

National Research University
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

Sidorova Maria

**The Concept of Action in the Philosophy of H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur:
the Comparative Analysis**

Dissertation summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy HSE

Academic supervisor:
Alexander F. Filippov
Professor, Doctor of
Sciences in Theory,
History and Methods of
Sociology

Moscow – 2019

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The Relevance of the Study

By “philosophy of action” it is often meant the Anglo-Saxon, analytical tradition of studying the action. It was formed in the mid-twentieth century and its preconditions were the logical positivism, the philosophy of language (L. Wittgenstein, M. Schlick, G. Ryle, J. Austin). The analytical theory of action became a separate field of philosophical knowledge after the book “Intention” (1957) by G. E. M. Anscombe and D. Davidson's article “Actions, Bases and Causes” (1963). At the same time, it received its name after the work of A. Danto “Analytical Philosophy of Action” in 1963. Its distinguishing feature is the causal approach to the action. Even Davidson, trying to combine the understanding and explanation of the action, has not gone beyond this approach. In his interpretation, the meaning (mental basis) of action is a separate event that precedes the action and is its cause¹. Some representatives of the analytic tradition criticize the concept of Davidson. For example, supporters of the anti-causal approach either revise the principles of mental causality (Tanney, Hutto, McGuire²) or deny the possibility of explaining the action from the standpoint of philosophy and social sciences (Hutchinson, Read³). However, they do not set themselves the goal to overcome the causal principle reducing understanding of the action to its explanation.

Despite the popularity of analytical theories, the interest to the action did not fade among representatives of continental philosophy in the twentieth century including H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur. They belong to different directions of the philosophical thought: Ricoeur to hermeneutics and phenomenology, Arendt – to political theory. However, their ideas about the action have similarities. Firstly,

¹ Davidson D. Actions, Reasons and Causes // The Journal of Philosophy. Vol. LX, No 23. 1963. P.5-6, P.9-11.

² McGuire J. M. Actions, Reasons, and Intentions: Overcoming Davidson's Ontological Prejudice. Dialogue XLVI, 2007. P. 459-479. Hutto D. A Cause for Concern: Reasons, Causes and Explanation // Philosophy and Phenomenological Research. 1999, Vol. 59, 2. P. 381-401. Tanney J. Why Reasons May Not Be Causes // Mind and Language. 1995, Vol. 10. 1-2. P. 105-128.

³ Hutchinson P., Read R. Toward a perspicuous presentation of «Perspicuous Presentation» // Philosophical Investigations. 2008. Vol. 31, Issue: 2. P. 141-160.

both philosophers use the term “action” in the sense that it received in the practical philosophy of Aristotle: action as praxis. Secondly, both Arendt and Ricoeur develop an independent approach to the action opposite to analytical theories. Namely, they determine the action within the framework of not ontology of the event, but of practical hermeneutics. If Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of action is a consequence of the hermeneutic, phenomenological orientation of his philosophy, the hermeneutic context of Arendt’s action theory is hidden behind the political content of her texts. Both philosophers ask a question about the understanding of action not only by the actors themselves, but also by *others* (spectators, interpreters of the action). They are looking for the basis of action not in its cause-and-effect relationships but in relations *between* people. Arendt finds the basis of action in political relations. Ricoeur finds the basis of action in interpersonal, social and political relations. For example in contrast with Davidson, they determine the action answering not the question “*why*”, but the question “*who*”. In Ricoeur's hermeneutics, “who” is the self (ipse). In Arendt’s political philosophy, the individual and meaningful action is considered as a phenomenon of common being. In it, the term “who” is endowed with public meaning. Thirdly, arguing about "who" Arendt and Ricoeur critically rethink the meaning of this term in Heidegger’s fundamental ontology. Therefore, a comparison of their approaches to action allows to rethink the history of philosophy of action as a history of not only Anglo-Saxon, analytical theory, but continental philosophy too.

In addition, a comparison of the action theories by Arendt and Ricoeur contributes to solving the issue of synthesizing various philosophical approaches to the action, namely, hermeneutic, phenomenological, anthropological, ethical-moral, and political approaches. If the anthropological, hermeneutical, phenomenological aspects of Arendt's theory of action are based on a political approach, the social, ethical-political, anthropological aspects of Ricoeur's concept of action are based on the phenomenological hermeneutics of the self. Their comparison opens up new perspectives for the study of action, not only in

philosophy but also in sociology and political science. It can, for example, be useful for refining M. Weber's definition of the social action as a meaningful act, for developing narrative methods of the social action research, for conceptualizing the history of ideas about political action and power.

Besides, the comparison of the theories of action by Arendt and Ricoeur is significant for the study of historical and philosophical prerequisites of their works. In particular, it is useful for analyzing the influence that Aristotle had on them. This comparison helps to collate their interpretations of such concepts of Aristotle's practical philosophy as *praxis* and *phronesis*. Furthermore, the comparison of the theories of action by Arendt and Ricoeur actualizes the "who" issue which is originated in Heidegger's fundamental ontology.

One of the prerequisites for comparing their theories of action is Ricoeur's interest in the political philosophy of Arendt. Their life paths converged at the University of Chicago in the early seventies⁴. In one of the interviews, Ricoeur has noted that the acquaintance with Arendt contributed to his approval for the position of permanent teacher at the University of Chicago. He has not mentioned Arendt in autobiographical conversations after that, however, her name is often found in his philosophical texts: "Oneself as Another", "Memory, History, Forgetting", "The Course of Recognition". At the same time, the question of the influence of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's hermeneutics has not yet received a deep and comprehensive consideration. However, from our point of view, the understanding of influence rendered by Arendt on Ricoeur contributes to the study of the ethical and political aspects of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. In addition, a comparison of their approaches to action reveals Ricoeur from a new, little-studied side as a researcher and commentator of Arendt's philosophy who influenced the spread of her ideas among a wide circle of French intellectuals. Thus, the edition of Arendt's

⁴Reagan Ch. E. Paul Ricœur: His Life and Work. Chicago.1996. P. 132.

book "Human Condition" in French (1983) begins with a preface written by Ricoeur⁵.

Thus, the relevance of our study is determined by:

1. The objectives of the philosophical analysis of action: taking into account not only concepts of the popular analytical theory of action but also the ideas of the hermeneutic, continental approach to the action.

2. The need to combine different approaches to the action for its definition: hermeneutic and causal, personal, reflective and public, political approaches.

3. The study of the influence of Arendt's action theory on the formation of the ethical-social, political aspects of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action.

4. Ricoeur's interpretation of Arendt's action theory.

The Extent of Prior Investigation of the Topic

Arendt's action theory and Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action are analyzed by foreign and Russian researchers. In the foreign researches of Arendt's philosophy, the topic of action is one of the most studied. During the second half of the twentieth century, such well-known commentators as M. Cannovan, M. McCartney, philosophers J. Habermas, P. Virno, J. Taminiaux have been turning to it. For example, J. Habermas described Arendt's concept of power in terms of his own theory of communicative action⁶. J. Taminiaux analyzed its phenomenological and anthropological aspects⁷. Today, there are several approaches to Arendt's action theory in foreign scientific thought: political, narrative, phenomenological, hermeneutical. The first approach is taken into account by most researchers. However, the divergence of views is possible, for example, on the issue of historical and philosophical prerequisites of Arendt's political philosophy. Thus, G. Kateb considers her action theory as a reconstruction of the ancient Greek idea

⁵ Ricoeur P. Action, Story and History: On Re-reading The Human Condition // Salmagundi. No. 60. 1983. P. 60-72.

⁶ See: Habermas J. Hannah Arendt's communications concept of Power // Social Research. Vol. 44. Issue 1. 1977. P. 3-24.

⁷ See: Taminiaux J. Phenomenology and the problem of action // Philosophy Social Criticism. 11. 1986. P. 207-219.

of political action, in particular – the practical philosophy of Aristotle⁸. In turn, S. Benhabib believes that it was not Aristotle inspired Arendt but his interpretation in the philosophy of Heidegger⁹. Furthermore, she combines a political approach with a narrative approach to Arendt's philosophy¹⁰. The narrative approach is revealed by J. Kristeva. She considers Arendt's action theory as a narrative concept¹¹. What about the phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches, they are analyzed by V. Vasterling¹².

As for Russian scientific thought, the interest to the political philosophy of Arendt and in her action theory arose in the 1990s¹³. It was the period that the first Russian-language translations of her texts were published: “Tradition and Modernity” (1991), “The Origins of Totalitarianism” (1996)¹⁴ and “Human Condition” (2000). Research works on Arendt's philosophy started to appear first of which was the book “Arendt and Heidegger: an Attempt to Make a Comparative Analysis of the Fundamental Human Ontology and Policy Ontology” by J. B. Mishkenene (1990)¹⁵. Then the articles by I. V. Kosich and J. B. Mishkenene¹⁶, E. G. Trubina¹⁷, A. V. Magun¹⁸, Yu. N. Davydov¹⁹, A. M. Etkind²⁰ were published.

⁸ See: Kateb G. Hannah Arendt: Politics, Conscience, Evil. New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984.

⁹ See: Benhabib S. The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers (Modernity and Political Thought). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

¹⁰ See: Benhabib S. Hannah Arendt and the Redemptive Power of Narrative // Social Research. Vol. 57. No. 1. 1990. P. 167-196.

¹¹ See: Kristeva J. Hannah Arendt: Life is a Narrative. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

¹² See: Vasterling V. The hermeneutic phenomenological approach to plurality: Arendt, Habermas and Gadamer // Phenomenological Perspectives on Plurality. Vol. 12. Leiden: BRILL, 2014. P. 158-174.

¹³ However, the first Russian-language text in which Arendt's ideas are analyzed is the article by A. S. Bogomolov “Modern existentialism: a “turn” or “crisis”?” It is published in 1971. It compares the idea of action with the Marxist concept of labor. See: Bogomolov A. S. Modern existentialism: a “turn” or a crisis? // The philosophy of Marxism and existentialism. M.: MSU, 1971. P. 217-235.

¹⁴ An excerpt from the “Sources of Totalitarianism” entitled “Masses and Totalitarianism” was published in the journal Issues of Sociology in 1992. See: Arendt H. Masses and Totalitarianism // Issues of Sociology. 1992. T. 1. P. 24-31.

¹⁵ See: Mishkinene, Y. B. Arendt and Heidegger: An Attempt of Comparative Analysis of the Fundamental Human Ontology and Policy Ontology / Moscow State University. M. V. Lomonosov. Philos. fac. M., 1990.

¹⁶ See: Kosich I. V. Mishkinene. Y. B. Hannah Arendt. Philosophy and politics // Moscow University Bulletin. Ser. 7. Philosophy. No. 6. 1991. P. 79-92.

¹⁷ See: Trubina E. G. Identity in the World of Multiplicity: Hannah Adrendt's Insights 1998. No. 11. P. 116-130.

After all, there were these researches of O. V. Shudra "Hannah Arendt: Essence, Conditions for the Emergence and Functioning of Totalitarianism" (1996) and A. A. Zolotov "The Problem of the Relationship of Culture and Politics in the Philosophy of H. Arendt" (2000). At the beginning of the 2000s, such texts as "Crowd, Masses, Politics: Historical and Philosophical Essay" (2001) by M. Heveshi and "Hannah Arendt Judges the 20th Century" (2003) by M. R. Heifetz, "The Community of Singles: Arendt, Benyamin, Scholem, Kafka" (2004) by M. B. Yampolsky appeared. And Yu.O. Malikova wrote the thesis "The Problem of the Relationship between Morality and Politics in the Philosophy of Hannah Arendt" (2004). Among all the works listed, we will not find those that are devoted to the topic of action. However, this topic is indirectly discussed in some studies. For example, one of the tasks of the article by I. V. Kosich and J. B. Mishkinene "Hannah Arendt. Philosophy and politics" (1991) is an analysis of such features of political action as *plurality* and *natality*²¹. On the whole, the research interest in Arendt's action theory was only in its infancy in those years.

Over the past ten years, Arendt evolved from a little-known Western political thinker in Russia into a practical philosopher who rethought the praxis of Aristotle, Kant's aesthetic judgment theory, and also criticized Heidegger's fundamental ontology. Such a change in the attitude of the Russian reader to Arendt is connected with an increase in the number of translations of her texts. Most of the books of Arendt have been translated into Russian today. There are "On Revolution" (2011), "Lectures on the Political Philosophy of Kant" (2012), "Responsibility and Judgment" (2013), "Between Past and Future" (2014), "On Violence" (2014), "The Life of the Mind" (2013), "Hannah Arendt, Martin

¹⁸ See: Magun A. V. The Concept of Judgment in the Philosophy of H. Arendt // Questions of Philosophy. 1998. No. 11. P. 102-115.

¹⁹ See: Davydov Y. N. Hannah Arendt and the Problem of Totalitarianism // The New and the Old in Theoretical Sociology / ed. Y. N. Davydov M.: Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1999. Book 1. P. 144-160.

²⁰ See: Etkind A. M. From Isms to Democracy: Ayn Rand and Hannah Arendt // Znamya. 2000. No. 12. P. 161-181.

²¹ See: Kosich I. V., Mishkinene Y. B. Hannah Arendt. Philosophy and politics // Moscow University Bulletin. Ser. 7. Philosophy. No. 6. 1991. P. 79-92.

Heidegger – Letters 1925–1975 and Other Evidence” (2016), early essays “Experiences of Understanding, 1930–1954: Formation, Exile, Totalitarianism” (2018).

In addition, there has been a lot of research on various topics of Arendt's philosophy in recent years. The most significant of them is the book by N. V. Motroshilova "Martin Heidegger and Hannah Arendt: Being — Time is Love" (2013), the article by A. F. Filippov "Thinking and Death: "The Life of the Mind" in Hannah Arendt's Philosophical Anthropology" (2013)²² and his afterword to "The Lectures on Political Philosophy of Kant" and to "The Life of the Mind"²³, afterword by M. B. Yampolsky to "On Violence"²⁴, articles by I. V. Dudenkova²⁵, A. N. Salikov²⁶, M. V. Yurlova²⁷, A. G. Zhavoronkov²⁸.

In addition, four theses on Arendt's philosophy were written in recent years. They are “Reception of Kant's Ideas in the Judgment Theory of Hannah Arendt” (2008) by A. N. Salikov, “Understanding and Politics: Hannah Arendt's Theory of Totalitarianism in the Context of her Philosophical-Hermeneutic Program” (2010) by A. V. Glinsky, “Revolution or Dictatorship: Hannah Arendt and Karl Schmitt on the Essence of the Political” (2013) by R. V. Gulyaev, “The Concept of “the Banality of Evil” in the Ethics of Hannah Arendt” (2015) by A. S. Moskovskaya. However, we will not find among the recently published works those in which the problem of action is the main feature of analysis unless we count the article by I. V. Dudenkova “Beginning, Birth, Action: Augustine and Hannah Arendt's Political

²² See: Filippov A. F. Thinking and death: “The life of the mind” in the philosophical anthropology of Hannah Arendt // *Voprosy filosofii*. No. 11. 2013. P. 155-168.

²³ See: Filippov A. F. Afterword // Arendt H. *The Life of the Mind*. SPb.: Science, 2013. P. 492-515.

²⁴ See: Yampolsky M. B. From Being to Instrumental. Violence enters the world // Arendt H. *About violence* / Trans. from eng. G. M. Dashevsky M.: New Publishing House, 2014. P. 116-145.

²⁵ See: Dudenkova I. V. Initiation, Birth, Action: Augustine and Hannah Arendt's Political Thought // *Sociological Review*. 2015. T.14. No. 1. P. 105-119.

²⁶ See: Salikov A. N. The ability of judgment as a political problem in the philosophy of Hannah Arendt // *Bulletin of the Baltic Federal University*. I. Kant. No. 6. 2008. P. 34-40.

²⁷ See: Yurlova M. D. Political Power and the Problem of Judgment in the Philosophy of Hannah Arendt // *Bulletin of the Northern Arctic Federal University*. 2013. No. 2. P. 68-72.

²⁸ See: Zhavoronkov A. G. The Philosopher and the State: Hannah Arendt on Socrates' Philosophy // *Sociological Review*. 2017. Vol. 16. No. 3. P. 303–318.

Thought” (2015). It considers one of the main, from Arendt’s point of view, conditions of action – *natality*. In general, Russian researchers have not yet developed a systematic approach to interpreting the action theory of Arendt.

As for studying the problem of action in Ricoeur’s philosophy, foreign researchers have been analyzing it for a long time. Such well-known Ricoeur specialists as D. Pellauer, J. Taylor, R. Kearny have repeatedly addressed to this topic. Thus, D. Pellauer has analyzed Ricoeur’s narrative approach to action²⁹. J. Taylor has considered his political approach to action³⁰. R. Kearney edited the book “P. Ricoeur: Hermeneutics of Action” (1996)³¹ consisting of articles by R. Kearney, P. Kemp, D. Gervolino, J. Greisch, M. Rainwater, J. Dune, D. Rasmussen, D. Trays, and others. In this book, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action is presented as an integral part of the hermeneutics of the self. There we can find an analysis of ontological³², narrative³³, ethical and aesthetic³⁴ aspects of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. After all, the issue of action is considered in books “From Ricoeur to Action: Socio-Political Importance of Ricoeur's Teaching” (2012)³⁵, “Paul Ricoeur in the Era of Hermeneutic Mind: Poetics, Action and Criticism” (2015)³⁶. On the whole, foreign researchers have analyzed all stages of the formation of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. There is hermeneutics of social action, the theory of narrative, hermeneutics of the self. However, it is impossible

²⁹ See: Plowlauer D. Narrative Time. Narrative Action // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 295-310.

³⁰ See: Editor's Introduction // Ricoeur P. Lectures on ideology and Utopia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986. P. i – xxxvi.

³¹ See: Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action / ed. by R. Kearney. London: SAGE Publications, 1996.

³² See: Kemp P. Ricoeur between Heidegger and Levinas // Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action. London. SAGE Publications, 1996. P. 41-62.

³³ See: Rasmussen D. Rethinking Subjectivity: Narrative Identity and the Self // Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action / ed. by R. Kearney. London: SAGE Publications, 1996. P. 159-172.

³⁴ See: Kearney R. Narrative imagination: between ethics and poetics // Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action / ed. by R. Kearney. London: SAGE Publications, 1996. P. 173-190.

³⁵ See: Fisher D. Ricoeur’s Atemwende: A Reading of ‘Interlude: Tragic Action’ in Oneself as Another // From Ricoeur to Action: The Socio-Political Significance of Ricoeur's Thinking / ed. by T. Mei, D. Lewin. London, New York: Continuum, 2012. P. 195-211.

³⁶ See: Pellauer D. Narrated action Grounds Narrative Identity // Paul Ricoeur and the Age of Hermeneutical Reason: Poetics, Praxis and Critique / ed. by R. Savage. London: Lexington Books, 2015. P. 69-84.

to call this analysis exhaustive and complete. In particular, if Ricoeur's narrative approach to action has been studied quite deeply then, for example, the meaning of the concept of action in the theory of "*capable man*" has not yet received comprehensive consideration.

In Russian studies on Ricoeur's philosophy, we find quite a few references to the issue of action despite the fact that the French thinker came to Russia with lectures in which, although not in detail, he talked about his approach to hermeneutics as a method of analyzing social action³⁷. Today, Ricoeur is known to the Russian reader as a representative of hermeneutics, phenomenology and a follower of E. Husserl, the interlocutor of G. Marcel, Mounier, Levinas, author of the narrative theory rather than debating with Davidson on issues of action and the creator of a unique concept of action. There are several reasons for this interpretation of Ricoeur. The first reason is the situation with the translation of his texts. Only the basic works of Ricoeur received the Russian language translation in which the features of his phenomenological hermeneutics or hermeneutical phenomenology are presented. They are "Conflict of Interpretations: Essays on Hermeneutics" (1995), "History and Truth" (2002), "Memory, History, Forgetting", "Oneself as Another" (2008), and other works. However, from the collection of articles "From Text to Action", reflecting the emergence of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of social action, only "Text Model: Meaningful Action as Text", "Imagination in Discourse and in Action" are translated³⁸. Then, only the first and the second volumes of "Time and Narrative" are translated which is not enough for a holistic view of Ricoeur's narrative approach to the action.

³⁷ In 1993, Ricoeur lectured three lectures at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences: "Hermeneutics and the Method of Social Sciences", "Narrative Identity", "Morality, Ethics and Politics" (See: Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. Moscow: Kanon+, 2013. P. 49-90). He repeatedly visited our country. In the 1970s, he visited the USSR, and in 1993, 1995, 1996 and 2003 participated in international congresses held in Russia.

³⁸ See: Ricoeur P. The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text // Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 7. No. 1. 2008. P. 25-43.

The second reason is the field of scholarly of leading Russian experts in Ricoeur's philosophy such as I. S. Vdovina, M. M. Fedorova, A. V. Yampolskaya, I. I. Blauberg, E. N. Shulga, O. I. Machulskaya, and others. Thus, the monograph by I. S. Vdovina "Paul Ricoeur: on the Champs Elysees of Philosophy" (2019) was recently published where Ricoeur is presented as the author of unique hermeneutic-phenomenological doctrine. According to Vdovina, the central theme of this doctrine is the problem of a human as a subject of cultural and historical creativity ("*capable man*")³⁹. On the one hand, she "sheds light" on Ricoeur's late hermeneutics of action. On the other hand, she does not set the goal to comprehensively reveal the problem of action in the concept of "*capable man*". Analyzing the theme of action in Ricoeur's philosophy, she turns rather not to his late ideas but to his early ones, namely, to the provisions on the connection of *the labor* with *the word* included in the "History and Truth" (1955)⁴⁰.

Apart from the monograph by Vdovina, the book "Paul Ricoeur: Man – Society – Civilization" (2015) was recently published. It is devoted to various aspects of Ricoeur's phenomenological hermeneutics: anthropological, social, ethical, political, narrative. This collection of works consists of articles by N. V. Motroshilova, I. S. Vdovina, M. M. Fedorova, A. V. Yampolskaya, P. S. Gurevich, I. I. Blauberg, O. B. Solovyova, E. N. Shulga, O. I. Machulskaya, and others. Some authors refer to Ricoeur's views on the action. So, M. M. Fedorova meditates on his approach to political action⁴¹, E. N. Shulga works with his idea of narrative action⁴². Analyzing Ricoeur's concept of ethics, O. I. Machulskaya describes his interpretation of action as an ethical-moral phenomenon⁴³. However, in this book, we will not find an article that would give an analysis of at least one of the

³⁹ See: Vdovina I. S. Paul Ricoeur: on the Champs Elysees of philosophy. M.: Kanon+, 2019. P. 3.

⁴⁰ See Ibid. P. 172-200.

⁴¹ See: Fedorova M. M. Political phenomenology of P. Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur: Man-society-civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.:Kanon+, 2015. P. 258-275.

⁴² See: Shulga E. N. Narrative Hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur: Man-Society-Civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.: Kanon+, 2015. P. 219-234.

⁴³ See: Machulskaya O. I. The Ethical Concept of Paul Ricoeur: The Answer of Anti-Normative Philosophy // Paul Ricoeur: Man-Society-Civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.: Kanon +, 2015. P. 249-257.

problems of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. We will not find it among the reports from the conference "Paul Ricoeur – the Philosopher of Dialogue" (Institute of Philosophy, RAN, 2006) published in the book "Paul Ricoeur in Moscow" (2013) as well. Among these works are only those which analyze the issue of action indirectly. For example, E. V. Petrovskaya, studying the concept of narrative, mentions that for Ricoeur the story is a way of understanding not only time but also action⁴⁴. E. N. Shulga comes to the conclusion that his hermeneutics appears as a method of interpreting and constituting a social reality that includes such element as action⁴⁵.

Nevertheless, Russian researchers tried to analyze Ricoeur's hermeneutics of social action. To this topic, the conference "New perspectives of hermeneutics in the social sciences and practical philosophy" (HSE, 2011) was devoted, organized jointly with the international community for the study of Ricoeur (Society for Ricoeur Studies). Some reports from this conference were published in the book "Paul Ricoeur in Moscow" (2015). The articles "Action as an Event and Text: to the Sociological Understanding of Paul Ricoeur"⁴⁶ by A. F. Filippov and "Social action and its meaning: historical hermeneutics after Ricoeur"⁴⁷ by S. N. Zenkin are the most significant of them.

In addition to these articles, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of social action is reviewed in articles of A. V. Borisenkova⁴⁸ and in her thesis "Methodology of Social Cognition in P. Ricoeur's Interpretation: a Critical Analysis of the Theory of

⁴⁴ See.: Petrovskaya E. V. Great narratology (Thinking about the book Ricoeur P. Time and narrative) // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberger, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 207-225.

⁴⁵ See: Shulga E. N. Hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur and Current Problems of Epistemology // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberger, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 237-255.

⁴⁶ See: Filippov A. F. Action as an Event and Text: Towards a Sociological Understanding of Paul Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberger, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 277-294.

⁴⁷ See: Zenkin S. N. Social Action and its Meaning: Historical Hermeneutics after Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberger, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 327-345.

⁴⁸ See: Borisenkova A. V. Hermeneutic Projects in Sociology // Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 6. No. 2. 2007. P. 39-49.

Narratives" (2011). Apart from her work, there are only two researches devoted to the ideas of Ricoeur: "The Philosophical Hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur" (2012) by J.S. Chernov and "The Concept of History in the Works of Paul Ricoeur" (2017) by A. B. Anikin. However, they do not address the problem of action.

As for the comparison of the theories of action by Arendt and Ricoeur, it is carried out in foreign researches of their philosophy. Firstly, foreign researchers compare Arendt and Ricoeur ethical-political approaches to action. Thus, K. Komparan⁴⁹ examines the influence of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's political thought. Mr. Marcelo⁵⁰ points out the importance of the notion of *plurality* for Ricoeur's ethical-social, political thought. M. Castillo⁵¹ analyzes the influence of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's concept of ethics and politics. Secondly, foreign researchers compare their narrative approaches to action. So, A. Speight⁵² compares the concept of Arendt's speech with Ricoeur's narrative theory. A. Bragantini⁵³ analyzes the problem of narrative identity in their texts. In addition, references to the similarities and differences of their narrative approaches to action are found in the articles of M. Tambuku⁵⁴, M. Stil⁵⁵. Third, some scientists compare their concepts of forgiveness, for example, G. Fiass⁵⁶.

Foreign researchers compare the views of Arendt and Ricoeur on the action not only in articles but also in reports, in public lectures. Thus, at the International Conferences of the Community for Ricoeur Studies (Society for Ricoeur Studies)

⁴⁹ See: Comparan C. A. G. Arendt and Ricoeur on Ideology and Authority // Ricoeur Studies. Vol. 5. No. 2. 2014. P. 64-80

⁵⁰ See: Marcelo G. The Conflict Between the Fundamental, the Universal, and the Historical: Ricoeur on Justice and Plurality // Philosophy Today. Vol. 58. Issue 4. 2014. P. 645-664.

⁵¹ See: Kastiyo M. The concept of ethics and morals in the teachings of Paul Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 139–151.

⁵² See: Speight A. Arendt on Narrative Theory and Practice // College Literature. 38(1). 2011. P. 117-130

⁵³ See: Bragantini A. Identité personnelle et narration chez Paul Ricoeur et Hannah Arendt // Lo Sguardo - rivista di filosofia. No. 12 (II). 2013. P. 135–149.

⁵⁴ See: Tamboukou M. 'Portraits of Moments': Visual and Textual Entanglements in Narrative Research // Current Narratives. No. 3. 2011. P. 3-13.

⁵⁵ See: Steele M. Arendt versus Ellison on Little Rock: The Role of Language in Political Judgment // Constellations. Vol. 2. No. 2. 2002. P. 184-206.

⁵⁶ See: Fiass G. Paul Ricoeur et le pardon comme au-delà de l'action // Laval théologique et philosophique. Vol. 63. No. 2. 2007. P. 363–376.

the influence Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's concept of forgiveness is often discussed and their political, hermeneutic, narrative approaches to action, to history, are compared. For example, B. Rosen⁵⁷, M. Johnson⁵⁸, C. Sharp⁵⁹ made presentations on these topics at the conference in 2018. The well-known thinker H. Hacker⁶⁰ devoted her plenary speech to the problems of law in the philosophy of Arendt and Ricoeur at the conference in 2016. One of the regular participants of these meetings is M. Joy, professor at the University of Chicago. She gives lectures about the topic of forgiveness and action in the theories of Arendt and Ricoeur⁶¹.

However, the foreign scientific thought has not yet developed a systematic, holistic comparison of Arendt and Ricoeur approaches to action. This is largely due to the lack of research in which Ricoeur would be viewed as an interpreter and follower of Arendt's action theory. Some foreign scientists refer to the works of Ricoeur dedicated to her philosophy. For example, E. Pucci analyzes his criticism of her political reconstruction of Kant's judgment theory⁶². Some speculate that it was precisely Arendt's concept of speech that influenced Ricoeur's concept of narrative, for example, H. Meretoja⁶³. But their effort is still not enough to spread the idea that Ricoeur is a commentator and follower of Arendt's action theory.

Among Russian studies, we will not find those in which a comparison of Arendt and Ricoeur approaches to action would be given. Nonetheless, some scholars mention Arendt among Ricoeur's regular interlocutors. So, B. L. Hubman,

⁵⁷ See: Rosen K. B. The Ethics of Poetic Testimony in Arendt, Celan, and Ricoeur. <http://www.ricoeursociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/2018-SRS-Conference-Abstracts.pdf>

⁵⁸ See: Ibid. Johnson M. Forgiveness, Creative Imagination, and Original Affirmation in Memory, History, and Forgetting.

⁵⁹ See: Ibid. Sharp Ch. Politics and Aesthetics in the "post-truth" World: Affect Theory and Phenomenological Hermeneutics.

⁶⁰ See: Hacker H. No Space. Nowhere. Refugees and the Problem of Human Rights in Arendt and Ricoeur. <http://www.ricoeursociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016-SRS-Chicago-Programme-1.pdf>

⁶¹ See: Joy M. Evil and Forgiveness in Paul Ricoeur and Hannah Arendt // <https://vimeo.com/125426284> [электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: <https://vimeo.com/125426284>, свободный (дата обращения 15.04.2018).

⁶² See: Pucci E. History and the question of identity: Kant, Arendt, Ricoeur // P. Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action / ed. by R. Kearney. London: SAGE Publications, 1996. P. 125-136.

⁶³ See: Meretoja H. Narrative and Human Existence: Ontology, Epistemology, and Ethic // *New Literary History*. Vol. 45. No. 1. 2014. P. 99.

listing the philosophers who influenced Ricoeur's approach to memory, indicates her name⁶⁴. M. M. Fyodorova calls Arendt's criticism of the philosophy of history one of the sources of his political phenomenology⁶⁵. A.V. Yampolskaya analyzes the influence of her theory of action on Ricoeur's concept of forgiveness⁶⁶. I. S. Vdovina recalls Arendt whenever considers such topics of his philosophy as the ethics of life⁶⁷, the problems of recognition⁶⁸ and promises⁶⁹, the concept of a political paradox⁷⁰, the concept of "*capable man*"⁷¹.

We will not find among Russian researches those in which Ricoeur would be considered as a commentator of Arendt's action theory as well. At the same time, in the reception of Arendt, we can find some references to the texts of Ricoeur. Thus, there is a quotation from Ricoeur's foreword to "The Human Condition" in the article by I. V. Dudenkova⁷², and there is a reference to the analogy between the three-part structure of activity life (labor, work, action) and political differences (violence, force, power) in the article by M. B. Yampolsky⁷³. As for the reception of Ricoeur, it contains indications of only one work in which the philosopher acts as the interpreter of Arendt, namely, "The Aesthetic and Political Judgment by Hannah Arendt". However, these indications are minor and descriptive. A. V. Pavlov, listing the texts included in Ricoeur's book "The Just", briefly recounts its

⁶⁴ See: Gubman B. L. H.-G. Gadamer and P. Ricoeur: historical experience and narrative // Paul Ricoeur: Man-Society-Civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.: Kanon+, 2015. P. 203.

⁶⁵ See: Fedorova M. M. Political phenomenology of P. Ricoeur // Paul Ricoeur: Man-society-civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.: Kanon+, 2015. P. 271.

⁶⁶ See: Yampolskaya A. V. Beyond the Event: Paul Ricoeur on Gift and Forgiveness // Paul Ricoeur: Man-Society, Civilization / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, I. S. Vdovina. M.: Kanon+, 2015. P. 302–314. Also, see: Yampolskaya A. V. Speech Act as an Event: Derrida between Austin and Arendt // Sociological Review. Vol. 13. No. 2. 2014. P. 9–24.

⁶⁷ See: Vdovina I. S. Paul Ricoeur: practical wisdom of philosophy // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 269. Also, see: Vdovina I. S. Paul Ricoeur: on the Champs Elysees of philosophy. M.: Kanon+, 2019. P. 228.

⁶⁸ See: Vdovina I. S. Paul Ricoeur: on the Champs Elysees of philosophy. M.: Kanon+, 2019. P. 209.

⁶⁹ See: Ibid. P. 225.

⁷⁰ See: Ibid. P. 243.

⁷¹ See: Ibid. P. 261.

⁷² See: Dudenkova I. V. Initiation, Birth, Action: Augustine and Hannah Arendt's Political Thought // Sociological Review. T.14. No. 1. 2015. P. 105-119

⁷³ See: Yampolsky M. B. From Being to Instrumental. Violence enters the world // Arendt H. About violence / Trans. from eng. G.M. Dashevsky. M.: New Publishing House, 2014. P. 116-145.

content⁷⁴. Therefore, it can be concluded that Russian research thought has not yet developed an approach to Ricoeur as one of those philosophers who systematically studied and interpreted the action theory of Arendt.

Thus, despite the interest of Western and Russian researchers in comparing the ideas of Arendt and Ricoeur, no works have been written in which their approaches to action were compared, the influence of the concepts of Arendt's philosophy on Ricoeur's hermeneutic of action was not analyzed, and he had not been studied as her commentator and follower.

Object and Subject-matter of the Study

The object of the study is the hermeneutic-phenomenological philosophy of Ricoeur and the political philosophy of Arendt. The subject-matter of the study is Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action and Arendt's action theory.

Study Tasks and Objective

The objective of the study is the comparison of the ideas of Arendt and Ricoeur on action based on the reconstruction of the influence of Arendt's theory on Ricoeur's hermeneutic philosophy and ethical, social thought.

It is divided into several research tasks:

1. To reconstruct and analyze the stages of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action: the hermeneutics of social action and the hermeneutics of action in the concept of a "*capable man*".
2. To identify the hermeneutic and anthropological aspects of Arendt's action theory.
3. To identify the common historical and philosophical prerequisites of the views of Arendt and Ricoeur on the action.
4. To analyze the influence of the concepts of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's ethics, his concepts of forgiveness, "*capable man*", "*political paradox*".

⁷⁴ See: Pavlov A. B. "The Just": A Philosophical Analysis of Law // Paul Ricoeur in Moscow / ed. by I. I. Blauberg, A. V. Borisenkova, I. S. Vdovina, O. I. Machulskaya. M.: Kanon+, 2013. P. 256-262.

5. To compare the anthropological and hermeneutic approaches of Ricoeur and Arendt to action.

The Methodological and Theoretical Framework of the Study

In our study, we will use such methods as the historical-descriptive method, historical-philosophical interpretation, conceptualization, comparative analysis, historical-philosophical reconstruction. The historical-descriptive method will allow describing the features of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action in the first chapter of our research and the features of Arendt's action theory in the second chapter. The historical-philosophical interpretation will allow interpreting their approaches to the action taking into account the comments of the scientists. The conceptualization method will be used to define the meanings of the concept of action. With it, we will consider the action as a metacategory of Arendt's political philosophy and Ricoeur's theory of a "*capable man*". To achieve the goal of the study, we will use comparative analysis with the help of which we will identify the common and distinctive features of the philosophy of action of Arendt and Ricoeur. This method will be used simultaneously with the historical and philosophical reconstruction which allows detecting similar assumptions underlying their approaches to action. In particular, the general historical and philosophical foundations of the ideas of Arendt and Ricoeur about action, the influence of the concepts of Arendt's theory on Ricoeur's ethical-political thought and their hermeneutic and anthropological approaches to action will be reconstructed in the third chapter of the study.

As for the theoretical framework of the study, there are five groups of textual resources. The first group consists of the texts of Arendt and Ricoeur. The most significant of them for achieving the goal of our research are "The Human Condition" and "The Life of the Mind" by H. Arendt; "Oneself as another", "Time and Narrative", "Text Model: Meaningful Action as Text" by P. Ricoeur. The second group of theoretical resources consists of the texts of philosophers to whom Arendt and Ricoeur address in the process of understanding the action. They are

“Nicomachean Ethics” by Aristotle, “Being and Time” by M. Heidegger. The third group consists of studies that reveal the main provisions of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. For example, there are articles by D. Pellauer, R. Kerney, I. S. Vdovina, S. N. Zenkin, A. F. Filippov. The fourth group of sources includes texts devoted to the analysis of Arendt's action theory and to identifying its anthropological, hermeneutical, phenomenological and narrative aspects. There are articles by J. Taminho, J. Kristeva, S. Benhabib, Vasterling. The fifth group includes studies that compare the ideas of Ricoeur and Arendt about action, forgiveness, and *natality*. There are the works by M. Joy, A. Bragantini, E. Pucci, G. Fiass, A. V. Yampolskaya.

The Originality of the Study

1. For the first time in the Russian scientific thought, the attempt was made not only to compare the approaches of Ricoeur and Arendt to action but also to reconstruct the influence of the concepts of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's hermeneutic philosophy.

2. For the first time in the Russian scientific thought, the role of Ricoeur in the history of the understanding Arendt's philosophy was revealed. In the study, Ricoeur is shown not only as a famous philosopher of the twentieth century but also as an interpreter of Arendt's action theory, her approaches to political power, forgiveness, and *natality*.

3. It is shown that there are two stages of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. The first stage is the hermeneutics of social action, based on the semantic of action and on the comparison of the action with the text, narrative. The second stage is the hermeneutics of action in the concept of “*capable man*”.

4. It is shown that Arendt action theory has not only philosophical, political, anthropological, ethical but also hermeneutic content.

Statements to be Defended

The statements to be defended are the results of the reconstruction of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action, the hermeneutic aspects of Arendt's action

theory and the results of the comparison of the approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action. The main prerequisites for this comparison are the common historical and philosophical foundations of their ideas of action; the study of Arendt's action theory carried out by Ricoeur; his use of Arendt's categories in the theories of "*capable man*" and forgiveness.

1. The hermeneutics of action is one of Ricoeur's philosophical concepts. Its distinguishing feature is the unification of the provisions of Anglo-Saxon theories of action with the principles of continental philosophy (hermeneutics and phenomenology). It consists of two parts: the hermeneutics of social action and the hermeneutics of action in the theory of "*capable man*". The first part includes the hermeneutics of text, semantics, and poetics of action. Ricoeur defines social action by analogy with the text as a meaningful phenomenon, captured and open to the interpretation. He develops a new hermeneutic methodology for the scientific study of social action. This is the dialectics of understanding and explanation. In the second part the idea of action as a meaningful act is complemented by the hermeneutics of the self, as well as an ethical-political approach, which allows Ricoeur to solve the problem of the meaning of the action dialectically: the meaning of the action is dual, it is created both by the actor and by *others* (participants of common being). The early and late stages of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action are interrelated. Their common feature is to define interaction in common being as a type of social action. In general, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action is a "path" from the hermeneutics of text, semantics and poetics to the hermeneutics of the self, the concept of "*capable man*". Its result is the understanding of action as a meta-category that unites questions about the "who" of the actor.

2. The theory of action by Arendt has not only political but also philosophical, anthropological, hermeneutic content. The action appears in the form of a special kind of active life, different from *workmanship* and labor in her philosophy. It is a form of an act expressing such essential attributes of a human as the ability to

create something new and the ability to *plural, common being*. This is the action that Arendt calls *political, public*. She defines it as an understood and meaningful act. Thereby Arendt enriches her political theory with hermeneutic context. There are three signs of Arendt's hermeneutic approach to action. The first sign is that the transformation of the issue “*who*” of action into the issue of authorship of action meaning. The second sign is that she defines speech not only as the action meaning but also as the source of its meaning. The third sign is the connection of the issue of judgment with the question of the authorship of action meaning and with a narrative approach to action.

3. Ricoeur is a researcher of Arendt's action theory. He is one of the first to find an anthropological content in it. Namely, he analyzes Arendt's view of *non-violent power* as an idea the variety of political action which is the condition of human life. In addition, Ricoeur was one of the first to see the hermeneutic context in her political philosophy. Firstly, he describes the public “*who*” of action as a phenomenon that is meaningful to the participants of the *common being*. Secondly, from his point of view, Arendt is not engaged in the reconstruction of genuine political action but in the recognition of its interpretations in the history of philosophy and politics.

4. Creating his own project of ethics in the framework of the concept of “capable man”, Ricoeur acts as a follower of the philosophy of Arendt. Her concepts had a significant impact on his ethical and moral approach to social action and to its variety as a political act. These concepts are *plurality, common being*. Using them, Ricoeur describes the ethical requirements for the public space of affairs (it should be common, consistent and plural) and defines social action as the interaction. In addition, Arendt's idea of non-violent political power helps Ricoeur to rethink the political paradox and determine his own strategy of defining political action as an ethical phenomenon.

5. Arendt's action theory has influenced Ricoeur's concept of forgiveness. In particular, Ricoeur borrows her notion of *natality* to substantiate the idea of

forgiveness “*for us*”. Moreover, if Arendt considers *natality* as a condition of action, not separating the actor from it, then Ricoeur applies the principle of *natality* not to the action itself, but to the self of its agent. In his interpretation, the forgiveness “*for us*” helps the guilty human to renew and continue himself as a participant of common life.

6. The category of forgiveness combines the anthropological approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action. Both philosophers, defining action as the condition of a person's life, consider forgiveness as a prerequisite for common being. In Arendt's theory, forgiveness is a single miracle or an exception to the rules of political being, contributing to its extension. In Ricoeur's philosophy, forgiveness is the constant of common life.

7. Anthropological approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action have an ethical and moral context. Both philosophers ask themselves the question of the moral contradictions of the practical life of man and consider judgment as a way to resolve them. In Ricoeur's ethics, this judgment is *the critical situational moral judgment of the actor*. In Arendt's later philosophy, this judgment is the judgment *of the spectator*.

8. The hermeneutic approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action include the idea of narrative. Both philosophers consider narrative as a solution to the problem of understanding action. In Arendt's philosophy, a story is a way of fixing the public meaning of an action. She gives the role of the narrator not to the *actor*, but to the *spectator*. In turn, Ricoeur considers the problem of understanding action not only as a public, political problem but also as a question of reflexive philosophy. The narrative is presented in his works both as a method of public understanding of the action and as a method of self-identification of the actor. In this case, both philosophers consider the story as a way of being an action. In this regard, their hermeneutical approaches to action can be considered ontologically-narrative. Their hermeneutical approaches to action are transformed into narrative approaches to history. In Arendt's political philosophy, history is a public narrative

memory, immortalizing the meanings of actions and their “*who*”. In Ricoeur's hermeneutics, history is the form of a narrative interpretation based on the dialectic of memory and forgetting.

The Theoretical and Practical Outcome of the Study

The results of the study help to analyze Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action and Arendt's political theory in connection. Our research leads to the expansion of ideas about the context of the notion of action in the texts of these thinkers. It shows that Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action includes aspects of ethics and political philosophy. The findings of the thesis show that the prerequisites of his hermeneutics of action are not only in the history of hermeneutics itself, not only in the analytical theory of action but also in the political philosophy of Arendt. The results of our research are significant for studying the influence of Arendt's action theory on the philosophers of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In addition, the results contribute to the detection of hermeneutic aspects of her theory.

The material and conclusions of the thesis research can be used to write textbooks and develop lecture courses, seminars on the history of philosophy, hermeneutics, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology; the special courses on the philosophy of action, Ricoeur's hermeneutics, Arendt's action theory.

Study Results Approbation

1. International conference “Ways of thought. Ways of Speaking” (Russia, Moscow, HSE, 04.22.2019-26.04.2019). Report: "Pluralization of modernity: Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutic approach."

2. International Workshop "The Symbolic of Evil" (France, Paris, fonds Ricoeur, 06.28.2018). Report: "Evil and methods of its understanding: Arendt and Ricoeur approaches".

3. International conference “Ways of thought. Ways of Speaking” (Russia, Moscow, HSE, 26.04.2018-30.04.2018). Report: "The concept of speech H. Arendt and the philosophy of narrative: the differences of approaches".

4. International Symposium "Ways of Russia - 2018" (Russia, Moscow, RANEPa, 03/31/2018). Report: "The role of the "judging spectator" in public politics: H. Arendt approach".

5. International Workshop "Rethinking Ideology and Utopia: 30 years later " (France, Paris, Fonds Ricoeur, 06.26.2017). Report: " The role of "Ideology and Utopia" in the hermeneutics of action by P. Ricoeur".

6. International, scientific and practical conference of young scientists "Vectors of the development of modern Russia" - 2017 (Russia, Moscow, Moscow Higher School of Social and Economic Sciences, April 2017). Report: "The issue of memory and oblivion of the past time in political philosophy: H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur approaches".

7. Russian, interdisciplinary conference "The Problem of War in the Humanities: History and Prospects of Research" (Russia, Moscow, HSE, 20.10.2016). Report: "The issue of war and the peace in the categorical framework of the philosophy of H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur".

8. International Conference "Society for Ricoeur Studies Conference 2016" (USA, Chicago, University de Paul, 02. 10.2014-06.10.2016). Report: "Forgiveness as a Condition of Selfhood in the Hermeneutic Phenomenology of P. Ricoeur: Reflections on Arendt's Concept of Natality".

9. Annual, international conference "Ways of thought. Ways of Speaking" (Russia, Moscow, HSE, 04/27/2016-30.04.2016). Report: "The Question of the political in the philosophy of P. Ricoeur: the appeal to H. Arendt".

10. VI All-Russian Conference of Students, Postgraduates and Young Scientists "Philosophy. Language. Culture" (Russia, Moscow, HSE, 04/29/2015 - 04/30/2015). Report: "The concept of action in P. Ricoeur's hermeneutics of the ethical subject".

11. International, scientific and practical conference of young scientists "Vectors of the development of modern Russia" - 2015 (Moscow, MVSESN, April

17, 2015 - April 18, 2015). Report: "The image of the historiographer as the author of the meaning of action in the political philosophy of H. Arendt".

12. International Conference "Society for Ricoeur Studies Conference 2014" (New Orleans, Loyola University, 24. 10.2014–26.10.2014). Report: " The topic of action, or how to recognize the synthesis of the Ricoeur's roles".

13. XXI International Scientific Conference of Students, Postgraduates and Young Scientists "Lomonosov-2014" (Moscow, MSU, April, 2014). Report: "The question of the continuity of thought H. Arendt in the philosophy of P. Ricoeur: the essence of the ethical and political".

MAIN BODY OF THE THESIS

The introduction provides a justification of the relevance of the research topic, reveals the degree of scientific elaboration of the topic, formulates the goal and objectives, identifies the subject and object of research, describes the methodology, sources and structure of the study, reveals the scientific novelty and theoretical significance of the work, and formulates the provisions submitted for defense.

The First Chapter “*Action as a Subject of P. Ricoeur's Hermeneutic Philosophy*” is devoted to the analysis of the main aspects of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action. We suggest clarifying its classification. In our opinion, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action consists of two parts: the hermeneutics of social action and the hermeneutics of action in the concept of "capable man".

In section 1.1. “*Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Ricoeur's Hermeneutics of Action*”, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action is considered as a theory based on the synthesis of Anglo-Saxon and continental (hermeneutic) approaches to action.

In paragraph 1.1.1. “*The Influence of the Continental Tradition*”, it is shown that Ricoeur studies the action as a representative of continental hermeneutics who learned the lessons of Schleiermacher, Dilthey and the hermeneutical projects of Heidegger and Gadamer. Ricoeur formulates the issue of action in the form of a question of understanding, interpreting and explaining its meaning. Unlike Dilthey, he proposes not to divide, but to combine the processes of explanation and understanding. “To explain more is to understand better” is a key statement of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action.

In paragraph 1.1.2. “*The Influence of Analytical Philosophy*” it is shown that Ricoeur's approach to action is based not only on the hermeneutical tradition but also on the principles of Anglo-Saxon philosophy. In particular, it is based on the theory of speech acts of Austin and Searle and on Davidson's action theory. Thus, the first theory helps Ricoeur to solve the issue of “*inscription*” of social

action. He compares the process of exteriorizing speech acts with fixing, capturing the action in social space. Criticism of the second theory helps Ricoeur to define action as a personal phenomenon. Disagreeing with Davidson's causal approach to action, he analyzes the question of "who" as the central issue of his hermeneutics of action.

In section 1.2. "*Features of the Hermeneutics of Social Action*", we consider the signs of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of social action. Its main ideas are formulated in "The Model Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text" (1971), "Imagination in Discourse and in Action" (1976), "Semantics of Action" (1977) and "The Symbolic Structure of Action" (1977). In these articles, the hermeneutics of social action is presented as the analog of the hermeneutics of text and as the semantics and the poetics of action.

In paragraph 1.2.1. "*Action and Text*", we give the analysis of the influence of hermeneutics of text on the formation of the hermeneutics of social action. We consider Ricoeur's four arguments for comparing an action with a text: 1. The action, like a text, is objectified (or "inscribed"). 2. The action, like text, is autonomous from its author. 3. The action, like text, overcomes *Umwelt* and is opened to *Welt*. 4. The action, like text, is addressed to an infinite number of readers. In the process of analyzing these arguments, we came to the following conclusions: 1. Ricoeur defines social action as an accomplished act, and thus as a label imprinted in social space. 2. He equates social action with meaningful action. 3. Interpretation of the meaning of action is considered by him as a social phenomenon.

In paragraph 1.2.2. "*Action and Narrative*", the influence of Ricoeur's narrative concept on his hermeneutics of social action is considered. It is shown that the comparison of action with narrative does not contradict the comparison of action with text in his philosophy. The influence of Aristotle's poetics on the formation of Ricoeur's narrative approach to action, namely, the concepts of "mimesis" and "mythos", is considered. It is revealed that the connection between

action and narrative is endowed in Ricoeur's philosophy with several meanings: 1. Narrative as "mimesis" and "mythos" of action. In other words, the narrative forms the unity of the meaning of action and the unity of actions themselves, the narrative plot reflects the integrity of practical life. 2. Narrative as a type of action. 3. Narrative as a narrative unity of time suggesting the unity of temporal structures of action.

On the whole, in paragraph 1.2.2., it is shown that the concept of the narrative enriches the Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action with narrative methods of fixing the meaning of action: imitation and ordering. In addition, it turns the hermeneutics of action into a kind of poetics of action or into a theory that uses the structure of poetic narrative as a form of describing real actions.

In paragraph 1.2.3. "*Action and Symbol*" we reveal that the basis of Ricoeur's hermeneutics of social action is the semantics of action. In his philosophy, social action is a symbolically mediated phenomenon. In particular, it is mediated by narrative characters that both present and construct an action. Therefore, Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action, being both semantics and poetics of action, require not only descriptive but also projective reconstruction of action with the help of narrative symbols.

In addition, in paragraph 1.2.3. it is shown that the hermeneutics of Ricoeur's action as semantics contains a turn towards the study of the socio-political forms of social action representation — ideology and utopia, defined as a kind of imagination. At the same time, the very social action in the interpretation of Ricoeur acquires the features of a political phenomenon, if by political we mean the joint life of people with each other. Within the framework of semantics supplemented by the concept of imagination and political issues, social action gets another definition, namely, it is understood as interaction.

In paragraph 1.2.4. "*Action and History*", it is examined the meaning of the notion of history (l'histoire) in the hermeneutics of social action. It is revealed that this notion is used by Ricoeur in several meanings: history as a textual fixation of

social action, history as a story about action, history as a narrative interpretation of actions, history as a science (the subject matter of professional historians), history as *praxis*. It is shown that the history as a narrative about social action turns out to be a kind of social action in Ricoeur's philosophy.

In paragraph 1.2.4., the approaches to history in the hermeneutics of social action are compared with the Ricoeur's late philosophy of history. It is revealed that in his late philosophy the history is divided into the professional activities of historians (it is based on the archiving of actions and events) and public history (it is based on the memory of actions, events). However, the prerequisites for distinguishing public history as a kind of historical knowledge are contained in the hermeneutics of social action. In "The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action considered as Text", Ricoeur defines the history as a "practical interpretation" of the action through *praxis*. In fact, he returns to this definition in the epilogue of "Memory, History, Forgetting", suggesting that history as a memory of action is possible only as a story that is created by citizens (i.e. in the process of social interaction of people in public space).

Section 1.3. *"Hermeneutics of Action in the Concept of "Capable Man"* is devoted to the analysis of Ricoeur's late hermeneutics of action. It proves the assertion that the concept of "capable man", developed in the works "Oneself as Another" (1990), "The Course of Recognition" (2004), includes the hermeneutics of action.

In paragraph 1.3.1. *"Action as a Metacategory of the Concept of "Capable Man"* we put forward the proposition that action is a fundamental category of the concept of "capable man". "L'homme capable" is one who is able to act. It has been revealed that in the concept of a "capable man" the hermeneutics of action is developed in parallel with the hermeneutics of the self. Not only the section devoted to the question of "who" of action but also all the chapters "Oneself as Another" are aimed at defining actions as actions of the

self. It is shown that Ricoeur proposes to consider not only *others* but the actor himself as the author of meaning too. Thereby, in the concept of “capable man”, the issue of authorship of the action meaning receives a new perspective of consideration. If in the hermeneutics of social action, the source of the action meaning was the narrative of interpreters, then in the hermeneutics of action as an integral part of the concept of “capable man”, the source of the meaning of action itself can be the agent of action as a self-possessing narrative identity.

In addition, in paragraph 1.3.1., it is shown that the goal of the second stage of Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of action is to define the ethical and moral “who” as a unity of “who” speaks, acts, tells. The ethical-moral “who” manifests itself in the role of a “capable man”. His action is praxis. However, according to Ricoeur, praxis is always what appears on the ontological foundation. Its foundation is a *conatus* as the synthesis of *energeia* and *dynamis*.

In paragraph 1.3.2 “Action as a Category of Ethics”, it is revealed that the basis of the hermeneutics of action in the concept of “capable man” is formed by the dialectic of ethics and morality. On the one hand, Ricoeur defines action as ethical-oriented social interaction. The rule of this interaction is to treat others as yourself. The action is equated with Aristotle's *praxis*, and its rules – with the free principles of *phronesis*. On the other hand, Ricoeur considers the norms of morality as conditions for the implementation of action in the space of co-existence. However, the essence of the developed dialectics of ethical and moral conditions of action lies in the primacy of the ethical. Thereby Ricoeur is a supporter of teleological, rather than normative, ethics. He considers not the norms and prohibitions, but the principles of free prudent choice to be the basis of the act.

In section 1.4. “Conclusions” it is formulated the conclusions of our analysis of Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of action: The stages of the hermeneutics of action — the hermeneutics of social action and the hermeneutics of action in the concept of a “capable man” – have both different and common features. In particular, at each stage, Ricoeur analyzes action from a social and political position. Namely, he

defines it as an act in the space of common being. If in the hermeneutics of social action such an approach to action is based on semantics and poetics of action, then in the concept of “capable man” it is based on the hermeneutics of the self and on ethics.

The Second Chapter of our study *"Action as the Basis of H. Arendt's Political Philosophy"* is devoted to analyzing Arendt's action theory as a philosophical concept that combines several approaches to action, namely, political, anthropological and hermeneutical approaches.

In section 2.1. *"Historical and Philosophical Background of Arendt's Theory of Action"*, the place of Arendt's action theory among the hermeneutic projects of the twentieth century is revealed. We show that it occupies an intermediate position between the ontological project of Heidegger's hermeneutics in which the topic of action was not fully articulated and the Habermas' hermeneutical project of communicative action.

Section 2.1. begins with a consideration of the influence of ancient Greek thought on the formation of Arendt's action theory. In particular, we consider the influence of Aristotle's practical philosophy, the idea of the separation of *praxis* and *poiesis*. Then, Arendt's action theory is analyzed as a concept that contradicts the principles of Heidegger's fundamental ontology. It is shown that Arendt's philosophy is built on the basis of a critical rethinking of the concepts of “Being and Time”, for example, on the basis of rethinking the category of “being-together-with-others”. In addition, the influence of the existential theory of Jaspers on the formation of the philosophical worldview of Arendt is considered, in particular, the influence of the principle of communication.

Furthermore, in section 2.1. it is said that Arendt's action theory occupies a definite place in the modern history of understanding actions, namely, it combines the political and hermeneutic approaches to action. Without being fully hermeneutically expressed, it influences the formation of J. Habermas' hermeneutics of action.

In section 2.2. “*The Main Provisions of Arendt's Action Theory*”, we provide a holistic analysis of Arendt's view of the action as a meaningful act in the space of common and public being. We recognize political, philosophical-anthropological, hermeneutical aspects in Arendt's approach to action.

In paragraph 2.2.1. “*The Role of the Concepts of “Human Condition” and “Vita Activa” in Arendt's Action Theory*”, the various semantic contexts of using the concepts of "human condition" and "vita activa" are revealed in Arendt's philosophy. In addition, the place and meaning of the notion of action in the concept of *vita activa* are considered, the differences between action, labor, and work established by Arendt, her approach to the political and social as different spheres of human life are analyzed. In addition, the criticism of her concept of non-violent power, in particular, the critical approach of J. Habermas, is considered.

In paragraph 2.2.2. “*The Problem of Defining Action: Synthesis of Approaches*”, Arendt's philosophy of political action is presented as a theory based on an anthropological and hermeneutic approach to action. In particular, *plurality* and *natality*, which are the basic conditions of political action from the point of view of Arendt, were analyzed by us as its anthropological features. In turn, as a hermeneutical basis of Arendt's action theory, we examined the publicly developed "who" of action: the "who" of action is determined not by the actor himself, but by those who tell about him.

In paragraph 2.2.2. we came to the conclusion that the synthesis of anthropological, hermeneutic and political approaches leads Arendt to a special idea of action which can be expressed as follows: action is that through which a person realizes human abilities, as well as that which is considered, interpreted by the participants of common being. The philosophical-anthropological and hermeneutic contexts of the analysis of action lead Arendt to a special notion of a political. First, the political is inextricably linked to the conditions of human existence, defined as the space for the realization of these conditions. Secondly, the political is seen as a space of understanding, interpretation. The political action

gets the opportunity to be the same high-grade object of hermeneutic study, such as text, a story in Arendt's philosophy.

In paragraph 2.2.3. “*The Role of the Concept of Speech in Arendt’s Action Theory*” we show that the concept of speech becomes the main category for Arendt in the process of solving the question of authorship of the action meaning. We reveal that speech as the narration and the story plays the role of a mechanism for the formation of meaning and understanding of action. In the philosophy of Arendt, there are two approaches to speech. Firstly, speech is understood as an individual action: the speaker is the one who takes himself to publicity by speaking acts in a common being. Secondly, speech is also defined as the story of others about the action of the actor. In this second meaning, the speech also formulates the meaning of action as a public act.

In section 2.3. “*The Place of Judgment in Arendt's Action Theory*” we show that the concept of judgment by Arendt not only does not contradict the early ideas of her theory of action but also develops them. In particular, it develops the idea that the meaning of action is a public phenomenon. We reveal that the retrospective judgment (the judgment of the *spectator*) in the political philosophy of Arendt is a type of speech as a way of thinking about actions. “Judging spectator” is defined by Arendt as a participant of common life, public world. He turns out to be not contemplating, but rather able, among other people, to express his own opinion about what is happening or what has happened. In Arendt’s philosophy, the judging spectator is endowed with the role of narrator involved in political life. He is the one who, using speech, fixes the public meaning of action, who judges on behalf of the whole community proceeding from *common sense*.

On the whole, in section 2.3. it is shown that the concept of judgment presented in later texts by Arendt does not divide her political philosophy into two parts (philosophy of action and philosophy of judgment), but, on the contrary, becomes a continuation of the action theory, namely, the idea that public, shared being is a true political space. Not only the actor but also the judging spectator as a

narrator is an active participant in political life. Arendt defines judgment as the ability of *vita contemplativa* which is different from all other mental abilities as the most political ability. In our opinion, this means that in her philosophy judgment appears as a "bridge" between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*.

In section 2.4. "*Conclusions*", we formulate the results of analysis of Arendt's action theory. Firstly, in her philosophy, the action (praxis) is a type of activity that fully realizes the conditions of human life (natality and plurality). Secondly, it is a political phenomenon. In the interpretation of Arendt, it means that action is only possible in the space of common being. In her philosophy, *the political* has an anthropological significance. Third, the action is a public phenomenon. It is open to interpretation. Fourthly, the speech (story) is a kind of action, therefore it corresponds to all the signs of praxis. Fifth, judgment is the kind of mental activity that is realized in the process of speech as a kind of political action.

In the Third Chapter "*The Concept of Action in the Philosophy of H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur: Similarities and Differences of Approaches*", the common and distinctive provisions of action theories by Arendt and Ricoeur are examined. To identify them, we compared the historical and philosophical background of the works of Arendt and Ricoeur, analyzed the influence of the notions of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's concept of "capable man", and also compared the approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action. In this chapter, Ricoeur is considered as both the researcher of Arendt's action theory and the philosopher who incorporates her ideas into his own hermeneutics project.

In section 3.1. "*Historical and Philosophical Prerequisites for Comparing the Philosophy of Arendt and Ricoeur*" we reveal that the practical philosophy of Aristotle and Heidegger's fundamental ontology are common historical and philosophical prerequisites of Arendt's and Ricoeur's ideas about action.

In paragraph 3.1.1. "*The Influence of Aristotle Practical Philosophy*" we show that following the ancient Greek thinker, they define the action as *praxis*. If

Arendt regards the action as the source of a person's political life, then Ricoeur reinterprets not the political essence of action introduced by Aristotle but the teleological aspect of praxis described by Greek philosopher ("to strive for the good life"). In his interpretation, ethical-oriented action is a social phenomenon, possible only in an institutionally organized society.

In paragraph 3.1.2. *"The Influence of Heidegger Ontological Hermeneutics"* we show that Arendt and Ricoeur create philosophical action projects in contrast to the idea of finiteness established in Heidegger's fundamental ontology. Both philosophers advocate the search for meanings in the power of life, not in the power of death. In addition, instead of the ontological hermeneutics of Heidegger, they offer practical hermeneutics.

In section 3.2. *"Ricoeur and Arendt: Interpretation and Continuity"*, the influence of Arendt's action theory on Ricoeur's hermeneutics is considered.

In paragraph 3.2.1. *"Arendt's Action Theory in the Interpretation of Ricoeur"*, we show that Ricoeur made a significant contribution to the history of interpretation of Arendt's action theory. He was one of the first to define it as a concept based on a synthesis of philosophical anthropology and politics of action. From Ricoeur's point of view, the source of this synthesis is Arendt's approach to political power as a kind of action. In addition, Ricoeur was one of the first to find hermeneutic content in Arendt's political philosophy, namely, he showed that its subject is the history of the interpretation of the concepts of action and power. In general, Ricoeur's hermeneutic approach to Arendt's action theory aims to refute the allegations in idealism against her. According to Ricoeur, Arendt is not engaged in the reconstruction of the ideal of political action, not the search for this ideal in history, but is engaged in the comprehension and search for its interpretations.

In paragraph 3.2.2. *"The Influence of Arendt's Theory of Action on Ricoeur's Ethical-Political Thought"*, it is revealed that Ricoeur's ethical-political approach to action as interaction was formed under the influence of Arendt's

philosophy, namely, under the influence of her ideas about plural and joint political existence. Agreeing with Arendt that common plural being is a condition of political action, Ricoeur regards it as a space of both political and social interaction. According to him, political action is controversial, namely, it is based both on rational interaction and on violent subordination. Arendt's concept of non-violent power helped Ricoeur to substantiate the possibility of resolving the political paradox in favor of the primacy of the ethical goal of power as an act of violence.

In paragraph 3.2.3. *“The Influence of Arendt's Theory of Action on Ricoeur's Concept of Forgiveness”*, we show that Arendt's theory of action had a direct influence on Ricoeur's concept of forgiveness. In particular, the French philosopher borrows her concept of *natality* to substantiate the idea of forgiveness *“among us”*. At the same time, the given interpretation of this term differs from the representation of Arendt. If Arendt defines *natality* as a condition of action, not separating the actor from the act, then Ricoeur proposes to apply the principle of *natality* not to the action, but to the personality of the actor, or rather to his or her *self*. In his philosophy, forgiveness is what allows the guilty self to renew his or her *self*.

In paragraph 3.2.4. *“The Notion of Promise in the Philosophy of Arendt and Ricoeur”*, it is shown that the approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to the promise have common and distinctive features. Using the notion of promise they try to solve the issue of the *fragility* of human action. According to them, to promise to do something and fulfill the promised action means to continue, prolong the world of action (common life). If, in Arendt's philosophy, this world is endowed with political attributes, then in Ricoeur's hermeneutics, *political* goes to the background, and the search for subjectivity (self) in a situation of recognition in social interaction comes first.

Section 3.3. “*Approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to Action*” is devoted to the comparison of anthropological and hermeneutic approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action.

In paragraph 3.3.1. “*The Anthropological Approach*”, we show that the anthropological approach to action leads both Arendt and Ricoeur to ethics. Both philosophers, speaking of action as a lot of human life, define it as a phenomenon that needs ethical evaluation. They wonder about the contradictory nature of moral norms of behavior. Ricoeur explains the antinomy of morality by the contradictory nature of human which is reflected in action and makes it tragic. Arendt finds the cause of the contradiction of moral norms in historical reality in which the possibility of genuine action is lost – the unique ability of a person to freely start new things. Both philosophers view judgment as a way of resolving the moral contradictions of practical life. In Ricoeur's ethics, it is a critical situational moral judgment, its purpose is to overcome *the tragedy of action*. This judgment is carried out on the actor and reflects the individual ethical “who” of his or her self. In late philosophy of Arendt, on the contrary, such a judgment is the judgment of the spectator, who is able to politically and ethically evaluate actions, to make public images of their “who”.

In paragraph 3.3.2. “*The Hermeneutic Approach*”, it is revealed that the hermeneutic approaches of Arendt and Ricoeur to action are aimed at solving the problem of understanding actions and are transformed into narrative approaches to history. In Arendt's political philosophy, the question of action as a phenomenon is publicly understood through the definition of history as a narrative memory, an immortal meaning of action. In turn, Ricoeur considers the problem of understanding action not only as a public, political problem but also as a question of reflexive philosophy. The narrative is presented in his works both as a way of integrating political events into storytelling and as a way of identifying the author of action. In Ricoeur's hermeneutics, the historical narrative is a variety of interpretations based on the dialectic of memory and forgetting.

In section 3.4. “Conclusions”, it is described the results of the third chapter of our study. In particular, it is concluded that after rethinking the practical philosophy of Aristotle, Heidegger's ontological hermeneutics, Arendt and Ricoeur propose an ethical-hermeneutical project of the theory of action. Aristotle's ethics helps them to formulate a teleological approach to action, as well as to define the political sphere of actions as a space free from violence. Their analysis and criticism of Heidegger's hermeneutics helps them to define the understanding as a condition of action in common being. In Arendt's philosophy, the ethical-hermeneutic project is implemented as a political theory. In Ricoeur's philosophy the ethical-hermeneutic project is implemented as a hermeneutic phenomenology.

In the Conclusion the main provisions and conclusions of the dissertation research are formulated. We comes to the conclusion that Arendt's political theory of action and Ricoeur's hermeneutics of action are an example of the fact that the philosophy of action is not reduced to an analytical tradition. Arendt and Ricoeur show that the issue of action can be solved by continuing the legacy of continental philosophy, namely, ancient Greek thought, philosophical hermeneutics, and anthropology. They despite the differences in approaches, determine the action not through its motives, goals, consequences, but by interpreting “who” of action. However, if for Ricoeur the “who” ultimately turns out to be the self, then for Arendt the “who” of action is a political and public phenomenon.

Author's publications on the topic of the thesis study

The works published by the author in journals indexed in the international databases of indexing and citation, as well as on the list of high-level journals of the HSE:

1. Sidorova M.A. The Concepts of Time in H. Arendt's Philosophy: from Vita Activa to The Life of The Mind // Bulletin of Moscow University. Ser. 7. Philosophy. No. 2. 2015. P. 3-18.

2. Sidorova M.A. Daimonion as a Metaphor for Acting and Thinking Who in The Philosophy of Hannah Arendt // Voprosy Filosofii. 2015. Vol. 12. P. 93-101.

3. Sidorova M.A. Forgiveness as a Possibility: The Approaches of H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur // The Russian Sociological Review. Vol. 15. No. 2. 2016. P. 192-207.

Other publications on the topic of dissertation:

4. Sidorova M. A. The issues of War and Revolution in The Political Philosophy of H. Arendt // Ethics of War and Peace: History and Perspectives of Research / ed. by B. N. Kashnikov, A. D. Kumankov. SPb.: Aletheia, 2016. P. 39-48.

5. Sidorova M. A. The Concept of Action in P. Ricoeur's Phenomenology of The Ethical-Moral Subject // Philosophy. Language. Culture / ed. by V. V. Gorbatov, A. V. Marey. No. 6. SPb.: Aletheia, 2015. P. 112-123.

6. Sidorova M. A. Features of The Use of Augustine's Time Terminology in The Philosophy of H. Arendt // Philosophy. Language. Culture / ed. by V. V. Gorbatov. No. 5. SPb.: Aletheia, 2014. P. 45-52.

7. Sidorova M. A. The Role Of The H. Arendt's Action Theory Terms in The «Capable Man» Concept by P. Ricoeur // Perm University Herald. Series «Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology». 2016. Iss. 3(27). P. 47–54.