

Annalisa Caputo

***Dialogues with Ricoeur, on the Edge of Languages
(on the Contents of the Issue)***

1) Ricoeur and the arts: a gap in literary criticism

There were three criteria for the 'collection' of the articles in this issue, linked to three particular intentions.

The first criteria (as I will explain further in my essay [*Paul Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of the Arts. From the Singularity of the Work of Art to the Singularity of Human Existence*](#)) is linked to the desire to begin to fill a gap in the critical studies on Ricoeur. In fact, as central as the world of literature, of symbol, of metaphor (and, as we shall see, also of painting and music), were to Ricoeur, he never devoted a monograph to the arts (keeping this intimate dialogue almost like a hidden secret). Perhaps also for this reason there are still no books dedicated to this subject. Of course there are some essays and monographs, but (apart from the precious book by Scott Davidson, *Ricoeur across the Disciplines*¹ a wide-ranging collection, with various contributions, thematically focused on this topic was, in our view, still missing. In any case, the relationship of Ricoeur with the arts is an area yet to be explored, much less examined than the other topics touched on by the French philosopher.

This issue of "Logoi", responding to this lack of critical studies, wants to revive the question, believing that there is still a lot to say and think about in this area.

2) The international 'dialogue' and the 'translation' of thought

The second criterion that guided the selection of the contents of this special issue was internationality, which is not meant to be just a label/adjective for this magazine, but a true style of dialogue, a style that (among other things) Ricoeur himself gave to himself and his interpreters. Ricoeur did not create a school of thought. His freedom and his respect for others' ideas would not allow him to do so. His study of otherness did not allow him to model 'pupils' in his image and likeness. «I am very happy – he said – not to have disciples, but to have friends»². And also: «I have never been a 'Leader' of a 'School' (...). 'Ricoeurism' does not exist. The word is unpronounceable»³. However, paradoxically, it was this style that created a 'School'. It is difficult today to find an author who manages to bring together such diverse scholars, with such diverse interests, from so many different parts of the world. In his life and in his texts, Ricoeur disseminated multiple paths and dialogues; and his writings were (and are today, even more than when he was alive) a meeting place of diverse issues. The *Fonds Ricoeur* (a study center that collects not only texts published by Ricoeur and his library, but also all his manuscripts), is the symbol of this international network, which not coincidentally has 'corrispondents' in all the countries of the world. Together with other associations which developed around Ricoeur⁴, the Fonds organizes seminars, events, and international conferences, where you can converse with a Chinese or South American colleague, with a Swedish one and another from Los Angeles, with an African and a European. The magazine "Études Ricoeuriennes / Ricoeur Studies" is another sign of this vitality and openness.

¹ Continuum, London/NY, 2010.

² P. Ricoeur *L'Unique et le Singulier*, Stanké/Alice éditions, Montréal/Bruxelles, 1999, p. 73.

³ P. Ricoeur - D. Bermond, "Lire. Le magazine des livres", juin 1998, n. 266, pp. 26-32.

⁴ Cfr. Association Paul Ricoeur, The Society for Ricoeur Studies.

This is another reason why we have chosen to introduce, in the *Philosophy and Languages* section, two valuable works on translation. Translating, for Ricoeur, does not mean moving content from one language to another, but accepting the other in his diversity and enriching oneself from his different perspective.

The scholar who introduced us to this type of interpretation, making us read Ricoeur as a philosopher of interpretation (and hospitality), was Domenico Iervolino⁵.

[M. Hénaff](#) and [P. Mena Malet](#) show us the possible developments of this interpretation.

The former presents the reflection that is in some ways most 'theoretical-problematic' in this issue of "Logoi" («aller plus loin avec Ricoeur – et si besoin sans lui»)⁶.

Hénaff, philosopher and anthropologist, professor at the University of California at San Diego (and before that at the University of Copenhagen, the *Collège international de philosophie*, the Johns Hopkins University and Kyoto University), more than an interpreter of Ricoeur is a 'partner' in his dialogue. As is known, in fact, he 'made' Ricoeur 'think'. Ricoeur, many times, in his last texts, let himself be provoked by Hénaff's research (just think of their dialogue on the subject of the gift⁷). The text translated into Italian was originally published in the prestigious Journal "Esprit" (*La pensée Ricoeur*, 2006, n. 3). This essay immediately presented (in practice) the difficulties of the translation, as early as its title: *La condition brisée des langues*. The term 'brisée' is, in fact, present in Ricoeur (in particular, used as adjectives in his dialectic: fragile and 'broken'⁸). However, in the original French (and, in particular in Hénaff), this term does not only indicate the breaking of the myth of unity (of a unique, original, founding language), but also, in some way, it indicate also the spreading, scattering of languages (Babel).

The reader (not only those interested in Ricoeur) will be fascinated by the path that Hénaff constructs between Ricoeurian philosophy, cultural anthropology (Claude Lévi-Strauss, in particular) and ethology. To reflect on translation is to reflect on the diversity of languages and cultures. «Le problème de la traduction est inhérent à la question de l'homínisation. Babel n'est pas un accident. Babel commence avec *Homo sapiens*»⁹.

In fact, there is no doubt also an animal language, a language that is not only functional, but also communicative, but the possibility of the language of the human animal [«la capacité des représentations de se détacher des signes, (...) la *polysémie*»] is also its tragedy.

All'opposto di qualsiasi uniformità del linguaggio intra-specie degli animali, anche dei più evoluti, (...) dobbiamo ammettere che *paghiamo l'estremo sviluppo della nostra capacità di parlare con l'estrema diversità delle lingue* (...) e delle culture. E, però, (...) questa diversità apre anche all'eventuale fallimento della comunicazione (...) e, nel caso delle culture, può generare una resistenza o addirittura (...) una violenza estrema sui suoi simili e questo non per la soddisfazione dei suoi bisogni, ma a causa dell'intolleranza rispetto all'identità dell'altro gruppo. L'animale umano, per la sua stessa possibilità di differenziazione interna *delle lingue e delle culture, avvertite come specie straniera* è esposto ad una tentazione di violenza – e perfino di sterminio – unica nel mondo dei viventi¹⁰.

⁵ See D. Iervolino, *Per una filosofia della traduzione*, Morcelliana, Brescia, 2008.

⁶ M. Henaff, *La condition brisée des langues. Ricoeur: diversité humaine, altérité et traduction*, in "Esprit" (*La pensée Ricoeur*) 2006, n. 3, tr. it. di A. Caputo, [La condizione 'spezzata' delle lingue. Ricoeur: diversità umana, alterità e traduzione, in "Logoi", 2015, I, 2](#), p. 62.

⁷ See P. Ricoeur, *Parcours de la reconnaissance. Trois études*, Stock, Paris, 2004.

⁸ I take the liberty of referring to my book A. Caputo, *Io e tu. Una dialettica fragile e spezzata: percorsi con P. Ricoeur*, Stilo, Bari, 2009.

⁹ M. Henaff, *La condition 'spezzata' delle lingue*, tr. it. cit., p. 71.

¹⁰ Ivi, p. 72 [cette diversité, en cela, est bien à l'opposé de la quasi uniformité du langage intraspécifique des animaux même les plus évolués. Il faut donc l'admettre: *l'extrême développement de notre capacité de parler se paie de l'extrême diversité des langues* (...) et des cultures. A ceci près que, dans le cas des langues, cette diversité ouvre à l'échec possible de la communication entre humains et, que dans celui des cultures, elle peut générer une résistance (...), une violence extrême sur ses semblables et cela non en vue de la satisfaction de ses besoins mais en raison d'une intolérance concernant l'identité de l'autre groupe. L'animal humain, par sa possibilité même de différenciation interne par *les langues et les cultures ressenties comme*

The theme is discussed also by [P. Mena Malet](#) (Santiago University), one of the leading exponents of Ricoeurian studies in Latin America. With an evocative style (in many passages more lyrical than conceptual) – and even here we should say: how difficult it was to translate! How painful translation is, when you are not only rendering content, but a sound, an atmosphere! – Mena Malet brings out the silence that ‘lingers’ at the bottom of each translation effort: a hostile silence, at times; a silence of welcome, in other cases; a listening silence, one hopes; but always tragic silence, which is the background and foundation of the Ricoeurian theory of otherness: poetics of agape, poetics of foreignness, poetics of translation. Because poetry does not exist without silence and the silence,

mantenuto per ascoltare, non è, in definitiva, che il silenzio dell’amore dichiarato all’altro, (...) per aprire uno spazio di prossimità che avvicina senza misura, perché è uno spazio per il dare, in cui il dono non viene misurato. (...) Pertanto, la traduzione è lo spazio in cui rinasce il debito con l’altro, (...) è un atto di co-implicazione, a partire dal quale si realizza gratuitamente, per quanto non senza sforzo, la reciprocità nella diversità¹¹.

For this reason, we have included in the *Philosophy and Language* section (and not in the *Ethics and Mimesis* section) the essay by Olivier Abel (President of the Scientific Committee of the *Fonds Ricoeur* and professor of *Philosophie et éthique* at the *Faculté de théologie protestante de Montpellier*), [La problematizzazione del mondo e la mimesis in Paul Ricoeur](#) (*La problematisation du monde et la mimesis de Paul Ricoeur*)¹². This, too, was an essay which was quite difficult to render in Italian, starting with the term ‘*problématisation*’ in the title, linked to ‘*problématologie*’, terms for which a literal calque was proposed (‘*problematological*’ and ‘*problematology*’), to preserve the echo of the ‘dialogue’ woven, by Abel, between the *mimesis* of Ricoeur and the *Problématologie* of Michel Meyer¹³.

According to Abel, in fact, both Meyer and Ricoeur force us to elude the «terrifying alternative» (which – we could say – in the end, is the false choice between Modernity and Post-modernity): referentiality («*les phrases-propositions existent isolément et sont intelligibles en elles-mêmes sur base d'une analyse interne*») or anti-referentiality («*la fiction, au lieu du littéral*»)¹⁴? Meyer’s *problematological* reasoning and Ricoeur’s theory of double reference of the sign, make it possible to escape the dilemma, making it more complex. «*La question à laquelle la réponse renvoie diffère de celle qu'elle résout*» – Mayer says cryptically¹⁵. However, is this not the same thing that hermeneutics tells us when it points out that, after searching for the meaning of a text at the beginning («*en amont, comme fonction des questions auxquelles il répond: intentions de l'auteur, situation du contexte, etc.*»), it is then necessary to search for that meaning at the end («*en aval, dans sa capacité à interroger, à ouvrir de nouveaux horizons de monde*»)¹⁶? And is this not a ‘translation’ of the world of the author in the world of the reader?

Therefore: here it is the centrality of the issue of translation in philosophy. In fact, it is a ‘substantial’ and hermeneutical-methodological question: that is why, in this issue of “Logoi”, you will find many translations of texts which come from other languages and cultures. It seemed the best way not only to introduce the Italian public to important texts

des espèces étrangères, est exposé à une tentation de violence - pouvant aller jusqu'à l'extermination - qui est unique dans le monde des vivants].

¹¹ [P. Mena Malet, Silenzio, ospitalità e traduzione, in “Logoi”, 2015, I, 2, p. 83.](#)

¹² Original French version in *Argumentation et questionnement*, a cura di C. Hoogaert, PUF, Paris, 1996 (see also on-line: <http://olivierabel.fr/ricoeur/la-problematisation-du-monde-et-la-mimesis-de-paul-ricoeur.php>).

¹³ M. Meyer, *De la problématologie*, Mardaga, Bruxelles, 1986.

¹⁴ Ivi, p. 241.

¹⁵ M. Meyer, *Logique, Langage et Argumentation*, Hachette, Paris, 1982, p. 125.

¹⁶ Tr. it. O. Abel, *La problematizzazione del mondo e la mimesis in P. Ricoeur*, “Logoi”, 2015, I, 2, p. 87.

on the subject of the symphony of languages, but also to implement this exercise of hospitality, which, in fact, is already a ‘network’ of study. It is no coincidence that many of the essays in this volume come from the members of the Scientific Committee (P. Fridlund, M. F. Henriques, P. Mena Malet, G. H. Taylor), who, with their valuable contributions, demonstrate the authenticity of their willingness to create a ‘network’ of research, dialogue, and questions.

However, in saying this, we have already introduced the third criterion that guided us in weaving together this issue, which is made up half of contributions (and translations) proposed and/or indicated by the Scientific Committee, and half of contributions which we received in response to the Call for Papers, which were, thus, subject to peer review: this, too, is a sign of the level of interest in Ricoeur.

3) A number of possible paths: with art, literature, music, cinema, ethics, psychology

We did not want to leave out almost anything. In fact, because of the number of contributions, this is a double issue. However, it seemed possible and desirable for the reader to include all these fragments in ‘one’ space. This, in fact, is the third objective for this issue: to give the reader a chance to orient himself within our topic, having access to a very broad (though, obviously, not necessarily exhaustive) spectrum, ‘in’ which most of the authors who, internationally, have dealt with the theme of the arts in Ricoeur (and have dealt with the dialogue between languages) can be found. Therefore, the index of our volume almost becomes the starting point for bibliographic research, a tool (which we believe can be) valuable for those who want to continue working on these issues: scholars and students.

Of course, some contributions will be very (too) complex for a novice student; others will seem too simplified for some scholars. ‘Diversity’ was more valuable to us than being ‘monolithic’. Therefore, in this issue (as, in general, in any issue of “Logoi”, because of the way the magazine is designed), many different paths are possible.

The Italian reader, as we have said, will appreciate the translation not only of numerous critical studies, but also, and especially, the translation of [P. Ricoeur, *Arts, Language and Hermeneutic Aesthetics. Interview with Paul Ricoeur. Conducted by Jean-Marie Brohm and Magali Uhl: *Le arti, il linguaggio, l'estetica-ermeneutica**](#)¹⁷. The French original and the English translation are available at the “Philagora” website. There was also a [Spanish translation](#). Now the text is more easily accessible even for the Italian reader. This interview will be referred to and discussed in some later contributions ([A. Caputo](#), [J. Cottin](#)), but we are certain that it will still offer much to think about, for the ‘novelty’ of some of the issues it contains.

The reader interested in the visual arts will be interested in the image of aesthetics that emerges from the contributions of [P. S. Anderson](#), [J. Cottin](#) and [D. Desai](#).

P. S. Anderson (professor at Oxford University and original interpreter of the thought of Ricoeur, starting from the perspective of a philosophy of religion attentive to the issue of gender), in her article *Paul Ricoeur’s Aesthetics: Tradition and Innovation* (which the reader can easily find online, also in the original English¹⁸), presents Ricoeur’s aesthetics as a critical rethinking of two normally opposing traditions, like those of Aristotle and

¹⁷ P. Ricoeur, *Arts, Language and Hermeneutic Aesthetics. Interview with Paul Ricoeur. Conducted by Jean-Marie Brohm and Magali Uhl* (September 20, 1996 in Paris), tr. engl. by R.D. Sweeney and J. Carroll: <http://www.philagora.net/philo-fac/ricoeur-e6.php>. Italian translation: P. Ricoeur, [Le arti, il linguaggio, l'estetica-ermeneutica. Intervista a cura di J.-M. Brohm e M. Uhl \(Parigi, 20 settembre 1996\), tr. it. di A. Caputo, in “Logoi”, 2015, I, 2](#), pp. 41-59). I thank the Journal “Philagora” and the Comité éditorial of Fonds Ricoeur for the permission to translate this Interview.

¹⁸ <http://jffp.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/jffp/article/viewFile/35/32>

Kant. In doing this, Anderson shows how Ricoeur encourages active engagement «with and against various critiques posed by Marxists, Post-structuralists and Post-moderns (...): to signify something new in the pregnant present vis-a-vis the immanent future»¹⁹. The paper is presented here, translated into Italian.

Next is the Italian translation of *Metafora ed estetica nel pensiero di P. Ricoeur*²⁰, by J. Cottin (he is professor at the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Strasbourg, author of numerous works on the theoretical foundations of art, as well as several articles on aesthetics and Ricoeur). In this essay, Cottin shows how aesthetics, understood as imaginative poetry, is at the heart of Ricoeur's hermeneutic discourse; and, making a parallel between visual sign and linguistic sign, analyzes the possible relationship between works of art and the world of the sacred.

D. Desai (Ottawa), in [An Autoportrait of Paul Ricoeur](#), follows, through the folds of Ricoeurian texts, the possibility of a joint interpretation of the theme of autobiography and the self-portrait, even touching on authors such as Proust and Joyce (and Norman Rockwell and Rembrandt), and coming to the conclusion that both artistic/self-narrative forms confirm the thesis that the self is not 'displayable' except in relation to the other.

My essay [Paul Ricoeur and the Hermeneutics of the Arts. From the Singularity of the Work of Art to the Singularity of Human Existence](#), begins with Rembrandt too, and with Ricoeur's interpretation of the famous painting *Aristotle touches the bust of Homer*. In particular, however, it focuses on the aforementioned Ricoeurian interview *Arts, Language and Hermeneutic Aesthetics* and tries to indicate the 'innovative' themes that Ricoeur presents in it; identifying, as a category-link between the philosophy of art and the philosophy of existence, the question of singularity (and the possibility/impossibility of communicating the naked experience that characterizes it).

Next is the section on *Philosophy and Literature* (although clearly the theme of aesthetics and the visual arts returns, as an emergence, in many of the other works that we have included in the other 'sections', confirming the unity of the symphony of the arts in Ricoeur). Here is the Italian translation of [Ricoeur's review of Sartre's play *Le Diable et le Bon Dieu*](#). In this review of 1951, Paul Ricoeur discusses Sartre's play, highlighting two possible levels of the work itself: that of the relationship between faith/atheism and that of the ethical/political dimension.

Next is the article by [F. Henriques](#) (professor at the Department of Philosophy of the University of Évora, a scholar who focuses not only on hermeneutics, but also on contemporary ethics, with particular attention to the issue of feminism), starting from 'Greece' all the way up to contemporary hermeneutics, shows how the *Conflict of Interpretations* (internal to the tragic nature of existence) has its exemplarity in the philosophy/literature dialogue. And Paul Ricoeur shows it: both 'in' his way of thinking (from *The Voluntary and the Involuntary* to his later works) and in his critical approach: in fact, Ricoeur is a philosopher (with Kant) of the limits of rationality, but also (with Hegel) of the search for meaning and mediation, through which to access an understanding of the world. And that is the 'work' of philosophy and literature (the one 'other' than the other): they respond to our limits, and 'relaunch' them in the logic of the possible.

The essay by P. Fridlund (University of Lund, Sweden), [Ambivalent Wisdom as the Fruit of Reading](#) is dense, substantial, intriguing and definitely 'beyond' merely literal Ricoeur. The author starts with the book by E. Løvlie and D. Von der Fehr, *Tro på*

¹⁹ Tr. it. [P. S. Anderson, L'estetica di P. Ricoeur: tradizione e innovazione, in "Logoi", 2015, I, 2, p. 129.](#)

²⁰ [J. Cottin, Metafora ed estetica nel pensiero di P. Ricoeur, in "Logoi", 2015, I, 2, pp. 130-138.](#)

Original French version: *Métaphore et esthétique dans la pensée de Paul Ricoeur*, in *La réception de l'œuvre de Paul Ricoeur dans les champs de la théologie* (Etudes de théologie et d'éthique, 3), D. Frey ed., Lit Verlag, Berlin, 2013, pp. 105-115. See also on-line: <http://www.protestantismetimages.com/Metaphore-et-esthetique-dans-la.html>

*litteratur. Religiøse vendinger fra Dante til Derrida, Fosse og Knausgård*²¹ (and literary texts, including *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by L. Carroll) and scours it starting with the theories of Ricoeur and Derrida. Questioning the word/concept/reality relationship, Fridlund shows how, on the one hand, literature seems to destabilize our relationship with the world (transporting us into the world of the unconceptualizable, so much so that it can be compared to the Religious), and this destabilization also characterizes philosophy (and this is why the two languages are comparable); on the other hand, however, it is true that literature and philosophy, in any case, say something about our world and a deeper understanding of the close parallels and similarities between philosophical writing and literature can only benefit not only them, but our way of living reality.

Next, there are real 'essays', in the sense of 'samplings' and 'experiments', that 'pursue' Ricoeurian theory, putting it to the test and comparing it directly with writers of stories and narrative texts.

So, Francesca Brezzi, a pioneer of the studies on Paul Ricoeur in Italy (professor at the University of Roma³), in her [*Borges e Ricoeur. Parola desiderata, parola ricercata*](#), shows how – in a different way – the Argentine writer and French philosopher «exceed the distinctions of philosophy and literature, although they come from those fields» and intersect (symphonically) on some key issues (not by chance, limit-issues), such as the word/writing, text/world, narrative/self-understanding relationships, and, in particular, the work of metaphor («language in celebration, festive language», as Ricoeur put it) and the labyrinthine game of imagination.

Instead, M. Casucci (University of Perugia: a scholar who constantly weaves the literary field with the philosophical in his research), in his [*La tentazione dell'eterno: Ricœur e La montagna incantata di Thomas Mann*](#), (*The Temptation of the Eternal. Ricoeur and 'The Magic Mountain' of Thomas Mann*) considers a writer who is more 'internal' to the Ricoeurian path (see *Time and Narrative*). Far, however, from limiting himself to explaining the Ricoeurian interpretation of Mann, starting from what Ricoeur highlighted, Casucci moves on to the study of the 'philosophical' roots of the question of temporality in Mann (also considering Schopenhauer) and trying to show how *The Magic Mountain* does not limit itself to suffering the 'temptation of eternity', but somehow renders it poetic through «a narrative that tends to propose alternatives, rather than 'impose' perspectives».

Sophie Vlacos (professor at the University of Glasgow and author of the recent book *Ricoeur, Literature and Imagination*, part of the fifth chapter is translated here²²), in her essay [*Poetica della volontà. Identità narrativa ed etica del Sé in Paul Ricoeur*](#) broadens our gaze, calling us to direct it to other writers examined by Ricoeur, like Proust and Musil, decisive for the discussion on identity narrative; but also like Sophocles and Antigone, who, as we know, become symbols of the ethical dilemmas in situations.

Henry Venema (University of Brandon, author of several works on the themes of imagination and narrative) also makes a contribution on this topic in the Italian translation of the essay *Paul Ricoeur on Refigurative Reading and Narrative Identity* ([*La lettura rfigurativa e l'identità narrativa in Paul Ricoeur*](#)²³). Venema explores the relationship between identity and narration in a 'structural' way, working not so much on the relationship between Ricoeur and literature, but specifically on the experience of refiguration (which links stories and subjects). Recommended as an introduction to these Ricoeurian topics. For us, together with the work of Vlacos, it becomes a valuable bridge to the next section.

²¹ Vidarforlaget, Oslo, 2013.

²² S. Vlacos, *Ricoeur, Literature and Imagination*, Bloomsbury, New York, 2014.

²³ Original English Version: *Paul Ricoeur on Refigurative Reading and Narrative Identity*, in "Symposium", 2000, IV, 2, pp. 237-248.

'*Ethics and Mimesis*' is not an 'ordinary' section in "Logoi". We can say that is a typically Ricoerian section, straddling issues between more imaginative/literary themes (i. e. the theory of *mimesis*) and more genuinely ethical-political ones. We felt we were 'demeaning it' by inserting it in the 'literature' section, but, simultaneously, it seemed important to give it prominence, as a practical application of the narrative theory of Ricoeur: a sign that narrative is never pure disengagement.

The essay of G. Taylor opens this section; Taylor is *Professor of Law* at the *University of Pittsburgh School of Law* and promoter of a whole line of research on Ricoeur (but not only), imagination and creativity as linked to the study of law. The paper presented here in the Italian translation, [Ricoeur, la narrazione e il giusto](#) (*Narrative Ethics and Moral Law in Ricoeur*²⁴) is based on this topic.

Building on Paul Ricoeur's theories of narrative and legal judgment, George Taylor (...) argues that determination of the just remains an ongoing task of contingent judgment. (...) Legal logic is not a matter of inevitability but of human choice, human judgment, and human creativity. We can look back on the evolution of human notions of justice and see logic in its development, but the logic could have developed quite differently²⁵.

The essay by F. Abbate (professor of Aesthetics at the University of Roma³ and author of numerous works on Ricoerian Aesthetics), [Dalle ideologie alla lotta per il riconoscimento: Paul Ricoeur e gli studi sull'immaginazione politica](#), starting from her personal experience with Ricoeur and thinking in particular about his ethical-political work (starting from the line of US research), interweaves and distinguishes the thread of the fair, the legal and the good within the theme of the just; and shows how the 'third party' does not concern only «narrative identity as a solution to the question of the subject», but also concerns its political fallout. As part of the dialogue between languages, we would like to highlight the thrust/attack that the author presents starting with the television series *House of Cards*.

And so we come to [Etica narrativa e legge morale in Ricoeur](#) (*Narrative Ethics and Moral Law in Ricoeur*²⁶) In this essay, Peter Kemp (University of Copenhagen) continues his 'discussion' with Ricoeur, which began in the late '80s (it is interesting for the reader to re/approach it from the beginning, in the exposition provided by Kemp himself). Sharing the idea that the narrative foundation of ethics is only one of its states, the author believes that it is possible and necessary to develop the agapic aspect of law, in relation to the centrality of self-responsibility of the Self.

The last essay of this section is framed in terms of narrative identity and its centrality to the formation of selfhood. The author is [V. Brugiattelli](#) (a young scholar, who studied at the University of Verona and is the author of several studies on Ricoeur), and the essay retraces Ricoeur's passage from the hermeneutics of the text to the understanding of the self, focusing on the theory of the threefold *mimesis*.

In the section *Philosophy and Music*, we present the Italian translation of a text by R. Savage, *Is Music Mimetic?* ²⁷ ([La musica è mimetica?](#)). It is the ideal completion of the essay we published in the last issue of "Logoi" ([Esperienza estetica, mimesis e testimonianza](#)).

Savage (professor of *Systematic Musicology* and *Director of Graduate Studies: Department of Ethnomusicology, UCLA - Los Angeles*) is one of the few on the

²⁴ "Universitas: Monthly Review of Philosophy and Culture" (Taiwan), CDLXX, 2013, pp. 145-58.

²⁵ G. H. Taylor, [Ricoeur, la narrazione e il giusto](#), in "Logoi", 2015, I, 2, pp. 224-231.

²⁶ English version in. J. Wall, W. Schweiker (eds.), *Paul Ricœur and Contemporary Moral Thought*, Routledge, New York and London, 2002, pp. 32-46.

²⁷ In "Journal of French Philosophy", 2006, 16, 1-2, Spring-Fall, 2006. <http://jffp.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/jffp/article/viewFile/188/184>

international level who have addressed the relationship between Ricoeur and music, and to have shown the centrality of this art in the understanding of our author. This is what I, too, try to do in my essay [Paul Ricoeur e la musica come caso-limite nella sinfonia delle arti](#) (*Music as Limit-Case in the Symphony of the Arts*).

Next is the section *Philosophy and Cinema*, in which we present two valuable contributions, both because they are innovative, and because they work on a theme that has truly been little explored in relation to Ricoeur (perhaps because of his ‘colleague’ Deleuze’s more obvious connection with film).

T. D. Moratalla (professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Madrid), in [Visitando Level Five \(Chris Marker\). Ricœur, el cine y la hermenéutica](#), expands Ricoeur’s narrative theory towards what he calls ‘cinematic narrativity and ‘hermeneutic philosophy of cinema’. He tries to apply all this to Chris Marker and, in particular, to the film *Level Five*, a film that Moratalla reinterprets in parallel with the Ricoeurian book *Memory, History, Forgetting*.

Instead, in [an interview she granted, D. Iannotta](#) (translator of the majority of Ricoeur’s work in Italy, as well as a fine interpreter) also offers a series of personal memories, which show us a less well-known Ricoeur: who loses himself among archaeological sites and museums, who listens to music, and who argues with the cinema, when it is not faithful to its sources and does not help the work of memory, still in the belief that all forms of art make us think.

In the section *Philosophy and Psychology*, we include two contributions that enrich the immense work that has already been done in this field. We know how Ricoeur was one of the pioneers of the dialogue between philosophy and psychoanalysis (particularly Freudian).

In Italy, Vinicio Busacchi (University of Cagliari) has long studied this subject. However, in the essay presented here (*L’identità come esperienza narrativa: quale fondamento in Ricœur?*), he does not only present the reconstruction of a process well known to the public, but questions the validity of the Ricoeurian narrative, forcing us to reconsider the question. Does it really have a psychological/psychoanalysis foundation? Or does it perhaps have an aesthetic foundation? Well, probably neither of these two, because it is in Ricoeurian onto-anthropology that every linguistic and epistemological symphony finds its roots.

Equally challenging is the essay by Marjolaine Deschênes (young Canadian researcher), entitled [L’attention aux récits sur soi. Paul Ricœur et Carol Gilligan autour du tragique freudien](#). She, starting from the ‘Freudian’ roots of Ricoeur and Gilligan (and showing how both develop the ‘hidden’ ethical dimension of these same roots), moves on to the interpretation that the two authors give the myths of Oedipus and Antigone and indicates their affinities and differences, from a feminist perspective.

In the section *Philosophy and Other Languages* we have collected another set of ‘dialogues’, which are ‘examples’ of the many other sections that could have been opened and explored: Philosophy and Architecture ([F. Sarcinelli, Ricoeur e il linguaggio dell’architettura](#)), Philosophy and Theology ([M. Chiodi, Ermeneutica, fenomenologia e teologia](#)), Philosophy and Interpretation ([C. Balbontin-Gallo, Ricœur critique de Levinas. Levinas critique de Ricœur](#); [V. Patruno, Ricoeur e l’introuvabile Kierkegaard](#)).

Finally, in the teaching section (*School at Play*), there are two experiences that [A. Mercante](#) and [A.T. Attollino](#) made in and with their classes through Ricoeur and the play of languages: a demonstration of how Ricoeurian thought need not be closed in academic studies. The *Teaching Resources* that we will put on-line in periodic updates (*Philosophia Ludens*) will offer teachers more ideas on how to work with Ricoeur in high schools; while in the *Blogoi Section*, we will mostly publish reviews (by young graduates) who will discuss the most recent texts by or about Ricoeur, to offer the reader (and especially those who approach Ricoeurian thought for the first time) a wide view of current criticism.