Difference in the Years 1931-1935*, at the international conference *Beyond Phenomenology* (14th annual conference of the *Nordic Society for Phenomenology*), University of Reykjavik, Iceland, 21-23 April 2016

2. Bogdan Mincă — international presentation: *Heidegger's Interpretation of the Aristotelian poiesis and its Importance for the pre-eminence of sophia over phronesis*, held at the international conference *2400 Aristotle*, organized by the Faculty of Philosophy,

University of Bucharest, 25-26 November 2016

3. Bogdan Mincă, international presentation: *Marion et Heidegger sur l'Ereignis comme donation et retrait. Théologie mystique ou pensée de l'être?*, held at the international conference *Issues in Contemporary Phenomenology*, University of Warsaw, Poland, 23-26 March 2017

4. Ileana Borțun — international presentation: *In Search of Heidegger's "Common Sense". The Political Relevance of Mitverstehen*, held on 23 April 2016, at the 14th Annual Conference of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology, entitled "Phenomenology and Beyond", organized at the University of Iceland, Reykjavik — 21-23 April 2016

5. Ileana Borțun - international presentation: *Imagining Oneself as Another. Imagination in Arendt and Heidegger*, held on 27 April 2016, at the Research Seminar entitled "Imagination as an Act: Phenomenological Approaches" – the 10th edition of the annual research seminar organized by the Centre of Research *Phénoménologies* (Département de Philosophie, Université de Liège) — Liège, 25-29 April 2016

6. Ileana Borțun — international presentation: *The Existential Status of Friendship. A Phenomenological Perspective on Aristotle's Philia*, held on 26 November 2016, at the International Conference "2400 Aristotle", organised by the Philosophy Department, University of Bucharest — Philosophy Department (UB), 25-26 November 2016

7. Paul-Gabriel Sandu – international presentation: *Die Dynamik des Verfallens. Eine genetische Perspektive*, presented at the conference *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*, University of Vienna, Austria, 4 May 2016

10 presentations at national conferences: Bogdan Mincă (3 presentations), Ileana Borțun (3 presentations), Paul Sandu (1 presentation), Răzvan Ostroveanu (2 presentations), Raluca Bujor (1 presentation)

1. Bogdan Mincă — national presentation: *Interpretarea dată de Heidegger archeului grec ca „salt originar” (Ur-sprung) în Originea operei de artă / Heidegger's Interpretation of the Greek arche as „Original Leap” (Ur-sprung) in the Essay The Origin of the Work of Art*, presented at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale – In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015) / Phenomenological Aesthetics, Hundred Years after. Historical Perspectives and Current Trends - In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015)*, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 21 November 2015

2. Bogdan Mincă — national presentation: *Gândirea acțiunii ca gândire a diferenței și identității la Heidegger / Thinking Action as Thinking Identity and Difference in Heidegger*, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*, organized in collaboration with IRH Bucharest and the Institute "Alexandru Dragomir", held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

3. Bogdan Mincă — national presentation: „«... esența acțiunii este aducerea la împlinire»” / ““...the essence of action is accomplishment””, held at the colloquium "Heidegger and his 'Letter on Humanism' - 70 years after", Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

4. Ileana Borțun — national presentation: *Locul subiectivității în înțelegerea operei de artă: Heidegger vs Schapiro [The Place of Subjectivity in Understanding the Work of Art: Heidegger vs Schapiro]*, held on 21 November 2015, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled "Estetica fenomenologică după centenar.

Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale” [“Phenomenological Aesthetics after Centenary. Historical Perspectives and Current Tendencies”] – *In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015)* — Philosophy Department (University of Bucharest), 21 November 2015

5. Ileana Borțun — national presentation: ***Identitatea lărgită. Exercițarea facultății de judecare ca ospitalitate*** [*Enlarged Identity. The Exercise of the Faculty of Judgement as Hospitality*], held on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled “Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Perspective fenomenologice” [“Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives”], organised in collaboration with The Research Institute of the University of Bucharest and with The “Alexandru Dragomir” – Institute for Philosophy — Philosophy Department (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

6. Ileana Borțun, national presentation: „**«Gândirea acționează în măsura în care gândește»**” / “**Thinking acts insofar as it thinks**”, held at the colloquium “*Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ - 70 years after*”, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

7. Paul-Gabriel Sandu — national presentation: ***Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană / Alterization: Constituting the Person in Relation with the Other in Husserl’s Phenomenology***, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*, organized in collaboration with IRH Bucharest and the Institute “Alexandru Dragomir”, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

8. Ionuț-Răzvan Ostroveanu — national presentation: ***Identitate practică și autonomie în filosofia morală kantiană / Practical Identity and Autonomy in Kant’s Moral Philosophy***, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*, organized in collaboration with IRH Bucharest and the Institute “Alexandru Dragomir”, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

9. Ionuț-Răzvan Ostroveanu — national presentation: ***The Absence of a Normative Component in Capabilities Theory***, presented on 18 November 2016, at the *Central and Eastern European LUMEN International Conference MEPDEV 2016*, Târgoviște, Universitaty Valahia, Lumen, 17-18 November 2016

10. Raluca Bujor, national presentation: „**«Ea [dominația -ismelor] se bazează, în special în epoca modernă, pe dictatura specifică a spațiului public»**” / “**It [i.e. the dominance of the “-isms”] rests above all in the modern age upon the peculiar dictatorship of the public realm**”, held at the colloquium “*Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ - 70 years after*”, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

Research abroad:

6 months of research at a guest institution abroad: Bogdan Mincă (1 month), Ileana Borțun (1 month), Paul Sandu (3 months), Raluca Bujor (1 month)

1. Bogdan Mincă – 1 month of research conducted from 8 August to 8 September 2016 at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris), at the invitation of Prof. Anca Vasiliu.

2. Ileana Borțun – 1 month of research conducted from 8 August to 8 September 2016 at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris), at the invitation of Prof. Anca Vasiliu

3. Paul Sandu – 3 months of research conducted from 1 September to 30 November 2016, at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Hamburg, at the invitation of Prof. Birgit Recki.

4. Raluca Bujor – 1 month of research conducted from 31 July to 28 August 2017 at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris), at the invitation of Prof. Anca Vasiliu

* * *

In the following, the individual research results of the four members of our project will be presented.

Project Director, Assist. Prof. Habil. BOGDAN MINCĂ, PhD, had the following research results:

1. Books:

—Bogdan Mincă, *Origin and Difference. Heidegger's Translative Thinking*, work in progress, soon to be submitted for publication to an important publishing house

In this volume, the author gathered articles that deal with: 1. the way in which Heidegger connected, in the years 1931-35, thinking, poetry and politics; 2. the way in which Heidegger addressed the issues of origin, difference, identity in his writings devoted to art and poetry in the years 1931-1935; 3. the way in which Heidegger understood the beginning throughout Western philosophy, focussing on the manner in which the source (the beginning, the origin) functions, which implies also the issues of identity, difference and otherness. Thus, key concepts of our project (thinking, origin, identity, difference, otherness) are explored in central writings of Martin Heidegger. This volume belongs to stages **2.1.** and **3.1.** of our project.

2. Publications in international contexts:

a) Chapter in a book, published by a renowned publishing house:

—Bogdan Mincă, “Dichtung und Politik bei Martin Heidegger”, in: Hans-Christian Günther (ed.), *Political Poetry Across the Centuries*, Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2016, pp. 15-26

The paper investigates the manner in which Heidegger linked together poetry and politics in the years 1931-1935. It shows that Heidegger's attempt to reform the German University, as well as his fatal political involvement with Nazism in 1933, is inextricably linked to his interpretations on the idea of origin, beginning and source - as origin of European thought from the Greeks onwards *and* as origin of Being itself -, as well as to his interpretations on the role of (German) politics in his epoch. Poetry (and especially Hölderlin's poetry), along with thinking, seems for Heidegger to bring together all the aspects of the real (mankind, the divine, things, world) and to keep them in an eternal dispute. This dispute is hosted by language itself, whose role, in Heidegger's view, is to manifest Being itself. The article ends with an interpretation of several passages from Heidegger's of *Rectoral Address* (1933), attempting to read in a philosophical-political-poetic key the relation between leader (*Führer*) and people (*Volk*) (this relation being constituted by the exercise of power by the leader and the simultaneous contestation of his power by the people). This paper belongs to stages **2.1.** and **3.1.** of our project.

b) Articles in international journals

—Bogdan Mincă, "Heidegger's Return to the Cave. The Interpretation of the Platonic *Cave Allegory* and *Theaetetus* as an Early Indication of *Kehre* and *Ereignis*", in: *Heidegger Studies*, vol. 33 (2017) (listed ERIH INT 1)

This forthcoming paper is dedicated to Heidegger's interpretations of Plato in the years 1931-32, i.e. to the same period with which the previous article had dealt. It focuses on the great importance of Heidegger's course of 1931-1932, dedicated to Plato, in order to see how key concepts of the second (or the later) Heidegger are born and developed, namely the concept of "return" (*Kehre*) and of *Ereignis* (usually translated as "enowning"). If, in the years 1921-1923, Aristotle was the key figure for Heidegger, in the years 1931-1934 Plato is the philosopher whom Heidegger fights the most when he tries to regain access to the origin of Western thinking, origin which - chronologically - is contained in the fragments of the Pre-Socratics in Greece (Heraclitus, Parmenides). Plato is here "guilty" of losing access to the primordial meaning of truth as *a-letheia*, "unconcealment", and of focussing only on truth as correctness (with falsehood as its counterpart). The author of the paper showed that Heidegger's return to Plato obeyed a complex scenario, whereby original truth returns in Western philosophy and for Western mankind. Heidegger's interpretation of Platon rests, in fact, on a rethinking of history (*Geschichte*) and of original time. This paper belongs to stage **1.2.** of our project.

—Bogdan Mincă, „Heidegger's Interpretation of the Aristotelian *Poiesis* and of its Importance for the Pre-eminence of *sophia* over *phronesis*” – work in progress, to be sent for publication in 2018 to the journal *Human Studies*.

This paper investigates Heidegger's deconstruction of Aristotelian philosophy, conducted by Heidegger in 1923-27, more precisely Heidegger's phenomenological interpretation of the Aristotelian dispute between theoretical wisdom, or *sophia*, and practical wisdom, or *phronesis*, as well as Heidegger's explanation for Aristotle's preference of *sophia* over *phronesis*. The paper argues that Heidegger was able to give an answer to all these questions because he developed a revolutionary view on production, *poiesis*, and on *techne*, the knowledge that guides any production, i.e. the fact that Aristotle analysed production in order to develop the array of concepts that made him famous: *dynamis-energeia*, *morphe-hyle*, *hypokeimenon*, *ousia*. In a second step, the paper contrasts Heidegger's view on these topics with Arendt's interpretation of "work" in her *Human Condition*, as well as her analysis of the differences between "work" and "action". The aim of the present paper is to show that Aristotle, by focusing on *poiesis* and its steps (which are all *perfectly* knowable *before* the beginning of the process), pushed Western thinking on a path that neglected practical wisdom and "action", because it is – from the viewpoint of *poiesis* – irreversible and imprevisible. This paper belongs to the stage **1.1.** of our project.

3. Publications in volumes of proceedings published at important academic Romanian publishing houses, recognized by CNCS:

—Bogdan Mincă, „**Interpretarea dată de Heidegger *arhe-ului grec* ca «salt originar» (*Ur-sprung*) în *Originea operei de artă*”**, in: Mădălina Diaconu & Christian Ferencz-Flatz (eds.), *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale*, Editura Universității A.I. Cuza din Iași, 2016 (listed in category B)

This paper contextualizes the Heideggerian essay *The Origin of the Work of Art* (1931-35), revealing its relations with other works from the years 1931-1936, especially with the course

from 1934 on Hölderlin. The paper focuses on the term “origin”, *Ursprung*, claiming that the topic of beginning and of originating source is arguably Heidegger's central topic of thinking in the years mentioned above. More specifically, the author emphasizes the central feature of the idea of “origin”, namely the “law of the origin” itself: any origin is the origin of something (which involves key terms such as identity and difference), as well as the fact that there is a primordial dispute between origin and that which is originated from it. The author also pointed out that Heidegger's way of approaching origin is indebted, in 1932, to the Greek term *arche*, “beginning”, as it appears particularly in Anaximander's fragments (cf. the course from the summer semester 1932, recently published). This presentation fits in the project's structure because it highlights how Heidegger is concerned, in the years 1931-1936, with the deconstruction of the traditional way of relating to things, in this special case with the work of art (this relation relying primarily on causality and uni-directional meaning), and with the development of a phenomenological-hermeneutical approach based on bi-directional meaning, reciprocity and mutuality. These lines of thinking are obtained by Heidegger through a deconstruction of the ancient Greek way of thinking the origin (*arche*), and, in close connection with this, of the relationship between the One and the multiple. This relationship is decisive, among other things, for the rethinking of the *political* dimension of existence. This paper belongs to stages **2.1.** and **3.1.** of our project.

—Bogdan Mincă, „**Gândirea acțiunii ca gândire a diferenței și identității la Heidegger**” / ***Thinking Action as a Way of Thinking Identity and Difference in Heidegger***, în volumul: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018 (listed in category B)

This paper investigates the role assigned by Heidegger to action (*Handeln*) in two seminal texts: *Being and Time* (1927) and *Letter on Humanism* (1946). Action is then connected with two main topics of later Heidegger, namely identity and difference. These two are, in fact, relations: identity concerns the relation between man (thinking) and Being, whereas difference concerns the relation between Being and beings (ontological difference). These two topics, identity and difference, are discussed by Heidegger in two of his latest texts, *The Principle of Identity*, and *The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics*, both dating from 1957. The present paper shows that, by investigating action understood as “production”, *Vollbringen*, i.e. as a constitution of the self that is possible only by letting an alterity be itself, Heidegger analyses the most original relation: freeing, opening up, engaging, letting the Other be. By letting the Other be, the liberator reaches to his own self. The “own” is thus primarily a relation and not an entity, because its constitution is essentially dependent on the Other. By focussing on the “own” (*das Eigene*), Heidegger aims at deconstructing the traditional *subjectum*, which is based on autarchy and substantiality. By looking at the relation between identity, difference and action, one can open up a way towards understanding the difficult seminal concept, *Ereignis*, of Heidegger's late thinking. This paper belongs to stages **2.1.** and **4.2.** of our project.

—Bogdan Mincă, „**«... esența acțiunii este aducerea la împlinire»**” / “**...the essence of action is accomplishment**”, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București (due to appear in 2018) (listed in category B)

The paper starts from a quotation from Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism* (1946), which is a seminal text for the relation between thinking and action in Heidegger. Here, Heidegger is at odds with J.-P. Sartre's existentialist way of understanding this same relation. The present

paper investigates all references to Sartre (implicit or explicit) in Heidegger's *Letter*. This aims at showing that Heidegger distances himself sharply from Sartre's existentialism, characterised by a metaphysical, ego-cogitative, Cartesian, subjectivist, voluntarist drive toward "acting" and "doing". By contrast, Heidegger defines action as *Voll-bringen*, "accomplishing", or, literally, "pro-ducing" something that *already* is, but which needs this pro-ducing in order to be as its most inner self. The supreme action is, for Heidegger, thinking, *Denken*, which is involved ("engagement") in an accomplishing of the (already) existing relation between thinking and Being. Thinking lets Being "be" in its "already there". The paper focuses at length on this "letting be", which is of extreme importance for Heidegger's later thinking. In a last step, the paper deals with a difficult question, concerning Heidegger's switch from the letting-be of Being itself to a letting-be of the Other (alterity). A possible answer is hinted at in the last lines of the *Letter*, namely the topic of translation and of meeting the Other on the background of language. This paper belongs to stages 2.1. and 4.2. of our project.

4. One edited volume (published at a renowned Romanian academic publishing house):

—Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani / „Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ – 70 years after”*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

This volume gathers 9 contributions to several topics contained in the *Letter on Humanism* (1946) by Heidegger. These 9 texts had been presented at the national colloquium dedicated to Heidegger's *Letter* (31 May 2017, Faculty Department, University of Bucharest) and organized by Cristian Ciocan and Bogdan Mincă. All contributions have a special title, featuring a quotation from the *Letter*. The topics discussed are summed up in two main domains: the relation between thinking and action (authors: Bogdan Mincă, Ileana Borțun, Raluca Bujor, Mădălina Guzun, Remus Breazu), and the critique of biologism and of man's traditional definition as *animal rationale* (authors: Cristian Ciocan, Alexandru Bejinariu). Two other contributors (Cătălina Condruz, Lucian Ionel) have dealt with other topics. This volume belongs to stages 2.1. and 4.2. of our project.

5. Co-organized international conferences:

—Bogdan Mincă was part of the scientific committee of the international conference *2400 Aristotle*, held on 25-26 November 2016 at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest (his specific task: to review the abstracts submitted for the panel "Aristotle and Phenomenology" and to establish the final programme of this panel).

The panel "Aristotle and phenomenology" covered topics related to the reception of Aristotle in phenomenology. The eight participants to this panel have dealt with topics relating to: Heidegger's interpretation of Aristotelian *poiesis* and its importance in establishing the pre-eminence of *sophia* over *phronesis* in Aristotle's thinking; Heidegger's interpretations of Aristotle's *Physics*; Heidegger's interpretation of the relationship between *phone* and *logos* in Aristotle; F. Brentano's interpretation of the polysemy of Being in Aristotle; the existential status of friendship in Aristotle, Heidegger and Hannah Arendt; the phenomenological interpretation of priority in Aristotle's *Categories*; the role played by *phantasia* in the Aristotelian treatise *De motu*. Two members of our project (Bogdan Mincă and Ileana

Borțun) presented contributions closely linked to the theme of our project (Heidegger and Aristotle on the relation between *sophia* and *phronesis*; Heidegger and Hannah Arendt on friendship, *philia*, in Aristotle). This activity belongs to stage **1.1.** of our project.

6. Co-organized national conferences:

—Bogdan Mincă co-organized (with Cristian Ciocan and Paul Marinescu) the annual conference of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, in collaboration with the Institute of Philosophy “Alexandru Dragomir” and the Inst. for Research in Humanities of the University of Bucharest (IRH), 16-17 November 2016, held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest. Conference Title: *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Perspective fenomenologice / Community - Identity - Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*

The conference aimed, among other major topics, at exploring how the relationship between identity and difference within a community can be understood through the lens of the relation between thinking and action. Greek antiquity was, due to Pre-Socratic and then to Platonic and Aristotelian thinking, responsible for the first configuration of the triad community-identity-difference, depending on: the relationship between the One and the multiple (both in the ontological and in the political sense); the dichotomy “theoretical wisdom – practical wisdom”, the dichotomy “thinking-action”. The relation between community, identity, and difference is reliable, in modernity, to receive new formulations, depending on: the role of thinking (understanding) in establishing the own identity of the person; action as appearance of the agent; thinking as a dialogue with myself as an other (thinking as friendship with oneself); the characteristics of the action (, irreversible unpredictable); totalitarian violence, directed against individuality; thinking community through the lens of the relationship between the One and the multiple (unity in diversity); the hermeneutic logos, active both in thinking and in action, as a way of letting the other appear in his/her own individuality; the communication between thinking and concrete action in individual cases; faculty of judgment as mediation between thinking (formal) and action (concrete); ethics of the situation; the constitution of the personal identity by relating from an ethical point of view to the other. This conference belongs to stages **2.1.**, **2.2.**, **3.1** and **3.2.**, **4.1.** and **4.2.** of our project.

7. Co-organized colloquium:

—Bogdan Mincă co-organized, with Cristian Ciocan, the national colloquium *Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ – 70 years after*, held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

This colloquium gathered 9 contributors to several topics contained in the *Letter on Humanism* (1946) by Heidegger. All presentations had a special title, featuring a quotation from the *Letter*. The topics discussed were summed up in two main domains: the relation between thinking and action (authors: Bogdan Mincă, Ileana Borțun, Raluca Bujor, Remus Breazu), and the critique of biologism and of man’s traditional definition as *animal rationale* (authors: Cristian Ciocan, Alexandru Bejinariu, Amalia Trepcă). Two other contributors (Cătălina Condruz, Lucian Ionel) have dealt with other topics. The fact that 70 years have passed since the publication of the *Letter* was an incentive for our project (dedicated to the ethic-political relevance of thinking and to an approach to the relation between thinking and action) to evaluate the way in which Heidegger managed (or not) to approach fruitfully these topics. This volume belongs to stages **2.1.** and **4.2.** of our project.

8. Presentations at international conferences:

—a) ***Origin and Difference. Heidegger's Thinking of the Difference in the Years 1931-1935***, at the international conference *Phenomenology and Beyond* (14th annual conference of the *Nordic Society for Phenomenology*), University of Reykjavik, Iceland, 21-23 April 2016

The central topic of the presentation is the question of difference in Heidegger, as it became manifest in the years 1931-1935, closely related to the question of the origin (beginning, source) and to the law governing the origin. It is the topic from which one can also approach with profit the famous episode of Heidegger's failed attempt to reform the German University in 1933 (as it is contained in his famous *Rectoral Address*). The topics pertaining to the origin are: ontological difference, otherness, identity, uni-directionality, bi-directionality, mutuality etc. At stake was to show that it is possible to read and interpret Heidegger's failed political involvement by looking at his interpretations from 1931-35 of Greek thinking (Aristotle and the relationship between potentiality (*Kraft*) and act, Plato and the relationship between truth and falsehood, the Pre-Socratics and especially Heraclitus's relationship between the One and the multiple). It can thus be shown that Heidegger's interest in reforming the academia in 1933 and his ardent wish to regain the vigour of the origin (as it is now attested in the first of his recently published *Black Notebooks*) is deeply connected to topics like: thinking, action and the going-over of thinking into action, power/force, opening, imagination and creation (*Schaffen*). This presentation belongs to stages **2.1.** and **3.1.** of our project.

—b) ***Heidegger's Interpretation of the Aristotelian poiesis and its Importance for the preeminence of sophia over phronesis***, held at the international conference *2400 Aristotle*, organized by the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 25-26 November 2016.

In this presentation, the author wanted to emphasize Heidegger's strong thesis regarding Aristotle, namely that the Greek meaning of Being, to which Aristotle constantly (albeit implicitly) refers in his metaphysical investigations, was Being-produced, *Hergestelltsein*, i.e. Being-brought-to-the-fore and thus Being-present, *Gegenwärtigsein*. The act of producing something (*poiesis*) is the paradigm which enabled Aristotle to develop his analysis of movement (*kinesis*) in his *Physics* and thus to obtain his celebrated concepts of *dynamis*, *energeia*, *entelecheia*, by which the first understanding of "nature" (*physis*) was made possible in the West. The Aristotelian achievement was so ground breaking, that this implicit meaning of Being as produced-ness (resulting in constant presence) was to dominate the whole history of ontology and metaphysics. Heidegger's deconstruction of Aristotle's philosophy is meant to lay bare the Greek bases of the meaning of Being as Being-produced (and of the relations "active-passive", "subject-object") and to open the way for a more original, *existential* understanding of man as *Dasein*, which starts from the irreducible meaning of Being as it is manifested by *Dasein* itself through the development of a hermeneutics of its own situation. Thus, Heidegger's deconstructive interpretations of Aristotle's *poiesis* are the necessary accompanying step for a real phenomenological analysis of man's Being. The author then focused on Heidegger's interpretations of the way in which Aristotle compared the two supreme faculties of the human soul, i.e. *phronesis* and *sophia*, and ascribed pre-eminence to the latter. By so doing, Aristotle only radicalized the theoretical (contemplative) dimension already at work in *techne*, which is the knowledge guiding the

poiesis. But, as Heidegger argues, by so doing Aristotle also abandoned a very fruitful way of investigating the nature of practical wisdom (*phronesis*), which is in consonance with man's everyday understanding. Heidegger shows why Aristotle *had* to let *sophia* – as the knowledge of the movement of perfect beings – win the contest: because the (implicitly) guiding Greek meaning of Being was Being-constantly-present, Being-arrived-to-its-end (perfection) and self-standing. Human being and its peculiar mode of “movement” (as well as the knowledge, *phronesis*, that opens access to its first principles) fails to reach perfection. This presentation belongs to stage **1.1.** of our project.

—c) *Marion et Heidegger sur l'Ereignis comme donation et retrait. Théologie mystique ou pensée de l'être?*, held at the international colloquium *Issues in Contemporary Phenomenology*, University of Warsaw, Poland, 23-26 March 2017

This presentation discusses Marion's interpretation of donation and of the meaning of *Ereignis* in Heidegger, and, implicitly, of the background of Marion's way of seeing these topics. This background is constituted by the Christian understanding of the relation between God and man, as well as by the “saturated” way in which God gives Himself to man. On this background, Marion argues that the donation of Being to man (as it is conceived by Heidegger, as *Ereignis*) is, in fact, still indebted to onto-theo-logy, and thus not able to reach to the deeper ground of donation. For Marion, donation is the ultimate horizon of man's nature and of phenomenality. The presentation then turns to Heidegger and argues that the way in which Being “gives” itself to man (as *es gibt*) points, contrary to what Marion believes, to a deeper level than Marion's understanding of donation, to the point of making it possible. The presentation showed that Marion's critique of Heidegger misses several key points, among them the connection between the “own” (*das Eigene*) in Heidegger and the way in which Being gives itself to man in order to be thought by it. This is a circularity that is perceivable in Heidegger's promotion of the term *Ereignis*, as a way of “donating” oneself to the Other in order for the Other to gain its self – so that thereby the Giver gains its own self. The presentation then investigated briefly Heidegger's roots in Pre-Socratic Greek thinking (i.e. *philia* in Heraclitus) and contrasted it with Marion's Christian understanding of donation, dependent on a totally different relationship between God and man (as *agape*). This accounts for the “saturation” involved in God's coming towards man. By so thinking, Marion adheres also to Levinas's manner of thinking the *absolute and infinite* way in which the Other gives himself/herself to me. This is also the background of Derrida's *De l'hospitalité*. This presentation belongs to stages **2.1** și **2.2.** of our project.

9. Presentations at national conferences:

—a) *Interpretarea dată de Heidegger arche-ului grec ca „salt originar” (Ur-sprung) în Originea operei de artă / Heidegger's Interpretation of the Greek arche as „Original Leap” (Ur-sprung) in the Essay The Origin of the Work of Art*, presented at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale – In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015) / Phenomenological Aesthetics, Hundred Years after. Historical Perspectives and Current Trends - In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015)*, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 21 November 2015.

For an abstract of the ideas presented at this colloquium, see above section 3 (Publications in volumes of proceedings published at Romanian publishing houses, recognized by

UEFISCDI). This presentation belongs to stages **2.1.** and **3.1.** of our project.

—b) *Gândirea acțiunii ca gândire a diferenței și identității la Heidegger / Thinking Action as Thinking Identity and Difference in Heidegger*, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*, organized in collaboration with IRH Bucharest and the Institute “Alexandru Dragomir”, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

The presentation highlighted the relation between thinking and action in Heidegger, because this relation helps us to understand better other two relationships of utmost importance for Heidegger, namely: the relation, or, more precisely, the *identity* of being and thinking, and, secondly, the relation, or, more specifically, the *difference* between Being and being. The author then showed how action (*Handlung*) relates to late Heidegger’s central philosophical term, namely *Ereignis*, itself the source of both identity and difference. The author began with a brief overview of the meaning of “action” in *Being and Time* in 1927, which was followed by an analysis of “action” in the *Letter on humanism* in 1946. The insights won were then paralleled with the main ideas of two later texts by Heidegger, as they were gathered in the volume *Identity and Difference* (1957): the conference *The Principle of Identity* and the essay *The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics*. The essence of action – as defined in the first sentences of the *Letter on humanism* as *Vollbringen* – is to “pro-duce”, or to “accomplish”, or to “bring to fulfilment” the other, where “the other” is primarily not man, but Being itself, to which man is bound by a sort of hearkening-listening. Human action is exercised not by way of factitive spontaneity, or as will to act, but rather as a sort of letting the other reach its own fulfilment/accomplishment: be it one’s self, the other person or a thing. The keyword here is *Bezug*, the “relation” between man’s essence and Being itself, a relation which “is” *already*, insofar as thinking man does only bring it to fulfilment: it is not thinking that constitutes, makes or performs the Being of beings. According to Heidegger, thinking is man’s supreme action, which is engaged by Being itself to think nothing other than the relationship between man and Being (i.e. a letting of this relationship to come to its fulfilment). By so speaking, Heidegger tries to avoid classical terms like “active”, “passive”, “subject”, “object”, because they do not manage to grasp the opening (“active”) character of thinking, which is simultaneously dependent (“passive”) on the engagement that comes from Being itself. Action is not simply active, initiating, efficient and “factive”, thus imitating in a certain way the divine creation as creation from nothing. Action as bringing to fulfilment that which *already* is is a letting the other gain his/her own Being. By so “doing”, action itself gains its own Being. Action thus does not create this otherness, but leads it to fulfilment. Finally, the author interpreted Heidegger’s analysis of the *identity* of Being and man, and of the (ontological) *difference* between Being and beings in the two texts mentioned above (from *Identity and Difference*), by showing how the question of identity and difference is ultimately connected to origin and the law which governs it (origin as the origin of something). In the opinion of the author, this last topic is Heidegger’s deepest concern in his whole work. This presentation belongs to stage **4.2. of our project**.

—c) „«... esența acțiunii este aducerea la împlinire»” / ““...the essence of action is accomplishment””, held at the national colloquium *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani / „Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ – 70 years after”*, held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

The presentation started with a quotation from Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism* (1946), which is a seminal text for the relation between thinking and action in Heidegger. Here, Heidegger is at odds with J.-P. Sartre's existentialist way of understanding this same relation. The presentation investigated all references to Sartre (implicit or explicit) in Heidegger's *Letter*. This aimed at showing that Heidegger distances himself sharply from Sartre's existentialism, characterised by a metaphysical, ego-cogitative, Cartesian, subjectivist, voluntarist drive toward "acting" and "doing". By contrast, Heidegger defined action as *Vollbringen*, "fulfilling", "accomplishing", or, literally, "pro-ducing" something that *already* is, but which needs this pro-ducing in order to be as its most inner self. The supreme action is, for Heidegger, thinking, *Denken*, which is involved ("engagement") in an accomplishing of the (already) existing relation between thinking and Being. Thinking lets Being "be" in its "already there". The presentation then focused on this "letting be", which is of extreme importance for Heidegger's later thinking. In a last step, the presentation dealt with a difficult question, concerning Heidegger's switch from the letting-be of Being itself to the letting-be of the Other (alterity). A possible answer is hinted at in the last lines of the *Letter*, namely the topic of translation and of meeting the Other on the background of language. This presentation belongs to stages 2.1. and 4.2. of our project.

10. Months of research at a guest institution abroad:

—Bogdan Mincă – 1 month of research conducted from 8 August to 8 September 2016 at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris), at the invitation of Prof. Anca Vasiliu, director of research at the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique, Paris-Sorbonne University, and the above-mentioned centre.

The aim of this research at a guest institution abroad (Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris)) was to obtain more detailed information about the relationship between *theoria* and *praxis*, on the one hand, and the relationship between *polis* and the community on the other, in ancient Greece. Chronologically, Bogdan Mincă focused primarily on Pre-Socratic thinking, but also on the works of Plato and Aristotle. Also, the rich resources of Parisian institutions have facilitated the access to secondary literature inaccessible in Romania, as well as the chance to enter a fruitful dialogue with some active researchers in the fields above mentioned, Mrs. Vasiliu being one of them. Bogdan Mincă's research focused especially on the way in which the relationship between the One and the multiple (i.e. the unity in diversity) is of outmost importance for the genesis of Western thinking in Greece (contained in its most clear form in the fragments of Heraclitus, but also of the Seven Sages). This primordial idea (unity in diversity) was possible only within the Greek *polis* and the relationship the citizen had to the divine. Pre-Socratic thinking emerged *before* the split between the theoretical and the practical, between the *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa* (in Arendt's words), between thinking and action, between individual and community. The way in which the divine is itself *dependent* on a domain of the world (whereby the divine is, *because* of this very dependency, the centre of power and organization of this domain) – all this constitutes the basis for understanding both the political relationship between polis and individual, and the ontological relationship between universal and particular (or general and individual). By studying the pronounced metaphorical way of speaking of several Pre-Socratics, one can obtain a very interesting perspective on the integrative power of early Greek philosophical language ("integrative" being not yet equivalent with "generalization" or "abstraction"): cf., for example, the metaphorical role played by *hygron* (the humid) in Thales or by *pyr* (fire) in Heraclitus.

Another path of research which was explored by Bogdan Mincă during his research in Paris was the relevance of a hermeneutical way of reading Plato's dialogues through the lens of this primordial relationship implied by the formula "unity in diversity", which can be found in the relationship between man and divine or individual and polis. This hermeneutical way of reading Plato would aim at overcoming traditional Platonism (the absolute dominance of the *ideai* over the individual things), as well as the dominant role of *ratio / logos* in figuring out the presence of the general (of the *idea*) within the multiple, by way of abstraction. This traditional Platonistic (and not Platonic) way of understanding the primordial relationship between the One and the multiple (as well as the role played by thinking in configuring it) is to blame for the birth of pure theoretical thinking (*vita contemplativa* and the focus on the eternal, in Arendt's words) and the gradual neglect of practical wisdom, *phronesis* (because it deals only with issues and matters that are not generalizable – even if these issues are pathways towards immortality, as emphasized by Arendt). Bogdan Mincă aims thus at developing this hermeneutical way of reading Plato (after a similar reading of Pre-Socratic thinking) and at detecting in Plato's dialogues traces of Pre-Socratic *integrative* (One-multiple, unity in diversity) thinking. This integrative thinking should be grounded in something deeper than the dichotomy thinking-action, thus constituting itself as their basis and preserving as the ultimate horizon of thinking the political realm. Bogdan Mincă believes that a successful elaboration of this integrative thinking – as it has emerged in ancient Greece – offers great resources for sustaining actual efforts of reconnecting the community to the purely political (and not the economical or the social), i.e. of providing a model for working together of leaders and political communities. This research abroad belongs to stage **3.1.** of our project.

* * *

The research carried out by **ILEANA BORTUN, PhD, postdoctoral researcher**, in the reported period was conducted towards the fulfilment of the research objectives that she assumed at the beginning of the project (see stages **2.1.**, **2.2.**; **3.2.**; **4.1**, **5.1.** of our project).

Regarding the activities related to the research and to the dissemination of its results, Ileana Bortun wrote and held **3 presentations at international conferences** and **3 presentations at national conferences**; she wrote **3 papers in Romanian** (1 published in 2016 by “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Press, Iași, 2 submitted for publication at Zeta Books) and **2 papers in English** (1 published in 2017 at Springer; 1 to be submitted to an international journal); and she carried out research at the “Léon Robin” Centre for Research on Ancient Thought (Paris).

In the following, these activities will be presented in detail, in chronological order, together with the corresponding stages of our project:

(1) International publications:

—a) „**Authenticity and Plurality. From Heidegger’s ‘Anyone’ to Arendt’s ‘Common Sense’ and Back Again**”, in: *From Conventionalism to Social Authenticity. Heidegger’s Anyone and Contemporary Social Theory* (Studies in the Philosophy of Sociality 10), eds. Hans Bernhard Schmid and Gerhard Thonhauser, Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 2017, pp. 133-156 (<https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319568645>).

This paper belongs to stages **2.1.** and **2.2.** of our project, because it argues that the authenticity of *Dasein*, as it is analysed by Heidegger in his book *Being and Time*, does not imply an isolation from the others – as any superficial reading of Heidegger’s analysis of *das Man*, “the Anyone” might infer. And, secondly, this paper belongs to stage **3.2.**, insofar as it argues that thinking – which appears in *Being and Time* as *Dasein*’s hearing of the voice of one’s own conscience, being involved in reaching one’s authenticity (as voice of the friend that any *Dasein* carries within itself) – is actually *indebted* to human plurality and is, therefore, *open* to this plurality.

—b) “**The Existential Status of Friendship. A Phenomenological Perspective on Aristotle’s *Philia***”. This paper belongs to stages **2.2.** and **3.2.** of our project, by bringing together *thinking* as friendship with oneself (see Heidegger’s and Arendt’s analyses of thinking) and Aristotle’s views on *friendship* (these again read on an existential background). The paper will be sent in 2018 for peer review at an international journal (*Human Studies*).

(2) National publications:

—a) “**Locul subiectivității în înțelegerea operei de artă: Heidegger vs. Schapiro**” [“*The Place of Subjectivity in Understanding the Work of Art: Heidegger vs. Schapiro*”], in the volume: Mădălina Diaconu & Christian Ferencz-Flatz (eds.), *Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale* [*Phenomenological Aesthetics after Centenary. Historical Perspectives and Current Tendencies*], “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Press, Iași, 2016, pp. 115-144. This paper belongs to stage **2** of the project, namely to show that *genuine thinking* – as a form of dwelling par excellence – *has an intrinsic ethical relevance*, i.e. that thinking is *in itself* ethical, in the original, pre-metaphysical sense of the word *ethos*, i.e. “abode, dwelling place”, mentioned by Heidegger in *Letter on “Humanism”*, where he characterizes the thought of being as “the original ethics”, given that this thought thinks about man’s *dwelling within* the being’s relation to man’s essence. The elaboration of

these two texts aimed at emphasizing Heidegger's destruction of subjectivity (which is entailed by this *dwelling*) in relation to the creation and reception of the work of art (which deepens the destruction of the subject from *Being and Time*).

—b) „**Identitatea lărgită. Exercițarea facultății de judecare ca ospitalitate**” [*Enlarged Identity. The Exercise of the Faculty of Judgement as Hospitality*], in: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență: Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

This paper corresponds to stage **5.1.** of our project, by proposing an existential interpretation of Arendt's theory of judging, as enrichment of one's own identity through the welcoming of the other's difference within the process of judging a concrete situation by taking into consideration the different perspectives of all those engaged in or affected by that situation. The work on this paper also involved a research on the meaning of “narrative identity” of Paul Ricoeur.

—c) „**«Gândirea acționează în măsura în care gândește.»**” / “**Thinking acts insofar as it thinks.**”, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), „*Scrisoare despre «umanism»*” după *70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

This paper belongs to stage **4.1.** of our project, by arguing that Heidegger's views on the relation between understanding and action in *Being and Time*, as well as on the relation between thinking and action in the *Letter on Humanism*, allow us to focus on the essential fold thinking-action (which goes deeper than the traditional dichotomy theory-practice). This stance enables us to connect Heidegger's interpretation of thinking with Arendt's view on action as a kind of interaction. For Arendt, thinking is not severed from action, but is rooted in human plurality, namely as representative thinking (i.e. representative for the plurality of beliefs characteristic of the community to which the thinking person belongs).

(3) Co-edited volume:

—Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență: Priviri fenomenologice* [*Community – Identity – Difference: Phenomenological Perspectives*], Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018.

This volume gathers the contributions to the annual colloquium of the *Romanian Society for Phenomenology*, organized in November 2016 at the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Bucharest. Among these contributions are the papers of three members of our project, all of them dealing with the relation between thinking and action and their connexion with the topics of identity, difference and community. This volume belongs to stage **5.1.** of our project.

1. Bogdan Mincă showed in his text (“**Gândirea acțiunii ca gândire a diferenței și identității la Heidegger**” / “**Thinking Action as Thinking Identity and Difference in Heidegger**”) that action and thinking, in Heidegger's view, helps us to better understand identity and difference, which are both two relations essential for Heideggerian philosophy, namely as identity of thinking and action, and as difference between Being and beings.

2. Ileana Borțun showed in her paper (“**Identitatea lărgită. Exercițarea facultății de judecare ca ospitalitate**” / “**Enlarged Identity. The Exercise of the Faculty of Judgement as Hospitality**”) how one's own identity is enriched by accomodating the Other's difference within judging (as it was discussed by Arendt).

3. Paul Sandu discussed in his paper („Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană” / “Alterization: Constituting the Person in Relation with the Other in Husserl’s Phenomenology”) how the Ego thinks the Other *as Other* (i.e. as different than itself) when it acts ethically towards the Other.

(4) International Presentations:

—a) *In Search of Heidegger’s “Common Sense”. The Political Relevance of Mitverstehen*, held on 23 April 2016, at the 14th Annual Conference of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology, entitled “Phenomenology and Beyond”, organized at the University of Iceland, Reykjavik — 21-23 April 2016.

— This activity corresponds to stage 3 of our project, namely to show that *genuine thinking has an intrinsic political relevance*, i.e. that thinking is *in itself* open to the human plurality, as a thinking of individuality *within plurality*. The argument that the existential *Mitverstehen* (from *Being and Time*) is a concept equivalent to Arendt’s notion of “common sense” had the role of showing that Dasein’s individualization analysed by Heidegger does not entail the isolation from others, as Arendt considered.

—b) *Imagining Oneself as Another. Imagination in Arendt and Heidegger*, held on 27 April 2016, at the Research Seminar entitled “Imagination as an Act: Phenomenological Approaches” – the 10th edition of the annual research seminar organized by the Centre of Research *Phénoménologies* (Département de Philosophie, Université de Liège) — Liège, 25-29 April 2016.

— This presentation corresponds to stage 5.1., in virtue of its attempt to emphasize the essential role of imagination within the aesthetic and political judgment (in Arendt) and within the self-understanding (in Heidegger).

—c) *The Existential Status of Friendship. A Phenomenological Perspective on Aristotle’s Philia*, held on 26 November 2016, at the International Conference *2400 Aristotle*, organized by the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, Romania, 25-26 November 2016. This presentation belongs to stages 2.2. and 3.2., by connecting *thinking* as friendship with oneself (see Heidegger’s and Arendt’s analyses of thinking) and Aristotle’s views on *friendship* (these again read on an existential background).

(5) National presentations:

—a) *Locul subiectivității în înțelegerea operei de artă: Heidegger vs Schapiro* [*The Place of Subjectivity in Understanding the Work of Art: Heidegger vs Schapiro*], held on 21 November 2015, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled “Estetica fenomenologică după centenar. Perspective istorice și tendințe actuale” [“Phenomenological Aesthetics after Centenary. Historical Perspectives and Current Tendencies”] – *In memoriam Walter Biemel (1918-2015)* — Philosophy Department (University of Bucharest), 21 November 2015. See further up, section 2, a).

—b) National presentation: *Identitatea lărgită. Exercițarea facultății de judecare ca ospitalitate* [*Enlarged Identity. The Exercise of the Faculty of Judgement as Hospitality*], held on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled “Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Perspective fenomenologice”

[“Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives”], organised in collaboration with The Research Institute of the University of Bucharest and with the “Alexandru Dragomir” – Institute for Philosophy — Philosophy Department (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016. This presentation corresponds to stage **5.1.**, by proposing an existential interpretation of Arendt’s theory of judging, as enrichment of one’s own identity through the welcoming of the other’s difference within the process of judging a concrete situation by taking into consideration the different perspectives of all those engaged in or affected by that situation. See further up, section 2, b).

—c) „«**Gândirea acționează în măsura în care gândește**»” / “**Thinking acts insofar as it thinks**”, held at the colloquium “*Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ - 70 years after*”, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017, organised by The Research Institute of the University of Bucharest and the “Alexandru Dragomir” – Institute for Philosophy — Philosophy Department. This presentation belongs to stage **4.1.** of our project. See further up, section 2, c).

(6) Research abroad:

International research carried out in the period 8 August – 8 September 2016, at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique „Léon Robin” (Paris), at the invitation of Professor Anca Vasiliu; there, Ileana Borțun researched the literature relevant for our project, with a special focus on the problem of the relation between imagination (*phantasia*) and action (especially in Aristotle), connected subsequently with the role of imagination within thinking/judging in Kant, Heidegger and Arendt (stage **5.1.**).

* * *

The results of the research of **PAUL-GABRIEL SANDU, PhD candidate**, were the following:

1. International publication:

—„*Die Dynamik des Verfallens. Eine genetische Perspektive*”, in: Gerhard Thonhauser (ed.), *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*, Alber, Freiburg, 2017

2. National publication:

—„*Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană*” / “*Alterization: Constituting the Person in Relation with the Other in Husserl’s Phenomenology*”, in: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București, due to appear in 2018

3. International presentation:

—*Die Dynamik des Verfallens. Eine genetische Perspektive*, presented at the conference *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*, University of Vienna, Austria, 4 May 2016

4. National presentation:

—*Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană / Alterization: Constituting the Person in Relation with the Other in Husserl’s Phenomenology*, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*, organized in collaboration with IRH Bucharest and the Institute “Alexandru Dragomir”, held at the Faculty of Philosophy (University of Bucharest), 16-17 November 2016

5. Research abroad:

—3 months of research conducted from 1 September to 30 November 2016, at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Hamburg, Germany, at the invitation of Prof. Birgit Recki.

In the months October 2015 – December 2016, the research of **PhD candidate PAUL-GABRIEL SANDU** focused on three closely interrelated areas. These areas of research belong to subsection **2.1.** of our project (“Researching on Heidegger's interpretation of thinking, in order to highlight its ethical relevance by establishing the thinking of Being as a thinking of one's own Being and of the Being of the other – and in order to overcome the forgottenness of the Being of the other in Heidegger”) and to subsection **2.2.** (Bringing together the interpretation of thinking as a response to the call of one's own Being with the Arendtian interpretation of thinking as a dialogue with myself as another; maintaining that the understanding of thinking as friendship with oneself (Arendt) is complementary to the determination of the voice of conscience as a „voice of the friend that every Dasein carries with himself” (Heidegger)).

1. **The first area** on which Paul Sandu focused was the relation with the alterity in Heidegger's thought during his so-called phenomenological period. More specific, his research was concerned with Heidegger’s critical reception of Husserl’s reflexive phenomenology and with Heidegger’s hermeneutical phenomenology, which problematizes (by coupling facticity with hermeneutics) the way in which the ego refers directly to itself. By so doing, Paul Sandu showed to what extent the Aristotelian concept of practical wisdom

(*phronesis*) is not only taken up by Heidegger, but it also receives a new meaning and, to the extent that it opens up the human being towards its own possibilities, acquires an ascendancy over *sophia* (theoretical wisdom). Whereas in Aristotle *sophia* was a dianoetic virtue that allowed for human fulfilment in the highest degree (as *the* autarchic type of activity par excellence, as pure contemplation), for Heidegger the key to an authentic existential project authentic is not a self-sufficient reflection, but an authentic relation, through an understanding of oneself as a hermeneutics of facticity, towards one's own possibilities. However, this thinking of the own being, understood as hermeneutics, is in its turn possible - as demonstrated by a number of works dating from the years after the phenomenological decade - only within the horizon of man's relation to being itself, i.e. within the thinking of being (the ambiguity pertaining to this objective-subjective genitive is relevant for the complexity of man's relation to being, in Heidegger's view). Paul Sandu showed that this exclusive anchoring of the *Dasein* in being and Heidegger's maintaining that thinking should to be understood exclusively in the light of *Dasein*'s relation to being must itself be left behind - namely, by involving alterity and by a deeper understanding of thinking as dialogue with myself as an Other (i.e. by taking into account Hannah Arendt's political ontology).

2. **The second area** of Paul Sandu's interest is visible in the drafting of the conference "**Die Dymnik des Verfallens. Eine genetische Perspektive**", which was presented on May 4, 2016 at the University of Vienna, at the international conference *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*. In this conference - and later in the paper he wrote during his research abroad at the University of Hamburg, which will appear in a collective volume (Gerhard Thonhauser (ed.), *Perspektiven mit Heidegger*, Alber, Freiburg, 2017) - Paul Sandu discussed the problematic way in which Heidegger approached the inauthentic way in which *Dasein* refers to itself, by looking at its inauthentic relation to the others. One of the most important conclusions drawn from this research is that Heidegger thought the relation between me and the other / the others in a critical manner, although there are a few instances - especially in volume 60 of his *Collected Works* - where Heidegger outlines the authentic possibilities of a relation to the other, based largely on his interpretations of St. Paul's *Letters*. This perspective is very interesting especially when analysed in the light of *Being and Time*, for it offers a significantly different perspective on the relationship with other as the one depicted in *Being and Time*.

3. **The third area of research** of Paul Sandu on which he worked thanks to the research abroad at the University of Hamburg in the period September 2016 - November 2016, was presupposed by the drafting of his **conference entitled „Alterizarea: constituirea persoanei prin raport cu celălalt în fenomenologia husserliană” / „Alterization: Constituting the Person in Relation with the Other in Husserl's Phenomenology”**, presented on November 17, 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives* (organized by Cristian Ciocan, Paul Marinescu, and Bogdan Mincă). In the research that aimed at the drafting of this text, Paul Sandu examined the fundamental and constitutive role of the relation to the other within Husserl's phenomenology. Even though there are considerable differences between the Husserlian and the Heideggerian phenomenology, there still are a lot of correspondences between them, and the difficulties faced by Heidegger in his attempt to understand the relation between the self and the other can often be detected in Husserl's elaborate considerations on this subject. One of the ideas that Paul Sandu analysed in depth in his conference is a good example of the above statement. For even Husserl's solipsistic ego - the residue of his phenomenological reduction - needs the encounter with an

alterity in order to be constituted as a person. Only by way of the encounter with the other – and by his constitution as other – can the subject establish a relationship with himself, which requires at first an alterization (the other being the one who allows him to look at himself from the outside) and then the constituting of himself as a social being. In other words, for Husserl – as before for Aristotle - it is clear that the human person can be thought of only in terms of a community and can understand itself only by starting from plurality. A topic on which Paul Sandu will research further is the question if the dialogue between Heidegger and Arendt (necessary for a reconfiguration of thinking as a dialogue with oneself, but through the intermediary of others, i.e. made possible by plurality) could not be deepened further by taking into account the Husserlian roots of Heidegger's position, i.e. Husserl's reflections concerning social relations and their constitutive role.

In the months January-September 2017, the activity of Paul Sandu was dedicated to two main research projects, which were closely interconnected:

1. The first project aimed at finalizing the doctoral dissertation, namely the chapter on the problem of intersubjectivity and transcendental plurality. The starting point of this research were Husserl's considerations from the 1930s, present mostly in manuscripts left unpublished. In his approach, Paul Sandu attempted to show that transcendental subjectivity can only be properly understood by starting from a deeper level (in the order of foundation), a level at which the very distinction between the ego and the transcendental alter ego only exists as possibility. The perspectives elaborated by J.R. Mensch and E. Fink on this issue were the cornerstones of Paul Sandu's research, in which he repeatedly criticized the interpretation developed by D. Zahavi, according to which transcendental subjectivity retains a kind of ontological preference, even if the relation with other egos is fundamental to it. Zahavi's interpretation, which Paul Sandu attempted to reject in his thesis, fails to respond to the accusation of solipsism, which targeted the Husserlian transcendental project and thus threatened to undermine the whole project.

2. The second project aimed at drafting the paper entitled "**Alterization: Establishing the Person in Relationship with the Other in Husserlian Phenomenology**", which had been presented at the annual conference of the *Romanian Society for Phenomenology* called "Community - Identity - Difference: Phenomenological Perspectives" (organized by Cristian Ciocan, Paul Marinescu, Bogdan Mincă). The central theme of this research was the issue of constituting my own ego as human person by relating to the Other. In order to properly formulate this problem, Paul Sandu attempted to delimit at first the starting point of the project of transcendental phenomenology, as well as the problems it involves, and to define some of the central concepts of Husserlian phenomenology in general. After Paul Sandu pointed, in a second step, to some neuralgic points of the Husserlian conception of the problem of constitution of the Other, in the second part of his work he focused his attention on the constitutive role of transcendental alterity, using a concept introduced by Theunissen, the "alterization" (*Veränderung*). In the last part of his work he tried to convey a new meaning this term, in order to argue that alterization does not actually claim an effective relationship with an alter ego, but is a phenomenon or, rather, a process inherent to the transcendental ego that allows one to meet an Other. The thesis he drew at the end of this study is that alterization is the one that precedes and makes possible alterity, not vice versa. This paper is due to appear, in 2018, in the volume of proceedings: Alexandru Bejinariu & Ileana Borțun (eds.), *Comunitate – Identitate – Diferență. Priviri fenomenologice*, Zeta Books, București. This paper belongs to stages **2.1** and **2.2.** of our project.

* * *

The research conducted by **PhD candidate IONUȚ-RĂZVAN OSTROVEANU** in the months October 2015 – January 2017 was devoted primarily to achieving two objectives of our project and to disseminating his research through conferences:

1. The **first objective** (stage **3.2.**) wants to construe the argument that thinking, understood as a dialogue with himself as another (the "friend" each one of us carries within himself) is actually *indebted* to human plurality (i.e. to the interactions with concrete "friends", i.e. with the others) and is, therefore, open to human plurality (i.e. to the future interactions);

2. and **the second objective** (stage **5.2.**) is to enter the field of applied ethics in order to highlight the relevance of ethical-political thinking for judgement and, implicitly, for acting in concrete life situations.

Concerning the first objective, the research results of Răzvan Ostroveanu were presented at the *Central and Eastern European International Conference LUMEN MEPDEV2016* (Nov. 17-18 Târgoviște, Valahia University), in a presentation entitled “The Absence of a Normative Component in Capabilities Theory”, presented on 18 November 2016, at the *Central and Eastern European LUMEN International Conference MEPDEV 2016*, Târgoviște, University Valahia, Lumen.

Concerning the second objective, the results of the research have been resumed in the the **presentation** “Identitate practică și autonomie în filosofia morală kantiană” / “Practical Identity and Autonomy in Kant’s Moral Philosophy”, presented on 17 November 2016, at the annual colloquium of the Romanian Society for Phenomenology, entitled *Comunitate – identitate – diferență. Priviri fenomenologice / Community – Identity – Difference. Phenomenological Perspectives*. In his presentation, Răzvan Ostroveanu showed that a rethinking of Kantian ethics cannot be based on the approach of Christine Korsgaard, who aims at inserting the concept of practical identity in Kant’s answer to the normative question “Why should I be a moral person?”, because the many ways in which we identify ourselves are contingent and dependent on particular circumstances, or are defined by taking into account the different contexts in which we live.

* * *

Research report of **RALUCA BUJOR, PhD candidate**, in the months February-November 2017.

Research results and activities:

1. National publication:

—„**«Ea [dominația -ismelor] se bazează, în special în epoca modernă, pe dictatura specifică a spațiului public»**“, in: Cristian Ciocan & Bogdan Mincă (eds.), *Heidegger și „Scrisoarea despre «umanism»” - după 70 de ani*, Zeta Books, București, to be published in 2018

2. National presentation:

—„**«Ea [dominația -ismelor] se bazează, în special în epoca modernă, pe dictatura specifică a spațiului public»**“ / **“It [i.e. the dominance of the “-isms”] rests above all in the modern age upon the peculiar dictatorship of the public realm”**”, held at the colloquium *“Heidegger and his ‘Letter on Humanism’ - 70 years after”*, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, 31 May 2017

3. Research abroad:

—1 month of research conducted from 31 July to 28 August 2017 at Le Centre de Recherches sur la Pensée Antique "Léon Robin" (Paris), at the invitation of Prof. Anca Vasiliu.

During her research, Raluca Bujor set as her major task to analyze the status of the Greek *logos*, starting from the Platonian dialogues. Her research involved the analysis of the socratic “examination” (*exetazein*, *elenchos*, etc.) as an existential way of converting the interlocutor to an activity inaugurated by *philosophia* - the care for the soul, *epimeleia tēs psychēs* (Apol. 29e). To this end, her research started from the *Charmides*, the *Apology*, *Republic* Book VII, the *Symposium* and the *Sophist*.

Starting from the passages concerning maieutics and the *elenchos* (*Theaitetos* 149d, and *Sophist*, 230c-231b, respectively), Raluca Bujor showed that these activities are nothing more than *discursive practices* developing within the horizon of education (*paideia*) and learning (*manthanein*). In order to illustrate their *performative* dimension, she studied the connection between *elenchos* and the Socratic “charm” in *Charmides* 155e sqq, *Menon* 80a and *Theaitetos* 149d-151c.

Finally, Raluca Bujor offered an interpretation of the dialogue *Charmides* as a text where one can see a substitution of a type of *paideia* with another type: the aristocratic-sophisticated *paideia* is replaced by the Platonic-philosophical one. The former is defined by Plato as a kind of instruction, of "planting" knowledge in the soul (understood, first of all, as thinking), while the other is a "twist" of the soul from the world of becoming to the intelligible world (cf. *Rep.* VII 518d), this twist having an erotic substrate which is understood not in the manner of the classical pederasty, but in the manner of equality and *sympathia* for the intelligible. Thus, Plato contrasts an education that starts from the assumption that the subject is unknowing with an education that sees in every human subject a possible autonomous subject in terms of knowledge. This mutation is visible in the

prologue and debut of the discussion between Socrates and Charmides: here, Socrates is both a restrained lover and a doctor who brings purification through *elenchos*.

The paideic twist of the individual frees him/her from the status of “object” of the sophistic education or, more broadly, of the public education, and contributes to his constitution as an autonomous subject of *dialogue* as a common research of truth. The emergence of philosophy as a discursive practice distinct from rhetoric, sophistication, poetry (in the ancient sense), and myth unfolds in the horizon of the *logos* and establishes this intrusion of dialogue.

By having a dialogue with the future tyrants Charmides and Critias, Socrates-Platon circumscribes a new political space (in the original sense): the *logos*. The action of the Socratic philosopher takes place especially in this discursive field, with the purpose of examining opinions and purifying (*katharsis*) the most terrible ignorance - the fact of believing that you know what you do not really know. Once this belief has been shattered, the possibility of tyranny is somewhat removed. There is thus a *distance* within the *psyche* between its “fruits” and their claim to truth; in other words, between the subjective and the objective, or the common. The tyrant is understood by Plato precisely as governed by species of desire that always lead back to himself, he is devoid of such an inner distance and the exercise of cultivation.

Raluca Bujor intends to deepen these latter hypotheses in her doctoral project, entitled *The Character of Socrates and the Meanings of the Term atopos in Plato's Dialogues. A Hermeneutical Attempt*, (conducted at the University of Bucharest and the University of Sorbonne, Paris, under the supervision of Lect. dr. Habil. Bogdan Mincă and Prof. Dr. Anca Vasiliu). Her activity within our project belongs to the broader investigation of the philosophical *atopia* understood as a perpetual deployment of the *eros* and the *logos*, resulting in a philosophical research practice (in its own right) that can become rigid and develop into a cultural *topos* without betraying its origin.

Beyond the research concerning the meaning of *theoria* in Plato's dialogues, of the relation between the philosopher and the *polis*, or of the contemporary interpretation of Platonism, Raluca Bujor's activity within our project explored hermeneutically all these texts, with a special focus on thinking, language and the relationship with oneself and with alterity. Her national publication and national presentation belong to stages 3.2, 4.1. of our project.

* * *

Project leader: Lect. Dr. Habil. Bogdan Mincă



București, 30 November 2017