

THE “BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY  
CLUJ-NAPOCA

# Summary

DOCTORAL THESIS

## The Construction of Reality

Coordinating  
Professor:

Univ. Prof. Dr. Andrei Marga

PHD student:

Francisc-Norbert Ormeny

Cluj-Napoca

2012

Starting from Edmund Husserl's idea that philosophy means and must always mean a perpetual becoming (that a constant renewal, rethinking and reformulation of its fundamental concepts and methods can turn philosophy into a concrete or actual expression of a vivid consciousness) and equally from Martin Heidegger's vision upon philosophy as on-the-way-to (something) [*als Unterwegssein*], where to be on the way to something means to refuse to attribute a unique significance to your works and to accept the challenge of an initiating journey towards the basis (the core reason) of all thinking processes, of existence and of human identity, a basis that remained still unthought (and maybe even unexperienced as effective and affective ontological possibility) – *the first chapter of this thesis attempts to define the conceptual structure needed for such a perpetual becoming, by identifying in the „plasticity of the limit” (Gabriel Liiceanu) the ontological condition necessary for any process of construction of reality.* The chapter takes as starting points Hume's and Husserl's observations on the spaces of constitution as spaces of junction, of interweaving, and of formation of sense. These observations have opened a new epistemological and phenomenological perspective on the concept of limit and on those functionally-neutral areas which allow (in virtue of this neutrality) the phenomenalization of and the articulation of meaning. The chapter discusses the need for a flexible concept and for a creative assuming of the limit in the context of the need to secure the frames of identity in the *late* (Anthony Giddens ) and *liquid* (Zygmunt Bauman ) modernity – a period with a high destructuring potential. The chapter interprets this limit and these intermediary spaces as niche, and proposes a transdisciplinary vision on this niche based on Basarab Nocolescu's theories about the Hidden Third, a Hidden Third which plays the role of an interface between subject and object. Not having to do properly neither with the subject, nor with the object and not even with a possible synthesis or synesthesia between the two entities, the Hidden Third is an element with an unique functional feature, in that it only offers the possibility of a dialogue between antagonisms ( *it does not replace* nor synthesize them) . From this point of view, the Hidden Third is a hidden "accelerator" of functions and a „supplier" of perspectival spaces.

Situated on a different level of reality (in the transcendental, as Husserl would say), once emerged, this Hidden Third transmits new synthesized energy back to our usual level of reality (from which the projection of the antagonisms or of the subject and of object was performed in the first instance), thus resemantizing this level - that is, investing it with new meanings and reconfiguring and resuscitating its ontological dynamics. We are confronted here with a kind of web-structured determinism, which places the entities it connects and

coordinates in a dialogical situation, *sustaining the structural compatibility and the functional coordination within the complexly related architectonics*. Approached from the perspective of the Hidden Third, the niche becomes *a living environment of articulation* (of formation), or a „living” quality of the environment (we do not refer to an organic aspect of the environment but to a certain special feature of it, a feature that enables it to generate and maintain within a balanced formula, a common energetic space of phenomenal coagulation and intensification for the entities that enter into structural interactions). Once having arrived at this point of our argumentation, if we retake the Husserlian statement according to which „The predelineation itself, to be sure, is at all times imperfect; yet, with its *indeterminateness*, it has a *determinate structure*”, we (as citizens of a late trans-connected modernity) will read the above-mentioned Husserlian theory as an epistemological basis for *functional or structural specificities of the niche*, such as: *determinate indeterminacy* (Alfred Schutz), *systematic fault* (constitutive error) and *sustained incoherence* (David Bohm), *predicative uncertainty* (Humberto Maturana), *Unabgeschlossenheit* or the fundamental *unresolved openness* (Karl Popper), *the capacity of our consciousness to intend beyond itself* or *Mehrmeinung* (Husserl), *constitutive void or non-being that makes the Being possible* (Democrit), *constitutive remainder* (Heidegger and Baudrillard) *negotiable limit* and *indecision* (Gabriel Liiceanu), *state of openness* or *die Erschlossenheit* (Heidegger). All these are marks of *openness, elements that make all types of processes possible (processes mainly understood as evolution and adaptation) within the networks of systems that configure the social existence*. This chapter discusses at full these functional (and contextual) specificities of the niche in their main functional posture – that of *conditions of actualization* and, within the phenomenon of actualization, in their posture of functional premises for the alternation of the theme and horizon (Schütz), an alternation through which reality provides (assures) for itself a well ballanced dynamics between the natural attitude and the reflexive attitude.

To thematize what is implicit in existence, means above all to construct reality starting from a series of identifications – which identifications are not at all coincidentally seen by Humberto Maturana the incontestable „bricks”, with the help of which one builds and perpetuates his reality - “*the reality-creating distinctions*”; to thematize what is implicit means to bring into the foreground of consciousness new domains of existence and to put them in position of being valorized (that is converted from something implicit into something explicit, from something invisible into something visible, from something latent into something active, from horizon into a theme for reflection).

As with *non-separability* principle enunciated by Basarab Nicolescu, Schütz grafts his vision upon reality onto a unitary and dynamic model of reality: the mechanisms of reality can only function within a unitary formula ( a synthetic and integrated formula), in which *theme and horizon, implicit and explicit, and visible and invisible* condition and enable each other; in which the intentional bringing of the routine (of the typizations supported through induction, of the things passed on „autopilot”, of the things that function *instinctually* or in virtue of the „*natural attitude*”) into the thematic foreground and the (subsequent) pushing of what has been until now thematic (back) into the background are simultaneous processes *which moderate, enhance, control, condition and adjust each others' dynamics* (we could say, in a way somewhat similar to the *checks-and-balances* model of political distribution of power).

*Furthermore, this is the very formula of the functional equilibrium of our reality.* Thus, we can state that theme and horizon are each other's reservoir. By horizon we understand that which has melted into its own functionality or that which has been so well integrated that it is no longer felt as an effort aiming at structural adjustment. This type of functional integration is manifested concretely at the level of the *common sense* (on the vector *common sense - well-doingness - good faith - good mood as good layout, as good orientation or disposition* in the world which one inhabits [that is, an understanding of the dynamics and of the times of action and of reaction as well as of the downtimes]), at the level of the *typizations* (Luckmann and Berger - the notion of „typization” denoting the standardized way in which social actors pertain to their social environment , that is, the subjective image , at the level of the common sense, of the objective world), and at the level of the *induction* (in Hume 's view , an operation which starts in logic and then , as it gets stabilized , it „descends” into instinctualness, it passes on „autopilot” and it constitutes the functional, ontological and phenomenological basis for the methods involved in the construction of reality, as it assures the necessary fluency and a certain support [called in the literature „inductive probability”] for our habitual actions - otherwise , a constant problematization would block and would fragmentize unbearably the naturalness of the flow [flux] of reality). David Hume clearly understood the undeniable fallibility of this mode of reasoning, realizing that the reasoning itself is rather an epistemological „crutch” and a form of theorizing in which specific facts are used to establish a theory that explains the relationships between facts and allows very general predictions ( and therefore never sure ) of the outcome of future relationships. Because it works essentially with typologies, the induction will never be able to impose its conclusions at an ontological level, nor at an epistemological level and not even at a logical

level. In other words, the truth obtained by induction will always remain a way too general truth and always somehow „already falsified” in that it is hopelessly dependent on past experiences. Karl Popper’s critique of the inductive reasoning appears *at this very level* (Popper states that the tradition related to this way of looking at the dynamics of the world materialized into true fatal systems for mystifying and for concealing of reality at the expense of the creative power of individuals, systems reunited by him under the nefarious label of *historicism*).

The functional equilibrium of reality thus becomes directly dependent upon the *adjustment (the need of counterbalancing)* of a reality that functions on the basis of typizations, inductions and common sense *by means of processes of inquiring of that which exists*, such as *the phenomenological reduction (Husserl)*, *reflexivity (Giddens)*, *problematization (Linda Hutcheon)*, *the interrogation of limits and the experimentation of their plasticity (Liiceanu)*.

The idea that under-stretches this approach is the one according to which, *within the equation of the balanced functionality and of the fluency of reality, exactly when it attains its naturalness and its elegance it must be counterpointed by reflexivity (and respectively, the radically-phenomenological expressions of this reflexivity – the phenomenological reduction and the eidetic variation)*, *in order to maintain an equilibrium of consciousness, of apperception, of noticing in real time and space of the actual weight of the creativity of the human presence in the medium. The problematization thus becomes, under all its forms (reduction, reflexivity, and so on and so forth) an investigation of the representational consciousness of society, while thematizing equals with being permanently in search of new approaches, of new placements and of new perspectives with the purpose of consolidating and stabilizing an accumulative structure, a zone of relevance and a trans-formative identity. The equilibrium of reality is always realized through the involvement of neutral intermediary structures (of „buffer” structures), but with the role of an activator, of a stabilizer and also of a regulator – an area due to the very ontological condition of man, a condition marked by (as we have shown when we discussed the concept of „the schizophrenic-ego hypothesis” at Schütz) a constant split in the personality of man, in all the aspects and at all levels of this personality. This division, in her role as binder, connector, catalyst and filter, ensures a balance between rationality and instinctualness, as well as the theme-horizon variation.*

In doing so, this division (split) helps man to avoid both isolation in canonical rigid formula, as well as the deepening into the natural attitude (uncritical assimilation of reality). *The niche, in all its already discussed functional postures, it ensures ( it provides and it sustains ) through its functional neutrality the necessary space (a space having the role of a buffer; a zone where the rigidities can find their suited cadence because they can "slide within their enclosing frames") for the realization of the unity and of the structural and functional equilibrium of reality (a unity concretely expressed as meaning [sense]).* The niche is the space that connects the theme to the horizon, the natural attitude to the phenomenological reduction, the typizations to problematization and to innovation.

This paper therefore seeks to approach (to arrange within a solid basis a series of visions and programmes and to argumentatively consolidate this structure) in the context of late modernity ( liquid ) the conceptual prejudices about reality coming from the sphere of *ontology* (the reality is objectivity , independent object of knowledge ), from the sphere of *theology* (the reality is immediacy, fullness and intensity of present experience, divining intuition of the great harmonies ), from the sphere of *epistemology* (the reality is the reality of knowledge, and knowledge is the validity of the typizations, of the laws and of the concepts), and from that of *axiology* ( reality is value , relevance , appropriateness [adequacy], timing [synchronization] , coordination , coherence , cohesion ) and this paper is also an attempt to overcome these conceptual prejudices through a social phenomenology and through a hermeneutics of the limit and of the constitutive spaces or spaces of actualization (spaces of construction of reality).

This paper attempts to define *a model of a functional equilibrium of reality, more precisely it aims at a balance between typization and problematization and between universals* („the foreign private fund „, Liiceanu ) *and contingencies* - a model within which these pairs will conjugate their essences in synthetic-complementary formulas (a balance grasped by Gabriel Liiceanu in the oxymoronic formula of „gravitational freedom” ) for making the lived-world (Lebenswelt) viable (workable). With the help of these formulas people are trying to identify the correct frame of reference to which one must refer the problems of relativism and of the exclusivity of expertise in the contemporary systems of representation and signification. Any border or any limit (be it given, received or constructed) individualizes ( defines and outlines ) a self, it authenticates, recognizes and confirms a specificity, simultaneously profiling the aesthetics (the plasticity ) of the uniqueness of this

specificity, a specificity lived as a mode of establishing and as a measure of the value and of the personal virtue within the more general phenomenon of the struggle against homogeneity which reduces everything to unintentional, to pre-being, the unconscious, to zero (to the equality to itself), to uncreated (uncaused), to „minus function” (Wolfgang Iser).

The construction of reality is not possible in the absence of this ontological support meant to settle down (and secure) the constitutive processes within an individuality which, thus assisted to coagulate (to crystallize) into a functional unit, will finally be able to achieve that degree of trans-integration (web-structured determinism within the real time and the real space of coherence and of cohesion) called self-consciousness. This ontological support is the boundary in its functional posture of niche, of a niche interpreted trans-disciplinarily in specific functional situations: *determinate indeterminacy* (Alfred Schutz), *systematic fault* (constitutive error) and *sustained incoherence* (David Bohm), *predicative uncertainty* (Humberto Maturana), and so on and so forth. *The boundary is therefore an ontological given (datum) that precedes any of our choices while simultaneously enabling them all. The plasticity of the boundary (of the limit or border in the form [guise] of the up-mentioned spaces of possibilization [or possibilizing]) is the ontological condition for the construction of reality. The direction of evolutions (developments) in our contemporary society constitutes such a boundary. The role of our consciousness is (above all) to give a direction. The direction is by its very definition already a limitation, something imposed, but there is no freedom in the absence of this constitutive limitation. Freedom without direction is chaos. The direction is the element which individualizes and provides a sense (a meaning) for our freedom.*

*The lines of force of the manifestation of the boundary within the architectonics of existence are : the existence ( the first level), the awareness of the existence (the second level), the awareness of finitude (the third level). The construction of reality is done (achieved) according to these three lines. The first level of the border (the actual existence) is ensured through the house itself, which makes it possible the habitation of the environment ( Chapter II of this thesis ) . The second level of the border (the awareness of the existence – the self-consciousness [ individual or collective ]) is ensured through language which mediates any human construct, as a tool, as a medium, as a container and as a generator of knowledge, and which, at the level of consciousness performs three constitutive functions : externalization, objectivation and internalization (Chapter III of this thesis ) . The third level of the border (the awareness of finitude) is ensured through the public sphere, which, by the*

instrumentality of the virtuality of the spaces that it generates and maintains, it makes possible the historicization and thus the consensual construction and accreditation of the meaning of the dialectics involved in the human becoming (*Chapter IV of this thesis*).

*We will translate in this thesis the concept of „border” by the concept of house and we will detail all its phenomenological implications on three levels of the house: the house itself (1), the language (2) and the public sphere (3). We will permanently refer this approach (this understanding of the house) to the concept of limit (border) and to the phenomenological conditioning which takes place in virtue of this. More specifically, in Chapter II of this thesis we will address the proposed issues starting from the very first level of any representation and of any anthropic sedimentation: the house. We will analyze together with Heidegger and Lévinas the ways in which the walls of the house establish an intermediate space between the inner sphere of the subject and the external environment and will observe how this generic wall adjusts and balances the modulations and the variations of the existent (of that which is) inside the very unpredictable dynamics of its networks and of its rhythmicities of expansion and of structural definition (formation, sedimentation). Then, in Chapter III, following the Heidegger’s remark according to which „Language is the House of Being” – we will transmute this argumentative and interpretive effort from the empirical level of the house onto the level of language and of the complex dynamics involved in the process of the construction of identities in and through language. Once these two main levels of the edifice of constitution were completed along a functional and constitutive vector, we are able to move our attention or our focus ( in the last chapter of this thesis ) on the public sphere as a unifying and trans - subjective space of all edifices, institutions and formative discourses of humanity. The level of the public sphere is the third level (level III) of the house – and here we will analyze how the discourses and the representations of contemporary media configure the creative consciousness of the society (our research discusses the phenomenon of advertising and of propaganda, in the context of the structural similarity of these two "cultural manifestations").*

*Among the three levels of the limit or border ( or of the house ) as well as between typizations and reflexivity or between theme and horizon – there intervenes a methodological principle that under-stretches the approach of the present thesis - that of the relating of distinct entities. None of the elements referred to hitherto could operate in an isolated formula. Effectivity is reached only in synthetic, relational and consubstantial contexts and formulas, ( in units of identity, of substance and of essence). Relationism, as a principle of*

*unity applied to the argumentation of this paper supports the idea that none of the three levels of the house ( or of the border or limit ) that we will analyze ( the physical house [ the house itself ], the language and the public sphere) is not realized (achieved) individually but only and permanently through the others, through the collaboration, the conjunction, the coaction (cooperation) and the functional complementarity with the other two levels. The house as a social phenomenon is always a synthetic, a complementary and a functional formula.*

In what concerns the dialectic relationism - relativism, quoting Karl Mannheim, we could say that *to replace the universal truth with a relational truth (on the line of utopia) and, respectively, to replace the obsession with the existential rooting in contexts with the availability for an existential congruence of contexts and even through these contexts (on the line of ideology ), means to step on the path of relationism - to adopt that particular understanding of reality that is able to make the synthesis between ideology and utopia, between theory and practice and that is able to create a new dynamics in the frameworks of history ( a dynamics called by Mannheim „existential congruence”- as an alternative to the previous utopian version of the „universal transcendence”).*

In terms of the theories of late modernity, the social role of the representational mechanisms put in relation within a web-structured determinism has a specific designation: *to position (to situate) the subjectivity*. A properly positioned subjectivity will give rise to a better individualized social agent - that is to a social agent endowed with a coordinated, a synchronized, a sustained and a determined at the structural level („*structure-determined*” and „*structure-understood*” in Maturana’s terms ) consciousness and identity – according to the equilibrium of the dynamics between universals and contextual specificities. The expressivity or the force of projection, of representation or of signification are directly proportional to the compatibility of the self with this equilibrium of the dynamics between universals and contextual specificities.

The following three chapters of the present thesis are intended to highlight, *in concrete instances* (affective and effective), within the framework of the three levels of the plasticity of the border or of the limit (the house, the language and the public sphere), the potential of actualization offered by *the functional specificities of the niche* which allow for the equilibrium between the theme and the horizon, between typization and problematization and between the universal and the contingent.

*Due to the force of nuancing and of covering of these functional specificities of the niche, the dependency on contexts of the representations and of the visions (we understand the representations as being relative to a specific conceptual scheme, to a theoretical frame of reference , to a paradigm, to a form of life , of society and of culture) - will never be a total one, so as to be able to restrict the combinatory or the metamorphic area of the idea, of the vision or of the representation, or to be able to limit in any way its evolution (the free variation of meaning). In other words , due to the above-mentioned functional specificities , the paradigm, the scheme, the concept or the context will never be able to exhaust the potential of an idea , of a vision or of a representation - and that is why "the recognition of the relativity of ideas does not mean relativism " (Andrei Marga ).*

In the following paragraphs we offer a very succinct overview of the following three chapters of this thesis.

*Chapter II: The social phenomenology of the border (of the limit or of the niche with its already mentioned functional specificities - determinate indeterminacy, systematic fault, constitutive error, sustained incoherence, predicative uncertainty, constitutive void, state of openness and so on and so forth) is applied in this chapter to a specific transcendent entity – the house. This represents a thoroughgoing study of the social phenomenology of the border started in Chapter I and it constitutes an attempt to understand the existent (that which is) in the complexity of the dynamics of its existence as a creator-of-reality subject. For Heidegger, man is always already in the world, already there (he exists in that world in „a state of thrownness” [Geworfenheit] before having realized it properly): Da - sein („Da” in German means " there”). The facticity that the Dasein exerts on the world is possible due to the existence of a space o movement, of an „ opening” (as Heidegger calls it ) - *all the constitutive moments of man as fact-of-being-in-the-world ( the understanding , the affective situation , the fall, the discourse )* are modes (modalities) of the state of openness of the world .*

*When man expresses himself, or when he takes some action, he reveals a specific „there”, that is a „there” bound however in a significant way to the historical and cultural situation and to the environment in which the agent lives, and shaped by the goals related to these latter elements. This is the facticity of the Dasein (Faktizität). Man defines himself (in the sense that he becomes real and visible to himself) and perfects an identity for himself with each and every fact of his – this is what makes him be radically different from simple factual occurrence (or factuality ) of a mineral for example . Although the Dasein is*

characterized by facticity and by thrownness ( Faktizität und Geworfenheit ), Heidegger does not hesitate to point out that he is not in an equally natural manner („by itself”) characterized by and essence. *The essence* (das Wesen des Daseins) comes out of the way and out of the types of relationships that man develop between him and the Welt, between him and the objects and the living creatures in the Welt. In other words, out of existence. In existence is to be found the essence of Dasein, in the fact of being active in the world in which he lives ("In-der-Welt-sein"). The climax of this active to-be-active-in-the-world occurs when Dasein gains a perspective on the Sein (on the Being).

*As Emmanuel Lévinas very well counterpoints, this type of opening is still an unsafe one and the Dasein needs an amortizing element, a protective membrane, a buffer zone between him and the Welt (namely, a house - whose phenomenology we have detailed at large in this chapter). The fall, the (burning) anxiety, the concern (Sorge) and the fear damage the authenticity of the Dasein because when he is seized with them, the Dasein estranges himself from himself, falls into a destructuring existential imbalance and ends up in alienating himself. The construction of reality by man begins with the transformation of his anxiety into fear, that is with the systematization and with the relationing (networking) of the „raw” energies of anxiety within a project of the self, within an apperception („self-consciousness”). Later refined ( acknowledged , analyzed and assimilated up to the last consequences) in fright, terror and horror, the fear ( as an over- determination of anxiety ) becomes a principle used in setting reality in order, in consolidating (strengthening) the civil society and in preventing the „ slippages” (back) into inhuman and into bestiality. This „project of the self” can not be achieved but in an area of safe refuge – the house. The void ( „the otherness” , „the alterity”) which can be a space of movement for us but which can just as well engulf us is therefore „the Dreadful determined phenomenally in its quality of Dreadfull.”*

Lévinas proposes here the transition from the Husserlian transcendental subjectivism to a trans-subjectivism within which the environment disquiets [Sorge] the individual primarily as a first and most immediate other. *Through the house one can not possess the unpossessable ( the other / the alterity par excellence ) but he can inhabit it.* Lévinas argues that only with the help of a buffer zone between man and the element, this man can enjoy the element. This buffer area (the house) is the equivalent of the human skin, at the level of the environment ( as a protective layer and as a surface of projection and of exchanges ). „House” appears here only as a generic title, as a standard-symbol - this (the house ) standing for the

entire range of phenomena related to *the transformation of the environment into a livable space*: the phenomenon of the dwelling-house per se, the phenomenon of the stronghold ( of the polis ), the phenomenon of the city, the phenomenon of the housing complexes and so on and so forth. *We can inhabit the environment and master the fury and the unpredictability of the undetermined through this buffer zone represented by this house.* The house is a concrete projection at the level of the transcendent (with the value of a buffer zone and of a protective and selective membrane ) of the space of delimitation (definition, separation) from amongst the faculties of knowledge – a space that makes possible the trans-dynamics of these faculties (sensibility, imagination, intellect). The Kantian principle of *separation of faculties* belongs therefore to a mobile and adaptable border amongst faculties – *a border able to provide a pluralistic and pragmatic individuation to each and every faculty and in the meanwhile a space of motion that is also understood as a space of expression or of projection.* As Virgil Ciomoş shows, we cannot simply reduce the Kantian experience to that of a simple static assuming of the limit; once the limit is assumed ( *em-peiria* ), it allows us, nevertheless, a certain architectonic 'passage' or overcoming ( *ex-perientia* ). The transition occurs, however, (and so to speak) only as long as we are *at*, or better, *in* the limit, meaning exactly in full passage. For just as long as we are in the limit we can overcome it. Or the other way around: we can „overcome” the limit solely by remaining, in some way, „inside” it. Therefore being modern, does not mean to live beyond the limit – in a sort of project thrown constantly towards the future – but, on the contrary, it means living at (in the) limit (also with the exaggerated sense of „on the edge”), with all the perils, but also with all the promises which issue from here. Living in the limit in the context of this second chapter means to inhabit a house and to act creatively upon the environment by means of this house. *The one who does not achieve firstly this quality of the „skin” meant to further ensure an ideal contact with the outer medium, cannot survive in the environment. The discourse of the house is perhaps the most harsh critique of the Heideggerian concept of Geworfenheit: „no shelter, no rest at house, this is the absurd world of the Geworfenheit “(Lévinas).* The house is in this context a safety psychological pillar (for sustaining the identity and the structure of the personality); a constant and a subconscious guarantee for the psychic equilibrium necessary before any incursion in the Welt.

*Contemplated in safety – from the window of the house, the medium/the element becomes bearable and even pleasant.* In the absence of this buffer zone (represented by the house), of this protective space, the man fully experiences the contact with the real, with the

hostility of the Welt (as it would feel it an astronaut on the moon remained suddenly without a costume): “The element in which I dwell exists at the border of a night.” (Lévinas). Having this type of privileged access to / in the real, the man roots himself in the reality and *becomes creator of a world*: “The man maintains itself in the world as coming to himself from a private territory, from a house, where he can withdraw at any moment (...) Simultaneously in and out, he walks towards the outside from an intimacy” (Lévinas). In this way the house becomes a principle of the non-separability between the man and the Welt. *Through the agency of the house* the man gains the capacity to activate the medium to his own advantage – meaning to actually put to work the formulas discussed in *Chapter I (the determinate indeterminacy of the world, the systematic fault and the sustained incoherence, the predicative uncertainty and so on and so forth)*.

Thus regarded, the house becomes the necessary premise and therewith the catalyst for all the phenomena related to awareness (the phenomenological reduction, apperception, recollection), *to representation and to signification. Through the protection that it offers to the human agent the house is at the same time a generator of time. We have analyzed in this second chapter of the thesis the concept of „Haus” and not the concept of „Heim”, because Heidegger does not say about the language that it would already be a home of the Being, but on the contrary, Heidegger argues that the language is the house (Haus) of Being - therefore a house transformable only ulteriorly, through the creative effort of the human, into a „home”, into a Heim.*

*Chapter III:* This chapter represents a shift in the phenomenological investigation which moves from the space of the transcendent to that of the transcendental – shift accomplished within the perspective of the Heideggerian maxim according to which „Language is the House of Being” („Die Sprache ist das Haus des Seins”).

The chapter discusses *the contingency as it appears at Richard Rorty* (there are no essences nor any transcendental instance, everything is realized through the combinational ingenuity of the communities), *the contingency as it appears at Humberto Maturana* (the sense of any behavior is not related to the characteristics of the processes which produce it and not even to the structural specificities of the anatomical conditions of the agents involved in this process, but to *the circumstances* in which the respective sense appears [occurs]; the cognitive field is the field of the *adequate* actions [adapted to the context] through consensual

coordination in language; *the language is a meta-phenomenal domain of the structural compatibilizations [To language is to interact structurally]*), *the contingency at Berger and Luckmann* (objectivation, objectivization, sedimentation, interiorization, identification), and *the contingency at Ludwig Wittgenstein* (the understanding is strictly related to the context in which a language game unfolds and to the rules that govern it; the rules are linguistic agreements; consensuses, a general practice, a custom inside a community; following a rule is in fact a habitual practice imposed by the linguistic community to which the participants to the conversation belong to; there are a number of public criteria of the rule-following process, which force the language to assume a public character: the understanding of an expression relies in being acquainted with the use of the expression within the varieties of the language games where it appears).

The chapter attempts an overcoming of the understanding of language as a contingent manifestations by means of a phenomenological model within which *the language* is seen as realizing a trans-integrations and a trans-functional synthesis between the internal world of the individual and the external medium, while posing these two mediums in a symbiotic situation (a pragmatic one) of viability (operationality) and sense. The symmetry of the two mediums is the expression of their functional equilibrium and it mirrors the quality of their synthesis. Due to this functional equilibrium the “outer” real corresponds (is translated in terms of the ) to the “inner” reality. Thus, the language transcends all the dichotomies of the inner-outer type and realizes the quality and the viability of the medium of creation (transposal, transposition) through a web-structured determinism capable to translate simultaneously in both directions.

The main consequence of this trans-integrated simultaneous translation (meaning a translation which brings together, in a functional manner, all the mediums from which it was projected and those towards which it was directed to) is the *socialization* – meaning *the internalization* of the society’s norms on the basis of some mechanisms of recognitions and understanding based on consensus.

*The language ensures the socialization (accomplishes in real time and in real space) and through this the functional integration of the ego – the coherence, the cohesion and the operational continuity of the ego with the others by way of a live medium of interaction and of structural coupling.* By realizing this quality of the medium, the language enhances the social functionality by generalizing the possibilities of collaboration, implication and efficiency and at the same time *it makes flexible the identity*, constantly enlarging its adaptive potential.

The chapter represents an attempt of a *structural, a conceptual and a phenomenal overcoming of the blockages of relativism and of structuralism* towards a reception theory (Roland Barthes) and towards a phenomenological model based of description as valorization (thematization, actualization) of the transcendental potential of language. In this sense we have approached *description from a neo-pragmatic perspective (Nelson Goodman), from a phenomenological perspective (Husserl - with a special focus of the noetic-noematic correlation) and from an epistemological perspective (Maturana)*.

The descriptions provided by the phenomenology are, in our vision, the most appropriate approaches in order to attain the understanding of the consciousness and of the world in which we live. And, *to understand*, as Elisabeth Ströker shows *is to ask oneself* “how is it that our knowledge arrives at possessing the validity attributed to it, and what does the discussion about their validity and truth means?” (which is the stake of their being discussed). Knowledge is in its phenomenal essence (and before being any other thing) a form of explaining (Maturana), of unraveling, of elucidation, of capturing in terms of the diversity of the possibilities which the world offers. For this reason, the criteria of acceptability (the legitimations), of integration and of typization on the basis of which this world functions are all effects and concretizations *in vivo* of the explicative capacities of a culture (society). The explanations are a direct expression of the human intentionality in its desire to fundament itself epistemologically. The explanations agglutinate in legitimations and in typizations.

Within the theories regarding the contingency of language, we have insisted upon Maturana’s vision and, respectively, upon the vision of Berger and Luckmann.

In his turn Maturana names the typizations „recursive consensual coordination” and affirms about the descriptions on the basis of which they were constructed that they do not replace from a functional point of view the experience which they manage to fix in terms, but that they „merely” offer a foundation (an epistemological basis) for the development of the ideas broadcasted in a society by means of subsequent and consequent descriptions; and that they ensure, through their capacity of capturing in terms at the level of the nuances and through their capacity of coordination, an operational coherence between different temporal or/and concentual levels of the descriptively assimilated instances.

Both the legitimations and the typizations are built and maintained in and through language. Two notions demand to be discussed here (in the case of Berger & Luckmann): the *objectivation and the objectivization*. Where the *objectivation* represents the active exteriorization of the human intentionality, the process which allows the human activities to

materialize in obvious, palpable products, characterized by objectivity - *the objectivization* represents the properly said result of the objectivation, of the exteriorization (meaning the object, the product, the purpose, the idea of the activity).

At the level of the *objectivation and of the objectivization*, the language trans-integrates or, in Luckmann and Berger's terminology, it "sediments". The meaning is related to this trans-circulation of the information and to its capacity to fuse/merge into a basis or a generative and integrating nucleus. This trans-circulation and trans-integration is possible because the sedimentation is inter- and trans-subjective, being accomplished by way of a common system of signals (the language) which makes an integrated common whole with its users (*being the very substance of the structural-synthetic couplings*). Thanks to this relation of trans-conditioning, "*the product acts upon its producer*" – because a *complete and synthetic circulation* of information is assured (from a temporal and spatial point of view). Thus and so, as in an integrated circuit (or as in a web-structured determinism) - "(...) the exteriorization and the objectivation are moments of a dialectic process in continuous unfolding and the third moment of this process is the internalization, through which the objectified social world is re-projected, reflected in the consciousness (Berger and Luckmann)."

The objectivation in a system of consensual signals gives to the sedimentations their socio-pragmatic dimension. In the absence of this system with a generalized functionality, the inter-subjectivity cannot become a trans-subjectivity capable to objectify the cultural inheritance. The objectivation transposed in objectivizations or, in other words, the synthetic and trans-conditioning relation between the objectivation (the act) and the objectivization (the product) is the formula through which the man constructs his reality (within which the man acts upon his products to the same extent in which his products act upon him – both actions being realized by way of language and being materialized in a synthetic trans-functional unity - the related society that Manheim talks about): "It is important to take into consideration the fact that the objectivity of the institutional world, no matter how massive it may seem to the individual, is an objectivity constructed, produced by the man. The process by which the products realized through the human activities gain the character of objectivity is the objectivation." (Berger și Luckmann)

*As Berger and Luckmann show, the internalization of the values and of the norms of a society is made by means of language, and the internalization attracts the identification. The legitimation, although it can be made through various rituals, traditions and customs is always*

translated, inevitably into language, or, in other words, nothing can be activated without it having an adequate correspondent in language, a correspondent capable to permanently contextualize (adapt) the legitimating mechanism (through modifications and semantic adjustments inside the discourse): - “The language is the one that operates the fundamental superposing of the logic over the objectified social world. The edifice of legitimation is built on the basis of the language and it uses the language as main instrument.” (Berger și Luckmann) *That is to say, there is no such a thing such as an empirical given to which humanity simply connects by means of linguistic equivalents, but there is an empirical basis which the subject infuses with his own creative energy.*

*In the same way as the sense is actually always an agreement (a consensus), the self-consciousness, far from being a circumscribed zone in the brain, it is always a way of co-existence – a social phenomenon of active integration (sustained at all the levels of the life through language – as consensual force of coordination).*

Intentionality, exteriorization, objectivation, and by means of legitimations – the internalization, all these processual trans-integrated moments equate (in the case in which they form a trans-integrated circuit) with the man’s ability to permanently adapt his reality and to construct it according to the context.

*In its second part the chapter contains a set of argumentations with regard to the transcendental origin of the language’s force of expressivity.* If in the first part of this chapter we have detailed the strictly delimited functions of the language as Roman Jakobson understood them, in this second part of this chapter we will walk on the path opened to us by Wilhelm Von Humboldt who suggested in his time that the linguist *cannot sin more than in the moments in which he arrives at believing that, listing the lexical elements and the grammatical rules, he manages to characterize the language in his fundamental data:* “The dissection of language into words and rules of usage is nothing but a dead artifice of descriptive operations.” (Humboldt).

*The essence of the language does not exhaust itself in the fact of being a means of communication, as it gives the possibility of being situated in the vortex of the opening of the humans towards the revelation of the Being. The revelation of the Being is accomplished in the passage from potency into act by means of language.*

The force of the language comes from the fact that it sends towards (comes from and aims at) other levels of reality which are retrievable and accessible only at the level of the language, where it would always leave precious traces.

On the path of these “traces”, other levels of reality (and of energy as well) can be tracked, followed, retraced or intuited on the entire magnitude of their functional span (of their power of configuration and of fertilization of the reality of the transcendent).

The idea attains its most systematized form in the philosophy of Kant where it is affirmed for the first time in an explicit manner *that the principle or the idea* (the transcendental one) of a discourse is never in that discourse (better said the living essence of the language descends or raises towards us from a place that does not belong to us).

The principle of a discourse is never in the collection of schematizations which compile and complete a discourse (it is not, in other words, in the determined system of the respective discourse) *but it is always in the transcendental possibility of that discourse.*

A functional whole is articulated and not “agglomerated” – articulated from the perspective of a transcendental idea. *In order to actualize an idea, a concept, the man needs a scheme. Any type of access from the transcendent to an idea from the transcendental is mediated by a scheme: the role of the language is that of a living surface (a living medium) of translation and adaptation. The language becomes thus a catalyst and a trans-coagulator of the syntheses and of the sense – because, as we have already stated, at least for those uninitiated in other extra-senzorial techniques, there is no direct access to the concept, to the idea from the transcendental.*

Because it is always mediated by a scheme or another (constantly assumed partially or fragmentarily), *the transcendental idea will never transpose itself entirely* (without any remainder) in the transcendent. *The niche or the constitutive remainder* hinders (prevents) a “total actualization” of the concept (of the transcendental idea) and in the same time it becomes the very functional principle of the variation, of the change and of the diversity – the role of the language being that of fertilizing continuously the empty space (the free space) ensured by this constitutive remainder. On the other hand, as Hillis Miller shows, within *the lecture, we must pursue not the reappraisal of an intention or the reconstitution of it but the reassuming on new coordinates of the way of functioning which made from the respective text an example concerning how the Law of Being can be translated into the language of our daily reality (in George Steiner’s metaphor - in the manner in which an opaque glass made transparent).*

*Exactly at this point appears the interest of phenomenology for institution (and for instituting) – and the consciousness of the fact that the principle of any instituting does not rest in that very instituting, but in that which has made possible the instituting (the principle of instituting is a transcendental one par excellence). Thus the idea cannot be constructed in*

*the transcendent (although it can become more and more complex and clearer – it will never attain a perfection which could allow it to close [in a catastrophic way for the horizon of knowledge] the series of schematizing) but through the agency of a series of schematizations grafted or spliced on that which Heidegger called the Gelassenheit – meaning the acceptance of the living force of the dialogue.*

In the absence of the synthetically functional analogues in the language, the individual would be obliged that every time he uses (puts to work) an idea to rebuild/to reconstitute the entire initial process of formation of that idea – such a constructivist handicap would signify on the one hand a very big repetition/redundancy (which would practically consume the psychic energy necessary for the development of an idea), and on the other hand the impossibility to stabilize anything, to maintain in knowledge an understood phenomenal territory (decrypted). Berger and Luckmann call this process “*systematic familiarization*”.

*The problem of communication and of the understanding is a problem of usage and of synchronization with careful consideration of the two functional pillars (generative pillars) to which the language stands connected: the transcendent and the transcendental. Inclusively for Kant to think equaled with to name something – meaning, to recuperate the transcendental horizon (any word is equal with the distance that separates us from the transcendental).*

In the last part of the chapter, along with Roland Barthes, Roman Ingarden and Wolfgang Iser we will observe how the crevice, the interstice or the niche become places of the state of opening of any text or of any socially accredited discourse; the place of an intended ambiguity of a text and thus of the maximum of availability at the level of the freedom of creation: *text=relief in formation=living relief= “proliferation of the significant”*.

The niche functions as a hidden third and falsifies constantly the destruction comprehended as a suffocating completeness and thus an enclosure (a hermetical one) of the sense and of the structures, through the trans-position which it operates, and through the fact that it constantly makes possible the paradox - as expression of the functional unity between contraries. The force of the language (materialized in the creative force of the critical spirit) becomes therefore the force for opening a “gap” or a space of movement in any monolithic structure – a niche as a trans-contextual place where occur the transfers and the authentic couplings of energies and meanings and where the society (and the reality in general) manages to obtain the maximum expression of its force of regeneration (and alike, that of the reinvention through creation).

*This chapter has thus attempted an overcoming of the formalism of the structuralist vision through a synthetic-unitary and functional vision of phenomenological and pragmatic inspiration guided by the belief according to which the humanity of the man depends on the capacity to make intelligible the Being through language.*

*Any entity which could have been brought into the dialogue is a certain presence, it exists – the existence of something which has been brought into the dialogue can under no circumstance be denied or ignored.*

*The accessibility* (the transformation by means of language of the experience into a general object accessible to knowledge; in an object which can be incorporated in a large body of traditions) is the most important consequence of this trans-temporal and trans-spatial synthesis operated by and through the language. *The accessibility* also signifies in the linguistic context the possibility of the indirect experiences (by reading one can experiment things, feelings or geographical areas to which, otherwise, one could not have access to) and of the indirect relevances.

The symmetry and the coordination between the external world and its understanding in the internal sphere of the individual - symmetry expressed in the viability, in the creative power or in the efficiency of the social agent – is a matter of continuous adaptation by way of translation into the language. The symmetry between the objective reality and the subjective one is never a static state of affairs, given once and for all. It must be produced and reproduced permanently *in actu*. In other words, the relation between *the individual and the objective* social world is a continuous act of equilibrating the instances. The internalization of the medium through language is a continuous adaptation, adjustment or balancing of the identity according to disruptive factors: “This internalization of society, of identity and of reality is not however given once and for all. The socialization is never complete and it never ceases.” (Berger și Luckmann) The niche and the plasticity of the border are the expression of this inexhaustible reservoir of sense.

*Chapter IV:* The communicative potential and the openness of the contemporary societies reach their effective expression (their actual words), their cultural legitimacy and their justification *in the public sphere: virtual house of all houses, of all languages and of all discourses*. The constructive potential of the modern society is due to a special property of the public sphere, namely its ubiquitous virtuality - its ability to transcend contexts and to assimilate them properly within the dynamics of our contemporary progress. The public

sphere is the permeable and selective membrane par excellence, this being the actual place of all *cultural negotiations* of concepts and of operations (relations materialized in consensus, in legitimacy and in innovation) and the living link between institutions and the public. This is the strength and the continuity of a discursive structure able to transcend the contextual specificities and to give a truly global and synthetically trans-integrated and trans-represented form (at the level of the functions of filtering and of balancing) to the house of humans [Haus] as well as to the house of Being [Sprache]. Due to this trans-contextual virtuality of the public sphere in its position of a zone of maximum functionality of all the phenomena of inter-mediation, filtering, balancing and adjustment, *we can no longer speak of a strictly determinate place of the critical spirit but of a non-place of this critical spirit*. Within the public sphere the transcendent house [that of humans] and the transcendental house [that of the Being ] build together *a home*. Although when discussing the public sphere Habermas discusses particular instances of it – he speaks about the development of the public postal service, of the print culture and of serials – the public sphere is far from being an area locatable in specific instances; on the contrary, it is a trans-space whose potential cannot be exhausted in an institutional setting or another, nor can it be reduced to a scheme or to a model of legitimation and implementation. *On the contrary, the public sphere designates a complex network of references, of relationings and of legitimations, a network configured by some firm ontological landmarks (grafted on a „gravitational freedom” as Liiceanu sees the issue) and underlain only in a conscious participatory way (a reflective and proactive way).*

The chapter discusses *the perversion of the concept of publicity and the falsification of the public sphere as a result of the transformation of the journalism of opinion into a commercial media and of the transformation of advertising into propaganda. Thus, we can say that the political economy was realized (achieved) literally*. Among the causes of this perversion we can recall *the degradation of the public role of parliament from a live forum to an abstract institution, an institution tributary to a predetermined proceduralism, and the depletion and the decay of the message of public discourses (of their fund) into their spectacular dimension (into their shape).*

*The ultimate consequence of this reality is that this public sedated information loses its access to the decision-making processes within the institutions, institutions that get more and more centralized and hermetic while simultaneously nailing the citizen in the position of an unconditional consumer who assimilates according to an input-output system: „a maximum of public character but very little opinion.”(Habermas) Thus, the public sphere*

loses its transparency and it veers decisively towards „the sinister bastard ” (Baudrillard) of publicity - *the propaganda, or the marketing and the commercialization (merchandising) of idea-forces, of people and of political parties accompanied by their “trademark image.”*

Thus, the form of publicity was imposed and developed at the expense of all other languages, as an increasingly neutral rhetoric, equivalent, without affects, like an „asyntactic nebula ”. (Jean Baudrillard). Along with this exacerbation of publicity (of advertising) we can speak of a dictatorship of the image over the word (idea detailed by Giovanni Sartori, in his *Homo Videns, Television and Post-thinking*) and we can also observe that the largest loss (and certainly the most painful fracture in the European culture) registered with the collapse of the public role of logocentrism is the warmth of the privacy between the individual and *his reality* ( a reality made up of the others, the environment, the networks of signification and of legitimation, and so on and so forth).

The tendency to occupy in an abusive way ( intrusively and with a „passion” and with an intractability which does not belong or relate to any consciousness of vocation but only to a raw political ambition ) the space of the literary public sphere ("which once went together with the configuring subjectivity within the intimate sphere of the bourgeois family") has degenerated into an „intimacy of reflectors” in which Habermas sees „the key towards a disinternalization of the declared interiority . " We will interpret this spotlight at the end of this study as an evil solvent of all substantialities ( something similar to the rain in Bacovia’s poetry ): *the walls of the house of Being ( the language ) disintegrate, decay, rot and crumble, leaving the humans without a buffer zone ( with the role of permeable and selective membrane) between them and the corrosive hostility and the environment.*

In the absence of a real quality of this protective membrane that allows the human intervention in the environment and generally the habitation in an environment ( the habitation implies an intimacy that is materializing as a leisure favoring constitutive operations such as aperception, phenomenological reduction or reflexivity ), the human agent sees himself faced with the impossibility to act upon the environment in a constitutive way - in other words, he sees himself in the impossibility to fulfill his destiny and purpose(meaning in life) in and through creation, *and a human agent who cannot express himself creatively is an entity on its way to „disontologizing”.*

Regarding the idea of niche and of plasticity of the border as an epistemological principle of the open societies ( in their relationship with propaganda ) – one must add that the

principle of the exclusivity of representation is the expression of the total (itarian) understanding of the nature through culture, and that a totalitarian understanding is an understanding which does not allow (admit) the constitutive remainder and thus nor the human capacity to build a reality in the form of an open society (Karl Popper- *Unabgeschlossenheit*) exploiting a *trans-contextual space of motion* ( exploiting this space within a synthetic and trans-integrated vision of reality which includes the consciousness of the *gravitational condition of freedom* detailed by Gabriel Liiceanu ) .

Considering all these aspects , we can conclude that the possibility of building reality depends on a functional equilibrium between theme and horizon, between natural attitude and reflexivity, between typization and problematization and, of course, it also depends on the functional equilibrium (materialized in complementarity, in mutual conditioning and coordination) between a work ( *Werk* ) and the activity that gave rise to that work ( *Tätigkeit* ) - Humboldt, or, if we are to use two famous Aristotelian terms, it depends on the equilibrium between *ergon* ( work totally done or a ready made thing) and *energeia* ( perpetual creative activity ).

*By means of this mobile nature of the border or of the niche (expressed, inter alia in the trans - contextual availability of the language) the human agents become creators of reality.*

*The subject has to perform both an act of cognition, as well as an act of constitution - a constitution understood as self-knowledge through (creative) externalization in an outer „environment ”. To adapt, in the case of our human society ( to understand the dynamics of the environment in which the man lives and to adapt to this environment by intervening in the mechanisms of conditioning of that dynamics or simply by placing oneself on the functional orbit of the environment) is to have the power to raise the individual at the level of the universal: „For everything that really matters in philosophy, and perhaps in culture as well, is not so much to be able to reach the universal and the law, as it is to be able to elevate the particular at the level of the universal and of the law ( Constantin Noica )”.*

## Bibliography:

### *Individual books:*

Aldén, Ann, *Religion in Dialogue with Late Modern Society* (A Constructive Contribution to a Christian Spirituality Informed by Buddhist-Christian Encounters), Peter Lang GmbH, Europäischer Verlager Wissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main 2006.

Alexander, Jeffrey C., *Modern, Anti, Post and Neo: How Social Theories Have Tried to Understand the « New World » of « Our Time »*, în “Zeitschrift für Soziologie”, Ig. 23, Heft 3, 1994, p. 66, citat în Andrei Marga, *Cotitura Culturală*, editura citată.

Adorno, Theodor, „Kulturindustrie” din *Dialectik der Aufklärung*, citat în Habermas, *Sfera Publică*.

Aristotle, *De Partibus Animalium (On the Parts of Animals)*, IV, xii, 694b; 13.

Armstrong, D.M., (*Challis Professor of Philosophy, University of Sidney*), *A Theory of Universals (Universals & Scientific Realism, Volume II)* Cambridge University Press, London, 1978.

Austin, J. L., *How to do things with words*, second edition, J. O. Urmson, and Marina Sbisa Editors, President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1975.

Bakunin, Mihail, *Dumnezeu și Statul (God and the State)*, On-line edition available at <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/godstate/index.htm>, consulted on 21.03.2008, 16:12 p.m.

Balaci, Anca, *Mic Dicționar Mitologic Greco-Roman (Small Greek and Roman Dictionary)*, Ed.Mondero, Bucuresti, 1997.

Balint, Michael, *Thrills and Regressions*, Hogarth, London, 1959.

Barthes, Roland, *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes*, translated by Richard Howard, New York, Hill & Wang Publishing, 1977.

Barthes, Roland, *Plăcerea textului (The Pleasure of the Text)*, Editura Echinoc, Cluj, traducere de Marian Papahangi, 1994.

Barthes, Roland, *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1972.

Barthes, Roland, *S/Z*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1970.

Barthes, Roland, *Critique et vérité*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1966.

Barthes, Roland, *Leçon*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1978.

Barthes, Roland, *La chambre Claire*, Paris, Gallimard-Seuil, 1980.

Baudrillard, Jean, *Simulacra and Simulation*, publicat în franceza de Edition Galike 1981, tradusa de Sheila Faria Glaser, Ed. The University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 1994.

Barglow, Raymond, *The Crisis of the Self in the Age of Information, Computers, dreams and dolphins* (London and New York, Routledge, 1994.

Bauman, Zygmunt, *Postmodern Ethics*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 1993.

Bawden, Henry Heath, *The principles of pragmatism: a philosophical interpretation of experience*, Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press Cambridge, Boston and New York, 1910.

Beck, Ulrich, *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne* Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 1986.

Beneviste, E., „*Problèmes de linguistique générale*”, Gallimard, Paris, 1966, citat în Andrei Pleșu, *Limba Păsărilor*.

Benjamin, Walter, *Iluminări (Illuminations)*, Editura Idea Design & Print, Colectia „Balkon“, Cluj-Napoca, 2002, traducere de Catrinel Pleșu; notă biografică de Friedrich Podszus.

Berger, Peter L., Thomas Luckmann, *Construcția Socială a Realității (The Social Construction of Reality)*, București, editura Art, traducerea de Alex Butucelea, 2008.

Berger, Peter, and Luckmann, Th., *The Social Construction of Reality*, Garden City, Anchor Books, New York, 1966.

Bernstein, Richard, *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1983, citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Blanchot, Maurice, *The Infinite Conversation*, translation and foreword by Susan Hanson, Theory and History of Literature, volume 82, Published by the University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Bohm, David, *Thought as System* (Transcription of a seminar held in Ojai, California from 31 November to 2 December 1990).

Brandt, Robert B., *Richard Rorty and his Critics*, Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Burghin, Victor, *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, pp.163-164, citat în Linda Hutcheon, *Politica postmodernismului*.

Caillois, Roger, « Les themes fondamentaux de J. L. Borges », Cahiers de L'Herne, n° Spécial « Jorge Luis Borges », Paris, Éds. de L'Herne, 1981 (1<sup>re</sup> éd., 1964).

Caponigri, A., Robert, *Time and Idea – The Theory of History in Giambattista Vico* p. 174, from Chapter IX: Poetry, Myth and Language, first published in 1953 by Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London, First Paperback edition (the present one) published in 1968 by University of Notre Dame Press Notre Dame/London.

Câmpeanu, Emil, Mircea Șerban, Marius Abrudan, *Neurologie clinică (Clinical Neurology), volumul III*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1980.

Ciomoș, Virgil, *Conștiință și Schimbare în Critica Rațiunii Pure, o perspectivă arhitectonică asupra kantianismului (Consciousness and Change in the Critique of Pure Reason, an architectural perspective on Kantianism)*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2006.

Ciomoș, Virgil, *Etre(s) de passage*, în Avant Propos, Editura Zeta Books, Bucharest, 2008.

Cocteau, Jean, *Opium Jurnalul unei dezintoxicări (Opium, the diary of a detoxification)*, Editura Art, traducerea Luminița Brăileanu, București 2007.

Copoeru, Ion, *Structuri ale Constituirii (Structures of the constituting)*, Ed. Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.

Copoeru, Ion, *Aparență și sens (Repere ale fenomenologiei constitutive) - Appearance and meaning ( Highlights of the constitutive phenomenology)*, Editura Dacia, Cluj Napoca, 2000.

Coseriu, Eugenio, El lenguaje y la comprensión de la existencia del hombre actual, în *El hombre y su lenguaje. Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística* (segunda edición, revisada), Editorial Gredos, Madrid, 1991.

Crăiuțu, Aurelian, explanatory notes in his translation of the Cartesian Meditations, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1994.

Cunningham, Suzanne *Language and the Phenomenological Reductions of Edmund Husserl*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands.

Deleuze, Gilles, *Logique du Sens*, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris, 1969.

Deleuze, Gilles, Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, Paris, Flammarion, 1977.

Delanty Gerard, *Community*, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London, 2003.

De Man, Paul, *Allegories of Reading*, Yale University Press, New Haven și Londra.

Denzin, Norman K., *The Cinematic Society*(London, SAGE Publications, 1995.

Derrida, Jacques, *Préjugés, devant la loi*, La faculté de juger, Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris, 1985.

Descartes, René, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, citat în Giddens, *Modernity and Self-Identity*.

De Unamuno, Miguel, *Agonia Creștinismului (The Agony of Christianity)*, traducere de Radu I. Petrescu, ed. Institutul European, Iași 1993.

De Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, translated by Henry Reeve, The Pennsylvania State University, 2002 ( A Penn State Electronic Classics Series Publication – pentru versiunea electronică [în format pdf a cărții].

De Vries, Egbert, *Man in Rapid Social Change*, Published for The World Council of Churches by Doubleday & Company, ING. Garden City, New York, 1961.

Di Cesare, Donatella, Introduzione, în *Wilhelm von Humboldt, La diversité delle lingue...*, Editori Laterza, Roma, 1991 (paginile introducerii - pp. XII-XCVI).

Doinaș, Ștefan Augustin, „Nietzsche și ‚discursul mixt’” (Nietzsche and the „mixed discourse”) în Nietzsche, *Așa grăit-a Zarathustra (Thus Spoke Zarathustra)*, Editura Humanitas, București, 1996, 2000.

Eco, Umberto, *Opera deschisă (The Open Work)*, Editura pentru Literatura Universală, 1969.

Eco, Umberto *A spune cam același lucru. Experiențe de traducere (Experiences in Translation)*, traducere de Laszlo Alexandru, Editura Polirom, 2008.

Eco, Umberto *Limitele interpretării (The Limits of Interpretation)*, trad.Ștefania Mincu și Daniela Bucșă ,ed. Pontica, Constanța,1996.

Eliade, Mircea, Moartea lui Unamuno (The Death of Unamuno ), în *Taina Indiei (The Secret of India)* – texte inedite, ed. Icar.

Evans, Joseph Claude, *Strategies of Deconstruction: Derrida and the myth of the voice*,(Minnesota Archive Editions) Published by the University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, United States of America, 1991.

Evans, Dylan, *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, Routledge, New York, USA, 1996.

Ferrara, Alessandro, *The Force of Example (Explorations in the Paradigm of Judgment)* Columbia University Press, New York, 2008.

Finlayson, James Gordon, *Habermas. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Foucault, Michel, *Les mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines*, Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Gadamer, G., *Truth and Method*, Continuum Publishing Group, translated by Joel Weinsheimer & Donald G. Marshall, London & New York, 2006.

Gagnon, Monika, „Work in progress: Canadian Women in the visual arts 1975-1987”, în Rhea Tregebov (Ed.), *Work in Progress: Building Feminist Culture*, Toronto: Women's Press, 1988.

Giddens, Anthony, *Modernity and Self-Identity (Self and Society in the late Modern Age)* First published 1991 by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Reprinted 1992.

Giddens, Anthony, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1990.  
Giddens, Anthony, *Beyond Left and Right. The Future of Radical Politics*, Stanford University Press, 1994.

Giddens, Anthony, *Beyond Left and Right. The Future of Radical Politics*, Stanford University Press, 1994, citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Goodman, Nelson, *Ways of Worldmaking*, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1978. Paperback, 1985.

Grassi, Ernesto, *Vico and Humanism (Essays on Vico, Heidegger, and Rhetoric)* in the collection Emory Vico Studies, Donald Phillip Verene – General Editor, Vol. 3, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York; Bern; Frankfurt am Main; Paris, 1990, printed by Weihert-Druck GmbH, Darmstadt, West Germany, translated into English by Azizeh Azodi.

Grayling, A.C., în Cosmina-Florentina Surlea, *Jocurile de limbaj ale lui Ludwig Wittgenstein. O explicație a comunicării intra și interpersonale (Ludwig Wittgenstein's language games. An explanation of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication)*, Editura Lumen, Iași, 2007.

Guénon, René, *Symboles fondamentaux de la Science Sacrée*, Gallimard, Paris, 1962.

Guignon, Charles, (University of South Florida), David R. Hiley (University of New Hampshire), *Richard Rorty*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Guiraud, Pierre, *Le langage*, Encycl. De la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris, 1968, citat în Andrei Pleșu, *Limba Păsărilor (The language of the Birds)*.

Habermas, Jürgen, *Sfera publică și dezvoltarea ei structurală (The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere)*, traducerea de Janina Ianoși, Editura Comunicare.ro, 2005.

Habermas, Jürgen, *Conștiință morală și acțiune comunicativă (Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action)*, Editura ALL Educational, București 2000, traducere de Gilbert Lepădatu (titlu original în germană: *Moralbewußtsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt am Main, 1983).

Habermas, Jürgen, *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Frankfurt M. 1983.

Habermas, Jürgen, *La Pensée Postmétaphysique* (Essais philosophiques), traduit de l'allemand par Rainer Rochlitz, Première Partie – Retour à la métaphysique?, Éditions: Armand Colin, Paris, 1993, p.26. / Titre original: Jürgen Habermas, *Nachmetaphysisches Denken. Philosophische Aufsätze*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1988.

Habermas, Jürgen, *La technique et la science comme 'ideologie'-Travail et interaction*, les essais CLXXXIII, Galimard.

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Theory of communicative action, Lifeworld ad System: a critique of functionalist Reason*, Beacon Press, 1987.

Habermas, Jürgen, *La pensee postmetaphysique*, Armand Colin Editeur, Paris, 1993.

Heidegger, Martin, *Ființă și Timp (Being and Time)*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2006, traducere de Gabriel Liiceanu și Cătălin Cioabă.

Heidegger, Martin,, *Etre et temps*, trad. F.Venzin, Paris, Gallimard, 1986.

Heidegger, Martin, *Originea operei de Artă (The Origin of the Work of Art)*, traducere și note de Thomas Kleininger și Heidegger, Martin, studiu introductiv de CONSTANTIN NOICA, HUMANITAS, 1995, București.

Heidegger, Martin, *Originea Operei de Artă (The Origin of the Work of Art)*, Ed. Univers, București, 1982, traducere de Th. Kleininger și Gabriel Liiceanu.

Heidegger, Martin, "Fenomenologie și teologie" (Phenomenology and Theology), în *Repere pe Drumul Gândirii (Pathmarks)*, Editura Politică, București, 1988, trad. Gabriel Liiceanu și Thomas Kleininger.

Heidegger, Martin, *Principiul identității (The Principle of Identity)*, Editura Crater, București, 1991, trad. Dan-Ovidiu Totescu

Heidegger, Martin, *Repere pe Drumul Gândirii (Pathmarks)*, Editura Politică, București, 1988, trad. Gabriel Liiceanu și Thomas Kleininger

Heidegger, Martin, *Discourse on Thinking*. Trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York, 1966, Harper and Row Publishing House.

Heidegger, Martin, *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Heidegger, Martin, An introduction to Metaphysics, trans. Ralph Manheim (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1961), citat în Ernesto Grassi *editura și opera citată*.

Heidegger, M., *Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit. Mit einem Brief über dem "Humanismus"*, ed a – II-a, Berna, 1954, p. 93, citat în Otto Pöggeler, *Drumul gândirii lui Heidegger (Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers)*.

Heidegger, M., *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, Pfullingen, 1959, p.198, citat în Otto Pöggeler, *Drumul gândirii lui Heidegger (Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers)*.

Heinrich Ott, „The Dialogue between Religions as a Contemporary Theological Responsibility”, in *Dialogue in Community*, (ed.) C.D. Jathanna, Karnataka Theological Research Institute, Manglore, India, 1982.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *La prose du monde*, Gallimard, Paris, 1969, citat în Andrei Pleșu, *Limba Păsărilor*.

Hegel, G. W. Fr., *Prelegeri de istoria filosofiei (Lectures on the History of Philosophy)*, Editura Academiei, București, 1963, trad. D.D. Roșca, Vol.I.

Hegel, G. W. Fr., *Fenomenologia Spiritului (The Phenomenology of Spirit)*, Editura Academiei, București, 1965.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von, *Introduction à l'oeuvre sur le kawi et autres essais*, Eds. du Seuil, Paris, 1974 (scriere publicată inițial în 1835).

Humboldt, Wilhelm von, citat în Jürgen Trabant, *Humboldt ou le sens du langage*, Mardaga, Liege, 1992.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von, Article adressé á Madame de Staël, în *Essais esthétiques sur Hermann et Dorotheé de Goethe*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1999, (pp. 237-264), articol publicat inițial în 1799.

Hume, David, *Cercetare asupra inteceptului omenesc (An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding)*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1987, traduce de Mircea Flonta, Adrian-Paul Iliescu, Constanța Niță.

Hume, David, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Sect. IV. Sceptical Doubts concerning the Operations of the Understanding Part II. pp.28-29, free on line edition on pdf.  
Husserl, Edmund, *Meditații Carteziene (Cartesian Meditations)*, traducere, cuvânt înainte și note de Aurelian Crăiuțu, Editura Humanitas, București, 1994.

Husserl, Edmund, *Cartesian Meditations (An Introduction to Phenomenology)*, translated by Dorion Cairns, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague/Boston/London, Seventh impression 1982 (First published in 1960), printed in the Netherlands.

Husserl, E., *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie*, Felix Meiner Verlag, Hamburg, 1977, p.2, citat în Andrei Marga, *Filosofia unificării europene*, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2003.

Husserl, E., *Ideen I Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, Erstes Buch: *Allgemeine Einführung in der reine Phänomenologie – V. Hua III/1*. Trad.fr.de Paul Ricoeur, *Idées directrices pour une phenomenology*, Paris, Editions Gallimard, 1950.

Husserl, Edmund « Postface à mes Idées directrices pour une phénoménologie pure », trad. L. Kelkel, in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, no 62, Paris, 1957, Husserl, MS.X x 5, 17-18, quoted by Biemel, “Einleitung des Herausgebers,” in *Die Idee der Phänomenologie*, vii-viii., citat în Joseph J. Kockelmans, *Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology*, Purdue University Press, 1994.

Hutcheon, Linda, *Politica Postmodernismului (The Politics of Postmodernism)*, Ed.Univers, Bucuresti, 1997 trad. Mircea Deac.

Ingarden, Roman, *Studii de estetică (Studies in Aesthetics)*, traducere de Olga Zaicik, Editura Univers, București, 1978.

Jameson, Fredric, *Haans Haacke and the cultural logic of postmodernism* ( 1986-7), citat în Linda Hutcheon, *Politica Postmodernismului*, Ed.Univers, Bucuresti, 1997 trad. Mircea Deac.

Jameson, Fredric, „Architecture and the critique of ideology”, în Joan Ockman (ed.), *Architecture, criticism, ideology*, Princeton Architectural Press, pp.51-87(pentru întreg articolul), 1985.

Jakobson, Roman, « Deux aspects du langage et deux types d'aphasie », in R. Jakobson, *Essais de linguistique générale*, t. I, Minuit, 1963.

James, Henry, *Literary Criticism: Essays on Literature, American Writers; English Writers*, Library of America, New York, 1984.

Kaufmann, Walter, *Nietzsche. Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1974.

Kant, Immanuel, *Critica rațiunii pure (Critique of Pure Reason)*, Editura IRI, București, 1994, traducere de Nicolae Bagdasar și Elena Moisuc.

Kant, Immanuel, *Critica Rațiunii Practice (Critique of Practical Reason)*, extras din *Secțiunea a Treia* la „Întemeierea Metafizicii Moravurilor”, Editura Științifică, București, 1972, traducere și note de Nicolae Bagdasar.

Kant, Immanuel, *Prolegomene la orice metafizică viitoare care se va putea înfățișa drept știință (Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics)*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1987, traducere de Mircea Flonta și Thomas Kleininger, publicat inițial în 1783 sub titlul *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*.

Kant, Immanuel, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. Hrsg., eingel. und erl. von Jens Timmermann. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2004, BA 83 (*Akademie-Ausgabe Kant Werke IV, S. 438, 18–21*). Sau, în varianta engleză /Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals* [sau, traducere alternativă, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*], translated by James W. Ellington [1785] (1993). 3rd ed.. Hackett.

Kant, Immanuel, *Was ist Aufklärung*, citat în Habermas, *Sfera Publică*.

Kant, Immanuel, *Întemeierea metafizicii moravurilor (Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals)*. *Critica Rațiunii practice*, traducere de Nicolae Bagdasar, Editura Științifică, București, 1972, p.84 – citat în J. Hillis Miller

Kant, Immanuel, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, în *Gesammelte Schriften*, citat în Virgil Ciomoș, *Conștiință și Schimbare...*

Kant, Immanuel, *Prolegomene la orice metafizică viitoare care se va putea înfățișa ca știință (Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics)*, trad. Mircea Flonta și Thomas Kleininger, Ed. All, București, 1998, citat în Virgil Ciomoș, *Conștiință și Schimbare...*

Kant, Immanuel, *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, par. 40, în *Gesammelte Schriften*, 24 vols. (Berlin: Reimer, 1902-66) 5:293, citat în Grassi, *Vico and Humanism*.

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*, translated and edited by Paul Guyer (University of Pennsylvania) and Allen W. Wood (Yale University), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Judgment (Kritik der Urteilskraft)*, e.g. for paragraph 231 in the footnote from page 420, translated by Werner S. Pluhar, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. Indianapolis, Indiana, 1987.

Kekes, John, *The Morality of Pluralism*, citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Kekes, John, *A justification of rationality*, State University of New York Press, 1976, p.200 citat in Andrei Marga, *Relativismul si Consecintele sale*”, Ed. Presa Universitara Clujeana, 2007.

Kierkegaard, Søren, *Scrieri I, Conceptul de anxietate (The Concept of Anxiety)*, traducere Adrian Arsinevici, Editura Amarcord, Timișoara, 1998.

Kneller, Jane, *Kant and the Power of Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2007.

Kreindler, A., *Agnozii și apraxii (Apraxia and Agnosia)*, Ed. Acad. R.S.R., București, 1977.- citat în Emil Câmpeanu, Mircea Șerban, Marius Abrudan, *Neurologie clinică, volumul III*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1980.

Lacan, Jacques, *Ecrits I. (Points)*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.

Lacan, Jacques, *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, din capitolul „The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis” , traducere de Bruce Fink, W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 2006.

Lacan, Jacques, *The Seminar, Book II. The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis, 1954–1955*.

Lacan, Jacques, *The Seminar, Book II. The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis, 1954–1955*, editor Jacques-Alain Miller, traducere de Sylvana Tomaselli, W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1988.

Lacan, Jacques, *The Seminar XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, editor Jacques-Alain Miller, traducere de Alan Sheridan, W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1977.

Leibholz, *Strukturprobleme der Demokratie*, Karlsruhe, 1958 p.97, citat în Habermas, *Sfera Publică*.

Lévinas, Emmanuel, *Signification and Sense, Humanism of the Other*, tr. Nidra Poller, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Lévinas, Emmanuel, *Totalitate și Infinit (Totality and Infinity)*, Ed. Polirom Iași 1999, trad. Marius Lazurca.

Lévinas, Emmanuel, *Totalité et Infini*, Paris, Le Livre de poche, 2000.

Lévinas, Emmanuel, *Liberté et commandement*, Paris, Le livre de poche, 1994

Lévinas, Emmanuel, *Le temps et l'autre*, Paris, P.U.F., 1994.

Liebig E., James, *Merchants of Vision. People Bringing New Purpose and Values to Business*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler (in cooperation with The World Business Academy).

Liiceanu, Gabriel, *Despre Limită (On Limit)*, ediția a II - a, Editura Humanitas, București, 1997.

Liiceanu, Gabriel, *Încercare în politropia omului și a culturii (A Trial within the Politropy of Men and Culture)*, Editura Cartea Românească, București 1981.

Lippmann, Walter, *The Public Philosophy*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 1995, pp.108-109 citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Lipoveski, Gilles *L'ère du vide, Essais sur l'individualisme contemporain*”, Gallimard, Paris, 1983.

Loader, Colin, *The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim*, Cambridge University Press, 1985 (Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge), USA.

Lovitt, William and Brundage, Harriet, *Modern Technology in the Heideggerian Perspective*. Vol. II. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press. 1995.

Luhmann, Niklas, and Schorr, Karl-Eberhard, *Problems of Reflection in the System of Education*, Waxmann Münster / New York, 2000, translated by Rebecca A. Neuwirth.  
Luhmann, Niklas, "Differentiation of Society", in *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1977).

Makkreel, Rudolf A., *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Judgment*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1990, Paperback edition 1994.

Mannheim, Karl, *Ideology and Utopia (Collected Works of Karl Mannheim)* Volume One, First published in 1936 by Routledge & Kegan Paul, Reprinted in 2002 by Routledge Usa & Canada.

Mannheim, Karl *Ideology and Utopia*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1949.

Mannheim, Karl, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. , 1966, citat în „KARL MANNHEIM AND THE POLITICAL INTELLIGENTSIA: AN ALTERNATIVE READING” – article by Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia. The pdf version of the document is available at <http://www.tasa.org.au/conferences/conferencepapers07/papers/122.pdf>

Mannheim, Karl, 'Competition as a Cultural Phenomena', in Volker Meja and Nico Stehr (ed.) *Knowledge and Politics: The Sociology of Knowledge Dispute*, London: Routledge. 1990., citat în Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, *op.cit.*

Mannheim, Karl, *Structures of Thinking*. Edited and translated by David Kettler, Volker Meja and Nico Stehr. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982., citat în Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, *op.cit.*

Mannheim, Karl, *Sociology as Political Education*. Edited by David Kettler and Colin Loader. London: Transaction Publishers, 2001., citat în Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, *op.cit.*

Mannheim, Karl, *Essays on the Sociology of Culture*. Edited by Ernest Mannheim in cooperation with Paul Kecskemeti. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1971., citat în Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, *op.cit.*

Mannheim, Karl, 'The Function of the Refugee', *New English Weekly*, 27 [April 19, 1945], citat în Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, *op.cit.*

Marcuse, Herbert, *Eros și Civilizație (Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud)*, Editura TREI pentru versiunea românească, București, 1996, traducere de Cătălina și Louis Ulrich, p. 34, publicat inițial în limba engleză în 1966 de către Beacon Press, Boston.  
Marga, Andrei, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale (Relativism and Its Consequences)*, Ed. Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2007.

Marga, Andrei, *Cotitura Culturală (Consecințe filosofice ale tranziției)/ Die Kulturelle Wende (Philosophische Konsequenzen der Transformation)*, Editura Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, 2004.

Marga, Andrei, *Diagnoze, Articole și Eseuri (Diagnoses - Articles and Essays)*, Ed. Eikon, Cluj Napoca, 2008.

Marga, Andrei, *Filosofia lui Habermas (The Philosophy of Habermas)*, Polirom Romania, 2006.

Marga, Andrei, *Introducere în filosofia contemporană (Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy)*, Polirom, 2002.

Marga, Andrei, *Reconstrucția pragmatică a filosofiei (The Pragmatic Reconstruction of Philosophy)*, Editura polirom, Iași, 1998.

Marin, Louis, *Le Portrait du Roi*, Paris, Ed.Minuit, 1981.

Marx K. and Engels F. *The German Ideology*, ed. C.J. Arthur London 1970.

Medina, Jose and Wood, David, *Truth. Engagements Across Philosophical Traditions*, Blackwell Publishing, USA.

Meiland, Jack W., and Krausz, Michael, *Relativism: Cognitive and Moral, Introduction*, citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, “*Phenomenology of Perception*” – lucrare tradusă de Colin Smith și apărută inițial sub egida Humanities Press, New York, 1962 și, respectiv, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1962.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *Causeries*, 1948. Seuil, Paris, 2002. Traducerea noastră s-a efectuat după varianta în limba engleză a textului - *The World of Perception*, London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Mihăilescu, Călin Andrei, Post – o extrodere postmodernă, postfață la Linda Hutcheon, *Politica Postmodernismului – în Linda Hutcheon, Politica Postmodernismului*, Ed.Univers, Bucuresti, 1997 trad. Mircea Deac.

Miller, J. Hillis, *Etica lecturii (The Ethics of Reading: Kant, de Man, Eliot, Trollope, James, and Benjamin)*, Grupul Editorial Art 2007, București, traducerea Dinu Luca.

Moore, G.H, *A defence of Commom Sense*, parafrazat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată

Negt, O., & Gluge, A., *Public Sphere and Experience. Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere*, University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Nicolescu, Basarab, *Noi, particula și lumea ( We, the particle and the world)*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2002, traducere din franceză de Vasile Sporici.

Nicolescu, Basarab, *Transdisciplinaritatea (Transdisciplinarity – a manifesto)*, Manifest, Junimea, Iași, 2007.

Nicolescu, Basarab, *Ce este Realitatea?Reflecții în jurul operei lui Stéphane Lupasco (What is Reality? Reflections uponStéphane Lupasco's work)*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 2009, traducere de Simona Modreanu.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Voința de Putere (The Will to Power)*, traducere de Claudiu Baci, Ed. Aion, Oradea, 1999.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Nașterea Filosofiei (The Birth of Philosophy)*, Ed. Dacia, Cluj 1992, traducere de Mircea Ivănescu.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Așa grăit-a Zarathustra (Thus Spoke Zarathustra)*, Ed. Huimanas, București, 2000, ediția a III-a, traducere de Ștefan Augustin Doinaș.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Amurgul Idolilor/ Twilight of the Idols* (în același volum cu *Știința Voioasă și Genealogia Moralei*), traducere de Alexandru Al. Șahighian și Liana Micescu, Editura Humanitas, București, 1994.

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Știința Voioasă/ The Gay Science* (în același volum cu *Amurgul Idolilor și Genealogia Moralei*), traducere de Liana Micescu, Editura Humanitas, București, 1994.

Noica, Constantin, introductory study for Martin Heidegger, *Originea Operei de Artă (The Origin of the Work of Art)*, traducere de Th. Kleininger și Gabriel Liiceanu, ed. Humanitas, București 1995.

Papahagi, Marian, notă explicativă în Roland Barthes, *Plăcerea textului (The Pleasure of the Text)*, Editura Echinoc, Cluj 1994.

Parsons, Talcott, *Societies, Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*, Prentice-Hall, INC. Publishing House, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966.

Platon, *Phaidon*, 115, e.

Patapievici, Horia-Roman, *Omul Recent, o critică a modernității (The Recent Man, a critique of modernity)*, ediția a doua revăzută, Editura Humanitas, București, 2002.

Patočka, Jan, *Introduction à la phénoménologie de Husserl*, Grenoble, Edition Jérôme Millon, 1992, citat în Copoeru, *Aparență și sens*, editura citată.

Pensky, Max, *Universalism and Situated Critic*, in Stephen K. White(ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Habermas*, Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp.69-70, citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Petrescu, Radu I., foreword for Miguel de Unamuno, *Agonia Creștinismului (The Agony of Christianity)*, Editura Institutul European, Iași 1993.

Pleșu, Andrei, *Limba Păsărilor (The language of the Birds)* Editura Humanitas, București 1994.

Pöggeler, Otto, *Drumul gândirii lui Heidegger*, traducere din germană de Cătălin Cioabă, Editura Humanitas, București, 1998, p.10. (în original, Otto Pöggeler, *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers*, Verlag Günther Neske, J.G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger GmbH, Stuttgart, 1963).

Pop, Ioan F., *Pedale de Hârtie (Pedals made of paper)*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1994.

Popper, K. R., *Societatea Deschisă și Dușmanii Ei (The Open Society and Its Enemies)*, Volumul I (Vraja lui Platon), traducere de D. Stoianovici, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1993, p.21. – în original – *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957.

Popper, K. R., *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957.

Popper, Karl R., Miller, David W., „A proof of the impossibility of inductive probability.” *Nature* 302 (1983), 687–688.

Preda, Marin, *Jurnal intim. Carnete de atelier (Intimate journal. Workshop booklets)*, Editura Ziua, București, 2004.

Raicu, Lucian, *Liviu Rebreanu*, Editura pentru literatură, București, 1967.

Rebreanu, Liviu, *Pădurea Spânzuraților (Forest of the hanged)*, Ed. Litera International, București-Chișinău 2002.

Ricoeur, Paul, *Conflictul interpretărilor (eseuri de hermeneutică) / The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, traducere și postfață de Horea Lazăr, Editura Echinox, Colecția „Săgetătorul”, Cluj, 1999.

Ricoeur, Paul, *Memoria, istoria, uitarea (La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli)*, traducerea de Ilie Gyurcsik și Margareta Gyurcsik, Editura Amarcord, Timișoara, 2001, în original - *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*, Seuil, 2000.

Ricoeur P., Parole et Symbole. *RevSR*, 49, 1975 citat în Casparus Vos, Liturgical Language as Metaphorical Language.

Ricoeur, P. Naming God. *USQR*, 34[4], 1979, citat în Casparus Vos, Liturgical Language as Metaphorical Language.

Rorty, Richard, *Contingency, irony and Solidarity*, Cambridge University Press, 1989

Rorty, Richard, *Continență, Ironie și Solidaritate (Contingency, irony and Solidarity)*, Editura All, 1998, traducere și note de Corina Sorana Stefanov.

Rorty, Richard, *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*, Princeton University Press, 1979.

Rorty, Richard, *Consequences of Pragmatism*, (essays:1972-1980), University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis, 1982.

Russel, Charles, „The Context of the Concept”, 1980, citat în Linda Hutcheon, *Politica Postmodernismului*, Ed.Univers, Bucuresti, 1997 trad. Mircea Deac.

Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Curs de lingvistică generală (Course in General Linguistics)*, Ed. Polirom, Iasi, 1998 (publicat inițial în 1916 - *Cours de linguistique générale*, Paris, Payot,1916.) trad. și cuv. Înaintede I. Tarabac

Schopenhauer, Arthur, *Lumea ca voință și reprezentare (The World as Will and Representation)*, trad. de Emilia Dolcu, Viorel Dumitrașcu și Gheorghe Puiu, Editura Moldova, Iași, Volumul I 1995.

Santayana, George, *Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies*, New York: Scribner's, 1922.

Sartori, Giovanni, “Homo Videns (Imbecilizarea prin televiziune și post-gândirea)/ *Homo Videns, Television and Post-thinking*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2005, traducere din italiană de Mihai Elin.

Schutz, Alfred, *Reflections on the problem of Relevance*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1970, edited, annotated, and with an Introduction by Richard M. Zaner.

Schutz, Alfred, *Collected Papers*, vol.I, Nijhoff, Haga, 1962.

Searle, J.R., *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Sennett, Richard, *The Fall of Public Man*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Siegle, Robert, *The Politics of Reflexivity: Narrative and the Constitutive Poetics of Culture*, Baltimore, Md and London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Surlea, Cosmina-Florentina, *Jocurile de limbaj ale lui Ludwig Wittgenstein. O explicație a comunicării intra și interpersonale (Ludwig Wittgenstein's language games. An explanation of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication)*, Editura Lumen, Iași, 2007.

Steiner, George, *După Babel (After Babel)*, traducere în românește de Valentin Negoită și Ștefan Avădanei, Ed. Univers, București, 1983

Ströker, Elisabeth, *Husserl's Transcendental Phenomenology*, Stanford University Press, California, 1993, translated by Lee Hardy, pp.50, 53-54 – initially published in German under the title *Husserls Transzendente Phänomenologie*, Vittorio Klostermann GmbH, Frankfurt am Main, 1987.

Stocker, Michael, *Plural and Conflicting Values*, Claredon Press, Oxford, 1990, p.1 citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată.

Taylor, Charles, *The Ethics of Authenticity*, 1991, pp.112-113 citat în Andrei Marga, *Relativismul și Consecințele sale*, editura citată

Trabant, Jürgen, *Humboldt ou le sens du langage*, Mardaga, Liege, 1992.

Trabant, Jürgen, *Traditions de Humboldt*, Eds. de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris, 1999.

Trollope, Anthony, *An Autobiography*, World's Classics(ed.), Oxford University Press, Londra, 1961, p.134 citat în Hillis Miller - *Etica lecturii*.

Ursa-Pop, Mihaela, *Scritopia sau Ficționalizarea subiectului auctorial în discursul teoretic (The Writing-Topia or the fictionalization of the authorial subject in the theoretical discourse)*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

Van Huyssteen, J.W., *Teologie as kritiese geloofsverantwoording*. RGN-Uitgewery: Pretoria, 1986 citat în Casparus Vos, *Liturgical Language as Metaphorical Language*.

Van Huyssteen, J.W., *Essays in Postfoundationalist Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1997, citat în Casparus Vos, *Liturgical Language as Metaphorical Language*.

Vico, Giambattista, *Scienza nuova seconda, Vindiciae, De nostri temporis studiorum ratione*, in Opere di G.B. Vico, edited by Fausto Nicolini, 8 vols. in 11(Bari: Laterza, 1911-41) – citat în Ernesto Grassi – *Vico and Humanism (Essays on Vico, Heidegger, and Rhetoric)* in the collection Emory Vico Studies, Donald Phillip Verene – General Editor, Vol. 3, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York; Bern; Frankfurt am Main; Paris, 1990, printed by Weihert-Druck GmbH, Darmstadt, West Germany, translated into English by Azizeh Azodi.

Vidal-Naquet, Pierre, *Vânătorul negru. Forme de gândire și forme de societate în lumea greacă (The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World)*, tr. Rom. Zoe Petre, Ed. Eminescu, București, 1985, citat în Andrei Pleșu – *Limba Păsărilor*.

Vîlcu, Cornel, Lector la facultatea de Litere UBB, *Curs de Lingvistică Generală pentru anul IV secția Engleză-Franceză*, 2006, curs nepublicat, *mimeo*s.

Weber, Max, *Economy and Society*, New York, Bedminster Press, translated and edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, 1968.

Weber, Max, *Staatssoziologie, Soziologie der rationalen Staatsanstalt und der modernen politischen Parteien und Parlamente*, mit einer Einführung und Erläuterungen hrsg. von Johannes Winkelmann, publicat în 1966 de către Duncker und Humblot, Berlin.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Philosophical investigations* (web source version) / *Cercetări filosofice*, Humanitas, traducere de Mircea Dumitru, Mircea Flonta, Adrian-Paul Iliescu, București, 2003.

Wolfgang, Iser, *Actul lecturii. O teorie a efectului estetic*, traducere din limba germană, note și prefață de Romanița Constantinescu, Editura Paralela 45, Colecția „Studii literare”, 2006, în original [*Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*, 1976].

Zapf, Wolfgang, *Entwicklung als Modernisierung*, in Manfred Schulz (Hrsg.), *Entwicklung*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, 1997, p. 39, citat în Andrei Marga, *Cotitura Culturală*.  
Zourabichvili, François, *Le Vocabulaire de Deleuze*, Paris, Ellipses, 2003.

***Authors in collective volumes:***

Kellner, Douglas M., și Durham, Meenakshi Gigi, *Media and Cultural Studies, KeyWorks* (revisited edition), edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, Blackwell Publishing, 2006, USA, UK and Australia.

Koczanowicz, Leszek, *The choice of tradition and the tradition of choice: Habermas' and Rorty's interpretation of pragmatism*, PHILOSOPHY & SOCIAL CRITICISM • vol 25 no 1 • pp. 55–70, Copyright © 1999 SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi) [0191-4537(199901)25:1;55–70;006705]

Hammer, Olav, “Same Message from Everywhere: The Sources of Modern Revelation”, in the collective volume *New Age Religion and Globalization*, edited by Mikael Rothstein, Aarhus University Press, 2001, Denmark.

James, William, *Concepția Pragmatismului Asupra Adevărului/* (traducerea s-a făcut după William James, ‘Pragmatism’s Conception of Truth’, în *American Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*, editor Paul Kurtz, The Macmillan Company, 1966, pp. 118-133), traducerea de Delia Marga, în *Filosofia Americană (Volumul I Filosofia Americană Clasică)*, selecția textelor, prefață și note introductive de Andrei Marga, Editura ALL EDUCATIONAL, 20.00, București.

James, William, *Concepte Filosofice și Rezultate Practice* (traducerea s-a făcut după William James, ‘Philosophical Conceptions and Practical Results’, în *American Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*, editor Paul Kurtz, The Macmillan Company, London, 1969, pp. 105-118), traducerea de Ecaterina Popa, în *Filosofia Americană (Volumul I Filosofia Americană Clasică)*, selecția textelor, prefață și note introductive de Andrei Marga, Editura ALL EDUCATIONAL, 2000, București.

Levine, D.N., (ed. and introduction), ‘Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms’. *Selected Writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Maturana, Humberto, *The Biological Foundations of Self Consciousness and the Physical Domain of Existence - in Beobachter (Konvergenz der Erkenntnistheorien?)*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag München, Bandredaktion: Karin Obermaier, Volker Redder, 1992.

Millikan, Max F., “Inquiry and policy: the relation of knowledge to action,” in: Daniel Lerner (Ed.), *The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences*. New York: Meridian Books, 1959 .

Ott, Heinrich, „The Dialogue between Religions as a Contemporary Theological Responsibility”, in *Dialogue in Community*, (ed.) C.D. Jathanna, Karnataka Theological Research Institute, Manglore, India, 1982.

Sekula, Allan, în “On the invention of photographic meaning”(1975) în *Photography in Print: Writings from 1816 to the Present*, collective volume edited by Vicki Goldberg University of New Mexico Press, 1988.

Tenbruck, Friedrich H., "Grenzen der staatlichen Planung," in: Wilhelm Hennis, Peter Graf Kielmansegg und Ulrich Matz (Hg.), *Regierbarkeit. Studien zu ihrer Problematisierung*, Band 1, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, S. 1977.

Vos, Casparus, Liturgical Language as Metaphorical Language, Volume: *Pathways to the Public Square; International Practical Theology(vol.1) Practical Theology in an Age of Pluralism*, International Academy of Practical Theology, Manchester 2003, Elaine Graham, Anna Rowlands (eds.), LIT VERLAG Münster, 2005.

### ***Authors in scientific journals:***

Barker, Eileen, „The Scientific Study of Religion? You Must be Joking!” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34, 1995: 287-310, also reprinted in the collective volume *Cults in Context – Readings in the Study of New Religious Movements*, edited by Lorne L. Dawson, Transaction Publishers New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London, (U.K.), fourth printing 2005, p.7

Bruce, Aune, *Rorty on Language and the world*, The Journal of Philosophy Vol. 69, No. 19, Sixty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division, (October 26, 1972), pp.665-667, <http://www.jstor.org>, Fri, Jun 22, 07:20, 2007.

Carnap, Rudolf, and Stegmüller, Wolfgang, *Induktive Logik und Wahrscheinlichkeit* (Vienna: Springer, 1959) citat în Grassi.

Derrida, Jacques, „The Principle of Reason”, *Diacritics* 13/3, pp. 3-20 quoted in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol.LIII, No. Four, December 1983, Chicago.

Dubost, Matthieu, EMMANUEL LÉVINAS ET LA MÉTHODE DE L’ALTÉRITÉ, DE LA PHÉNOMÉNOLOGIE À LA ÉVIGILANCE ÉTHIQUE, articol publicat în *Studia Phaenomenologica* VI 2006, Ed.Humanitas București.

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article* (1964), în *New German Critique*, Nr. 3 (Toamna 1974).

Heinimann, David, *Richard Rorty’s Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity, False Prophet or Second Becoming ?* -, luat de pe Revue électronique publiée par Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal Directeur : [Jean-Claude Guédon](http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/revues/surfaces/) ISSN : 1188-2492

(<http://www.pum.umontreal.ca/revues/surfaces/>), volumul II din 1992, secțiunea II.21 - Acts of the Conference "RETHINKING CULTURE".

Jakobson, R., « *De la poésie à la linguistique* », *L’Arc*, numéro spécial « Jakobson », librairie Duponchelle, 1990.

Luhmann, Niklas, 1997, “Globalization or World Society: How to Conceive of Modern Society?” *International Review of Sociology*, 7/1, p.75.

McKeon, Michael, *Parsing Habermas’s Bourgeois Public Sphere*, în *Criticism*, 2004, Vol. 46, Nr. 2.

Patočka, Jan, *Le monde naturel comme problème philosophique*, La Haye, Martinus Nijhoff, col. „Phaenomenologica”, vol.68, 1976.

Pezze, Barbara Dalle, Heidegger on Gelassenheit *Minerva, An Internet Journal of Philosophy* 10, 2006).

Popper, Karl R., David W. Miller. „A proof of the impossibility of inductive probability.” *Nature* 302, 1983.

Reybrouck, M. ‘ A Biosemiotic and Ecological Approach to Music Cognition, Event Perception Between Auditory Listening and Cognitive Economy’, *Axiomathes: an international journal in ontology and cognitive systems*, 2005.

### **Internet sources:**

Hume, David, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* , Sect. V. Sceptical Solution of these Doubts, Part II .p. 40, free on line edition (on pdf).

„KARL MANNHEIM AND THE POLITICAL INTELLIGENTSIA: AN ALTERNATIVE READING” – article by Bob Ellis and Rodney Fopp, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia. The pdf version of the document is available at <http://www.tasa.org.au/conferences/conferencepapers07/papers/122.pdf>, paper consulted on the 1st of June 2011, 16:55 p.m.

Martin Heidegger , *Unterwegs zur Sprache (Calea spre Limbă)*:<http://orfeuskharm.org/text/3/>, consultat la data de 4 iulie 2011, 22:54. p.m.

Ștefan Bolea - Editorial#0, <http://www.egophobia.ro/1/0/bolea.html>

Thomas Sheehan, Astonishing! Things Make Sense! Thomas Sheehan (<http://www.heideggercircle.org/Gatherings2011-01Sheehan.pdf>)

<http://www.heideggercircle.org/> / from the *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* Vol. 1 (2011) (The Heidegger Circle Annual)

<http://www.descopera.ro/>

<http://www.dex.dictoo.eu/index.php>

<http://www.afladespre.manager.ro/inconstient-vs-subconstient-1741.html>

<http://www.psychologies.ro/Dictionar-de-psihologie/S/SUBCONSTIENT-1256951>

<http://www.gailgastfield.com/mhh/mhh.html>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apraxia>

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/anxiousness>

[http://www.geocities.ws/dualis\\_mit\\_filo\\_nietzsche.htm](http://www.geocities.ws/dualis_mit_filo_nietzsche.htm)

[http://video.crestinortodox.ro/EFocrvuWBhM/Timp\\_si\\_rastimp\\_Dan\\_Puric.html](http://video.crestinortodox.ro/EFocrvuWBhM/Timp_si_rastimp_Dan_Puric.html)

[http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sch%C3%A9ma\\_de\\_Jakobson#cite\\_note-Jakobson-0](http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sch%C3%A9ma_de_Jakobson#cite_note-Jakobson-0)

[www.cartepremium.ro/produs/4705/Homo-videns-Imbecilizarea-prin-televiziune-si-post-gandirea.html](http://www.cartepremium.ro/produs/4705/Homo-videns-Imbecilizarea-prin-televiziune-si-post-gandirea.html)

<http://www.cartepremium.ro/produs/4705/Homo-videns-Imbecilizarea-prin-televiziune-si-post-gandirea.html>

[http://books.google.ro/books?id=uWJv6n5zv4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Community++Gerard+delanty&source=bl&ots=POG456xFJn&sig=DQ4gwxj13VfaoCFrZ6eEKCH\\_zV8&hl=ro&ei=guIkTK3LEcqd\\_AaH5ZnDBA&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CCQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.ro/books?id=uWJv6n5zv4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Community++Gerard+delanty&source=bl&ots=POG456xFJn&sig=DQ4gwxj13VfaoCFrZ6eEKCH_zV8&hl=ro&ei=guIkTK3LEcqd_AaH5ZnDBA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CCQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q&f=false)