Abstract: This paper analyzes the methodological use of dialectic in the philosophy of Paul Ricœur, arguing that at its core this philosophy is moved by the dynamics stemming from the interaction between conflict and conciliation. In sketching an alternative model to better understand Ricœur’s original approach to philosophy, my rational reconstruction of his method assesses his “post-hegelian Kantism”, the procedures of conflict, mediation, conciliation and dialectic and the importance of the engaged reader. I will contend that one of Ricœur’s lasting contributions to philosophy is to show how one can be original while being thorough and that the enlarged perspective built by his thinking together successfully explains phenomena by avoiding reductionism and striving for the quest of new meaning through a process of perpetual reinterpretation.
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Resumo: Este artigo analisa o uso metodológico da dialéctica na filosofia de Paul Ricœur, defendendo que esta é fundamentalmente animada pela interacção entre o conflito e a conciliação. A reconstrução racional do método...
de Ricoeur que é levada a cabo neste artigo propõe um modelo alternativo àqueles que usualmente se apresentam, visando com isso tentar perceber a originalidade da abordagem filosófica do filósofo francês. Para esse efeito, analisam-se as noções de “kantismo pós-hegeliano”, conflito, mediação, conciliação e dialética e enfatiza-se a importância do leitor envolvido. Argumentar-se-á que uma das contribuições decisivas que Ricoeur lega à filosofia é a demonstração de que se pode ser original sendo-se rigoroso e que a perspectiva alargada possibilitada pelo *penser ensemble* consegue explicar vários fenómenos ao evitar o reducionismo e proceder a uma busca do sentido – a uma reinterpretação – constante.
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What’s the difference between a scholar and a truly original thinker? Is it really possible to *think* something through from the start and to reach meaningful conclusions while ignoring completely the efforts made by others on the same subjects, the thoughts that have come to life – really, that have become *actual* – through the meaningful works, which add up to what we call *tradition*? Apparently, yes. Wittgenstein, for one, claimed almost never having read Kant, despite the obvious similarities between the former’s *Tractatus* and the latter’s transcendental philosophy. In European, continental tradition, philosophers often pay special attention to the history of philosophy; this carefulness often contrasts with the way analytic philosophers tend to consider the validity of arguments as such, regardless of their historicity.

Therefore, in this sense, one could, at least in continental-style philosophy, establish a distinction between 1) someone who is a *scholar*, in the sense that he is someone very familiar with the tradition and very competent in his philological remarks and 2) someone who develops a new, powerful and intelligent philosophy, disregarding almost completely the tradition. The question we have to pose ourselves though is whether this is an either-or alternative. And the answer must be: obviously not, as anyone acquainted with the specific kind of rationality represented by hermeneutics will avow. It would be fairly naïve to consider that originality as such would be a spontaneous, *ab nihilo* feature. One should not underestimate the power of hermeneutical appropriation in the making of one’s own thought. In fact, one can be a scholar *and* still fashion an independent thought; *Selbstdenken* and hermeneutics are not incompatible – in what follows I will argue that the philosophy of Paul Ricoeur is a good example of such a capacity.

I should start by saying that I am looking for a model to understand and describe what’s at stake in the philosophy of Paul Ricoeur as a whole.