

Canadian Society for Continental Philosophy
La société canadienne de philosophie continentale

University of Ottawa, October 11–13, 2012

Congress 2012 Programme and Abstracts

Please note that all sessions will take place on campus in the Simard Building (SMD 125 and 129). However, the Thursday evening reception will take place in the next building over, in Arts 509.

Veillez noter : tous les événements — sauf la réception du jeudi soir — auront lieu dans le pavillon Simard (locaux 125 et 129). La réception du jeudi soir aura lieu dans le pavillon des Arts (local 509).

Thursday, October 11

2:30 PM–
4:00 PM

Registration
Atrium, Simard Building (near SMD 129)
University of Ottawa

4:00 PM–
5:00 PM

Plenary Session
Andrew J. Mitchell
(Emory University)
“The Art of Exposure: Thinking Sculpture with Heidegger”
Chair: Philip Buckley (McGill)
SMD 125
Simard Building

5:00 PM–
6:00 PM

Plenary Session
David Carr
(Emory University)
“Experience and History”
Chair: Philip Buckley (McGill)
SMD 125
Simard Building

6:00 PM–
8:00 PM

Reception
Arts 509
Arts Building (next to the Simard Building)

Friday, October 12

8:30 AM–
9:00 AM

Coffee and Registration
Atrium, Simard Building (near SMD 129)

9:00 AM–
9:45 AM

Noah Moss Brender
(Boston College)
**“Symmetry-Breaking and
the Genesis of Sense in Nature”**
Chair: Don Beith (Bishop’s)
SMD 125

Garrett Zantow Bredeson
(Vanderbilt University)
**“Hegel on Newton’s
Unspeakable Metaphysics”**
Chair: Jared Babin (Ottawa)
SMD 129

9:45 AM–
10:45 AM

Plenary Session
Isabelle Thomas-Fogiel
(Université d’Ottawa)
« Aspects de la phénoménologie française contemporaine »
Chair: Marie-Eve Morin (Alberta)
SMD 125

10:45 AM–
11:00 AM

Coffee break

11:00 AM–
11:45 AM

Shannon Hoff
(Institute for Christian Studies)
“Rights and Worlds”
Chair: Jeffrey Reid (Ottawa)
SMD 125

Wes Furlotte
(University of Ottawa)
**“Animality and the Problem of Original
Sickness in Hegel’s *Naturphilosophie*”**
Chair: Jeff Renaud (Ottawa)
SMD 129

11:45 AM–
12:45 PM

Plenary Session
Diane Enns
(McMaster University)
“‘The Care for Existence’: Arendt on Politics and Peace”
Chair: Sonia Sikka (Ottawa)
SMD 125

12:45 PM–
2:45 PM

Lunch (on your own)
&
Business Meeting (SMD 123, all are welcome)

2:45 PM–
3:30 PM

Xander Selene
(Université de Montréal)
“Shudder: Plato and Adorno?”
Chair: Matt Wood (Ottawa)
SMD 125

Christiane Bailey
(Université de Montréal)
« Affection, compréhension et langage :
l’être-au-monde animal chez
le jeune Heidegger »
Chair: Martine Béland (Édouard-Montpetit)
SMD 129

3:30 PM–
5:00 PM

Scholars’ Session
GARY MADISON
Calvin Schrag
(Professor Emeritus, Purdue University)
Graeme Nicholson
(Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto)
Paul Fairfield
(Queen’s University)
Jean Grondin
(Université de Montréal)
Organizer and chair: Felix Ó Murchadha (NUI Galway)
SMD 125

Saturday, October 13

8:30 AM–
9:00 AM

Coffee and Registration
Atrium, Simard Building (near SMD 129)

Panel

The Philosophy of Education

David Grunner
(Fordham University)

**“Enslaved Ancestors, Liberated Grandchildren:
Considering Rancière’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* via Walter Benjamin”**

9:00 AM–
10:30 AM

David Gadon
(Fordham University)

“The Science of Sexism: Le Dœuff and the Female Student”

Sarah Cates
(Fordham University)

“The Truth of the Ignorant Schoolmaster: Rancière’s Perspectivism”

Chair: Peter Gratton (MUN)

SMD 125

10:30 AM–
11:15 AM

Peter Gratton
(Memorial University of Newfoundland)
“Life as a Political Absolute in Spinoza”
Chair: Sean McGrath (MUN)
SMD 125

Marc-Antoine Vallée
(École des hautes études en sciences sociales)
**« Au risque de soi :
l’événement et la relation »**
Chair: Christiane Bailey (Montréal)
SMD 129

11:15 AM–
11:30 AM

Coffee break

11:30 AM–
12:15 PM

Arthur Cools
(University of Antwerp)
**“Beyond the Skin?
Levinas on Metaphor”**
Chair: Lorraine Markotic (Calgary)
SMD 125

Andreea Parapuf
(Radboud University Nijmegen)
“Hermeneutics as Announcement”
Chair: Drew Desai (Ottawa)
SMD 129

Plenary Session

Deborah Cook

(University of Windsor)

“Really Existing Socialization”

Chair: Martin Desrosiers (Montréal)

SMD 125

12:15 PM–
1:15 PM

1:15 PM–
2:45 PM

Lunch (on your own)

Amrit Heer

(Villanova University)

**“The Limits of Transcendental Argument
in Levinas and Deleuze”**

Chair: Pamela Lee (Ottawa)

SMD 125

Martine Béland

(Collège Édouard-Montpetit)

**« La constitution de soi comme auteur :
les préfaces philosophiques de Nietzsche »**

Chair: Marc-Antoine Vallée (EHES)

SMD 129

2:45 PM–
3:30 PM

3:30 PM–
4:15 PM

Maxime Doyon

(McGill University)

**“The Transcendental
Claim of Deconstruction”**

Chair: Christopher Norris (Cardiff)

SMD 125

Daniel Harris

(University of Guelph)

**“Friendship, Self-Knowledge
and Deception in Nietzsche”**

Chair: Devin Shaw (Ottawa)

SMD 129

4:15 PM–
4:30 PM

Coffee break

4:30 PM–
5:30 PM

Plenary Session

Christopher Norris

(Cardiff University)

“Concept-Creation: Perspectives from the Two Traditions”

Chair: Maxime Doyon (McGill)

SMD 125

5:30 PM–
8:15 PM

Free time

8:15 PM

Dinner

Sign up at the registration desk
by Friday at 5 p.m. for a common meal at

Vittoria Trattoria

35 William Street, Byward Market.

Each person pays his/her own way.

Seventh annual *Symposium* Book Prize: the CSCP executive committee would like to congratulate this year's recipient of *Symposium's* annual book prize: **Espen Hammer**, for his *Philosophy and Temporality from Kant to Critical Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

The CSCP executive committee would also like to congratulate the winner of this year's graduate student essay prize: **Noah Moss Brender** (Boston College), for his paper "Symmetry-Breaking and the Genesis of Sense in Nature."

Félicitations aux deux gagnants !

The CSCP would like to thank the following people and groups for their support in making this conference possible:

Nous tenons à remercier les personnes et groupes suivants pour leur appui :

Our local organizers, Professors Jeffrey Reid and Sonia Sikka; the Faculty of Arts, Vice-President Research, and the Department of Philosophy at the University of Ottawa; Professor Douglas Moggach; and Professor Francisco Gonzalez.



Abstracts / Résumés

Christiane Bailey (Université de Montréal), « Affection, compréhension et langage : l'être-au-monde animal chez le jeune Heidegger »

Les cours récemment publiés du jeune Heidegger montrent que, contrairement à ce qu'il affirme dans *Être et temps*, les animaux ont bien le mode d'être du *Dasein*. Ils ne sont pas simplement des êtres vivants, mais ils ont comme nous un monde qui leur importe. Retraçant la genèse des structures existentielles (affection, compréhension et langage) dans la vie animale, nous soutiendrons que la structure de l'être-au-monde appartient aux animaux non pas en un sens large et simplement dérivé, mais qu'elle leur appartient intrinsèquement. Nous verrons que c'est même à partir d'une réflexion sur les capacités fondamentales de la vie des animaux que le jeune Heidegger va forger les structures qui vont devenir les existentiels de l'analytique existentielle.

Martine Béland (Collège Édouard-Montpetit), « La constitution de soi comme auteur : les préfaces philosophiques de Nietzsche »

Nietzsche a publié 17 livres en autant d'années, mais il a écrit 24 préfaces. Il tenait ses préfaces de 1886 pour « la meilleure prose » qu'il ait écrite jusqu'alors, mais cette forme de son écriture passe pourtant inaperçue des commentateurs. Dans cette communication, à l'aide des catégories de la théorie littéraire, je préciserai la singularité de son cas en ce qui a trait à la préface philosophique. La préface est un outil philosophique pour Nietzsche, qui sert à la constitution de la parole de l'auteur comme œuvre ouverte au lecteur. Avec ses préfaces, Nietzsche rejette les limites entre l'auteur, l'œuvre et ses lecteurs, et démontre l'imbrication de ces pôles de la production et de la réception. À travers les préfaces, il montre que son

œuvre existe, comme prise de parole vivante, et il explique ce que cela implique de ses lecteurs. Il se dégage donc des préfaces nietzschéennes une conception de la philosophie comme exercice. La préface philosophique chez Nietzsche remplit ainsi une essentielle fonction performative.

Garrett Zantow Bredeson (Vanderbilt University), “Hegel on Newton’s Unspeakable Metaphysics”

In his *Encyclopædia*, Hegel singles Newton out as the target of some of his fiercest polemics. In this paper I will try to explain just *why* Newton holds such significance for Hegel. As I see it, Newtonian physics represents, for Hegel, one possible—and dangerous—endpoint for natural philosophy. Far from overcoming the rationalist attempt to provide a rigorous foundation for physics, Newton in fact remains tacitly committed to it, even while he disavows the very resources needed to render the rationalist presuppositions intelligible and permit their systematic criticism. As the philosopher of the understanding (*Verstand*) *par excellence*, Newton’s worldview is peculiarly well-suited to the study of nature in all its contingency and manifoldness, but just because of this it constitutes a significant obstacle for the natural philosopher, whose distinctive task is to dialectically trace the development of nature into spirit.

Noah Moss Brender (Boston College), “Symmetry-Breaking and the Genesis of Sense in Nature”

In his early work, Merleau-Ponty attempts to develop a new ontology of nature that avoids the antinomies of realism and idealism. The key to this new ontology is the concept of *form*, which Merleau-Ponty appropriates from Gestalt Psychology. However, Merleau-Ponty struggles to give a positive characterization of the phenomenon of form which would clarify its ontological status—a struggle which Merleau-Ponty renewed in his late work on nature and *The Visible and the Invisible*. In this talk, I will take up this search for a new ontology of form. Drawing on recent scientific work in the study of complexity and dynamic systems, I will offer an account of form as *asymmetry* or difference, and of the genesis of form in nature as *symmetry-breaking* or self-differentiation. By studying the genesis of form, I hope to shed some light on Merleau-Ponty’s claim that nature is the “autoproduction of a sense” that is prior to language and thought.

David Carr (Emory University), “Experience and History”

Though it had played a major role in the history of modern philosophy, the term “experience” all but disappeared in mainstream philosophical works of the second half of the 20th century. This disappearance roughly coincided with the so-called linguistic turn, in both analytic and continental philosophy. There is some evidence that the linguistic turn has come un-turned in more recent times, but with a few exceptions, the concept of experience has not returned. Yet it seems to me a valuable term, and needs to be revived. Among other things, I think it can be valuable in thinking about history. So here I propose to devote some discussion to the history of the term and the concept, as well as its connection to epistemological foundationalism. This will contribute, I hope to its clarification. After that I will venture some ideas about how the concept of experience, suitably clarified, can contribute to our thinking about history.

Sarah Cates (Fordham University), "The Truth of the Ignorant Schoolmaster: Rancière's Perspectivism"

In this paper I will show that Rancière's *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* offers not only a lesson in pedagogy, but a lesson in philosophy as well, albeit through a pedagogical lens. Specifically, I will attempt to illustrate the perspectivism that I see him developing throughout the work. I first show that the assumption of equal intelligence is not only significant for educational purposes, but also counts as a general claim that human beings are pure individual wills. This is important because as pure wills, we only interact with one another through an internal relation with all the rest. Each will is an individual perspective, all of which orbit around the same thing: truth. In the end, I will show that each individual will is actually merely an individual perspective driven by truth. We thus relate to one another through our individual perspective on truth, creating ourselves in the process.

Deborah Cook (University of Windsor), "Really Existing Socialization"

Adorno and Foucault often make similar criticisms of Western societies—criticisms which reveal that the standard arguments against socialism may more justifiably be levelled against really existing socialization in the West. After outlining these criticisms, the paper takes up Foucault's challenge to invent a specifically socialist art of government. It shows that Adorno can be read as rising to this challenge as he attempts to combat current forms of collectivism and individualism, or what Foucault called the twin dangers of totalitarianism and individualization.

Arthur Cools (University of Antwerp), "Beyond the Skin? Levinas on Metaphor"

Levinas' notion of the face has been repeatedly criticized for being an abstraction. Breaking with the visible, the face seems just to name an abstract and ungraspable infinity. The radical movement of Levinas' thought puts him in a difficult position which becomes obvious when he states in an interview that he "does not know whether a snake has a face or not." Referring to this quote, Jacques Derrida has put in question what he calls the validity of Levinas' account of ethics, and even of otherness: if Levinas does not know and cannot say what the face is, then he has no argument to privilege the human face as the prototype for ethical meaning. In my paper I discuss this criticism and examine the main reasons for certain difficulties in Levinas' philosophy. I will argue that Derrida is incorrect when he states that the ethical obligation with regard to animals is "only" a metaphorical transfer from primordial (non-metaphorical) human ethics. This statement does not take into account the role of metaphors in Levinas' philosophy and does not consider the question how the metaphorical displacement of language is related to the face. I go on to show how metaphorical displacement is inherent in Levinas' account of subjectivity.

Maxime Doyon (McGill University), "The Transcendental Claim of Deconstruction"

Of all the philosophers of the post-Husserlian era, it is perhaps Jacques Derrida that has had the most self-conscious relationship toward the transcendental tradition. Despite the severe criticism of Kant's transcendental philosophy and especially of Husserl's transcendental phenomenology in his first publications, Derrida repeatedly insisted throughout his work on the relevance and legitimacy of the transcendental approach. Derrida's renewal of the transcendental problematic is most clearly marked by the concepts 'ultra-' and 'quasi transcendental', which he introduced to stress the impossibility of *pure* conditions of possibility. For Derrida, all conditions of possibility depend on empirical and contingent

conditions and function only inasmuch as they stay open to the possibility of their own failure. In that sense, every condition of possibility is also at the same time a condition of impossibility. This contradictory stance of deconstruction towards the transcendental will serve as a guiding thread in my presentation.

Diane Enns (McMaster University), “‘The Care for Existence’: Arendt on Politics and Peace”

This paper responds to two contemporary “movements”: the affirmation of agonism or disagreement as the defining truth of politics, and what some are calling “a new era of protest,” characterized by the public expression of grievance. These movements tell us much about violence and its relation to politics, but I’m more interested in what they say—or fail to say—about peace. If an acceptance of violence at the heart of emancipatory politics risks the permanent coupling of extreme violence and dissent, as I will argue, we need to make clear the distinction between violence and conflict on the one hand, and between an artificial (passive) peace and agreement on the other. With reference to the work of Balibar, Rancière, and above all, Arendt, I seek a politicized version of peace, or a nonviolent version of politics, in which “the care for existence” precedes even justice and cultivates the very conditions for politics.

Wes Furlotte (University of Ottawa), “Animality and the Problem of Original Sickness in Hegel’s *Naturphilosophie*”

Concentrating on Hegel’s controversial *Naturphilosophie* (1830), this paper attempts to defend its continued relevance to the precise degree that it develops a unique account of the internal relationship existing between various fields of external-materiality and the self-relational structure of subjectivity (ideality). Reconstructing Hegel’s analysis of the animal organism, the processes constituting Assimilation (the phenomena of lack, hunger, digestion and excrement) and the Genus (Sex, Violence, Sickness and Death), the paper attempts to develop how the aseitic (self-referential) structure of the animal organism is perpetually entangled (*verwickelt*) with the material externality of its contextual environment. This problematic entanglement leads Hegel to claim that animality is, at its structural heart, an “original sickness” (*ursprüngliche Krankheit*). The paper contends that this constitutive “sickness” expresses the myriad of ways in which incipient self-relating ideality’s emergence depends upon the fluctuations of its material, external environment. One of the merits of Hegel’s *Naturphilosophie*, then, is the unique way in which its speculative analysis of animality makes it impossible to speak of ideality in the absence of materiality and vice versa.

David Gadon (Fordham University), “The Science of Sexism: Le Dœuff and the Female Student”

Using a recent study to situate the writing, this essay will attempt to address the continued discrepancies in performance and comportment towards academia across gender lines. Specifically, I aim to use the work of Michèle Le Dœuff to see how it is that socially constructed differences are ingrained into the psychology of the typical female student, and how this process is exacerbated by pseudo-scientific attempts to calcify essential differences between men and women. While Le Dœuff’s critique centers on publications that may now seem dated, this essay will show how even contemporary science – under the banner of evolutionary psychology – falls into the same sexist pitfalls of its predecessors. When science is blind to the nuanced effects of societal prejudices, attempts to objectively delineate gender differences

inevitably end up reinforcing the status quo and perpetuating inequalities that continue to impact the students of today.

David Grunner (Fordham University), “Enslaved Ancestors, Liberated Grandchildren: Considering Rancière’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* via Walter Benjamin”

This essay places Jacques Rancière’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* in dialogue with Walter Benjamin’s “On the Concept of History” as I believe reading Rancière with Benjamin helps us attain a richer understanding of the former’s text and discern possible new directions for it. As such, I would like to take this opportunity to think through some possible connections between the two. In §1 I discuss the critique of progress found in both Benjamin’s and Rancière’s texts and tease out the resulting implications for philosophies of education; in (Interlude) I examine the revision of temporality in the face of the critiques of progress presented in §1; in §2 I discuss the principle of equality operative in both texts; and in §3 I conclude with a Benjaminian offering for our conception of the philosophical canon.

Peter Gratton (Memorial University of Newfoundland), “Life as a Political Absolute in Spinoza”

Much has been written about bio-political sovereignty in the wake of Agamben’s work, which relies, at least in the first volume of *Homo Sacer*, on Carl Schmitt’s transcendental account of sovereignty. This paper argues, however, that Foucault and Arendt rightly identify what Derrida once called the “changing shape and place of sovereignty” in modernity, which for them is horizontal and disseminated within a presupposed nation. For this reason, we will look to the source of modern philosophical immanentism, Spinoza, to show that he is not extrinsic to this modern bio-politics, and demonstrates how the sovereign exception and its nationalized version work hand-in-glove in the era of which he was a part. In this way, we argue that it is Spinoza’s political theology, not Schmitt’s, that is the better pass-key to what Foucault and Arendt identify as biopolitical. By doing so, we put in tension two trends in recent Continental philosophy: philosophical vitalism and the critique of biopolitics.

Daniel Harris (University of Guelph), “Friendship, Self-Knowledge and Deception in Nietzsche”

I suggest that just as Nietzsche questions our will to truth, he questions our desire for self-knowledge, and furthermore that Nietzsche credits our friends with helping us to overcome our drive to self-knowledge. The will to truth is for Nietzsche the most recent evolution of the ascetic ideal, the fundamentally nihilistic denial of the value of the earth and so of our material natures. Nietzsche portrays friendship as therapeutic, a means to coming to know ourselves through our aesthetic, deceptive rather than truth-tracking capacities. Friends reanimate the celebration of artistic creation and finitude Nietzsche lauds in the Greeks, serving as openings onto the spectral nature of the self, the affirmation of which Nietzsche calls joy.

Amrit Heer (Villanova University), “The Limits of Transcendental Argument in Levinas and Deleuze”

I argue that certain transcendental arguments given by Emmanuel Levinas and Gilles Deleuze are formally homologous despite the fact that their conclusions are divergent. The arguments I will analyze are from Section II of Levinas’ *Totality and Infinity* and from Chapter II of Deleuze’s *Difference and Repetition*. By establishing the formal homology between these two arguments, I can then assess the basis, both internal and external to the argument itself, of the divergence in conclusions. My claim is that there

are limits *of* this transcendental argument in two senses: first, the argument itself deals with certain limits and that it draws its force from these limits; second, the nature of these limits involves an ambivalence which necessitates a limit to transcendental deduction itself. As such, the internal limit, as the object of this argument, marks the external limit to the argument itself.

Shannon Hoff (Institute for Christian Studies), “Rights and Worlds”

Modernity is characterized by an assertion of the individual as a singular unit of significance, and its various political, legal, economic, etc. systems have taken their lead from the notion of the individual as rights-bearing. This modern prioritization of the individual, however, while a powerful accomplishment, is also problematic: it does not adequately recognize how the individual it prioritizes would *itself* point to other contexts of significance or worlds of value by which its identity is constituted and made meaningful. This paper will explore this basic tension between these two visions of selfhood—the one expressed in terms of “rights” and the other in terms of “worlds.” It will show how care for these basic worlds of value is necessary for the very operation of right, and it will point to various ways in which the significance of these “worlds” could be politically recognized and protected.

Andrew J. Mitchell (Emory University), “The Art of Exposure: Thinking Sculpture with Heidegger”

Heidegger’s later aesthetic theory is predominantly concerned with the art of sculpture. In texts from the 1950’s and 1960’s, Heidegger analyzes sculpture in terms of how the sculpted body engages with the space around it, both affecting and being affected by that space in a reciprocally determining fashion. This interface between body and space requires a renewed thinking of delimitation. Attending to Heidegger’s thoughts on sculpture is consequently no isolated aesthetic endeavor, but instead a way of thinking a corporeal being-in-the-world. The first part of this paper outlines the “logic” of the limit in Heidegger’s later thought, the second part shows how this logic is operative in the work of four sculptors that Heidegger considers in his writings on sculpture: Ernst Barlach, Giacomo Manzù, Bernhard Heiliger, and Eduardo Chillida.

Christopher Norris (Cardiff University), “Concept-Creation: Perspectives from the Two Traditions”

Gilles Deleuze’s idea that philosophy is, or should be, more about creating than merely analyzing concepts is one that—perhaps understandably—has not received very much attention from mainstream analytic philosophers. All the same it is a distinction that arguably goes to the heart of the otherwise much-exaggerated rift between ‘continental’ and ‘analytic’ traditions. Moreover, it is one that helps us to pinpoint certain deep-laid problems on the analytic side, problems that were first diagnosed by G.E. Moore in his shrewd comments on the ‘paradox of analysis’. In this paper I shall try to unpack that paradox and the various forms it has taken down through the long and multiplex history of analytic thought. I shall also—in a more positive vein—discuss a variety of ways in which certain continental thinkers, among them Derrida, Deleuze and Badiou, have managed to avoid it and practice more creative or inventive modes of philosophical thought. At the same time, and quite compatibly with that, their work has for the most part continued to exhibit the core (i.e., non-proprietary) analytic virtues of clarity, rigour, and critical acumen.

Andreea Parapuf (Radboud University Nijmegen), "Hermeneutics as Announcement"

This paper addresses the issue of hermeneutics in Heidegger's later thinking. As one can easily notice, hermeneutics does not enjoy much attention in his works beginning with 1930's and heading as late as his private seminars from 1970's. The concept barely makes any appearance at this later stage. However, a number of indications we find in a dialogue from 1953-1954 open up the possibility of reassessing the meaning and the function of hermeneutics. The aim of this paper is twofold. First, the paper examines an alternative account of hermeneutics. Starting from the Greek meaning of *hermeneuein*, hermeneutics is conceived as the process of *announcing, making known and bringing a message further (Kunde bringen)*. Secondly, the present paper retrospectively assesses the meaning and the function of hermeneutics in *Being and Time* by highlighting a distinction hardly noticed in this early text: the distinction between *hermeneuein* ("the hermeneutical") and interpretation.

Xander Selene (Université de Montréal), "Shudder: Plato and Adorno?"

In *Aesthetic Theory*, Theodor W. Adorno proposes defining aesthetic comportment as "the capacity to shudder." What appears to be an excursion into literary haziness is in fact the compact expression of an extensive reworking of Plato's *Phaedrus*. In Plato's dialogue, the philosophical initiate shudders at the sight of the beautiful face or body, imitating the mimetic relation between this beautiful particular and the beautiful itself. Such a moment of divine madness, enthusiasm, has the potential for idolatry just as well as for wisdom. While defending enthusiasm as a necessary condition for knowledge, Adorno interprets the shudder as a remainder, preserved in the beautiful itself, of rationality's historical denial of nature. In Adorno's materialist transformation of the concept, shudder opens a new potential for the reconciliation of nature and spirit: the potential of art to raise all thinking, necessarily conceptual, to self-reflection.

Isabelle Thomas-Fogiel (Université d'Ottawa), « Aspects de la phénoménologie française contemporaine »

Il s'agira d'interroger quelques représentants de la phénoménologie française la plus contemporaine (Marion, Chrétien, Lacoste, Romano...) pour tenter d'en saisir les thèmes les plus structurants et, en même temps, en pointer les éventuelles apories.

Marc-Antoine Vallée (École des hautes études en sciences sociales), « Au risque de soi : l'événement et la relation »

Ce texte s'efforce de définir la contribution possible de la phénoménologie française contemporaine au développement et à la radicalisation du projet d'une herméneutique du soi tel que d'abord formulé par Paul Ricœur. Il s'agit, plus spécifiquement, de préciser quelle conception décentrée du soi ressort des récents travaux de Claude Romano sur l'événement et d'Emmanuel Housset sur la dimension relationnelle de la personne. Pour ce faire, l'auteur insiste sur les convergences entre les deux œuvres, notamment sur la critique de toute conception du soi qui repose ultimement sur l'idée d'un maintien de soi. Il termine en interrogeant les limites de ces approches.