

**Annalisa Caputo**

## ***A Maze of Streets and Houses. Languages and Philosophy***



Paul Klee, *Rotierende Haus* (1921), © Museum Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid

«Light and the rational forms  
are locked in combat;  
light sets them into motion,  
bends what is straight,  
makes parallels oval,  
inscribes circles in the intervals,  
makes the intervals active.  
Hence the inexhaustible variety»  
[P. Klee, *Diary III*]

«Our language can be seen as  
an ancient city: a maze of little streets  
and squares, of old and new houses,  
and of houses with additions  
from various periods; and this  
surrounded by a multitude of new  
boroughs with straight  
regular streets and uniform houses»  
[L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*]

«Language is the house of Being.  
In its home man dwells».  
[M. Heidegger, *Letter on Humanism*]  
«Ma il linguaggio accade autenticamente solo nel colloquio»  
[Id., *Hölderlin and the Essence of the Poetry*]

### **1) Klee's *Rotierende Hause* as a metaphor for the maze of languages**

The subtitle of this first issue of “Logoi” is a line from Klee<sup>1</sup> and we have also chosen a painting by Klee as the cover image<sup>2</sup>. Indeed, it is an evocative image, which provides a concise key to understanding the issue and the Journal itself. The symbol is so simple that it runs the risk of being trivial. Two of the greatest thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Wittgenstein and Heidegger) in different ways – but both approachable because of the metaphorical use of the image – used it to ‘indicate’ the language: language as a maze of houses and streets (Wittgenstein); language as the house of Being, where man dwells (Heidegger)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It is a poem that Klee wrote in 1908 and that we can read in *The Diaries of P. Klee (1898-1918)*, tr. and ed. by F. Klee, University of California Press, Berkeley (CA), 1964, p. 229. Massimo Donà lingers on this expression in M. Donà, *Da tutto questo, l'inesauribile diversità*, in “Aut-Aut”, 2003, n. 313-314, pp. 213-22; see also Id., *Arte e filosofia*, Bompiani, Milano, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Klee, *Rotierende Haus* (1921), Oil and pencil on cotton cheesecloth mounted on paper, 37.7 x 52.2 cm (Museum Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid). The picture belongs to the period when Klee taught at the Bauhaus (it is evident in the style). It is interesting, from our point of view, to remember that Klee lived firsthand the proposal of a synthesis of languages, typical of the Bauhaus.

<sup>3</sup> Obviously, we are not overlapping in a banal and indistinct way the thought of Heidegger and Wittgenstein, which were certainly very far apart. We do not think that they say the ‘same’ with respect to language and we do not want to combine them superficially (although it would be sufficient to refer to Simona Venezia’s recent work to show how many commonalities exist between the two authors; see S. Venezia, *La misura della finitezza. Evento e linguaggio in Heidegger e Wittgenstein*, Guida, Napoli, 2013). In any case, far from wanting to discuss Heidegger and Wittgenstein, who deserve much more space than an *Introduction*, it is important for us to reaffirm that we mention them simply as ‘examples’ of two authors fundamental for a

But what is happening in Klee's painting? Let us 'read' the image. In the center there is a really *naïf* house, which inevitably recalls a child's drawing. Then, it recalls us to reduce things to the elementary. Indeed, the poem quoted in *exergue* begins exactly in this way.

Reduction! One wants to say more  
than nature and one makes  
the impossible mistake  
of wanting to say it  
with more means that she,  
instead of fewer<sup>4</sup>.

Therefore, the image of Klee works by subtraction. It works with the intent to cross-refer to something essential. Heidegger says: «Thinking is on the descent to the poverty of its provisional essence. Thinking gathers language into simple saying»<sup>5</sup>. However, this reflection on language is not so simple; and neither is simple Klee's painting, which is ambiguous even in its title: *Rotierende Hause*. But what does it mean? *Rotating House* or *Revolving House*? However, in the end, the real problem is not in the translation, but rather in the paradoxical concept put into 'work'. Indeed, a house refers to the idea of stability. A house that rotates is no longer a house, but a kind of turntable. The oxymoron (*rotierende Hause*) not only brings together stasis and movement, but gives a rotating dynamic to the painting itself. So we realize that this is not a house, but a city

The central house-square sorts the paths to the lateral houses; and these are even more stylized than the first, and even more devoid of substance, so much so that they seem like mere cardboard scenarios. It is not clear what these lateral houses hide and if they are truly homes, or just facades and doors.

Maybe there is not even a house-square at the center of other houses. Maybe there is a door that opens (itself onto) other doors. It is a maze, a *sui generis* labyrinth: and you are inside it.

Then, the first problem (somewhat Kafkaesque) is that you do not know how you got in. Indeed, in language, in the languages, we are always already: not by our choice. And even in this rotating house of Klee, we have always already been. In fact, it is not clear how you can access it.

Let us 're-read' the image. It seems that there are two doors, one on the wall to the right and one on the wall to the left. But these openings could also be windows, because they are not resting on the ground. If so, the paradox would be even more evident: are there two doors or is there no door? How can we get into the house? And before that: is there a road?

At the bottom right, almost parallel to the diagonal of the painting, we see something that could resemble a road, or perhaps a staircase, which actually leads to the central house. But this road/staircase does not correspond to any opening. It ends up, in fact, against the wall of the house...

That being said, we can return to the discussion with which we began and we can try to project Klee's image/metaphor on the theme of 'logos'. If the 'house' is the 'language', here we have a road that "strikes" against the walls of language.

«Man feels the urge to run up against the limits of language», writes Wittgenstein, commenting on the 'ethical' effort of thinkers such as Kierkegaard and Heidegger. It is a

---

reflection on language in the 20<sup>th</sup> century: two authors who (near and far) used the same image (i.e. the house) to indicate the being of language.

<sup>4</sup> *The Diaries of P. Klee (1898-1918)*, p. 229.

<sup>5</sup> It is the well known ending of the *Letter on Humanism*, in M. Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, tr. by F. A. Capuzzi, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 276. On the issue of language in Heidegger (and in particular in *Letter on Humanism*), I take the liberty of referring to my book *Heidegger e le tonalità emotive fondamentali*, Franco Angeli, Milano, pp. 368 ff. On the relationship between Klee and Heidegger, see P. Cappelletti, *L'inafferrabile visione: pittura e scrittura in P. Klee*, Jaca Book, Milano, 2003, pp. 18 ff.

«running up against paradox»<sup>6</sup>. Language is the Sisyphean task... to pass through an opening that does not exist. «But the inclination, the running un against something, *indicates something*»<sup>7</sup>. And what does it indicate? It indicates a rotating center, which could be understood metaphysically as the essence of language, and understood deconstructively as the heart of the labyrinth, the game of the forms of life, the game of the languages (which grow into each other, one on top of the other, with complex layers and references).

It is not a matter of choosing between Heidegger and Wittgenstein, but of trying to think, with them, perhaps beyond them. Indeed, if language becomes a *rotierende Hause*, then, each of the lateral houses can become a new door, a new center, a new turntable<sup>8</sup>.

If we return to the picture, we can see this paradox. The central house seems to have walls and no doors; while the lateral houses seem to have only doors and no walls. What does this mean? That the boundaries of language are broken? That they can be broken? Or simply that we are no longer even able to distinguish between inside and outside, between the road and the house? Maybe everything is language? Or nothing is language? With Jean-Luc Godard and his last film do we really have to say *Adieu au Langage*?

Heidegger said, referring to Wittgenstein:

The difficulty in which thinking stands compares with a man in a room, from which he wants to get out. At first, he attempts to get out through the window, but it is too high for him. Then he attempts to get out through the chimney, which is too narrow for him. If he simply turned around, he would see that the door was open all along.

We ourselves are permanently set in motion and caught in the hermeneutical circle<sup>9</sup>.

Suddenly, the image appears to us from a different perspective. Maybe it is not the house that turns, but 'we' must 'turn' in it, because it presents itself as a circle. Perhaps we must not search for an opening (a door, an open border between an inside and an outside), but we must inhabit this opening, this scenario of lines and colors, this complex world, where «light and rational forms are locked in combat» (to quote the poetry of Klee in *exergue*).

This is where the space of "Logoi" (the space of the plural *logoi*) opens. Indeed, "Logoi" wants to be this dialogue between different languages (philosophy, art, literature, music, cinema): to discover – in this «activating interval» – «the inexhaustible variety» of the dialogue itself.

The *logos* of «the rational forms» (the *logos* of philosophy) has traditionally been «in combat», to quote Klee, with rotating centers, with splashes of light, with colors, with extra-conceptual languages, with what appears il-logical. However, we know that this *logos* can be «set into motion»<sup>10</sup>. And, when this happens, when language becomes a turntable, then we find that there is no longer 'one' logos, because language is 'plural'. Perhaps it always has been so, but now we are able to realize it: there is no 'one' house of Being, but houses. The hermeneutic circle is, in truth, a vortex (*rotierende*). Therefore, in this

---

<sup>6</sup> L. Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle, Blackwell, Oxford, 1979, p. 68.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> It is an issue that could be investigated (not in an *Introduction*). Klee speaks of the meaning of the 'center' of the picture, which is for him «the standard of irradiation», a standard that, far from being rigid, is instead a «logos of dissemination» and, hence, the dissemination of the other visual elements, around the center.

<sup>9</sup> M. Heidegger, in M. Heidegger – E. Fink, *Heraclitus Seminar (1966-'67)*, tr. by C. H. Seibert, University of Alabama Press, Alabama, 1979, p. 16.

<sup>10</sup> In this sense we can reconsider Dorflès' classical intuition: Klee puts the 'time' inside the canvas (see: G. Dorflès, *Il divenire delle arti*, Einaudi, Torino, 1959). This is an intuition also echoed by C. Greenberg (*Saggio su Klee*, in *Klee. Classici dell'arte*, Rizzoli, Milano, 2004, pp. 7-26) e G. Di Giacomo (*Introduzione a P. Klee*, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2003): Klee's drawing is temporal and, therefore, it forces those who see it to follow a path through time; it traces a wandering that must be shared by the viewer.

labyrinth, every house is reflected in the others. Therefore, they become, in alternation, center and periphery, interpreter and interpreted.

## 2) Philosophy and languages. The “Logoi” challenge

If the reader has associated the title of this issue with the *Philosophy of language*, he will be disappointed.

Actually, “Logoi” is a hermeneutical Journal and not a magazine of aesthetics, nor of philosophy of language. Here we will not address languages and their conceptual structures, nor theorize on the meaning and value of art. Our aim is to recognize the plurality of the languages of thought, because they are a wealth for philosophy. Indeed, alongside the language of the concept lies the language of the image, and alongside them is the language of music, and that of poetry and literature, and that of the cinema.

Therefore, if languages are the houses of being – if they are that maze of streets and squares in which men (and women) dwell and lose themselves – then philosophy cannot only let the Being express itself or only describe the play of everyday language. Yes, this too (why not?), but perhaps not only. Perhaps, in this «active interval» – which is the space of the difference and closeness between different *logoi* (science, painting, music, literature, cinema ...) – there is the possibility for a different challenge for philosophy: the wager of a dialogue. And a dialogue is always plural; or, at least, between two: otherwise it is not. From this challenge comes the base-structure of “Logoi”, a structure that will remain relatively similar although with varying issues and themes.

At the center, in the *Rotierende Hause*, we find the theme of the Journal. In this first issue, the theme (in a meta-reflexive way) is *Languages* themselves. In the third issue, for example, the theme will be *Play*. Our Journal is wagering that, by placing an ‘object’ (a theme) on the turntable of languages, this object will be enriched, but even the languages will be enriched, thanks to their comparison and dialogue. Therefore, each theme is not treated ‘only’ from the philosophical point of view (in a self-referential manner), but philosophy has the task of guiding the dialogue.

The reader will notice, from this point of view, that the main and largest section of the magazine is titled *Mirror of Languages*. It is divided into several fundamental sub-sections, linked to some *logoi*: *Philosophy and art*, *Philosophy and literature*, *Philosophy and music*, *Philosophy and cinema*. We entrust these dialogues with the task of refracting the main subject of the issue.

In this specific case, for example, we asked Jean Luc Nancy what language is (what languages are) from the point of view of *philosophy and painting*, and we persuaded him to interpret painters like René Magritte, Francis Bacon e Lucian Freud. Then, we chose to translate an essay by R. Brandt that works with the language of images, starting with Caspar David Friedrich and Albrecht Dürer.

In the section on *philosophy and music*, an essay by R. Savage (professor at Department of Ethnomusicology, UCLA, Los Angeles), introduces the problem of the relationship between the truth of music (and art, in general) and its imaginative and emancipatory potential. Then, the article by C. Watkin expands the subject in the direction of dance and recalls, with Nancy, the theme of body language.

The section on *philosophy and literature* explores, with E. Bencivenga, the closeness between literary instance and philosophical instance, reminding us of the idea of a game between the languages (more than a language game). Instead, the essay by F. De Natale, starting from the ontology of the artwork of Gadamer, shows how (in hermeneutics) the ‘extreme situation’ of literature is much more than a simple case of rhetoric.

B. Roberti offers us an essay that analyzes the relationship between *philosophy and cinema* inside the poetics of filmmakers like Julio Bressane, Manoel De Oliveira, Raul Ruiz.

Finally, we have a section on *philosophy and psychology*. We were in doubt whether or not to include it and what to call it: might it be better to use the term ‘psychiatry’? Or ‘psychopathology’? Or ‘science of the psyche’?. A productive meeting with Giampiero Arciero (and his team, whose important scientific study we have included) convinced us of the usefulness of this section, and the usefulness of ‘keeping’ our chosen title (*Philosophy and psychology*)<sup>11</sup>. And the unpublished work of Bruno Callieri, which we present in this issue of “Logoi” (a part of the *Inaugural Lesson of Psychiatry*, held in 2010, at the University of Rome), confirmed this choice: i.e. the need to reconsider the dialogue between philosophy and psychology, beyond mere scientism (according to which neither philosophy nor psychology have anything to say on the psyche), and beyond the mere generic reference to the melting pot of the *Humanities*.

However, “Logoi” is not only this. As has been pointed out to us, “Logoi” is almost two Journals combined. A fundamental pillar – and basically symmetrical to the ‘theoretical’ study of *Mirror of Languages* – is, indeed, the didactic aspect.

At play here is a second wager, perhaps more demanding than the theoretical one. The wager of not considering high school (and the reflection on the didactic of philosophy) as a second class interest as compared to academic research (on this, the testimony of Enrico Berti – that opens the section *Teaching Philosophy* – is both precious and clear). So, consequently, here is at play the wager of not treating the section on the schools as an appendix that is separate from the subject of the magazine (as usually happens in philosophy journals that ‘also’ have a teaching section).

Therefore, the choice is to cover, in the educational section, the ‘same’ theme that is treated in the theoretical section, whatever it may be. This is because we deeply believe that there are no academic issues that do not have (or cannot have) practical implications: in education and politics in general. The important essay of J. Rohbeck (University of Dresden) is a true testament to this: every philosophical movement can be transformed into a teaching resources. Indeed, languages and methods of the various currents can become means for transmitting skills, in addition to content. Eventually, the essay by A. Gaiani (author of several texts on didactic of philosophy) shows the possibility for a dialogue between different languages in high school. The example given by Gaiani is that of philosophy and poetry, but other examples will be shown in the updates.

This leads to the third section, where, fortnightly, there will be pages dedicated to teaching resources. In the case of this first issue, we will propose activities for ‘Philosophy and Art’, ‘Philosophy and Cinema’, ‘Philosophy and Literature’, etc.

Conversely, the section *Blogoi* will gather fortnightly updates on the theoretical aspect: and, therefore, in *Blogoi* you will find critical discussions, reviews, insights related to the topic of the issue (for the first issue, the *blogoi* will refer to the dialogue between languages).

This is the overview of our turntable, which, as previously mentioned, will remain essentially the same, with changes in the subject, or the author of reference. As you will read in the Call for Papers, we shall also have monographic issues on authors and not just concepts. For example, the next issue will be on Paul Ricoeur. However, even when the issue will be about a thinker (rather than a theme), his thought will always be analyzed by creating a dialogue with art, literature, music, cinema, and, of course, teaching.

---

<sup>11</sup>See G. Arciero, *Il problema difficile e la fine della psicologia*, in *Prima e terza persona. Forse dell'identità e declinazioni del conoscere*, “Atque”, 13, 2013, a cura di F. Desideri e P. F. Pieri.

### 3) When literary metaphors meet pictorial and philosophical metaphors

We would like to conclude by returning to the image of Klee. To implement the dialogue/reflection that we intend to carry out in our Journal, we would like to relate it to one of the other languages that is of key importance for us: the language of literature<sup>12</sup>.

At the beginning, we used the words of Heidegger and Wittgenstein to connect Klee's image to the maze of languages; in this concluding paragraph, we want refer to the metaphor (on houses and roads) of a master of the Italian literature of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: Italo Calvino.

Really, *Rotierende Hause* could be an illustration for one of Calvino's *Invisible Cities*<sup>13</sup>.

Think of Eutropia, which is truly a kind of turntable: a set of cities that are inhabited cyclically (when people get tired of being in one, they move to another: «so their life is renewed from move to move»<sup>14</sup>).

Think of Eudoxia, «which spreads both upward and down, with winding alleys, steps, dead ends, hovels»<sup>15</sup>: in the end you discover that Eudoxia is a carpet (how can you not think of Klee's tele-carpet<sup>16</sup>? How can we forget that even *Rotating House* is a painting composed with pieces of voile and cotton, specifically to create this effect of texture?). Indeed, Eudoxia is a city that is both the maze and the thread to exit the maze («it is easy to get lost in Eudoxia: but when you concentrate and stare at the carpet, you recognize the street you were seeking in a crimson or indigo or magenta thread»<sup>17</sup>).

Think of Penthesilea. As in the *House* by Klee, you've been in it for hours «and it is not clear to you whether you are already in the city's midst or still outside it. (...) And so you continue, passing from outskirts to outskirts». And, when it comes time to leave and «you ask for the road out of the city; you pass again the string of scattered suburbs like a freckled pigmentation»..., but you do not know how to get out; just as you do not know how you entered. Then, «you give up trying to understand whether, hidden in some sac or wrinkle of these dilapidated surroundings there exists a Penthesilea the visitor can recognize and remember, or whether Penthesilea is only the outskirts of itself. The question that now begins to gnaw at your mind is more anguished: outside Penthesilea does an outside exist?»<sup>18</sup>. Perhaps, Penthesilea is the name of all the possible cities, is the map of all the stories of the world...

Are the *Invisible Cities* perhaps the map of all the languages of the world? But how should one orient oneself, then, in this maze?

We have already been told that “Logoi” is too many things, that it's not clear how to ‘use it’, how to hold the different parts together. Maybe it's true. However, we like to imagine the ideal reader of our Journal in the same way that Calvino (...but also Nietzsche) imagined his ideal reader: a reader, for whom “Logoi” could be a sort of fellow traveler.

If I have been successful in doing what I wanted, it should be one of those books that you keep on hand, which you open every now and then ( Italo Calvino<sup>19</sup>).

---

<sup>12</sup> An *Introduction* cannot take the place of a complex essay and, therefore, we will only make brief reference to 'one' language: the language of literature.

<sup>13</sup> I. Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, tr. by W. Weaver, Harcourt Brace & Company, San Diego - New York – London, 1974.

<sup>14</sup> Ivi, p. 64.

<sup>15</sup> Ivi, p. 96.

<sup>16</sup> Consider, for example, *Teppich der Erinnerung (The Carpet of Memory)*, 1914, a painting prepared almost like a real textile.

<sup>17</sup> I. Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, p. 96.

<sup>18</sup> Ivi, pp. 156-58.

<sup>19</sup> Id., *Sono nato in America. Interviste 1951-1985*, a cura di L. Baranelli, Mondadori, Milano, 2012. We could also add as written by Calvino in *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*, Harvard University press, Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1988, pp. 71-72: «I built up a many-faceted structure in which each brief text is close to the

*A guide for travelers, to be read on the way.* (...) A book that is not read from top to bottom, but that you browse frequently: today our focus falls on one sentence, tomorrow on another and we consider it deeply (F. Nietzsche)<sup>20</sup>.

A polyhedron book, that has a few conclusions sprinkled throughout it, written along all its edges (I. Calvino)<sup>21</sup>.

We like a text that has no conclusions, except those that the *reader* wants to draw, because *he/she* is responsible for the construction of the trip. Perhaps, the reader will be interested in visiting only one of our cities, of our sections, of our dia-logues; or maybe two or three, and he/she will be interested in building bridges between them. Maybe. Indeed, as Calvino always writes, putting these words into the mouth of Marco Polo, the protagonist of *Invisible Cities*<sup>22</sup>: «Cities, like dreams, are made of desires and fears (...). You take delight not in a city's seven or seventy wonders, but in the answer it gives to a question of yours. Or the question it asks you, forcing you to answer, like Thebes through the mouth of the Sphinx»<sup>23</sup>.

So, we like to think the essays collected in this issue (and those in the coming issues) as a casting of questions and a gathering of answers. In this sense, we strongly invite our readers to respond to our call for papers, and to contribute to the construction of these dia-logues.

Undoubtedly, many will tell us that there was no need for yet another philosophy journal; that there are so many online magazines that deal with 'culture'; that every day new ones appear. Perhaps we could use our time more profitably, in an era – like ours – in which there are definitely bigger problems requiring attention, in an era when, more than ever, cultivating the Humanities is a luxury for the few: for the few who are (still) lucky enough to be able to earn a living teaching and writing: and, so, for a few insiders.

«Why do you amuse yourself with consolatory fables?» – Kublai Khan asks Marco Polo. «I know well that empire is rotting like a corpse in a swamp»<sup>24</sup>.

Marco Polo does not deny; he cannot deny the profound truth of this political realism. However, his response to Kublai Khan remains, for us, a provocation to think and to act.

Yes, the empire is sick, and, what is worse, it is trying to become accustomed to its sores. This is the aim of my explorations: examining the traces of happiness still to be glimpsed, I gauge its short supply. If you want to know how much darkness there is around you, you must sharpen your eyes, peering at the faint lights in the distance (...). When you know at last the residue of unhappiness for which no precious stone can compensate, you will be able to calculate the exact number of carats toward which that final diamond must strive.

The inferno of the living is not something that will be; if there is one, it is what is already here, the inferno where we live every day, that we form by being together. There are two ways to escape suffering it. The first is easy for many: accept the inferno and become such a part of it that you can no longer see it. The second is risky and demands constant vigilance and apprehension: seek and learn to recognize who and what, in the midst of the inferno, are not inferno, then make them endure, give them space<sup>25</sup>.

In this sense *unzeitgemäß* (untimely) and, therefore, also deeply political, "Logoi" wants to contribute, in its small way, to broadening this space: the space of thought and

---

others in a series that does not imply logical sequence or a hierarchy, but a network in which one can follow multiple routes and draw multiple, ramified conclusions. In my *Invisible Cities* every concept and value turns out to be double – even exactitude».

<sup>20</sup> F. Nietzsche, *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1876-'78*, in Id., *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, IV, 2, 1967, n. 24 [1].

<sup>21</sup> I. Calvino, *Le città invisibili felici e infelici*, "Vogue Italia", n. 253, 1972, pp. 150-151.

<sup>22</sup> The novel, in fact, as is well-known, is none other than a long dialogue between Marco and Kublai Khan, i.e. the tale of the cities visited by Marco Polo.

<sup>23</sup> I. Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, p. 44.

<sup>24</sup> Ivi, p. 59.

<sup>25</sup> Ivi, pp. 59; 60; 165.

discussion; the space, to say it again with Klee, of the «inexhaustible diversity» and preciousness of the dialogue between languages; the space of a wager.

In this sense, allow me, as I end this first editorial, to thank all those who believed in this wager: first the authors, who, with their contributions, all of great value, gave breadth to what looked like a pipe dream just a year ago.

Then, in particular, the professors who have generously agreed to be part of the Scientific Committee: they did so from the beginning, when “Logoi” was just a name without content, trusting in us and our project. I am pleased to recall their names and their affiliations: Giampiero Arciero (Genève – CH); Fernanda Henriques (Évora- P), Luca Illetterati (Padova – IT), Patricio Mena Malet (Santiago de Chile – RCH), Bruno Roberti (Università della Calabria – IT), Johannes Rohbeck (Dresda – D), George Taylor (Pittsburg – USA), Chris Watkin (Monash – AUS) and especially Ferruccio De Natale (Bari – IT), who deserves a special thanks: the kind you give to the teachers who know how to encourage and accompany you, unobtrusively, with the discretion of humility.

In addition, we must thank the *Deputy Directors*: Patrik Fridlund (Lund, Sweden) - International Relation; Mario De Pasquale (Bari, Italy) - Section ‘Teaching philosophy’. They was decisive in their fields for their knowledge and support (both scientific and on the level of friendship).

Finally, but more than anyone else, I want to (and must) thank the young people of the editorial staff, who are the real answer to the “Logoi” wager.

First and foremost because – together with many young people who continue to enroll in degree courses in *Philosophy* (or, in general, continue to cultivate the humanities) – they are proof that there are those who still have the courage to choose the unnecessary and the untimely, and to waste time with it.

Second, in particular, because they are the answer to the challenge we have set for ourselves: to maintain the high scientific profile (of the Journal, the authors, the Editorial Board) with the resources and creativity of so many ‘minds’ from whom we are stealing the desire for the future, the real possibility of doing philosophical research and writing.

A sincere thanks, then, to Gemma Adesso, Sterpeta Cafagna, Michela Casolaro, Laura Parente, Valentina Patrino, Luca Romano, Michele Sardone. They are not only the ‘Editorial staff’, but the soul of the Journal. In fact, as we wrote in the *Manifesto* (which we invite you to read), “Logoi” is first and foremost a project. “It’s a ‘space’ for shared research. It’s a lot of hours spent discussing with one another (and also fighting, if necessary). Thinking, indeed, and thinking differently and then trying to come to some consensus. “Logoi” is a set of different needs and skills; and, if it is ‘too much’, the intention is not to humiliate any of these plural needs and skills. This plural is not intended as a closed ‘we’ but as an ‘intertwining’ of ‘you’, as an net of stories (plots, storylines), looking for new companions for journeys, for languages, for dialogues”... for cities, for bridges.



V. Kandinsky, *Fragile* (1931)

Marco Polo describes a bridge,  
stone by stone.

“But which is the stone that  
supports the bridge?” - Kublai Khan asks.

“The bridge is not supported  
by one stone or another”, Marco answers,  
“but by the line of the arch that they form”.

Kublai Khan remains silent, reflecting.

Then he adds: “Why do you speak to me of the stones?  
It is only the arch that matters to me”.

Polo answers:

“Without stones there is no arch”  
[Italo Calvino]