

The LAPEF: An Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Research

Vinicio Busacchi¹

Abstract: This paper introduces the LAPEF, or Laboratory of Psychoanalysis, Hermeneutics and Phenomenology, an interdisciplinary Italian laboratory that gathers philosophers, psychoanalysts and psychiatrists from various schools who share a common scientific and humanistic interest for a holistic approach on the human being and its condition. The text outlines LAPEF's major theoretical-philosophical and procedural-scientific characters, along with its significant commitments and achievements to fostering both an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration. Furthermore, it highlights LAPEF's endeavors in research, education and cultural engagement.

Keywords: interdisciplinarity, phenomenology, critical hermeneutics, Freud, Jung, Husserl, Jaspers, Ricoeur

1. Philosophy for psychoanalysis, psychoanalysis for philosophy

The LAPEF – Laboratory of Psychoanalysis, Hermeneutics and Phenomenology (Laboratorio di Psicoanalisi, Ermeneutica, Fenomenologia) – was founded in 2014. It includes, philosophers, psychoanalysts and psychiatrists originally gathered within an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary group of study, research and discussion on the central themes concerning the human being and its condition. This group immediately recognized the productivity and importance of a mutual fertilization between psychoanalysis and philosophy, to develop an in-depth reflection on the human being and the human condition in general, referencing our society knowledge and technology, increasingly multicultural and global, as well as characterized by new lifestyles and new crises of meaning, new creative itineraries of realization and new forms of alienation and suffering. Nowadays, philosophy needs to dialog with the sciences to deepen its reflection and understanding of the human condition. Conversely, psychoanalysis benefits from philosophical insights to clarify ideas and perspectives, to “interpret” current times, and to develop a critical self-reflection on its own process, its own knowledge, its own possibilities for increasing development and contribution. From the outset, therefore, the laboratory did not propose neither philosophical research on psychoanalysis, nor psychoanalysis of philosophy, but rather a joint research to explore existential questions.

¹ University of Cagliari, Italy.

From the point of view of philosophy, the contributions of the phenomenological tradition – i.e., of phenomenology of classical origins (Edmund Husserl and Edith Stein, particularly) – of hermeneutics – i.e., of methodological hermeneutics (Emilio Betti), of phenomenological hermeneutics (Paul Ricoeur), and of existential hermeneutics (Karl Jaspers) – are favored. From the psychoanalytic point of view, the contribution of Freud and Jung’s psychoanalysis are favored, with particular attention to those contributions that have focused on the theme of the other, of intersubjectivity and of the psychoanalysis of psychoses (among the various names, Wilfred Bion and Donald Winnicott stand out).

The LAPEF considers the relationship between psychoanalysis and philosophy according to models of the “continental” tradition which are susceptible of a critical re-application. This critical re-application aims to deepen the dimension of the human relationship, i.e., the relationship of a person with another, and with himself/herself. In this regard, Jaspers’ perspective assumes particular significance, starting from the existential-philosophical relief that the human being (who is a being whose fundamental dimension is affectivity) is a *relational being*: human existence, in fact, being rooted in “possibility”, finds a field of action and struggle, of realization and setback in the relationship with the world, in which one is seeking release from anguish, and lives the experience of anguish; in the relationship with himself, in which one is forced, according to different intensity, to face despair; and in relationship with the Transcendent, in which one faces the critical point and suffering of the paradox experience. In this context, on several fronts, an interesting dialectical link is established between hermeneutic-existential perspective and the phenomenological one, in particular that of later Husserl who thematizes, precisely, the question of the other. On closer inspection, both Jaspers and Husserl place the function of conscience at the centre, as an “organ” of knowledge, as a cognitive and reflective centre, but not in the sense of the scientific-positivist approach. It is known that Husserl’s research opens precisely to the overcoming of the positivist paradigm and moves in the direction of a reflective philosophy that embraces human experience in its entirety: his is not a theory of knowledge *tout court*, nor a pure and simple essence description procedure. On the other hand, Jaspers’ project, both as a philosophy and as a psychology, presents itself as an existential approach and an “existential elucidation” (*Existenzerhellung*). Within its elucidation, human existence shows that it cannot be treated as an object of knowledge, nor as a measurable and knowable reality: to exist is to (somehow) express an existential research. Thus, the rigorous essence of science is not all the truth, nor can it grasp the whole truth: the form of every statement is linked to objective contents and therefore to a universal meaning. Yet if an attempt is made to clarify existence in the statement,

then its meaning is no longer universal, because it transcends the meaning of universality itself (see Jaspers 1970: Ch. I). However, coming back to the point of the centrality of conscience, Jaspers repeatedly emphasizes that the reality that is uniquely accessible to us is the human being: understanding can only occur through the human being. This is the idea which broadens the horizon of the use of his model to the phenomenological field because it places consciousness at the centre. Jaspers' idea that the psychic arises from the psychic in a way we understand goes beyond its immediate message and obvious meaning: we cannot have a full rational or scientific explainable knowledge of another's psychic state and experience, however we can fully and deeply understand it. The fulcrum is the work of conscience existential analysis which is not only "analysis" in the technical-ration or procedural sense, but an empathetic and reflective experience and approach. Given this premise, the dialectic of explication and understanding also comes into play. This is a dialectic which Jaspers helps to redefine and which, in the specific interest of the LAPEF, gives reason to graft the hermeneutical discourse. This discourse, in different ways and according to different modalities and gradations, affects all psychoanalysis, both in the branches attentive to the deciphering of dreams and the symbolic heritage (the understanding of the depth in general), and in the ones useful for clarifying and perfecting the therapeutic technique itself, as well as in those more generally interested in theoretical or metapsychological themes. This makes common reference to Paul Ricoeur's work and to the various stages of his hermeneutics (symbols and metaphor, text and narration, translation and recognition). It remains central, still in the philosophical field, and paves the way for various itineraries within the hermeneutical philosophical tradition: with reference to Heidegger for the dilemma of the human ontological foundation, as well as to Levinas for the dilemma of the meaning of intersubjective relationships, and to Betti for the scientific and methodological aspects etc.

Over the years the group has systematically dealt with the themes of the image (2013-2015), of the person (2016-2018), of the unconscious (2018-2021), and is now addressing the issue of attention (2022-2023). Further on, more will be said of the collaboration and proceedings that this research has led to, as the various scientific and cultural initiatives that the LAPEF has promoted and still promote will be recalled, as to illustrate its path and history.

Before concluding this paragraph, it may be helpful to briefly introduce the members who worked on the foundation and development of the LAPEF. This can help grasping its scientific profile more clearly and, in some way, to better understand its characterization and cultural orientation, as well as its aims. Thus, let's proceed in alphabetical order considering the last name. First, *Angela Ales Bello*. She is professor emeritus of history of contemporary

philosophy at the Pontifical Lateran University of Rome and visiting professor at the Faculty of Psychology, São Paulo State University, and at Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas, in Brazil. She is president of the Italian Centre of Phenomenological Research (www.centroitalianodiricerchefenomenologiche.it) and of the Edith Stein Italian Association (www.aiesitalia.it). Her field of research is classical phenomenology, Edmund Husserl and Edith Stein, with reference to contemporary philosophical movements. The topics she has covered concerns philosophical anthropology, with particular attention to issues of gender, the phenomenology of religion, psychology and phenomenological psychopathology². Second, *Luigi Aversa*. Aversa is a psychiatrist and a Jungian psychoanalyst. He worked and taught in a psychiatric clinic at the Sapienza University of Rome and, later, in the clinic at the University of Rome Tor Vergata. He was president of the Italian Centre for Analytic Psychology (Centro Italiano di Psicologia Analitica – CIPA; www.cipajung.it) and director of the School of Psychotherapy. He was a founding member of the Italian Society of Transcultural Psychiatry. Together with Mario Trevi and Umberto Galimberti he founded the journal *Metaxù* and developed an important collaboration with Paul Ricoeur regarding some hermeneutical aspects of psychoanalysis³. Third, *Gabriella Baptist*. She is an associate professor of moral philosophy and philosophical anthropology at the University of Cagliari, Italy. Baptist follows an open research itinerary, mainly interested in contemporary German and French thought, from a phenomenological, hermeneutical and deconstructionist orientation. She studied at the universities of Rome (La Sapienza), Zurich and Bochum (in Germany) earning her doctorate with a thesis on “The problem of modality in Hegel’s logics: An itinerary between the possible and the necessary”. She was an Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung scholar⁴. Forth, *Angelomarco Barioglio*. He is a psychiatrist at the Hospital of Ascoli Piceno (Italy), a cognitive-behavioral psychotherapist, and expert in forensic psychiatry, and has a wide range of philosophical interests. In the clinical field he mainly deals with affective and personality disorders. Fifth, *Franco Bellotti*. He is a Jungian psychoanalyst, sociologist and analyst member of the CIPA, as well as member of the International Association for Analytic Psychology (Associazione internazionale di psicologia analitica IAAP; www.iaap.org)⁵. He is a professor at the School of Specialization in Psychotherapy, and author of several publications in the journal *Aperture* (www.aperture-rivista.it), concerning the study of the analytic relationship in a phenomenological perspective. He combines the Jungian concept of “affect”

² Among her numerous publications are the following: Ales Bello 1982; 1985; 1997; 2013; 2014.

³ Among his publications are the following: Aversa 1978; 1995; 1999; 2014.

⁴ Among her publications are the following: Baptist 2010; 2011; 2012.

with the phenomenological concepts of intersubjectivity and the body. His clinical activity mainly concerns the private profession as a psychotherapist. Sixth, *Vinicio Busacchi*. He is a full professor of theoretical philosophy (University of Cagliari, Italy) and president of the Association ASUS, as well as co-founder and co-director of Critical Hermeneutics: Biannual International Journal of Philosophy (www.ojs.unica.it/index.php/ecch). His research interests are focused on philosophical hermeneutics, epistemology of human and social sciences, historical knowledge and Buddhist studies⁵. Seventh, we have *Filippo Maria Ferro*. He is a neurologist and psychiatrist with a psychoanalytic background. He carried out activities at the Catholic University Sacred Heart of Milan, and then, at the D'Annunzio University of Chieti, where he was full professor of psychiatry. He was head of the psychiatric diagnosis and treatment service (Servizio psichiatrico diagnosi e cura - SPDC) in Guardiagrele (CH, Italy). He has worked on the clinic of psychosis and on the history of psychopathology. His psychopathological attention to the psychosis' beginning states was the basis for research in the field of neuroscience in collaboration with the University of Parma. He is also honorary president of the Italian Society for Phenomenological Psychopathology⁶. Eighth, *Daniella Iannotta*. She was professor of communication ethics at the Roma Tre University (Italy) and professor of semiotics at the LUMSA University. She cultivates philosophical-hermeneutical interests of a linguistic-analytical and ethical-ontological nature. Her privileged point of reference is Ricoeur's thought and work, on whose footsteps she thinks we can face the challenges that contemporaneity throws at thought. Some questions which are particularly urgent today are intertwined with the phenomenon of mass media and multicultural communication⁷. Ninth *Angiola Iapoce*. She is psychoanalyst and Jungian philosopher, analyst member of the CIPA and member of the IAAP. She teaches at the School of Specialization in Psychotherapy. She founded the publishing house Fattore umano edizioni (www.fattoreumanoedizioni.com) and is the director of the journal Quaderni di cultura junghiana (www.quadernidiculturajunghiana.it). Her research is mainly aimed at deepening the affective dimension, renewing the concept of "affect" in analytical psychology in a phenomenological sense⁸. Tenth, *Giuseppe Martini*. He is a psychoanalyst, member of the Italian Psychoanalytic Society (Società Psicoanalitica Italiana – SPI; www.spiweb.it), and he was chief psychiatrist of the District XVII Mental Health Unit of the Department of Mental Health in Rome (Unità Salute Mentale Distretto XVII, Dipartimento di Salute Mentale, Roma).

⁵ Among his publications are the following: Busacchi 2011; 2013; 2015; 2016; 2018; 2019.

⁶ Among his numerous publications are the following: Ferro 1989; 1990; 2006.

⁷ Among her publications are the following: Iannotta 1996; 1998; 2004; 2004b.

⁸ Among her publications are the following: Iapoce 1997; 2014; 2018.

He deals with the relationship between psychoanalysis and hermeneutics and with the psychotherapy of psychoses. The themes of translation and the unrepresentable are at the centre of his reflection and hermeneutical research⁹. Eleventh, *Angelo Moscardiello*. He is an expert in cinema and a professor of history of cinema at the University of L'Aquila. Several of his publications are dedicated to film registers (Godard, Chabrol and Losey), and many others are dedicated to the issue of filmic language¹⁰. He has also dealt with the relationship between cinema and the arts¹¹. Twelfth, *Gaspare Mura*. He is a philosopher and theologian, emeritus professor of philosophy at the Pontifical Urban University, as well as professor of hermeneutical philosophy at the Pontifical Lateran University and at the Pontifical University of Holy Cross. He was director of the editorial house Città Nuova (Rome; www.cittanuova.it) and the Urbaniana University Press (Vatican City; www.urbaniana.press), and he was also director of the journal of philosophy and theology *Euntes docete*. He is honorary president of the ASUS (Rome)¹². Thirteenth, *Andrea Scardovi*. He is a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, at SPI, he has a PhD in human psychobiology. He worked in various territorial services and was for years an adjunct professor at the School of Specialization in Psychiatry at the University of Bologna. He has been involved in the training of doctors in communication with the patient and in the preparatory work for psychotherapy for medical students and psychiatry residents. He is a member of the Paris Group, a study group of the International Psychoanalytic Association (www.ipa.world) specifically on psychoanalytic treatment today. He is on the reading committee of the journal *Rivista di Psicoanalisi* (www.riviste.raffaellocortina.it). His fields of interest concern the integration between metapsychological thinking and the relational aspects of analytic theory and practice; the extension of psychoanalytic thought to the world of culture; the rooting of philosophical reflection in the experience of the psychoanalytic clinic. In this light he is currently carrying out an in-depth study of the psychoanalytic concept of "pleasure" in reference to theory, clinic and social analysis. Finally, *Önay Sözer*. Died in 2022, he was professor emeritus of theoretical philosophy at the Bosphorus University (Istanbul), he had studied in Istanbul, Cologne and Bochum (Germany) and had been scholarship holder of the A. von Humboldt-Stiftung (from 1969) and (from 1994) of the Italian Institute for Philosophical Studies (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici - IISF; www.iisf.it). He had also taught at the Collège International de Philosophie (www.ciph.org) and had been called as

⁹ Among his publications are the following: Martini 1998; 2005; 2011; 2021.

¹⁰ On the filmic language, see Moscardiello 1982.

¹¹ See Moscardiello 1981; 2005. Among his last books, we remember: Moscardiello 2011; 2012.

¹² Among his numerous publications are the following: Mura 1983; 2001; 2005; 2016-2018.

visiting professor at the universities of Bochum and Cologne, as well as a repeatedly invited guest at international conferences¹³.

2. A laboratory of research, a laboratory of culture

2.1. Necessity of an interdisciplinary work

As already stated, the LAPEF has the physiognomy of an interdisciplinary research laboratory around the human being, with a humanistic and existential approach. Certainly, from a philosophical point of view, one of the major references on the theoretical-practical and speculative level is represented by critical hermeneutics, defined by following the methodological and speculative example of the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur. Already in the 1960s, this philosopher revealed the problem of discourse fragmentation on the human being, as the result of the fragmentation/specialization of knowledge. In his view, we belong to the post-Hegelian era of scientific and speculative thought. In one way or another, we face some kind of mourning regarding the impossibility of making a system, of summing up knowledge under a system. This work of mourning develops a kind of tension between, on one hand, what Jaspers called systematicity without final synthesis and, on the other, a deliberately fragmentary way of thinking (see Ricoeur 1991).

Ricoeur's is a philosophy of the long course (*voie longue*), not only in opposition to the short course of Heidegger's ontological hermeneutics, but for the design of a research that today requires the long journey and the long effort of interdisciplinary work. In addition, it is a hermeneutic model that is grafted onto phenomenology, which therefore reveals the parallel path of eidetic analysis and the interpretative procedure to be fully practicable.

The interdisciplinary character of Ricoeur's philosophy does not simply mirror the vastness of his interests and domains of research and reflection. In fact, there is an integrated axis of this various researches which subsumes the epistemological dilemmas about the constitution of the human and social sciences in parallel with the challenges and problems related to the fragmentation of sciences. This axis connects the epistemological problem of the human and social sciences with the contemporary problem of fragmentation of different knowledge and, at the same time, with the dilemmas about the reality and meaning of human life and existence: How do we obtain a comprehensive discourse on the human being?

As Ricoeur had already explained in his *Freud and Philosophy* (1965, 1970), today "we are able to encompass in a single question the problem of the unification of human discourse.

¹³ Among his publications are the following: Sözer 1999; 2000; with Keskin 1999.

[...] Today the unity of human language poses a problem” (Ricoeur 1970: 3–4). Such a unified philosophy of language and knowledge cannot be “any one man”, because “a modern Leibniz with the ambition and capacity to achieve it would have to be an accomplished mathematician, a universal exegete, a critic versed in several of the arts, and a good psychoanalyst” (Ricoeur 1970: 4). Sixty years after *Freud and Philosophy*, it would perhaps be better to consider neuroscience and cognitive psychology in addition, or even as a substitution, to psychoanalysis; and, certainly, there are even other important disciplines that must be listed. But the essence of Ricoeur’s analysis does not change. Sixty years after, dismemberment and fragmentation have progressed, and beyond any attempt to get the sciences and knowledge closer or to synthesize them, what emerges is a new Babel of knowledge and culture. However, a widespread understanding of the importance of working towards interconnecting different kinds and domains of knowledge is growing day by day; and in this context, Ricoeur’s work offers a solution and example.

With his long course of multiple philosophic detours, Ricoeur has crossed and traversed a large part of the theoretical and speculative traditions of our epoch, and even scientific and non-scientific disciplines. Flicking through his research we come across spiritualism, phenomenology, existentialism, hermeneutics, philosophy of science, empirical psychology, structuralism, psychoanalysis, linguistics, anthropology, religion, philosophy of language, philosophy of mind, critical theory, rhetoric, narrative theory, theory of action, analytical philosophy, pragmatism, history, sociology, political philosophy, law, mythology, neuroscience, and much more.

Inspired by Jaspers’ idea of co-philosophize Ricoeur engages in open dialogue and confrontation, potentially with all disciplines. This is an essential part of his strategy and methodology as a comprehensive approach able to overcome the disciplinary fragmentation of knowledge. On one side, it is in this way that, step by step, he progressively reinforces his ability to use and apply philosophy with flexibility and with transversal efficacy; on the other side, it is the nature of philosophy in itself – an intra- and inter-discipline – to offer a flexible and transversal possibility in scientific and non-scientific uses and applications.

Ricoeur has indirectly participated in the historical debate between Gadamer and Habermas collected in *Hermeneutik und Ideologiekritik* (1971) with a short essay, “Herméneutique et critique des idéologies”, where he placed himself in a middle position between hermeneutics of tradition and critique of ideology. This is precisely what Ricoeur explicitly called “critical hermeneutics”, a vision with a strong potential to be extended and generalized. In fact, directly or indirectly, the Gadamer-Habermas debate involves an

articulated *querelle* against specific epistemological traditions, above all on the epistemology and methodology of the social sciences and the role of philosophy for the epistemology of science. A narrow connection exists between Ricœur's use of Freud's psychoanalysis as a model for the human and social sciences, having a bifacial epistemology (with a linguistic register of energetics and hermeneutics) and Habermas' critical philosophy which has been structured following the model of the dialectical logics of the social sciences in contrast to the predominant, positivist, model of the analytical logics (see Adorno, Popper et. al. 1969). In Ricœur, the hermeneutics of psychoanalysis – as well as the hermeneutics of history, text and action – play a central role for the hermeneutic arc theory, which is a methodology and an epistemology transversally disposed between *explanation* and *understanding*. Obviously, this is not an easy relationship; and Ricœur has largely analyzed its productive and difficult aspects (for example, in *From Text to Action*, 1986).

In Ricœur, there is certainly a direct and strong connection between his efforts to find a more integrated and flexible methodology and to work in an interdisciplinary way. On different occasions, he has explained that interdisciplinary work is a must in our post-Hegelian, non-systematic era (see Ricoeur 1991) and that philosophy is condemned to disappear if it interrupts its dialogue with the sciences (see Ricoeur 1995: 62).

Considering Ricœur's philosophy as a whole, we may extract the following, procedural, aspects which have a direct connection with, and impact on, the multileveled and interdisciplinary work of critical hermeneutics: the collegial work of scientists and scholars; the multi- and interdisciplinary approach in studying specific problems; the balance between analytical and critical argumentation; the movement of analysis and critics from a theoretical to a practical level, and vice-versa; the dialectic between theorization and speculation, between non-philosophical and philosophical knowledge and between non-scientific and scientific discourse; the exercise of science and philosophy as a 'theoretical practice'; the transversal and tensional disposition between distinction and connection, separation and unification, and conflict and mediation; the articulation of research and discourse from different levels, degrees, and registers.

2.2. An interinstitutional work. Scientific, educational and cultural activities

In developing its interdisciplinary research, the LAPEF has promoted the encounter and collaboration between different institutions and realities. It was not, and it is not simply a natural consequence of the active commitment of its members through the involvement of the institutions of their respective affiliation, but rather a path intertwined with the research itself

and with the more general interests of the LAPEF. Its interests are not only sectorial and scientific but more broadly cultural and humanistic. In this sense, the LAPEF reveals its sensitivity to that field which is defined as the “third mission”. The so-called “third mission” strictly qualifies the public engagement of a university, the contribution that a university offers to society, and social and civic development. However, in a broad sense, it can refer to any institution and reality that promotes research and education. Today philosophy and psychoanalysis will die as emancipatory, cultural, and civilizing forces if they get caged in a task closed only to the disciplinary sector and/or professional field to which they belong. Not even institutions and training schools can completely fulfill their task without being open to other institutions. Thus, the LAPEF, over time, has collaborated with clinical-hospital realities (such as the Hospital of Ascoli Piceno), with university departments (Roma Tre University, University of Cagliari, Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul [UFMS, Brazil] and others), with research and training centers (ASUS, Centro di Psicoanalisi Romano [www.centropsicoanalisiromano.it], CIPA, CIRF, IISF, SIPEA [www.sipea.eu]), as well as with publishing houses and scientific journals (Critical Hermeneutics, Eleuthería [www.periodicos.ufms.br/index.php/reveleu], Fattore Umano Edizioni, Jaca Book [www.jacabook.it]), and with culture centers and other public institutions (Centro studi Lorenzo Milani, Comune di Ascoli Piceno [www.comune.ap.it], Comune di Filottrano [www.comune.filottrano.an.it]).

These inter-institutional collaborations have accompanied the various scientific, educational, and cultural activities that the LAPEF has promoted during its almost decade of life. It is a large series of activities, sometimes carried out by individual members, other times by several members of the group or by the group as a whole which, in various ways, have prepared, accompanied, and, in some cases, guided the work within LAPEF’s internal meeting (they were and are carried out basically every six months between Lazio, Marche, Tuscany and Sardinia). Among the most recent scientific training activities of the laboratory, we recall the seminary course of Psychodynamic Psychopathology – Rome, from October 2019 to October 2020. The LAPEF proposed a refresher course to psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychotherapists on psychodynamic psychopathology proposing to take up the challenge of the opening of horizons and perspectives, beyond nosographic reductionism. Psychopathology helps to articulate the field of research and treatment beyond the horizon of school and technique, opening to the joint contributions of philosophy, psychology, and psychiatry. In its original outline, the one established by Jaspers, it places particular emphasis on the rethinking of the care relationship and on the redefinition of the relationship with the patient, who is above

all a “person”, a human being who is the bearer of a unique and always significant existential experience. The course was characterized by “mixed” teaching in which the overture by the philosophers, aimed at probing the foundations of the existential discourse on which psychopathology is based, is accompanied by lessons of a theoretical-clinical nature by psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, who aim at an illustration of psychodynamic psychopathology in its general aspects and in reference to specific pathologies. Particular attention was paid to the clinic, through the discussion of cases followed by the participants in a private or institutional setting, with a psychotherapeutic or integrated setting, to focus on that complex but extremely fruitful transit that leads from psychopathological categories to the dual relationship and confirms that irreducibility that some psychiatry tends to deny. After the success of the course, web seminars on Psychodynamic Psychopathology followed in 2020-2021. It was a seminar cycle on “Language and visions of the world: Between psychoanalysis, phenomenology and hermeneutics”, i.e., a new series of interdisciplinary in-depth seminars aimed at investigating issues on the border between psychotherapy work and psychopathological experience, and at the center of reflection on being human and a person. As before, the seminars were characterized by a mixed teaching which allows a comparison between the uncertain knowledge of psychoanalysis and psychiatry, aimed at giving meaning to madness, and the millennial but incomplete philosophical discourse, aimed at probing the ontological and ontic foundations on which psychopathology itself rests. The challenge remains one of being able to think beyond the shoals of biological, social, and psychological reductionism while avoiding where the dual relationship closes itself in a self-centered knowledge unaware of the anthropological categories that support it. It was decided, according to the specific declination of each day, to cross a shared horizon that has language and visions of the world at the center since it is perhaps in the meshes of their relationship that both personal identity and psychic suffering are generated, according to a dynamic that finds its nucleus in the unconscious-consciousness dialectic. The seminars will cross the territories of art, psychosis, institutional psychiatry, philosophy, and transcendence, taking account of some authors who have somehow marked the stages of the path we intend to probe, starting from an idea of language as an expression of the essential link between the ego and the world.

On the same line, of interdisciplinary work and exploratory openness, the seminar activities of the LAPEF continue today. An important novelty is represented by the recent opening to the collaboration with the PhilPsyCh, “Rede de Pesquisa em História e Filosofia dos saberes Ψ e das Ciências Humanas”, of the Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul. Among the events, we recall (1) the participation in the international conference “X Semana

de Filosofia UFMS – VII Seminário de Pesquisa GP Subjetividade, Filosofia e Psicanálise” (UFMS, Brazil - 27 October 2021); (2) the participation in the international web-conference on “Interpretation between Consciousness, History and Knowledges” (University of Cagliari, Italy - 13-14 May 2022); and (3) the participation in the 1st International web-congress PhilPsyCh¹⁴ (UFMS, Brazil, 27-29 October 2022).

3. Publications

LAPEF’s first publication came out in 2015. It was a book entitled *Between the Image and the Word: Passages and Landscapes (Tra imagine e parola. Passaggi e paesaggi;* Busacchi, Martini 2015). Thus, speaking of the image, from the beginning we intended to reaffirm its intrinsically linguistic character, as well as its inescapable correlation with the word, highlighting how precisely their interconnection has foundational value for the psyche and is specific to human thought. Divided into two parts (from philosophy to science of mind; and from science of mind to philosophy), the book explores the question of the image, first from the philosophical side, in its interweaving with the question of the archetype (Mura), of language (Iannotta), of personal identity (Busacchi) and of the cinematographic phenomenon (Moscariello); subsequently, it explores the question of the image from the psychoanalytic side, with a focus on the sense of the tragic (Aversa), on the crux of the internal image (Iapoce), on the translatable-untranslatable nexus (Martini), on the temporality/gratuity relationship (Scardovi), on the intersubjective relationship beyond the therapeutic situation (Bellotti) and on the intentionality/gratuity nexus neuronal life (Barioglio).

This first book was followed by a second one: *Who are you? Self, Subject and Person (Chi sei? Sé, Soggetto, Persona;* Baptist, Barioglio 2018¹⁵), published in 2018. This book explores the question of personal identity in its complexity, particularly studying the subject as inextricably linked to another subject, a subject that is in relationship with others and with the world, therefore crossed by passion and affection.

A third book was published in 2021 with the title *Multi-voiced Unconscious: Multidisciplinary itineraries between psychoanalysis, hermeneutics and phenomenology (L’inconscio a più Voci. Percorsi multidisciplinari tra psicoanalisi, ermeneutica,*

¹⁴ Rede de Pesquisa em História e Filosofia dos saberes Ψ e das Ciências Humanas” – Centro de Estudos de História e Filosofia das Ciências Humanas /Grupo de Pesquisa Filosofia da Psicanálise / Diretório dos Grupos de Pesquisa no Brasil, Lattes / Grupo de Pesquisa Subjetividade, Filosofia e Psicanálise” / Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS).

¹⁵ The book collects contributions of Angela Ales Bello, Luigi Aversa, Gabriella Baptist, Angelomarco Barioglio, Franco Bellotti, Vinicio Busacchi, Domenico Chianese, Marcella D’Abbiere, Sossio Giametta, Daniella Iannotta, Angiola Iapoce, Gaspare Mura, Giuseppe Martini, Angelo Moscariello, Alison Scott-Bauman, Öney Sözer.

*fenomenologia*¹⁶; Busacchi, Iapoce, Sözer 2021). This book focuses on unconscious reality and develops an analysis of its key concepts from an interdisciplinary point of view (consciousness, dream, representation, etc.). The authors of this book intend to place the concept of the unconscious once again at the centre of their reflections, to re-evaluate its vitality which still retains this dimension that not only belongs to the domain of psychoanalysis but extends to touch the existence of every human being since its daily implications. The theme of the unconscious is revisited considering the long journey that has been made since its birth in psychoanalysis, more than a century ago; thus, to find even in the original source of a philosophical matrix that freshness of a gaze that remains open and thus manages to avoid unilateral withdrawal within the disciplinary and school boundaries.

As previously noted, LAPEF is currently working around the theme of Attention and is developing its collaboration with the Brazilian PhilPsyCh, Rede de Pesquisa em História e Filosofia.

References

- Adorno, Th. W, Popper, et al. (1969). *Der Positivismusstreit in der deutschen Soziologie*. Neuwied und Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand Verlag GmbH.
- Ales Bello, A. (1982). *L'oggettività come pregiudizio. Analisi di inediti husserliani sulle scienze*. Roma: La Goliardica.
- Ales Bello, A. (1985). *Husserl. Sul problema di Dio*. Roma: Studium.
- Ales Bello, A. (1997). *Culture e religioni. Una lettura fenomenologica*. Roma: Città Nuova.
- Ales Bello, A. (2013). *Il senso delle cose. Per un realismo fenomenologico*. Roma: Castelveccchi.
- Ales Bello, A. (2014). *Il senso del sacro. Dall'arcaicità alla desacralizzazione*. Roma: Castelveccchi.
- Aversa, L. (1978). *Interpretazione e individuazione. Progetto ermeneutico per la psicologia analitica*. Roma: Borla.
- Aversa, L. (1995). *Fondamenti di Psicologia Analitica*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Aversa, L., ed. (1999). *Psicologia analitica. La teoria della clinica*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Aversa, L. (1978). *Psiche: dialoghi sulle zone di confine*, Fattore Umano Edizioni, Roma 2014.

¹⁶ This book collects contributions of: A. Ales Bello, L. Aversa, G. Baptist A. Barioglio, P. Barone, F. Bellotti, V. Busacchi, F.M. Ferro, R. Finelli, A. Iapoce, R. Lanfredini, R. Lombardi, G. Martini, A. Moscariello, G. Mura, Ö. Sözer, N. Zippel.

- Baptist, G. (2010). *Derridas Glas zwischen Hegel und Levinas*, in B. Keintzel, B. Liebsch (Hg.), *Hegel und Levinas*. München: Freiburg i. Br.
- Baptist, G. (2011). *Fink und Hegel am Fenster der Kunst*, in *Kunst als Kulturgut, III: Musealisierung und Reflexion. Gedächtnis - Erinnerung - Geschichte*, hrsg. von A. Gethmann-Siefert, B. Collenberg-Plotnikov, E. Weisser-Lohmann. Fink: München.
- Baptist, G. (2012). *Dietro le orme dei poeti. Immaginazione, verità, scelta*. Milano-Udine: Mimesis.
- Busacchi, V. (2011). *Ricœur vs. Freud*. Paris: Harmattan.
- Busacchi, V. (2013). *Pour une herméneutique critique*. Paris: Harmattan.
- Busacchi, V. (2015). *The Recognition Principle: A Philosophical Perspective between Psychology, Sociology and Politics*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Busacchi, V. (2016). *Habermas and Ricoeur's Depth Hermeneutics: From Psychoanalysis to a Critical Human Science*. Cham: Springer.
- Busacchi, V. (2018). *Philosophy & Human Revolution: Essays in Celebration of Daisaku Ikeda's 90th Birthday*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Busacchi, V. (2019). *Action, Intersubjectivity and Narrative Identity*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Busacchi, V., Martini G. ed. (2015). *Tra immagine e parola. Passaggi e paesaggi*, Fattore Umano Edizioni, Roma 2015.
- Baptist, G., Barioglio, A.M. eds. (2018). *Chi sei? Sé, Soggetto, Persona*. Roma: Fattore Umano Edizioni.
- Busacchi, V., Iapoce, A., Sözer, Ö. Eds. (2021). *L'inconscio a più voci. Percorsi multidisciplinari tra psicoanalisi, ermeneutica, fenomenologia*. Roma: Fattore Umano Edizioni.
- Ferro, F.M. (1989). *Controversie sulla catatonia*. Milano: Vita e pensiero.
- Ferro, F.M. (1990). *L'epilessia tra neurologia e psichiatria*. Milano: Vita e pensiero.
- Ferro, F.M., Riefolo, G. (2006). *Isteria e campo della dissociazione*. Roma: Borla.
- Iannotta, D. (1996). *Percorsi dell'esistenza*. Torino: Società editrice internazionale.
- Iannotta, D. (1998). *Frammenti di lettura: percorsi dell'altrimenti con Paul Ricoeur*. Roma: Aracne.
- Iannotta, D. (2004). *Pensare la differenza. Incontri*. Cantalupa (TO): Effatà.
- Iannotta, D. (2004b). *La comunicazione fra simbolo e immagine*. Cantalupa (TO): Effatà.
- Iapoce, A. (1997). *Il sogno. Una ferita per il logos: Jung e la metodologia del paradosso*. Montella (AV): Vivarium.

- Iapoce, A., Magagnini et al., eds, (2014). *Carl Gustav Jung. 50 anni dopo. Confronto tra la psicologia analitica e il mondo contemporaneo. Atti dei lavori delle sezioni parallele*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Iapoce, A., ed. (2018). *Riflettere con Jung*. Roma: Fattore Umano.
- Martini, G. (1998). *Ermeneutica e Narrazione. Un percorso fra psichiatria e psicoanalisi*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Jaspers, K. (1970). *Philosophy*, vol. 2, trans. By E.B. Ashton. Chicago: Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- Martini, G. (2005). *La sfida dell'irrapresentabile*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Martini, G. (2011). *La psicosi e la rappresentazione*. Roma: Borla.
- Martini, G., Busacchi, V. (2021). *Personal identity between psychology and philosophy: A perpetual metamorphoses?* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Moscariello, A. (1981). *Cinema e/o letteratura*. Bologna: Pitagora.
- Moscariello, A. (1982). *Come si guarda un film*. Milano: Laterza.
- Moscariello, A. (2005). *L'immagine equivalente*. Bologna: Pitagora.
- Moscariello, A. (2011). *Cinema e pittura*. Bari: Progedit.
- Moscariello, A. (2012). *Breviario di estetica del cinema*. Milano-Udine: Mimesis.
- Mura, G. (1983). *Emmanuel Levinas: ermeneutica e separazione*. Roma: Città Nuova.
- Mura, G. (2001). *Pensare la parola. Per una filosofia dell'incontro*. Città del Vaticano: Urbaniana University Press.
- Mura, G. (2005). *Introduzione all'ermeneutica veritativa*. Roma: Edizioni Università della Santa Croce.
- Mura, G. (2016-2018). *Scripta hermeneutica*, III voll. Città del Vaticano: Lateran University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*, trans. by Denis Savage. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1991). *Autocompreensão e historia*. In T. Calvo Martínez, R. Ávila Crespo, *Paul Ricœur. Los caminos de la interpretación*. Barcelona: Anthropos, 26-42.
- Ricœur P., (1995). *Réflexion faite. Autobiographie intellectuelle*. Paris: Editions Esprit.
- Sözer, Ö. (2000). *Das Problem 'Zwischen' bei Hannah Arendt und Martin Heidegger*, in *Metaphysik der praktischen Welt: Perspektiven im Anschluss an Hegel und Heidegger*, eds. Andreas Grossmann and Christoph Jamme. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 130-142.
- Sözer, Ö. (1999). *Yuvaya-Dönüs'te "Kapi" Sorunu-Georg Simmell ve Martin Heidegger'*, *Cogito*, 18: 116-127.

Sözer, Ö., Keskin, F., eds. (1999). *Pera Peras Poros*, İstanbul: YKY.