

## Opponent's opinion on the bachelor thesis of Lamija Čehajić.

**Thesis title: *Patočka and the Problem of the End of History*, Prague 2021.**

Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Charles University

Our colleague Lamija Čehajić has written a thesis that has an unusual character. It is basically an original philosophical thesis that uses the arguments and analyses of Jan Patočka, especially in the Heretical Essays but also in other texts, for a kind of Patočkean reflection on the nature of European history in the global "post-European" age and the possibilities of living responsibly in present with an awareness of historical responsibility. In this reflection, however, she clearly goes beyond Patočka, her reading is - we can perhaps say - post-colonial, as she tries to carefully cleanse Patočka's reflections, which grew out of Husserl's Eurocentrism, of any remnants of this burden.

The strength of the work is its distinctly authorial focus, its thoughtful taking of a standpoint. Čehajić is not content with a mere recapitulation or interpretation of Patočka's theses, but rather she brings them further, thus reviving Patočka's philosophy in unexpected contexts. Her interpretive approach is convincing, her interpretation meticulous.

In addition to Patočka, the author also uses Kojév and his Hegelian lectures. In my opinion, this is also a certain weakness of the work. Patočka's understanding of history as openness and shattering of certainties or the result of interactions of free people who "understand what history is about". It is clearly at odds with a teleological understanding of the metaphysics of history. In other words, while in the Hegelian sense one can speak of the goal of history and thus of its completion or end (also in F. Fukuyama's version), in Patočka's version the issue stands as whether the historical person wants to confess to history, or rather history and responsibility escape to various forms of orgiastic, consumerist, everyday self-forgetfulness, or to exploitation of beings. History will not end as long as there is *polemos* of free people, shaken in their certainty of meaning and searching for meaning.

A certain weakness of the work is thus, in my opinion, the excessive vagueness with which the author uses the terms *telos*, teleology or the West. In the excessive focus on the alleged connection between the teleological nexus and Eurocentric imperialist tendencies (p. 43), I am getting a little lost and what is close to Patočka's heart is, I think, disappearing.

The language of the work is very good, the work reads nicely, although reading it requires quite a bit of concentration and requires some prior familiarity with Patočka's work. Occasionally, there are minor typos and minor errors.

For discussion:

Reading the work requires sometimes prior knowledge on the part of the reader. Could you briefly explain what a subjective phenomenology is?

In the first part of the thesis, the author presents the heretical nature of Patočka's essays. Could you reflect on other possible interpretations of the heretical nature of Patočka's essays? After all, isn't each of these essays a kind of heresy towards a certain widespread understanding of history (i.e. not only towards Husserl's phenomenology)?

The interpretation of Patočka's three movements of existence is presented here against the background of Hannah Arendt's analysis of the typology of human activities in *The Human Condition*. Patočka certainly develops the motifs of labour, work and action and their temporal characteristics in a distinct way. However, it would also be worth comparing the motifs of biological reproduction and

nality in Arendt and Patočka, respectively. Could you prepare such a comparison and reflect on the implications for understandings of freedom and "life-arousal" (životní vzmach)?

I consider the thesis to be **excellent**; in its treatment it clearly exceeds the demands made on undergraduate theses in philosophy. I can even imagine that in an edited and abbreviated form, the work could be submitted to a professional journal for review.

Prague, 14<sup>th</sup> September 2021

Milan Hanyš, Ph.D