

The Opinion of Examiner

Title of thesis: Patočka and the Problem of the Second Movement of Existence.

Author: Heriberto Castilla Hernández

Prague 2019

The subject of presented thesis is of a complex nature and quite advanced to be covered by bachelor thesis in its full extent. To be adequately grasped it requires insight into details of Patočka's concept of movement, which is at least partially and in a rather descriptive fashion provided both in a relatively rich Introduction and explicitly tied to Patočka's movement of existence in three chapters dedicated to particular movements. Closing paragraph of Introduction depicts "specific problem" to be discussed in thesis: "The specific problem we want to discuss is that even in the second movement, which emphasizes the present and in which the passivity of the past as an awaiting of movement has been overcome by the "ready-made potentials (which) are put to use in order to alter the present"; we remain still "under the rule of the past-a hidden rule, no longer immediate but mediated by things."" (p. 8) In the title of thesis is promised that the core subject to be treated there is "the problem of the second movement of existence". More realistic insight into what is in fact treated can be inferred from the Conclusion: "We have presented a discussion on the concept of existence as movement and further analyzed the three specific movements of human existence. In our discussion we want to identify the characteristics of each movement, its temporality, referent, ideal and self-understanding. In identifying each movement independently we then characterize the relationships between them. Specifically out (*our?*, T.K.) work is concerned with the relationship of the second movement with the first, it has been our thesis that we can explain the problem of the second movement of existence in its intrinsic relation to the first movement. We have found not only the phenomenological characteristics of each moment (*movement?*, T.K.) but have managed also to address the essence of our being in the whole of these movements." (p. 27 – 28). Therefore, my first two thesis defence questions are: **What is meant by the problem of the second movement of existence? How the problem of the second movement of existence is treated in the thesis?**

In the list of literature the author is using distinction between "works cited" and "supplementary bibliography". My third defence question is: **Could the author present at least one argument in his thesis inspired or derived from works listed in supplementary bibliography?** Not only in the Introduction is the author using reference in form of „Kohák. *Jan Patočka : philosophy and selected writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989" or simply "39 Kohák.1989, p. 274". I found this confusing. My defence question no. 4 is: **What is in fact quoted? Patočka's work as translated by Kohák and published in his volume or Kohák's interpretation as exposed in the first part of his book?** Final defence question (no. 5) is: **Is there any argument in presented thesis inspired by or derived from Kohák's philosophical biography of Patočka?**

The examiner recommends to submit thesis for defence. Depending on the merit of author answers to defence questions, proposed marking is "good" (3).

Prague, 23. 8. 2019


PhDr. Tomáš Kunca, PhD.