Social sciences and humanities, and cultural heritage have been investigated at CNR since the agency’s reform of March 4, 1963. From that date on, CNR has made it possible for the Italian SSH and CH communities to undergo a fast and strong development evolution, which has brought about vital technological innovations—such as the setting up of Italy’s first digital library in 1964—as well as substantial services to the country—one thinks of the industrial applications provoked by the rapid improvement of cultural heritage restoration techniques in the aftermath of the Florence flood of 1966.

Today SSH and CH researchers are part of the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Cultural Heritage (DSU-CNR). At the center of DSU-CNR investigations are all social objects, be
they material of immaterial (artifacts, books, social findings), but always set by a person, which makes today a repositioning as regards technological development more and more urgent. Persons are not out there only to make sure machines work, they are expected to pose the questions the human being finds it necessary to pose while going on the via humanitatis. Culture is about people that take part in the project of constructing Europe as a society that ought to be less unequal, less unjust, less segregating, and less passive with regard to differing starting environments.
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CNR researchers work in synergy and express potentialities of diverse sectors. They have integrated findings and methods of history, philology, linguistics, archaeology, physics, chemistry, and ICT. Among the new cross-disciplinary fields that have emerged are: heritage science, the ageing society, and migration studies.

With migration among the key issues at the top of public and academic agendas worldwide, the sub-activity aims at a new interpretation of transnationalism within the study of globalization with special reference to the migrant practices of transfer of
organizing principles and conditions for developing competences to act in multicultural settings. At stake are some basic concepts that become more and more crucial in the context of twenty-first century social and demographic developments, such as cosmopolitan memory, human rights, borders as connectivity. Nation states ought to consider embracing a intercultural identity centered on loyalty to liberal democratic constitutional principles, rather than on an arbitrary thick cultural identity assumed as a weapon and not, as it should, a living heritage, a source of wealth and differences. In a globalized world we need to make mutual enrichment possible.

The result is a multidisciplinary context, which is dynamic and productive, and in which natural sciences dialogue with humanities for the sake of cultural heritage cognition, conservation, and valorization. CNR researchers have involved a number of stakeholders such as the cultural industry, heritage operators, and professional associations—e.g., ConfCultura (http://www.confcultura.it), Confindustria SIT (http://www.confindustriasi.it/index.php), and Assoknowledge (http://www.assoknowledge.org), as well as social actors like cities and regional governments that base their action of cultural identities.
issues, notably in Calabria, Campania, Latium, Lombardy, Sicily, and Tuscany—all regions that have set up *Cultural Heritage Technological Districts*.

DSU-CNR is the natural intermediate between the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, and Tourism (MiBACT), which is responsible for cultural heritage management and protection, and the Ministry of Education, Universities and Research (MIUR), which is in charge of investigation and education actions. In addition DSU-CNR cooperates with Italy’s cultural heritage system in connection with a number of scientific networks, some of which are funded by MIUR (INFN-Italian Institute for Nuclear Physics, ASI-Italian Space Agency), some by MISE-Ministry of Economic Development (ENEA-Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development), and one by MD-Ministry of Defence (TPC-Comando Carabinieri Tutela Patrimonio Culturale).
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The new scientific challenge is the passage from **Data Science** to **Data Humanities**. Europe recognizes the need and urgency to have advanced facilities for interdisciplinary cutting-edge research in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities, Cultural Heritage (SSH and
The main goal is to deal with every aspect of science and technology related to the field, offering innovative solutions to major societal challenges of the new millennium. In fact, also SSH and CH researchers are confronted with huge amounts and an increasing complexity of data in highly interdisciplinary settings. SSH and CH researchers are currently developing enabling technologies, such as: NFC-Near Field Communication; CRM-Content Rights Management; Contents-aware networks (CH> fruition and enjoyment); Low-latency networks (CH> warning and security); Huge-bandwidth networks (CH> augmented reality).

European research infrastructures today are of different kinds: their scope goes from the large concentrations of advanced instrumentation (e.g., the CERN Laboratories, the European Synchrotron Laboratory, etc.) to resources devoted to knowledge storage, such as archives and databanks. The latter have stopped being mono-locational, they are instead the result of an integration of resources and laboratories that are distributed all over Europe, with governance and legal status structured in the shape a European Research Infrastructure Consortium (ERIC). In this case, research infrastructures go well beyond their hardware and constitute a Virtual
Research Environment, on which very large data sets are run. Also in the SSH and CH researchers are confronted with huge amounts and an increasing complexity of data: Experimentalists are engaging thousands of informants via mobile devices which will in a very few years amount to 1 TB of data per day. Most of these studies are being carried out in highly interdisciplinary settings. Apart from the heterogeneity and the highly structured nature of much of the data relevant for SSH research, RIs in the SSH have to tackle licensing and other IPR issues.

This raises the question of how services and data are best brought together in a distributed. E-infrastructures are planned, built and managed for serving vast research communities, which operate in diversified sectors on the basis of the principles of open access and competition.

In the Roadmap Italiana delle Infrastrutture di Ricerca di interesse panEuropeo, launched in 2010 by DG-IR of MIUR, Italy has defined national priorities as regards participating in e-infrastructures in Europe and in setting up e-infrastructures in Italy. Developing the Italian patrimony of national e-infrastructures, identifying the best ones and planning a national strategy make it possible to influence
European work-programs, thus increasing the effectiveness of Italian research funding. Obviously, a strong connection with the private sector in terms of technology transfer shall stimulate industrial innovation.

CNR aims at bringing together the existing research infrastructures in the SSH and CH through a holistic and innovative governance approach.

The role of CH in Italy is universally recognized as extremely important for the country. What is not agreed upon is the specific reasons for that importance, which is usually attributed to the, quite uninteresting, fact that Italy has the largest number of cultural objects in the world. It is argued, instead, that such a large patrimony, if correctly taken, is actually an occasion to foster advanced developments, such as that of digital technologies for Virtual Cultural Heritage.

CNR works in line with ESFRI (European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructure) and the Integrated Infrastructures Initiative (I3) of the EC-DG Research and Innovation-(EC-DG R&I). The coordinating role of CNR-DSU strengthens and implements the existing infrastructures through the design and development of an
Open net of nets. It will plan and implement new coordinated actions within the major national and European infrastructures operating in the Social Sciences, Humanities and Cultural Heritage.

CNR acts upon the following infrastructures:

- **DARIAH** (Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities, www.dariah.eu), e-Infrastructure, which is currently in the process of becoming an ERIC (European Research Infrastructures Consortium) as the first permanent European infrastructure for Arts and Humanities;

- **CHARISMA** (Cultural Heritage Advanced Research Infrastructures: Synergy for a Multidisciplinary Approach to Conservation / Restoration, www.charismaproject.eu), I3 FP7 in the field of science and technology for cultural heritage, marked as interest by SHH Thematic Working Group of ESFRI and from which will be developed IPERION-CH in H2020, which is a project idea that has already been submitted to the Consultation on RIs – Topics for Integrated Activities of the EC-DG R&I in October 2012. In cooperation with Università di Perugia. First and foremost, IPERION-CH shall be the first planned ERIC to be set up in Italy.

- **CESSDA** (Council of European Social Science Data Archives, www.cessda.org) is an umbrella organization for European social science data archives across, active since the 1970s to improve access to data for researchers and students and enhance exchange of data and technologies among data organizations. In cooperation with Università di Milano-Bicocca.

- **ESS-ERIC** (European Social Survey, www.europeansocialsurvey.org), which aims not only to provide an academically robust way of ‘knowing Europe’ but also to contribute to the scientific community’s endeavor in order to develop, test and implement methods of reliable social measurement. In cooperation with LUISS Rome.

- **SHARE-ERIC** (Survey on Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, www.share-project.org) aims at elaborating a statistical survey of lifestyle, health, economic and social conditions of
the population in over fifty European countries. In cooperation with Università di Padova.

- CLARIN-ERIC (Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure, www.clarin.eu) offers a large-scale pan-European collaborative effort to create, coordinate and make language resources and technology available and readily usable.

The national activities are coordinated by the identification of cross-cutting scientific areas and the existing synergies among the RIs. The collaboration between the RIs will cover the scientific and operational aspects, as well as the dissemination, training, collaboration with companies and issues linked to legal and ethical aspects.

Due to its ample and multidisciplinary expertise, CNR promotes new collaborations among these infrastructures. In this perspective, CNR takes up the role of unique Italian partner in DARIAH-ERIC, thanks to its expertise in digital humanities, as well as the role of coordinator in IPERION-CH, thanks to its network of excellence in advanced technologies for the conservation and cultural heritage. Concerning the three other infrastructures, actions to create the most appropriate partnerships in construction.

CNR serves as a hub for Italian research, facilitating all services of virtual and/or instrumental access to data, simulations and best
practices as well as actions/interventions for the emerging scientific and technological Data Humanities community. The infrastructures will be of service to the broad interdisciplinary community of stakeholders (researchers, students, policy makers, SMEs, end-users, both public and private). In addition to access services will be implemented actions of networking, joint research activities, technology transfer activities and dissemination of results. At the national level, the joint management of SSH and CH infrastructures will be an important connective tissue for the management of innovation and technology transfer actions, linking regional centers and technological districts. Finally, it will support the drawing of the actions to be carried out under the theme Smart Cities and Communities, by the creation of smart tools to be used in challenge 6 of H2020: “Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies”. CNR activities provide the starting point to meet the priorities of the Smart Cities and Communities.

3 Cultural innovation sounds like an oxymoron. It is not, though. It is something real that tops up social and technological innovation.
Reflective society is a term that covers a vast array of social sciences and humanities dealing with the past and the present from history to geopolitics through cultural heritage studies and practically all fields of the humanities (EC 2015: 6). As a contribution toward cultural innovation for the reflective society, the intercultural history of philosophy measures its effectiveness by establishing continuities and interactions of cultural traditions. It is time to move beyond the mere passive acceptance of the fact of multiple cultures effectively existing in a society (inclusive society) and to promote cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue (reflective society). This paper argues that twenty-first-century history of philosophy can be usefully reinvented on the basis of a development towards intercultural dialogue.

Imagine a second-generation Chinese immigrant who attends humanities high school in Italy. At a certain point, he/she might be asked to read a text by Plato, the *Apology of Socrates*, which he/she shall first do in Italian and later perhaps also in the Greek original or the Latin rendering of Marsilius Ficinus. The point is that the student ought to read the same text also in modern unified Chinese (*putonghua*), for he/she might be able to start in his/her Chinese-speaking family a discussion on Socrates. Inversely, schoolmates
might seize the opportunity for appropriating the *Analects* of Confucius on the basis of the references indicated by our student. The issue is not simply having translated texts, which are available already in large numbers. It is much more: at stake are corpora, corpora that talk to each other. What the students are doing is nothing more and nothing less than rethinking the discipline of the history of philosophy within an intercultural framework. Our student and his/her Italian schoolmates are examples of both theory and practice of the intercultural history of philosophy. Today, also the history of philosophy is taking a global perspective. It relies on validated corpora, which implies: analysis of original texts, transliterations in other alphabets or ideograms, and aligned translations. We are talking of a complex task because not everything is translatable and when we look for comparison we must take into account the diversity of cultural contexts.

Eventually, our students might start thinking together about *dong*-movement, *jing*-rest, *renji*-human being, *ren*-humaneness, and come to grasp the essential closeness between ethics and reality as expressed both by the Socratic *anthrōpon zētēō* and the neo-Confucian restoration of the Heavenly Principle by diminishing
human desires (Wang 2005: 320). No utopia in this view, because pupils today delve easily into multi-layered multilingual hypertexts, and they do so on the basis of the reciprocal guidance made possible by social reading tools. Time has come for going beyond previous attempts to establish an intercultural dialogue in philosophy (Wimmer 1990; Kimmerle 1991; Dawson 2000; Mall 2000; Fornet-Betancourt 2001; Mabe 2005; Sweet 2009). This paper argues that an intercultural history of philosophy is possible. More than that: it is necessary. First and foremost, it is necessary for Europe with its 23 official languages, its responsibility for cultural heritage, and its being currently a crossroad of migrations (UNESCO 2001; ESF 2004; COE 2008; EAC 2014; EC 2015).

The e-corpora are already there, available in currently operating social sciences and humanities research infrastructures such as the Chinese Text Project (www.ctext.org), Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure (www.clarin.eu), Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and the Humanities (www.dariah.eu), Europeana (www.europeana.eu), European Cultural Heritage Online (www.echo.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/home), Lessico Intellettuale Europeo: Banca dati di testi filosofici dell’età moderna
Cultural diversity has hardly been thematized by philosophers. It is nonetheless a reality. As Kerwin Lee Klein writes: “Rather than elaborating ever more intricate principles for differentiating historical and non-historical cultures and texts, we need to consider what happens to historicity when we imagine all peoples, regardless race, religion, or literacy, as historical, and to think of their narratives as different varieties of historical discourse rather than romantic alternative to it” (Klein 2011: 111). In its current global dimension, philosophy is overcoming past distinctions and is ready for the encounter with the world. It is time to move beyond outmoded exclusive dichotomies such as traditional/modern, West/the rest, and local/global. We need non-dichotomous thinking (Tu Weiming 2010: 91).

There is nothing new in principle about scholarship in the history of philosophy concerning itself with philosophy around the globe. The effort to understand cultures not only past but also alien
used to be a frontier of intellectual history at the end of the twentieth century. Scholars were talking about the point of view of the “other,” which is not only blacks and women excluded from male cultural monopolies but also colonial victims of the expansionist spirit of the western powers, which point of view can only be inferred from the outside—“the eternal dilemma of anthropology” (Kelley 2002: 307-08). The urgent question is rather “what if anything might be new about working on the history of philosophy in the era of globalization?” (Schneewind 2005: 170). In other words, the community ought to know for sure when it is time to switch and abandon parochialism in favor of an approach to philosophy that turns on the need of factoring other cultures into one’s own. Historians of philosophy should not “tell the story of the past only from the vantage point of a single part of the world or of powerful elites, but rather widens his or her scope, socially and geographically, and introduce plural voices into the account” (Davis 2011: 190).

The World Congress of Philosophy (20th WCP Boston 1998, 21st WCP Istanbul 2003, 22nd WCP Seoul 2008, 23rd WCP Athens 2013) has impressively shown that the community is looking into new ways of thought, which are intercultural. To give an idea of how
global philosophy has become, one needs only to list the titles of the nine plenary symposia that are planned for the 24th WCP Beijing 2018: “Ren, Ubuntu, Love, and the Heart; Mind, Brain, Body, Consciousness, Emotions; Philosophy at the Margins: Domination, Freedom, and Solidarity; Rights, Responsibility, and Justice; Human, Non-human, Post-human; Science, Technology, and the Environment; Creativity, Symbol, and Aesthetic Sense; Reason, Wisdom, and the Good Life; Expressibility, Dialogue, Translatability.”

As Karl Jaspers pointed out: in China Confucius and Laozi lived and taught, in India the Upanishads were produced and Buddha lived, in Persia Zarathustra, in Palestine the prophets, in Greece Homer, Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Plato. “Everything implied by these names developed almost simultaneously in China, India, and the West” (Jaspers 1949: 2). Rémi Brague has noted that the Arabic term قاموس (qāmūs) is a transliteration of the name of the Titan of Greek mythology Ὡκεανός (’Okeanós), in the original literal sense of a liquid extension that embraces all emerged lands, permitting navigation and hence communication (Brague 2005). Leibniz has used the ocean metaphor for an encyclopedia, which is exactly the idea the paper is about to pursue, as languages are the
place of constant commerce, and commerce takes place in space and time. Today, the intercultural history of philosophy gives rebirth to the cultural melting pot spoken about by Plato in the *Timaeus* (23c) with regard to the translation of the art of writing from Egypt to Greece, thus prefiguring “the translation of Greek words, culture and thoughts into the Latin words of Cicero and Boethius, or the dynamics of the great Mediterranean cultural circle made of translation and tradition of philosophical, religious, and medical texts from Greek and Hebrew into Arabic, Latin, and all vernacular languages” (Gregory 2012: 12).

In the Far East, “the Buddhist conquest of China during the Tang dynasty and the Confucian transformation of Buddhism are a process that brought about the introduction via Daoist categories, domestication, growth, and appropriation of an Indian form of spirituality, which lasted for at least six centuries” (Tu Weiming 2010: 219).

Cultures are part of national identities, in which case they are bound to one country’s language and history. However, cultures are fundamentally the constituent of transnational ties and identities (ESF 2004: 15), and we are talking about the special notion of cosmopolitanism that concerns culture and the self (Taraborrelli 2015:
Political boundaries define some as members, but lock others out. More and more people live in countries that are not their own, given that state sovereignty is not as strong as in the past and borders are becoming porous (Gupta 2003). Cultures are in themselves more than their means of support. Cultures are immaterial. They are lights, namely the aura of invisible light that the civilized human being attaches to the object as a token of appreciation, veneration, and awe.

At the center of all research on cultural heritage are auratic objects, be they material or immaterial (artifacts, books, social findings), but always set by a person, which makes today a repositioning as regards technological development more and more urgent (EC 2015: 14, 20).

Persons are not out there only to make sure machines work, they are expected to pose the questions the human being finds it necessary to pose while walking on the via humanitatis.
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