

## Summaries

### **Veronika Darida: Philosophy and Puppetry**

Puppets and puppetry have fascinated some of the most significant thinkers of the previous centuries. This essay revolves around the question why and in which way does puppetry invite us to rethink some major paradigms of modern philosophical thinking. Even for Rilke, the experience of contemplating puppets seems to go beyond something that could have been described by the positions of “subject” and “object”: the puppet cannot be dominated, it cannot be standardized by human knowledge. This can be linked to Benjamin’s and Agamben’s criticism of human language, to their attempt of giving voice to a pre-lingual signification, a worldly presence of human existence that comes before any separation between the subject and the object of an experience. For de Man and Deleuze, puppetry, as a permanent and unlimited play of significations, serves as a model for philosophy as well: it redefines the very technique of philosophical writing.

### **Bence Péter Marosán: The Concept of Play and its Role in the Epistemology of Edmund Husserl**

One of the focal points of phenomenological philosophy is the attempt to understand the very activity of “playing”. It may surprise us, however, how neglected this topic is in discussions of Husserl’s philosophy. This paper not only aims to identify some texts where Husserl speaks about human play, but goes further, and looks for its systematic place in Husserlian thinking. Phenomenology often speaks about playing in terms of “taking something seriously” or, somewhat differently, in terms of “freeing ourselves from the severity of a situation”. Even though these seem to describe two opposite attitudes: ontification and neutralization in phenomenological termini, Husserl considers them rather as complementary elements. To better understand its systematic role, I distinguish between play in the context of image consciousness, of phenomenological reduction, of free imaginative variation, and finally, play in the context of the origin of human sciences. These investigations reveal play as a crucial element of Husserlian thinking, so much so that playing can be understood as a constitutive part of human existence.

### **Miklós Márton: What is the “physical”? The problem of defining the concept of “physical” in the mind-body debate**

According to contemporary physicalism, everything in the world has physical nature. However, it is far from clear how exactly we should understand the concept of the “physical”. Although today’s physicalism is the intellectual heir of traditional materialism, with the development of physics, the traditional concept of materiality has become outdated. On the one hand, it seems we must not commit ourselves independently of empirical research to any *a priori* definition, and this, on the other hand, threatens to empty the thesis of physicalism.

In this article, I will exhibit the contemporary attempts to define the concept of the “physical”, along with the arguments for and against them. I will treat the so-called theory-based solutions, which allude to physical theories to the definition of the “physical”. I also present the solutions built on paradigmatic examples and the so-called *via negativa* theories. The former tries to define the concept through objects that are typically considered physical in everyday life, while the latter through mental phenomena. At the end of the essay, I try to explain the failure of the attempts to define the concept by distinguishing two different meanings of physicalism.

### **Mikós Nyíró: On the scope of the concept of play – Heidegger, Fink and Gadamer**

1960 was a peculiar year for German phenomenology: two of the most important members of the tradition, Eugen Fink and Hans-Georg Gadamer, published their *chef-d’œuvres* that year. Both of these books give a special emphasis to the philosophical significance of the concept of “play”. Remarkably enough, neither Fink nor Gadamer refer to this concept as a primarily anthropological or cultural one, but they approach it from an ontological-cosmological angle. Even if there are non-negligible similarities between the two endeavors, their differences are just as evident for a closer reading. The aim of the article is to give a faithful interpretation of these phenomenological theories of play without turning a blind eye to the fact that with time, these thoughts themselves have gone through considerable change. Comparing the pertaining works of the two philosophers shows us how different their theoretical motivations are, and to what kind of consequences these differences lead.