



L'anno duemilaquattordici, addì **27 maggio** alle ore 15.30, a seguito di regolare convocazione trasmessa con nota prot. n. 30424 del 23 maggio 2014, nell'Aula Organi Collegiali si é riunito il Senato Accademico per l'esame e la discussione degli argomenti iscritti al seguente ordine del giorno:

.....**o m i s s i s**

Sono presenti: il Rettore, prof. Luigi Frati, ed i componenti del Senato Accademico: prof. Antonello Folco Biagini, prof. Stefano Biagioni, prof.ssa Maria Rosaria Torrisi, prof.ssa Emma Baumgartner., prof.ssa Alessandra Zicari, prof. Giorgio Graziani, prof. Stefano Catucci, prof.ssa Rita Asquini, prof.ssa Stefania Portoghesi Tuzi, prof.ssa Matilde Mastrangelo, prof. Alessandro Saggioro, prof. Giorgio Piras, prof. Emanuele Caglioti, prof.ssa Maria Grazia Betti, prof. Felice Cerreto, prof. Giorgio De Toma, prof.ssa Susanna Morano, prof. Marco Biffoni, prof. Giuseppe Santoro Passarelli (entra alle ore 16.05), prof.ssa Paola Panarese, i Rappresentanti del personale: Beniamino Altezza, Pietro Maioli, Carlo D'Addio e i Rappresentanti degli studenti: Valeria Roscioli (entra alle ore 16.15), Stefano Capodieci, Pierleone Lucatelli e Diana Armento (entra alle ore 16.45).

Assistono: il Direttore Generale, Carlo Musto D'Amore, che assume le funzioni di Segretario, i Presidi: prof. Giuseppe Ciccarone, prof. Giorgio Spangher, prof. Fabrizio Vestroni, prof. Renato Masiani, prof. Marco Listanti, prof. Vincenzo Nesi, prof. Roberto Nicolai, prof. Giuseppe Venanzoni, prof. Cristiano Violani, prof. Eugenio Gaudio, i Prorettori: prof. Giancarlo Ruocco, prof. Federico Masini, prof.ssa Giuseppina Capaldo, prof. Giorgio Alleva, il Direttore della Scuola di Studi Avanzati prof. Alessandro Schiesaro e la Rappresentante degli assegnisti e dottorandi Valentina Mariani.

Assenti giustificati: prof.ssa Beatrice Alfonzetti, prof. Augusto D'Angelo e la Rappresentante del personale Germani.

Assenti: prof. Davide Antonio Ragozzino, il Rappresentante del personale Roberto Ligia e i Rappresentanti degli studenti Maria Gabriella Condello, Manuel Santu.

Il Presidente, constatata l'esistenza del numero legale, dichiara l'adunanza validamente costituita ed apre la seduta.

.....**o m i s s i s**



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

Senato
Accademico

Seccuta del

27 MAG. 2014

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA
Area per l'Internazionalizzazione
Settore Internazionalizzazione Ricerca
Il Capo Settore
Giuditta Carabelli

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA
Area per l'Internazionalizzazione
Il Dipartimento
Dott.ssa Antonella Cammisa

ACCORDO PER L'ADESIONE AL GDRI "ORDINARY LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY AND ORDINARY CONCEPTIONS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES"

Il Presidente sottopone all'esame del Senato Accademico la seguente relazione predisposta dall'Area per l'Internazionalizzazione.

Il Consiglio del Dipartimento di Filosofia, nella seduta del 15 luglio 2013, ha approvato la proposta avanzata dal prof. Piergiorgio Donatelli di adesione ad un Gruppo di Ricerca Internazionale sul tema della filosofia del linguaggio ordinario e le concezioni dell'ordinario nelle scienze sociali.

L'accordo GDRI (Groupements de Recherche Internationaux), dal titolo "ORDINARY LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY AND ORDINARY CONCEPTIONS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES (PloCo)", è sottoscritto dal CNRS (Francia) e le seguenti unità:

- The Université de Picardie Jules Verne "UPJV" – France;
- The Université Paris 1 Pantheon-Sorbonne – France;
- Johns Hopkins University "JHU" – USA;
- Tufts University "Tufts" – USA;
- The Universidade do Porto "UPorto" – Portogallo;
- Università Degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza" – Italia.

L'obiettivo principale di PloCo è quello di promuovere un'attività di ricerca congiunta sul tema della vita ordinaria dal punto di vista filosofico, etico, politico e delle scienze sociali al fine di garantire maggiore internazionalizzazione delle attività di ricerca in materia dei singoli partecipanti.

L'accordo avrà durata quadriennale e, per la Sapienza, il Dipartimento direttamente coinvolto nelle attività di PloCo è, quindi, il Dipartimento di Filosofia. Responsabile scientifico per le attività risulterebbe il prof. Piergiorgio Donatelli.

Il Consiglio del Dipartimento di Filosofia ha altresì stabilito che ogni onere finanziario derivante dalla partecipazione all'iniziativa graverà sui fondi di ricerca disponibili intestati al docente interessato.

Allegati parte integrante:

- Memorandum for the establishment of the international Scientific Network PloCo;
- Verbale Consiglio Dipartimento di Filosofia del 15 luglio 2013.

9.2



Senato
Accademico

Seduta del

27 MAG. 2014

DELIBERAZIONE N. 300/14

IL SENATO ACCADEMICO

- LETTA** la relazione istruttoria;
- VISTA** la proposta di accordo per la costituzione di un Gruppo di ricerca Internazionale denominato "PloCo";
- VISTA** la delibera del Consiglio di Dipartimento di Filosofia del 15 luglio 2013;
- ACCERTATA** la copertura finanziaria da parte del Dipartimento di Filosofia;

con voto unanime

DELIBERA

di autorizzare il Magnifico Rettore alla firma dell'accordo medesimo.

Letto e approvato seduta stante per la sola parte dispositiva.

IL SEGRETARIO
Carlo Musto D'Amore

IL PRESIDENTE
Luigi Frati



ESTRATTO NUMERO 2 DEL VERBALE DEL CONSIGLIO DEL
DIPARTIMENTO DI FILOSOFIA
SEDUTA DEL GIORNO 15.7.2013

Il Consiglio del Dipartimento di Filosofia si è riunito il giorno 15 luglio 2013, alle ore 12,30, nell'aula XII di Villa Mirafiori per discutere e deliberare sul seguente ordine del giorno:

1. **Approvazione del verbale della seduta precedente;**
2. Nomina Commissione di entrata del Dottorato;
3. Approvazione dell'accordo GDRI "Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences" tra CNRS (Parigi) e Sapienza Università di Roma (Responsabile dell'unità Sapienza Prof. Donatelli);
4. **Varie ed eventuali:**
 - 4.1 Cambio denominazione insegnamento Filosofia politica e sociale (prof. Virginio Marzocchi)
 - 4.2 Richiesta nulla osta prof.ssa Irene Kajon
 - 4.3 Contratto editoriale Lithos Editrice

Sono presenti i proff. Ordinari: Massimo Luigi Bianchi, Carlo Borghero, Giuseppe Di Giacomo, Piergiorgio Donatelli, Stefano Gensini, Irene Kajon, Virginio Marzocchi, Pietro Montani, Stefano Petrucciani, Francesco Saverio Trincia.

Sono assenti giustificati i proff. Ordinari: Mirella Capozzi, Antonello D'angelo, Donatella Di Cesare, Annamaria Ioppolo.

Sono assenti i proff. Ordinari: Roberto Cordeschi, Tito Magri.

Sono presenti i proff. Associati: Luciano albanese, Sergio Bucci, Cesare Cozzo, Marina De Palo, Elena Gagliasso, Claudia Mancina, Maria Muccillo, Emidio Spinelli, Pierluigi Valenza, Mauro Zonta.

Sono assenti giustificati i proff. Associati: Alessandra Attanasio, Francesco Fronterotta, Filippo Gonnelli, Stefano Velotti.

Sono assenti i proff. Associati: Edoardo Ferrario, Paolo Vinci.

Sono presenti i ricercatori: Nunzio Allocca, Stefano Bancalari, Fiorella Bassa, Luciano De Fiore, Daniele Guastini, Emiliano Ippoliti, Luca Marchetti, Marcello Musté, Simone Pollo, Diana Quarantotto, Francesco Valerio Tommasi.

Sono assenti giustificati i ricercatori: Chiara Adorisio, Silvia Berti, Caterina Botti, Candida Carella Assunta, Orietta Ombrosi, Luisa Valente.

Sono assenti i ricercatori: Guido Coccoli, Marialucrezia Leone, Arcangelo Rosati, Annalisa Schino.

Sono presenti i rappresentanti del personale tecnico – amministrativo: Antonio Bomarsi, Daniela Bozzetti, Paola Cataldi, Luigi Emanuele, Mauro Lattanzi, Samantha Maruzzella, Maria Mangano Gallo, Annamaria Salatino, Roberto Vitali.



Sono assenti giustificati i rappresentati del personale TAB: M. Ersilia Racioppi, Marcello Moscelli.

Sono assenti i rappresentanti degli studenti.

Constatato il numero legale dei presenti, alle ore 12.45 il Direttore dichiara aperto il Consiglio.

... O.M.I.S.S.I.S. ...

3. Approvazione dell'accordo GDRI "Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences" tra CNRS (Parigi) e Sapienza Università di Roma (Responsabile dell'unità Sapienza Prof. Donatelli);

Il Direttore comunica di aver ricevuto la richiesta da parte del prof. Piergiorgio Donatelli di stabilire un accordo tra GDRI "Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences" tra CNRS (Parigi) e Sapienza Università di Roma (Responsabile dell'unità Sapienza Prof. Donatelli).

L'accordo GDRI (Groupements de Recherche internationaux) dal titolo "Ordinary language philosophy and ordinary conceptions in the social sciences (PloCo)" è stabilito tra il CNRS (Francia) e le seguenti unità: Université de Picardie Jules Verne (Centre universitaire de recherches sur l'action publique et le politique. Epistémologie et Sciences sociales), Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (Philosophies contemporaines), Johns Hopkins University (Humanities Center; Department of Philosophy), Tufts University (Department of Philosophy), Sapienza Università di Roma (Dipartimento di Filosofia), Universidade do Porto (Mind, language and action group; Instituto de Filosofia) sul tema della filosofia del linguaggio ordinario e le concezioni dell'ordinario nelle scienze sociali. Il responsabile dell'unità Sapienza è il prof. Piergiorgio Donatelli. Il network è costituito per la durata di quattro anni, rinnovabile, al fine di favorire la ricerca comune sul tema della vita ordinaria dal punto di vista filosofico, etico, politico e delle scienze sociali.

Il GDRI inserisce la Sapienza dentro un network accreditato di istituzioni universitarie e favorisce l'internazionalizzazione della ricerca dell'ateneo. La conferenza conclusiva della ricerca è prevista a Roma.

Il Dipartimento di Filosofia si impegna a fare fronte agli oneri economici derivanti dalla partecipazione di Sapienza, che sono stati fissati nella cifra annuale minima di 500 euro.

Il Consiglio approva all'unanimità e seduta stante.

... O.M.I.S.S.I.S. ...

Alle ore 13.30 non essendoci null'altro su cui deliberare, il Direttore dichiara chiuso il Consiglio.

Il Direttore
prof. Stefano Petrucciani

Il Segretario Amministrativo
Daniela Bozzetti

**Memorandum for the establishment of
the International Scientific Network (GDRI)**

*“ORDINARY LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY AND ORDINARY CONCEPTIONS IN THE SOCIAL
SCIENCES - PloCo”*

BETWEEN

- **THE CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE**, hereinafter referred to as **“CNRS”**, a public scientific and technological institution, with headquarters at 3 rue Michel-Ange, 75794 Paris cedex 16, France, represented by its **President, Prof. Alain Fuchs**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of:

- Centre universitaire de recherches sur l'action publique et le politique. Epistémologie et Sciences sociales (CURAPP-ESS) UMR 7319, Director: Prof. Frédéric Lebaron;

AND

- **THE UNIVERSITÉ DE PICARDIE JULES VERNE**, hereinafter referred to as **“UPJV”** a public scientific, cultural and professional institution, with headquarters at Campus universitaire, Chemin du Thil, 80025 Amiens, France, represented by its **President, Prof. Michel Brazier**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of:

- Centre universitaire de recherches sur l'action publique et le politique. Epistémologie et Sciences sociales (CURAPP-ESS) UMR 7319, Director: Prof. Frédéric Lebaron;

AND

- **THE UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 1 PANTHÉON-SORBONNE**, hereinafter referred to as **“Paris 1”** a public scientific, cultural and professional institution, with headquarters at Centre Panthéon, 12 place du Panthéon, 75231 - Paris cedex 05, France, represented by its **President, Prof. Philippe Boutry**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of:

- Philosophies contemporaines (Phico) EA 3562, Director: Prof. Sandra Laugier

AND

- **JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY**, hereinafter referred to as **“JHU”**, a private not-for-profit research university, with headquarters at 3400 N Charles St, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America, represented by its **President, Prof. Ronald J. Daniels**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of:

- Humanities Center, Director: Prof. Hent de Vries,
- Department of Philosophy, Chair: Prof. Michael Williams.

AND

- **TUFTS UNIVERSITY**, hereinafter referred to as “**Tufts**”, a private not-for-profit research university, with headquarters at Ballou Hall, 2nd Floor, Medford, Massachusetts, United States of America, represented by its **President, Prof. Anthony P. Monaco**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of:

- Department of Philosophy, Chair: Prof. Erin Kelly;

AND

- **UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA "LA SAPIENZA"**, hereinafter referred to as “**La Sapienza**”, a coeducational, autonomous state university, with headquarters Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy, represented by its **Rector, Prof. Luigi Frati**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of the:

- Dipartimento di Filosofia, Director: Prof. Stefano Petrucciani;

AND

- **THE UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO**, hereinafter referred to as “**UPorto**”, a public institution of higher education, with headquarters at Praça de Gomes Teixeira, 4099 Porto, Portugal, represented by its **Rector, Prof. Marques dos Santos**,

Acting in its own name and on behalf of the:

- Mind, language and action group (MLAG), Director: Sofia MIGUENS ;
- Instituto de Filosofia, Director: José MEIRINHOS;

Hereinafter referred to jointly as the “Parties” or individually as the “Party”.

PREAMBLE

The International Scientific Network named “PloCo” aims at establishing a scientific collaboration between 6 teams, which are internationally renowned for their expertise in the study of “Ordinary language philosophy” (OLP), whose main representatives are L. Wittgenstein, J. L. Austin, and S. Cavell. The teams are already used to work together (they have published together several times and already organized several conferences together, thus participating to the renewal of OLP) and the GDRI provides the opportunity, by focusing on the relationship between ordinary language philosophy and the social sciences, to develop an interdisciplinary synergy allowing to concentrate researchers’ efforts on tackling a critical and contextual examination of social practices and institutions and of the human forms of life (including, centrally, the way human beings use language). Thinking about ordinary language will also open new researches in the fields of ethics and applied ethics (for instance, feminist ethics), of epistemology and will make it possible to concretely broaden linguistic issues.

The collaboration with ExeCo’s team (scientific coordinator: S. Laugier) will allow to extend the work on ordinary language philosophy in applying its methodology to issues in the social sciences and to ethical issues. This collaboration will take the form of a main seminar in which, during 3 years (2013, 2014, 2015), all the teams will present and discuss their results. ExeCo will also organize an International Colloquium on “Ordinary Conceptions of Ethics and Feminism” in 2014.

The collaboration with Johns Hopkins’ research team (scientific coordinator: P. Marrati) will concentrate on epistemological and ethical issues, such as scepticism and moral life. It will give rise to a major international conference in year 2015.

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

The collaboration with Tufts’ research team (scientific coordinator: N. Bauer) will concentrate on epistemological and linguistic issues, which have direct implications in feminist philosophy. It will explore what we are able to do with language – the many ways in which we are making speech acts – and the consequences it may have on our ethical and political life. In order to accomplish such a project, we will have to deal with many methodological issues concerning the various possible analysis of how the language works. Another line of research will investigate the relations between OLP and conceptions of rationality in the social sciences. These researches will be done during a research stay at Tufts ending by a workshop on “Ordinary language and the society”. Tufts will welcome and organize the research stay and the workshop in 2013.

The collaboration with the University of Porto’s team (scientific coordinator: S. Miguens) will concentrate on epistemological and linguistics issues, such as contextualism and direct realism in philosophy of language and mind. It will mainly take the form of a workshop on “Ordinary language and contextualism” in 2014.

The collaboration with La Sapienza (scientific coordinator: P. Donatelli) will mainly concentrate on ethical issues of OLP. The team will participate in the organisation of an international colloquium on “Ordinary Conceptions of Ethics and Feminism”, to be organized in 2014. It will also welcome and organize the ending Summer school on “Ordinary language philosophy’s actuality” in 2016.

The CURAPP-ESS’ team (scientific coordinator: B. Ambroise) will manage the scientific collaboration between all the participants and supervise their many scientific exchanges. It will welcome and organize several seminars (and a workshop on “Kinds of rationality in the Social Sciences” in 2015), and participate to the elaboration of all the research activities. It will also centralize the scientific information (by means of a website) and documentation, aiming at becoming the main research centre in OLP in the European Union.

An International Scientific Network is a cooperation devoid of legal status, hereinafter referred to by the initials, GDRI, and is governed by the following provisions.

THE FOLLOWING HAS BEEN AGREED UPON

Article 1 – Purpose

The purpose of this Memorandum is the establishment of an International Scientific Network (hereinafter referred to as the “Network”), a non-incorporated means of cooperation, named *Ordinary language philosophy and ordinary conceptions in the social sciences (PloCo)*, the purpose of which is to exchange information on the following scientific theme: Ordinary language philosophy (OPL), its actuality and its relations with ordinary conceptions in the social science, hereinafter referred to as the “Network Theme”.

The scientific purpose of the Network within the framework of the Theme and the activities resulting from it are stated in Annex 1.

Article 2 – Composition

The Network is composed of the laboratories or institutes listed above.

The activities to be coordinated by the Network shall extend only to the scientific work inherent to the Network Theme of *PloCo* described in Annex 1.

All personnel of the said laboratories or institutes contributing to the Network activities shall remain assigned to their home laboratory/institute and institution.

For information purposes only, the list of the staff of the signatory Parties to the Memorandum and of external interested participants is attached to the present Memorandum.

Article 3 – Resources

Each Party shall undertake to make available to the members of the Network affiliated to said Party the means it deems necessary to promote their activities within the framework of the regulations of the individual Parties and in particular:

a/ The exchange of information between Network members through the organization of conferences, seminars, colloquia, workshops, thematic schools or work meetings on said theme.

b/ Discussion of the setting-up and running, if necessary, of joint research projects on said theme at a later stage.

c/ Cooperation in terms of information and scientific documentation, in particular, through the exchange of publications and scientific reviews on the Network Theme.

d/ Facilitate contacts and exchanges of researchers participating in the Network on said Theme; including researchers and academics, postdoctoral fellows and, if necessary, Ph.D. students.

Article 4 – Organization

A Network Coordinator, whose identity is given in Annex 2, shall be jointly appointed by the Parties for a four (4) year period.

The role of the Coordinator is to steer the Network activities and the Theme with the Scientific Committee, and to transmit the information submitted by the Parties to the Network members.

The Coordinator shall be assisted by a Scientific Committee made up of representatives of the Network Parties. The scientific committee is composed of representatives from member laboratories or institutes, appointed by the Party (or Parties) to which the laboratory/institute is affiliated. The composition of the Scientific Committee selected is set forth in Annex 3.

The Scientific Committee shall meet at least once every two (2) years and as often as needed at the initiative of the Coordinator or of one third (1/3) of its members. As necessary these meetings may be held by videoconferencing. All minutes of those meetings shall be distributed to the Parties

Each Party shall transmit to the Coordinator the names of the scientists participating in the activities of the Network, for each member laboratory/institute affiliated to said Party. The Coordinator shall compile the list and transmit it to all the members of the Network. The Coordinator shall update the list whenever necessary.

The Coordinator shall draw up an annual scientific and financial report on the Network activities which shall be submitted to the Parties.

Article 5 – Implementation of the Network activities

The conferences (after consultation with the Network laboratories and institutes), seminars, colloquia, workshops, thematic schools or work meetings on the Network Theme are organized under the sole responsibility of the Party that takes the initiative to do so. Each Party shall fund the participation of each of its members in the Network activities.

Within the framework of section d) of article 3 above, the relationship between the institution to which the researcher belongs and the host institution shall be strictly bilateral and their terms and conditions are not governed by this Memorandum.

The Parties shall mention the financial resources that they intend to allocate to their participation in Network activities for information purposes in Annex 4.

If two or more Parties intend to carry out research work jointly within the framework of the Network Theme, they shall establish the terms and conditions of said cooperation in a separate agreement binding on the signatory Parties, particularly with regard to Intellectual Property, the ownership and exploitation of results, which is not enforceable against the other signatory Parties.

Article 6 – Duration

This Memorandum is entered into for a non-renewable period of four (4) years as of January 1st, 2013.

Any Party may withdraw from this Memorandum by giving a six (6) months advance notice by registered letter with acknowledgement of receipt addressed to the other Parties.

Article 7 – Confidentiality

Each Party shall undertake to keep confidential and not to disclose to third parties any information that has been previously designated as confidential by the originating Party within the framework of the Network.

Article 8 – Disputes

The Parties shall endeavor to settle their differences out of court in an amicable way.

Should they fail to do so, any disputes may be settled in accordance with the rules of conciliation and the arbitration of the International Chamber of Commerce, under the aegis of one or more arbitrators appointed pursuant to these rules.

The Memorandum is drafted in seven (7) original copies.

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR THE CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE

Prof. Alain Fuchs

President

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR THE UNIVERSITÉ JULES VERNE DE PICARDIE

Prof. Michel Brazier

President

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR THE UNIVERSITE PARIS 1 PANTHEON-SORBONNE

Prof. Philippe Boutry

President

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Prof. Ronald J. Daniels

President

Place: Date:

FOR TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Prof. David Harris

Provost and Senior Vice President

Acting on behalf of:
Prof. Anthony P. Monaco
President

Formattato: Francese (Francia)

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA "LA SAPIENZA"

Prof. Luigi Frati

Rector

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Place:

Date:

FOR THE UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

Prof. Marques dos Santos

Rector

ANNEX 1 – DESCRIPTION OF THE COOPERATION

This project is the continuation of the PICS « Langage ordinaire et sens commun » [“Ordinary Language and Common sense”] (2010-2013), promoted by Sandra Laugier at the CURAPP-ESS. This PICS was based on a first Franco-American collaboration with the University of Chicago on Ordinary Language Philosophy (OLP), which is not a mainstream paradigm but still a very influential one at the international scale in the philosophy of language. It pays particular attention to the examination of the actual and day-to-day uses of language and to their circumstances, rather than to the logical or semantic analysis or to the cognitive conditions for the production of language.

This paradigm has revealed very fruitful in the course of the XXth century and more particularly recently, in the opening of a genuine interdisciplinary research. It is nowadays being renewed, as shown, for instance, by the success of the OLP website <http://olponline.wordpress.com/> which presents every international research taking place in Ordinary Language Philosophy; as well as by the numerous discussions about the works of J.L. Austin, L. Wittgenstein, and their current inheritors, such as Stanley Cavell, Charles Travis and Cora Diamond, many writings of whom have recently been edited, discussed and translated into French, Portuguese and Italian; and by the frequent use of Wittgenstein’s conception of language games or of the Austinian theory of speech acts in sociology, anthropology, economy and politics, in France and internationally.

We can probably explain this renewed interest in OLP by the difficulties encountered by mainstream analytic philosophy, in spite of several attempts to promote “social cognition”, to work together with the social sciences from Durkheim on, i.e. as a critical and contextual examination of social practices and institutions and of the human forms of life. Thinking about ordinary language also opens new researches in the fields of ethics and applied ethics and makes it possible to concretely broaden linguistic issues. Hence, since the 1980’s and after an eclipse period of ten years or so, the uses of ordinary language philosophy in the social, ethical and political domains have revealed various and fruitful. This is precisely this new resource that we wish to explore in the context of the international collaboration presented here.

The CNRS PICS program CURAPP-University of Chicago has been very efficient from two points of views: that of the creation of a Franco-American axis in OLP researches, with many common activities and publications from the two teams involved and that of the broadening of the network to a number of researchers, in the USA and in Europe; the innovative aspect of the researches discussed and presented at conferences and workshops in the PICS have raised a lot of interests from various teams and the progressive emergence at the international of a network of researchers willing to improve the visibility of that sort of philosophy and to develop new researches, including empirical researches, in this domain.

In view of this scientific and academic success the idea came naturally that we should extend the PICS program in the framework of a GDRI that would enlarge the French network while giving visibility to this new international community partly emerged from the PICS and to use the international dimension and the extent of this network to make further progresses into the theme, but also to think the PICS questions anew and to move them from the general issue of “common sense” towards a concrete validation of the procedures of OLP in the context of new fields: sociological analysis of ordinary practices, “ordinary” ethics (care), gender studies, political speech and expression analysis, economical concepts and theories, not forgetting the epistemological issues that have historically been a major application field.

Analytic philosophy, which is a result of the “linguistic turn”, is often conceived in France in relation to a mainstream related to cognitive sciences and the philosophy of mind. Such a program is indeed fruitful and has made exchanges possible with experimental psychology and sometimes economy. But it is nevertheless partial and has not yet permitted satisfying interactions with philosophy in its historical and critical form and with the social sciences, as they have developed in France since Durkheim. This program has also systematically neglected some trends that are nevertheless very important and alive in the United States and in Great Britain – trends that raised and developed a philosophy of language which cannot be reduced to the cognitivist patterns: ordinary language philosophy.

In France, particular attention has been paid, since the 1960’s (with J. Bouveresse and G.-G. Granger) to the work of Wittgenstein and to the Austinian methods of Oxonian philosophy. The latest has been carefully studied in various research programs at the University of Picardie - Jules Verne (programme IUF of Sandra Laugier (1999-2004), researches from the “axe 2: *Savoirs*”, CURAPP-ESS, regional program « Sens commun ») and at the Université Paris 1 – Panthéon Sorbonne (PhiCo), through various collaborations with the University of Chicago in the context of the PICS, and with the University Johns Hopkins in Baltimore. The French-American cooperation has revealed particularly useful in this domain and will allow showing the topical character of this philosophy and its international dimension as an alternative paradigm. It has already largely started through common publications (listed below) as well as many various common activities: workshops and conferences bringing together researchers from the two universities involved in the PICS and beyond (on sense-data, in 2002 and 2003, on J.L. Austin in 2000 and 2002, on P.F. Strawson in 2003, on J. Cook Wilson, in 2004, on the ordinary and the political, in 2005, on J.L. Austin and speech acts, in 2006, on the feeling of injustice, in 2007 and 2009, on J.L. Austin and perception, in 2007, on J. McDowell, mind and world, in 2007, on common sense and normativity, in 2008, on Cora Diamond’s moral philosophy, in 2010, on moral perfectionism, in 2008, 2009, and, in the context of the PICS: workshops on Wittgenstein and on R. Brandom’s “Making it explicit” in 2010 and 2011, Wittgenstein seminar at the University Paris 1 (2010-2013), conference on Stanley Cavell and ordinary language in 2011, on speech act and feminism in 2012); several dissertations defended in Amiens and Paris 1 with members of the committee belonging to the participating universities; numerous invited conferences on both sides.

A GDRI, in the continuation of the PICS, will be an opportunity to systematise and to formalise this cooperation between France and the USA, to extend it further to other American universities and to a European network, and to improve the elaboration of a common knowledge and of a reference work in the domain. It will also permit more formal and systematic interactions with the social sciences, ethics, gender studies and economy. The interest of a number of sociologists and economists in this tradition of “ordinary language” is undeniable and has risen in the context of a conference on Goffman and Austin at the CURAPP in 2007. It went on with various interdisciplinary publications and, at the CURAPP-ESS, an interdisciplinary research team, through collaborations between philosophers and sociologists in the second axis, and between this axis and some economists from the University Lille 1 and the University Paris 1, through seminars and common publications.

The GDRI can rely on a number of 6 young researchers and lecturers from the CURAPP-ESS who specialise in the domain and an interdisciplinary dynamic, that have made the first works from the PICS possible. On the side of the University Paris 1, it can rely on a dynamic research centre (EA 3562, PhiCo), with many doctoral researchers, leading lecturers in the domain, and which benefited from the support of the University for research programs

in the same field: on “La justesse” (ordinary language and art critic) in the context of University Paris 1’s scientific policy, ANR program “Pouvoirs de l’art” on the role of emotions in ethics and aesthetics. Internationally, the network is growing and expanding to new research centres, where we can find the best researchers in OLP: Johns Hopkins University (Paola Marrati, Hent de Vries, M. Williams, Yi-Ping Ong) and Tufts University (Avner Baz, Nancy Bauer) in the USA, Roma la Sapienza (P. Donatelli), and Porto (S. Miguens, Charles Travis) in Europe.

The collaboration is articulated around three main research topics, that have been partly explored in the listed publications and which structure the program of forthcoming researches.

- 1) Ordinary language philosophy as an alternative paradigm
- 2) An ordinary view of ethics and politics
- 3) Epistemology of ordinary language, speech acts and social sciences.

1. Ordinary language philosophy, a minority but fruitful trend of analytic philosophy and contemporary thought, has been lately renewed in the Anglo-American philosophy and appears as an alternative to the “standard” framework of analytic philosophy. The latter seeks to ground its analysis on the ideal language of logic, which supposedly constitutes a framework of rigour to be found in reality. OLP rather aims at taking ordinary uses of language as a starting point of philosophical analysis, and considers that this is the very condition to avoid falling into the “scholastic fallacy” denounced by Austin in the 1950’s, which consists in taking the things of logic for the logic of things and which often leads to the sterilisation of thought in vain scholastic quarrels, thus losing any grounding on the actual issues of ordinary life and/or scientific research.

In the history of philosophy it is instantiated by Wittgenstein and Austin, and is nowadays rediscovered by major American and British philosophers – H. Putnam, Ch. Travis, S. Cavell – but also in various branches of the philosophy of knowledge in order to think anew issues of perception, meaning and the relation between mind and action. This singular method of addressing issues, which mainly aims at a “conceptual analysis” of the terms in which they are posed, genuinely leaves room for the context in language, thought and perception, that is to say in our ways of apprehending reality, while defending a form of non-metaphysical (i.e. non-fondationalist) realism, grounded on the speaking, thinking and perceiving of the agent’s practices themselves. It thus influences the current trend of “contextualism” in philosophy of language and knowledge. We aim at developing these researches in a fashion that is more grounded on the notion of the “ordinary”.

One thread of this research will be the way the ordinary, while often an object of interest or even fascination in contemporary thought, is diversely denied, minored or neglected (not seen or taken into account) in thinking, e.g. the collection of data. A first hypothesis of this program is that such neglect has to do with neglect for ordinary life, in the sense of *domestic*, private life, and has to do with gender categories or with a hierarchy of the objects of intellectual research.

But the genuine starting point of this research is the idea of a philosophy of language that is neither (or not only) grounded on the standard view of analytic philosophy, nor on continental philosophy, but on a philosophy that pays attention to the uses of language, to language as used, *in use*, in circulation, and as having a certain *efficiency*. This point has been largely developed in the works of Charles Travis and also of Sandra Laugier on Wittgenstein and Austin, of Jocelyn Benoist in his latest books, in the work of Bruno Ambroise, Christophe Al-Saleh, Layla Raïd; but it has remained theoretical. One aim of this new research is to

articulate these theories of the ordinary to practices of the ordinary and to discover and uncover ordinary theories into these practices – not by suggesting “theories of practice”, as it has sometimes already been done, sometimes with condescension, but “ordinary theories”, the thought emerging from these practices or the intelligence these practices bring to their own realisation.

OLP thus conceived aims at ordinary realism and at showing that language is a fine tool for describing reality (suggesting the ideas of fit and perception of differences and resemblances to account for realist inspirations), but without separating it from the accountancy of a fact: that language is part of the world, that we use it daily in exchanges. Ordinary language philosophy must be understood as taking this into account: language is used, spoken and is better understood in practice than in theory. What the later Wittgenstein understands by a *form of life*: the point is not to ask whether language is an image of reality anymore, but to “get back to the ground”, to quote the *Investigations*, and to see the practices in which language is embedded, which enclose our words.

Ordinary language philosophy leads to the search and promotion of a particularist ethics, defined by the reading of literary works and in an ethics of care, always grounded on attention to the ordinary. It aims at finding and investigating the grounds of expression and practice of the ordinary. One ground has been the ground of sociological enquiry (on care activities, on political mobilisation discourses), but the bet here is that the new ground should be as much open in the domain of gender and feminist studies, following the creation of a research network in the USA on ordinary language and feminism, which includes several researchers from the collaborating departments in the GDRI.

Ordinary language philosophy was at the core of the PICS program and remains at the root of the collective research of the GDRI. The point is to pursue a continuing investigation and to go back to some of its essential parts, and to develop some thus far unseen parts. The aim of the GDRI, like the PICS, is, first of all, to make this trend of contemporary philosophy known and to restore it to favour, notably represented by the Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin. The PICS and its publications notably afforded to show a minor and really alternative trend of thought in the philosophy of language and in the active and acknowledged field of pragmatics. We can find a report of these activities in the reference collection of essays, *J.L. Austin et la philosophie du langage ordinaire* (Olms, 2011) and in a number of works by S. Laugier, J. Benoist, L. Raïd, B. Ambroise, C. Al-Saleh who have shown the importance of this philosophical trend, through a study and re-evaluation of its claims, through a new reading of the “official” story of analytic philosophy, and through the development of unpublished works on language, action, symbolic efficiency, taking as a starting point a method based on this renewed reading.

The standard program in analytic philosophy systematically neglected some trends however important and alive in the USA and in Great Britain, which have promoted and developed a philosophy of language irreducible to cognitive patterns and that pays attention to the daily uses of language. The works developed at the UPJV around Austin and OLP in general have aimed at seeing and presenting, in ordinary language philosophy, a genuine alternative and a coherent and credible framework. It now appears that OLP, as a minority trend but however fruitful of analytic philosophy and contemporary thought, is now being renewed in Anglo-American philosophy and constitutes a non-continental alternative to mainstream analytic philosophy (see the OLP website).

OLP intends to take the uses of ordinary language as a starting point of philosophical enquiry in order not to fall into the “scholastic fallacy” denounced by Austin in the 1950’s, and by Bourdieu, a fallacy which consists in taking “the things of logic for the logic of things” and which leads to the sterilisation of thought in a vain scholastic, loosing all relation with

actual problems of ordinary life and concrete researches. OLP is already directed towards the social. Its primary methodological ambition is a “conceptual analysis” allowing to make full space for the context in the practice of language, in perception and thought, that is to say in our various ways of engaging with reality, while defending a non metaphysical realism grounded on the agent’s practices themselves – their speech, expressions and thoughts. It inspires the current trend of contextualism in philosophy of language and knowledge. This aspect – the development of contextualism or even of “relativism” (in the very sense that M. Williams gives to this term, on the basis of certain claims by R. Rorty) – left aside some important aspects of OLP: its descriptive aim, as much precise as possible, the cognitive, perceptual, linguistic, social and moral dimensions of our uses and an exam of every form of expression, not only descriptive and performative, but also emotional. It is notably the domain of the perlocutionary, which is so to speak a “black continent”, never explored anyway by philosophical writings, except by Stanley Cavell and Nancy Bauer. It is indeed the issue of the accuracy and felicity of utterances which can thus be revisited in the prospect of the perlocutionary. We widely analysed, in collected and individual works, this issue of the adequacy of utterances, which is common to J.L. Austin and E. Goffman, of the conditions of felicity. With the Austinian notion of linguistic phenomenology, OLP leads a reflection on language towards a kind of adequacy which is not correspondence (in terms of the metaphysics or the philosophy of mind), but the preciseness of accuracy, in relation to the perception of differences. We must then understand that linguistic phenomenology encourages, neither to define the meaning of a term as the set of situations that it fits (this is the situation semantics, developed by Barwise & Perry) nor as a bunch of determined uses (a misunderstanding of Wittgenstein and his definition of meaning as use), but to examine how the meaning is always a matter of improvisation and invention, due to its embedment into practice. (Cf. the key conclusion of Austin’s (and then Goffman’s) analysis of “excuses”: meaning is always dependent on an agreement, which will not be the fitting of words to meaning, but constantly re-institutionalises the possibility of a use and renegotiates agreement.)

This is this novel lead that we want to follow in the GDRI with our partners’ network: the lead of an experience of words and language as part of reality, as affecting us and allowing us to affect others, and to constantly transform meaning. Linguistic phenomenology precisely aims at paying attention to words, but in the sense that they are liable to bring a new meaning. In turn, we get a “sharpened awareness” (Austin) of words and what they are about (*i.e.* reality). The agreement that lies at the heart of linguistic phenomenology is not the fitting of words to things (form to form, term to term), but indeed the agreement between us, what we *mean* (Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?*, 1969) and reality.

On this view, ordinary language philosophy is not apart from the philosophy of language, but it is its genuine form, the maintenance of an initial requirement. “When we examine what we should say when, what words we should use in what situations, we are looking again not merely at words (or ‘meanings’, whatever they may be) but also at the realities we use the words to talk about: we are using a sharpened awareness of words to sharpen our perception of, though not as the final arbiter of, the phenomena.” (Austin, “A Plea for Excuses”, 182)

Our aim is to fulfil this integration of words to reality by highlighting the sensitive relation we have with our words. OLP indeed wishes to show the link between language and the world, not in terms of the traditional analytic tradition of realism or of correspondence, but according to *our* fitting with words. That this adequacy is not evident or rather that the moment in which we evidently agree in language (which make Austin happy) are inseparable from (or the other side of) an anxiety built into the use of language, the threat of inadequacy,

this remains to be shown. We wish to extend Austin’s insight: we must not just focus on analysis but on what we would say, on the *we* and the *say*: to ask what we do in such and such situation is part of what we say. Cavell’s *Must we mean what we say* (1969) has been the first book to raise the question of the *relevance* of our utterances as *relevance towards oneself*, by appealing to unexpected resources.

It is this new idea of *relevance*, understood independently of any kind of mentalism, that we wish to explore and validate, as an alternative to its mentalist version. The issue is not the issue of the content (objective, semantic or empirical) of the propositions any more, neither the issue of non-sense so dear to the Wittgensteinians, but it is the issue of the infelicities of ordinary expression. We replace realism (even “natural” à la Putnam) by the search for the finest fit between expression and reality: fitting is a concept that is not correspondence or correction anymore, it means the adequate character of the utterance in these circumstances (proper). “The statements fit the facts always more or less loosely, in different ways on different occasions for different purposes” (Austin, “Truth”) – what we are then interested in is the search for (or the loss of) the right tone or the right word, conceptually, morally and sensibly. The point is to find within ordinary uses, the fine sensitivity to things and the fitting of words. This issue is raised by Cavell first and then by Travis: How can I know whether I am properly projecting the words I learned into new contexts? There is an “infelicitous” dimension, of failure in OLP, obsessed by cases where language fails, does not fit or express or articulate. In the background of Cavell’s analysis, we find the classification of *infelicities* suggested by Austin in *How to do things with words* in relation to his definition of performative utterances. The constant possibility of failure of the performative defines language as a human activity, felicitous or infelicitous. One of the aims of OLP and of our project is thus to determine ordinary ways for an utterance to fail, not fit, be improper or irrelevant to reality.

We will then need to sail between the Austinian criticism of “expression” (as related to psychology) and caricatured forms of emotivism, which separate the content of our emotion speech from the emotion “associated” to it. In the end, the issue is an aesthetic and a moral one – of articulating the right tone, the right expression with self-knowledge. It is this very articulation of the linguistic, the pragmatic and the moral that we wish to explore through the question of expressiveness and a takeover of the analysis of the perlocutionary, which escapes the conformism of current pragmatics and other unsatisfying or neglecting uses of Austin. We will put to work a conceptual research in collaboration and in the context of exchanges and encounters with our partners: workshops on Austin at the University, publication on “fitness”, conference on OLP and expressivity at Johns Hopkins.

2. An ordinary conception of ethics and politics

On the ground of this conception of OLP, we may uncover the lines of what would be an ordinary ethics. We started this work in our research programs on care (programme ANR *care* codirected with Patricia Paperman) and more broadly in the development of an heterodox ethics, inspired by views in moral sociology, the ethics of care as an alternative to mainstream views on ethics and by moral perfectionism. In continuity with the first line of this research, this second line aims at refocusing moral philosophy on ordinary language and expression, and at raising anew the issue of the role of emotions. Therefore we wish to continue to develop in the GDRI the idea of an ethics formulated *in a different voice*, such as it is expressed in a feminine voice, which can be found and studied in literary and film corpus. In that ordinary conception of ethics, morality is not to be grounded on universal principles, but is to be found in the quotidian experiences and conversations of real people living their ordinary life. It is best expressed not expressed not in the form of a theory, but as an activity,

for instance, care as action (taking care, caring for) and as attention, concern (care about). Care is at once a practical response to specific needs—which are always those of individual, singular others (whether close or not)—an activity necessary to maintaining persons and connections, work carried out both in the private sphere and in the public sphere, and sensitivity to the “details” that count. Care is a concrete matter, glued to the ordinary details of human life, ensuring the maintenance (in several senses, including the sense of conversation and conservation) and continuity of the human world. This is the definition of ethics (which may be called a paradigm shift) that we intend to pursue on the basis of care, by showing the transformations it entails of the very notion of ethics.

The importance of the ethics of care, which now appears with the hindsight brought by all the polemics that dotted its introduction in both academics and politics, is that it subverts well-established intellectual and social hierarchies and attracts attention to a number of phenomena that are overlooked because they are connected to the feminine. It is a matter of showing that the (moral) sentiments of women are not an inferior level of morality, but a moral resource that has been ignored, and which would make it possible to profoundly renew moral and social thought. This is on the condition of seeing care not only as a sensibility or a sub-theory but also as a practice, an ethics defined not by abstract principles but by the concrete work done for the most part by women, and neglected because of it. In fact, taking into consideration the social, moral, and political importance of care makes it necessary to refer to “women,” one of the categories to which the work of care has principally been assigned, which has led to it being criticized as “differentialist.” We hope to go beyond this prejudice and to return to the question of universalism. Even if the ethics of care were to defend a properly feminine morality, the change brought by care and its subversive nature would still have to be understood: the incapacity of the language of justice to take into account the experiences and points of view of women as morally relevant. The hypothesis of a “different voice” is indeed that of a moral orientation that identifies and treats moral problems differently than the language of justice and liberal moral philosophy do.

Ethics of care have thus contributed to modifying a dominant understanding of ethics. They have thereby introduced ethical stakes into politics, and have placed vulnerability at the heart of morality. In this way, they have joined up with “Wittgensteinian” ethics, which connect the vulnerability of the human with a vulnerability of the human form of life. This idea of *Lebensform* is associated in Cavell and Das with attention to the ordinary human form of life: to what Cavell calls “the uncanniness of the ordinary” and what Das more directly calls “the everyday life of the human.” Care is first of all attention to ordinary human life in its vulnerability. The ethics of care calls our attention to what is just in front of our eyes but which we do not see, because of a lack of attention or precisely because it is too close. Care is defined on the basis of the specific attention to the *invisible* importance of things and moments.

Redefining morality on the basis of importance and on the link between morality and the structural vulnerability of the human experience may thus help in rethinking the theoretical stakes of the ethics of care, which have become somewhat vague in recent debates. The notion of care is inseparable from an entire cluster of terms, which constitute a particular language game: attention, concern, importance, meaning, mattering. This attention results from the development of a perceptive ability to see how a detail or an expressive gesture stand out against a background, as OLP suggests. The notion of care refers to a quite ordinary reality, one that we do not see precisely because it is defined by invisibility: the fact that people take care of others and thus look after the functioning of the world. The notion of care points to a specific blindness in contemporary moral thought: blindness to the practical conditions of its own development within the human form of life.

The notion of care proposes bringing ethics back to the “rough ground of the ordinary” (Wittgenstein). The subject of care is a sensitive subject inasmuch as he or she is affected, caught in a context of relations, in a form of life—is attentive, and things situations, moments, or persons count for him or her. The center of gravity of ethics is shifted from the “just” to the “important,” exactly as Wittgenstein proposed shifting the meaning of importance by destroying what seemed to be important. Assessing the importance of care for human life means going against the ideal of autonomy that animates majoritarian moral theories, and accepting the idea that we need others in order to satisfy our primordial needs—that the human form of life is fragile, since for many humans it is threatened.

The ethics of care, by suggesting a new attention to unexplored details or neglected elements of life, confronts us with our own inabilities and inattentiveness, but also with how these things are then translated into theory. The stakes of ethics of care ends up epistemological by becoming political: ethics of care seek to highlight the connection between our lack of attention to neglected realities and the lack (or more directly, the rejection) of theorization of these social realities rendered “invisible,” and in this way to understand why ethical, and often philosophical, thought is blind to certain ordinary realities, in particular those connected with the domain of the private and the feminine. Thus, we find the continuation of the project of OLP and the anthropological project of Wittgenstein’s *Philosophical Investigations*: “What we are supplying are really remarks on the natural history of human beings...observations which no one has doubted, but which have escaped remark only because they are always before our eyes.” (*PI*, §415). On the ethical level as well, the ordinary is defined within this difficulty in accessing what is just before our eyes, which we must learn to see. The ordinary is always the object of an *inquiry*—this is pragmatism’s mode of approaching ethics and values. That allows us to link together the ordinary conception of ethical values and the pragmatist epistemology of the social sciences, in order to examine their interesting convergences.

Thus the work done in the GDRI will be able to structure all the OLP consequences regarding ethics in developing a kind of moral philosophy embedded in the various forms and norms of ordinary language and in a shared sensibility. The program of activities will consist in extending the development of a heterodox conception of ethics, which favours, against the priority often given to the rationality and calculus over choices of ethical judgements, a descriptive approach, firmly fixed in ordinary experience and ordinary affects.

3) Ordinary language, epistemology and social sciences.

All these researches will have an epistemological extension, which is an essential dimension of OLP since its beginning with Austin and Wittgenstein, be it in an historical perspective or in a constructive one. These researches will aim at using the tools offered by OLP to think anew many contemporary issues in the social sciences (especially anthropology and economics), thus showing the epistemological and practical fruitfulness of OLP.

We will begin by considering anew all sorts of epistemological issues concerning the foundations and the nature of knowledge, and try to propose a “deflationist” yet “realistic” solution through the use of concepts offered by theories such as “contextualism” or “radical contextualism”, which are defended, in a somewhat different way, by Ch. Travis and M. Williams, elaborating respectively upon Austin’s work and Wittgenstein’s and Rorty’s works. Starting from the OLP’s idea that any utterance of knowledge is necessarily situated (in a context), the researchers of the GDRI will criticise any foundationalist account of knowledge which wants to find a more stable ground for knowledge than ordinary language itself, as it is used in particular ordinary circumstances (or in scientific circumstances, if there are such circumstances). OLP’s tools permit to think that any utterance aiming at offering a certain

knowledge (for instance, at describing the world) is a particular speech act which as such is always situated and determined by many (social, cultural, linguistic, historical, etc.) conditions; but these conditions are always precise and knowable: they are conditions we can agree upon, at least in a certain community sharing a certain “form of life”. This is the reason why, though OLP takes into account the situated nature of utterances (their “relativity” to a situation), it takes advantage of such a situation to redefine the objectivity of knowledge. In this framework, objectivity does not depend on an absolute authority, be it universal, metaphysical or foundational, but lies on the particular positions occupied by human beings who use ordinary language – that is the language in which all kinds of knowledge are expressed, even the most scientific. It will then be possible to show that the scientific forms of knowledge do not get away from determined and forever singular, or contextual, conditions – which, precisely because of their singularity and determinateness, allow people to say precise things in a situated context which, as such, may be true or false (at least in that particular identified context). In that sense, scientific discourses do not need to claim a special nature or a metaphysical difference anymore, differentiating it from ordinary discourse. Rather it is a discourse whose validity conditions (or “felicity conditions”, to borrow Austin's expression) are perhaps stricter or more controlled, even perhaps more general, but not metaphysical, foundational nor in any case non-contextual.

It will be necessary to explore how the renouncement to foundations is the preliminary condition to think a knowledge that is certain, indubitable – how that renouncement is the condition to neutralise the threat of general scepticism which is only attractive because of the desire to get an absolutely certain foundation. OLP will thus appear as the means to see that renouncement is a kind of paradoxical “foundation” for a renewed kind of realism. OLP will also appear as the means of establishing knowledge of the world that does not reduce to the physical world but may also take into account the social or cultural world, which cannot be grasped in the same way. Such an epistemological departure will allow to develop a new model of reasoning that gives to human and social sciences the kind of scientific character they were claimed not to possess, especially in the analytic tradition of philosophy which, following logical positivism, always took as a model of science the formal procedures of formal logic. Indeed, since Frege, formal logic intends to establish the rules of correct (or true) reasoning, such that the valid rules of inference are correct in any mundane conditions. A valid (or correct) inference is thus one whose formalisation is universally valid. It is the same with all the logical laws which are the principles of correct reasoning according to formal logic, and which would be the laws of thought according to Frege. In such a framework, a set of sentences making up a reasoning, whose parts are premises and inferences, has a certain form that secures its validity – that validity staying the same whatever the context and the context of the sentences. This framework applies to ideal languages such as classical formal logic and its many variations. But the logic of contextual reasoning that takes place in real situation cannot be formalized that way, since the inferences made in it depend in most part on the context in which they are to be done – as is any kind of knowledge according to OLP. In ordinary language, any reasoning will be realized by means of given speech acts whose relevance depends on conventional and contextual conditions. In ordinary language, one can correctly assert something – and make sense – only if the speech act of asserting takes place in an appropriate manner within the context of enunciation. Now the adequacy of an assertion in ordinary language does not merely depend on the respect of the rules of logic. This is shown by the fact that enunciating the tautologies of formal logic has almost no relevance in the context of a conversation, while they are supposedly universally valid. This leads us to abandon the universality of logic formalisations to turn to

the study of situated reasoning that takes into account contextual determinations in the validity of inferences.

This is the new framework proposed by a student of Wittgenstein, S. Toulmin, and then by Jonsen, Janik and Rieke. In this framework, Toulmin (2006) suggests to take into account the context of reasoning as a moving background that allows, under certain conditions, to get from a premise to its conclusion. Contrary to non-classical logics and illocutionary logic developed by Vanderveken, Toulmin's framework prevents from formalizing the intervention of context into definite conditions, identifiable and satisfiable, since the intervention of context depends on the occasion of appealing to it. He nevertheless allows thinking the legitimacy of an inference by recalling that it is legitimate only as situated and by appealing to several contextual features.

Thus, the objectivity of reasoning or judgment does not depend on the proper application of formal rules but on a certain sensitivity to the context that allows to appeal to the relevant features of context in order to judge correctly. Formalisation of reasoning should not then be based on the form of reasoning but on the whole context and on properly human interests that may intervene in judging a given question.

One consequence of taking context into account to build a theory of situated reasoning is that the framework will not be formed by various developments of formal logic, but by legal reasoning taking place on a given occasion and established by the tradition of casuistic. It is indeed the analysis of legal judgment, which must serve as a framework to formulate some “rules” of judgment that will apply on a given occasion.

This situated framework can be generalized to account for the objectivity and scientificity that specifically applies to social sciences. As J.C. Passeron started to show, criticizing the framework of objectivity promoted by Popper, reasoning in the social sciences always aims at explaining necessarily situated realities, historically and socially, which cannot, in this respect, be duplicated. The reasoning that can explain their existence is thus necessarily and structurally singular and non-universalisable. It cannot be formalised like the view of science promoted by logical positivists and Popper since it aims at proposing a science of the singular. This however should not lead us to deny any sort of objectivity to the social sciences or to endow them with a kind of “hermeneutical” quality. This should rather lead us to recognise the necessary elaboration of a new formalisation, which can both account for the objectivity of ordinary reasoning (Toulmin) and the scientifically approved validity (in that it appeals to numerous and discriminating procedures of evidence), of situated reasoning in the social sciences. In other words, the point is again to resist the scholastic fallacy, which takes the things of logic to be the logic of things and to recognize the complexity of human action – and thus the necessary complexity of a science that aims at accounting for its principles. This will necessarily lead to think anew the account of the rationality of social agents proposed by the social sciences: this is a deeply anthropological question that must be solved through OLP to shed light on the kind of rationality at stake in human affairs. Converging with questions related to moral issues, we will consider how OLP helps us shed light on the kind of rationality at work in human affairs. Converging with questions related to moral issues, we will look at the ordinary of people's social life in order to understand the reasoning they put to work when acting in society (following the path opened by V. Descombes). To tackle these questions sociologists and jurists will naturally be appealed to work together.

Finally as a way of a primary empirical elucidation of concepts from OLP and from a multidisciplinary perspective, we aim at investigating with our partners the way in which economics, economical sociology and the anthropology of science and techniques borrow concepts belonging to the family of “performativity” in order to think some kinds of socio-

economic efficiency. This enquiry, which already started in 2012 through collaboration between the CURAPP-ESS and the CLERSE (UMR 8019, CNRS/U. Lille 1), will mainly concentrate on the way the word “performativity” is now used by a whole number of reflections to think anew the effects of economics – economics as a science and as a form of speech. These effects had so far been identified in terms of “ideologies” or “symbolic power” (a non contingent rapprochement since P. Bourdieu himself (in *Language and symbolic power*) proposed to analyse performativity in terms of symbolic efficiency). The idea is to consider economic science not merely as a neutral discourse that aims at accounting for way the world is – the state of economic relations between human agents – but also as modifying and transforming this discourse. In this sense, it has been considered that, like speech acts transforming the state of the world (e.g. promises and marriages) it had a “performative” effect. The word “performative” has been introduced by Austin to analyse language anew and to show that it did not merely say things but that it actually did things. And he showed that all sorts of discourses had that sort of efficiency. The rapprochement is thus tempting. But we must still specify the special kind of effect Austin had in mind when framing the term “performativity” – knowing that he himself abandoned it in the course of his research.

Now a first characterization of performative efficiency is its ability to bring to existence what it talks about: the utterance of an order or a promise creates (or at least seems to create) an order or a promise. Does economy bring to existence, in this sense, what it talks about? This is a first question to which we may add a second key feature: performative efficiency brings to light what an utterance is about by means of speech itself, i.e. precisely by saying something. It is in saying (in one way or another) that we promise that we do promise; it is in saying that we order that we do order; it is in saying that we marry that we do marry, etc. In other words, this is an efficiency of speech, which can, in this respect, receive a linguistic analysis (in terms of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary values). But can we consider that economy, in the same way, creates certain things – and which things – through the speech and discourses of those who say it?

Of course, Austin himself, and Searle and Bourdieu, brought out non-purely linguistic (but contextual and institutional) conditions which determine this sort of efficiency. In this sense, they tried to show that performative efficiency has “material” conditions of success. So we might be tempted to say that economy can also provide some ways to put to work or to performatively realize its discourse. However, Austin considers the proper effect of performative efficiency as a singular effect (the illocutionary effect, distinct from the perlocutionary effect rather linked to the consequences of an act). The illocutionary effect has a logical role in the very act of saying something – we could, in this respect suggest that it is the “symbolic” order or that it belongs to the domain of meaning (which is not to say that it is nothing). But is this really what economists or sociologists of economy have in mind when they use the word “performativity” in their work? And what do they get from it (notably in comparison with other concepts)? These will be the questions that will feed our researches in collaboration with sociologists, economists and also jurists, in relation to the researches led in the axe 2 of the GDRI, on the side of gender studies, which also appealed to “performativity”.

This enquiry, centred on economic efficiency, as a science and as a discourse, will open the gate to a more systematic historical, epistemological and critical investigation of the concept of “symbolic efficiency”, introduced in the French social sciences (by Cl. Levi-Strauss) to think the kinds of social efficiency irreducible to merely causal efficiency. Again, it will show the fruitfulness of OLP.

Program of activities:

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
 “Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

Year	Semester	Task	Scientific coordinator(s)	Teams implication
2013	S1	Website's construction	Bruno AMBROISE	PhiCo : 75 %
			Sandra LAUGIER	CURAPP-ESS : 15 % University of Porto : 10 %
	S2	Inter-universities Research Seminar (Paris, Amiens)	Sandra LAUGIER	CURAPP-ESS : 30 %
			Layla RAÏD	PhiCo : 30 % University of Porto : 10 % La Sapienza : 10 % Johns Hopkins : 10 % Tufts University : 10 %
		Research stay at Tufts University (research work with N. Bauer, A. Baz and R. Moran)	Bruno AMBROISE	CURAPP-ESS : 75 % Tufts University : 25 %
			Exploratory workshop (Tufts University, Boston)	Nancy BAUER
Bruno AMBROISE	CURAPP-ESS : 50 % PhiCo : 20 %			
2014	S3	Seminar « Performativity and the social sciences » (Amiens)	Bruno AMBROISE	CURAPP-ESS : 90 % PhiCo : 10 %
		Workshop « Ordinary language philosophy and Contextualism » (University of Porto)	Sofia MIGUENS	University of Porto : 50 %
	Bruno AMBROISE		CURAPP-ESS : 50 %	
	S4	Inter-universities Research Seminar (Paris, Amiens : 6 sessions)	Layla RAÏD	CURAPP-ESS : 30 %
			Sandra LAUGIER	PhiCo : 30 % University of Porto : 10 % La Sapienza : 10 % Johns Hopkins : 10 % Tufts University : 10 %
International Colloquium « Ordinary Conceptionsof		Sandra LAUGIER	CURAPP-ESS : 30 %	

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
 “Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

		Ethics and Feminism » (Somme, Picardy)	Paola MARRATI Nancy BAUER	PhiCo : 30 % Johns Hopkins : 30 % Tufts University : 10 %
2015	S5	International Colloquium (Johns Hopkins, Baltimore)	Paola MARRATI Sandra LAUGIER	Johns Hopkins : 40 % PhiCo : 40 CURAPP-ESS : 10 % La Sapienza : 10 %
		Inter-universities Research Seminar (Paris, Amiens : 6 sessions)	Sandra LAUGIER Bruno AMBROISE	CURAPP-ESS : 30 % PhiCo : 30 % University of Porto : 10 % La Sapienza : 10 % Johns Hopkins : 10 % Tufts University : 10 %
	S6	Workshop « Rationality of action in the Social Sciences» (CURAPP-ESS, Amiens)	Bruno AMBROISE	CURAPP-ESS : 60 % PhiCo : 20 % Tufts University : 20 %
2016	S7	Preparatory meetings for the Summer School (Paris, Amiens)	Sandra LAUGIER Layla RAID	CURAPP-ESS : 50 % Phico : 30 % La Sapienza : 20 %
	S8	Summer School (La Sapienza, Rome)	Piergiorgio DONATELLI Sandra LAUGIER	La Sapienza : 30 % CURAPP-ESS : 20 % PhiCo : 20 % University of Porto : 10 % Johns Hopkins : 10 % Tufts University : 10 %

ANNEX 2 - NETWORK COORDINATOR AS OF JANUARY 1, 2013

The signatory Parties to the Network entitled “Tittle - Abbreviation” hereby appoint Dr. Bruno Ambroise (Centre Universitaire de Recherches Administratives et Politiques de Picardie – UMR7319) as Coordinator of the network as of January 1, 2013 for a period of four (4) years.

ANNEX 3

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE OF THE NETWORK AS OF JANUARY 1, 2013

- **Bruno Ambroise (coordinator)**, Researcher, Centre Universitaire de Recherches Administratives et Politiques de Picardie (CURAPP-ESS), UMR 7319, Amiens, France
- Sandra Laugier, Professor, Philosophies contemporaines (Phico) EA 3562, Paris, France
- The Director of the Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences or his/her representative at CNRS, France
- Paola Marrati, Professor, Humanities Center, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA,
- Nancy Bauer, Dean of Academic Affairs for Arts and Sciences, Department of Philosophy, Tufts University, Medford, MA, USA,
- Piergiorgio Donatelli, Professor, Dipartimento di Filosofia, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza" University, Italy
- Sofia Miguens, Associate Professor, Instituto de Filosofia, Universidade do Porto, Portugal

ANNEX 4 - NETWORK PROJECTED RESOURCES FOR THE FIRST YEAR

Country	Signatory institution	Resources	Amount
France	CNRS	a) Supplementary resources from Institution: - Travel and short visits, - Meetings, workshops, seminars, - Operating expenses (up to 20 %).	14 000 euros
		b) Laboratory budget (CURAPP-ESS UMR7319): - Visa's costs, - seminars	250 euros
	UPJV	a) Supplementary resources from Institution: (A Visiting Professorship will be applied for)	–
		b) Laboratory budget (CURAPP-ESS UMR7319):	–
	Paris 1	a) Supplementary resources from Institution: - Institut Universitaire de France (Sandra Laugier) : Travel and short visits, ; Meetings and workshops.	7 500 euros
		b) Laboratory budget (Phico EA 3562): - Meetings, seminars,	1 250 euros
	TOTAL for France		23 500 euros

EXAMPLE			
Country	Signatory institution	Resources	Amount (optional)
USA	JHU	a) Department budget: Humanities Center: - Amount covering the organizational costs of an International Conference in JHU in 2015, and accommodation costs for speakers	1250 USD
		b) Supplementary resources from JHU /	/
	Tufts	a) Department budget: Philosophy Department : - Amount covering the organizational costs of a workshop in 2013.	1250 USD

Draft Memorandum for the establishment of the International Scientific Network (GDRI)
“Ordinary Language Philosophy and Ordinary Conceptions in the Social Sciences - PloCo”

	- Travel - research stay	
	b) Supplementary resources from Tufts /	/
	TOTAL for USA	1250 USD + JHU's contribution to be specified

EXAMPLE			
Country	Signatory institution	Resources	Amount (optional)
Italy	Sapienza	a) Department budget : P. Donatelli's team: amount covering organizational costs of the Summer School.	500 euros
		b) Supplementary resources from Sapienza /	/
		TOTAL for Italy	500 euros

EXAMPLE			
Country	Signatory institution	Resources	Amount (optional)
Portugal	UPorto	a) Department budget : MLAG : amount covering organizational costs of the Workshop “Ordinary language philosophy and contextualism”, and for Travel and short visits.	2 000 euros
		b) Supplementary resources from UPorto /	/
		TOTAL for Portugal	2 000 euros