



potentialities

COLLECTED

ESSAYS

IN

PHILOSOPHY

Giorgio Agamben

EDITED AND TRANSLATED, WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY DANIEL HELLER-ROSTEN

Edited and Translated
With an Introduction
By Daniel Heller-Roazen

Stanford
University
Press

Stanford
California
1999

POTENTIALITIES

Collected Essays in Philosophy

Giorgio Agamben

Stanford University Press

Stanford, California

© 1999 by the Board of Trustees of the

Leland Stanford Junior University

Printed in the United States of America

CIP data appear at the end of the book

Contents

<i>Editor's Note</i>	ix
----------------------	----

Editor's Introduction: "To Read What Was Never Written"	I
------------------------------------------------------------	---

PART I: LANGUAGE

§ 1 The Thing Itself	27
§ 2 The Idea of Language	39
§ 3 Language and History: Linguistic and Historical Categories in Benjamin's Thought	48
§ 4 Philosophy and Linguistics	62
§ 5 Kommerell, or On Gesture	77

PART II: HIST●RY

§ 6 Aby Warburg and the Nameless Science	89
§ 7 Tradition of the Immemorial	104
§ 8 *Se: Hegel's Absolute and Heidegger's <i>Ereignis</i>	116
§ 9 Walter Benjamin and the Demonic: Happiness and Historical Redemption	138

§ 10 The Messiah and the Sovereign: The Problem of Law in Walter Benjamin	160
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

PART III: P●TENTIALITY

§ 11 On Potentiality	177
§ 12 The Passion of Facticity	185
§ 13 <i>Pardes</i> : The Writing of Potentiality	205
§ 14 Absolute Immanence	220

PART IV: C●NTINGENCY

§ 15 Bartleby, or On Contingency	243
<i>Notes</i>	275
<i>Index of Names</i>	303

§ 12 The Passion of Facticity

The Absent “Mood” (*Stimmung*)

It has often been observed that the problem of love is absent from Heidegger’s thought. In *Being and Time*, which contains ample treatments of fear, anxiety, and *Stimmungen* in general, love is mentioned only once, in a note referring to Pascal and Augustine. Thus W. Koepps,¹ in 1928, and Ludwig Binswanger,² in 1942, reproached Heidegger for not having included love in his analytic of Dasein, which is founded solely on “care” (*Sorge*); and in a *Notiz* that is undoubtedly hostile, Karl Jaspers wrote that Heidegger’s philosophy is “without love, hence also unworthy of love in its style.”³

Such critiques, as Karl Löwith has remarked,⁴ remain fruitless as long as they do not succeed in replacing Heidegger’s analytic with an analytic centered on love. Nevertheless, Heidegger’s silence—or apparent silence—on love remains problematic. We know that between 1923 and 1926, while Heidegger was preparing his greatest work, he was involved in a passionate relationship with Hannah Arendt, who was at this time his student in Marburg. Even if the letters and poems in the Deutsches Literaturarchiv in Marbach that bear witness to this relationship are not yet accessible, we know from Hannah Arendt herself that, twenty years after the end of their relationship, Heidegger stated that it had been “the passion of his life” (*dies nun einmal die Passion des Lebens gewesen sei*) and that *Being and Time* had thus been composed under the sign of love.⁵

How, then, is it possible to explain the absence of love from the analytic of Dasein? It is all the more perplexing if one considers that on

Hannah Arendt's part, the relationship produced precisely a book on love. I am referring to her *Doktordissertation* (published in 1929), *The Concept of Love in St. Augustine*, in which it is not difficult to discern Heidegger's influence. Why does *Being and Time* remain so obstinately silent on the subject of love?

Let us closely examine the note on love in *Being and Time*. It is to be found in §29, which is dedicated to the analysis of "state-of-mind" (*Befindlichkeit*) and "moods" (*Stimmungen*). The note does not contain even one word by Heidegger; it is composed solely of two citations. The first is from Pascal: "And thence it comes about that in the case where we are speaking of human things, it is said to be necessary to know them before we love them, and this has become a proverb; but the saints, on the contrary, when they speak of divine things, say that we must love them before we know them, and that we enter into truth only by charity; they have made of this one of their most useful maxims." The second is from Augustine: "One does not enter into truth except through charity" (*Non intramur in veritatem, nisi per charitatem*).⁶ The two citations suggest a kind of ontological primacy of love as access to truth.

Thanks to the publication of Heidegger's last Marburg lectures from the summer semester of 1928, we know that the reference to this fundamental role of love originated in conversations with Max Scheler on the problem of intentionality. "Scheler first made it clear," Heidegger writes, "especially in the essay 'Liebe und Erkenntnis,' that intentional relations are quite diverse, and that even, for example, love and hatred ground knowing [*Lieben und Haß das Erkennen fundieren*]. Here Scheler picks up a theme of Pascal and Augustine."⁷ In both the essay cited by Heidegger and a text of the same time published posthumously under the title *Ordo amoris*, Scheler repeatedly insists on the preeminent status of love. "Before he is an *ens cogitans* or an *ens volans*," we read in *Ordo amoris*, "man is an *ens amans*." Heidegger was thus perfectly conscious of the fundamental importance of love, in the sense that it conditions precisely the possibility of knowledge and the access to truth.

On the other hand, in the lectures of the 1928 summer course, love is referred to in the context of a discussion of the problem of intentionality in which Heidegger criticizes the established notion of intentionality as a cognitive relation between a subject and object. This text is precious since it demonstrates how Heidegger, through a critique that does not spare his teacher, Husserl, overcame the notion of intentionality and ar-

rived at the structure of transcendence that *Being and Time* calls Being-in-the-world.

For Heidegger, what remains unexplained in the conception of intentionality as a relation between a subject and an object is precisely what is in need of explanation, that is, the relation itself:

The vagueness of the relation falls back on the vagueness of that which stands in relation. . . . The most recent attempts conceive the subject-object relation as a "being relation" [*Seinsbeziehung*]. . . . Nothing is gained by the phrase "being relation," as long as it is not stated what sort of being is meant, and as long as there is vagueness about the sort of being [*Seinsart*] of the beings between which this relation is supposed to obtain. . . . Being, even with Nicolai Hartmann and Max Scheler, is taken to mean being-on-hand [*Vorhandensein*]. This relation is not nothing, but it is still not being as something on hand. . . . One of the main preparatory tasks of *Being and Time* is to bring this "relation" radically to light in its primordial essence and to do so with full intent.⁸

For Heidegger, the subject-object relation is less original than the self-transcendence of Being-in-the-world by which Dasein opens itself to the world before all knowledge and subjectivity. Before the constitution of anything like a subject or an object, Dasein—according to one of the central theses of *Being and Time*—is already open to the world: "knowing is grounded beforehand in a Being-already-alongside-the-world [*Schon-Sein-bei-der-Welt*]." ⁹ And only on the basis of this original transcendence can something like intentionality be understood in its own mode of Being.

If Heidegger therefore does not thematically treat the problem of love, although recognizing its fundamental status, it is precisely because the mode of Being of an opening that is more original than all knowledge (and that takes place, according to Scheler and Augustine, in love) is, in a certain sense, the central problem of *Being and Time*. On the other hand, if it is to be understood on the basis of this opening, love can no longer be conceived as it is commonly represented, that is, as a relation between a subject and an object or as a relation between two subjects. It must, instead, find its place and proper articulation in the Being-already-in-the-world that characterizes Dasein's transcendence.

But what is the mode of Being of this Being-already-in-the-world? In what sense is Dasein always already in the world and surrounded by things before even knowing them? How is it possible for Dasein to open itself to something without thereby making it into the objective correlate

of a knowing subject? And how can the intentional relation itself be brought to light in its specific mode of Being and its primacy with respect to subject and object?

It is in this context that Heidegger introduces his notion of “facticity” (*Faktizität*).

Facticity and Dasein

The most important contribution made by the publication (which has barely begun) of Heidegger’s lecture courses from the early 1920s consists in decisively showing the centrality of the notions of facticity and factual life (*faktisches Leben*) in the development of Heidegger’s thought. The abandonment of the notion of intentionality (and of the concept of subject that was its correlate) was made possible by the establishment of this category. The path taken here was the following: intentionality-facticity-Dasein. One of the future tasks of Heideggerian philology will no doubt be to make this passage explicit and to determine its genealogy (as well as to explain the progressive eclipse of the concept of facticity in Heidegger’s later thought). The observations that follow are only a first contribution in this direction.

First of all, it must be said that Heidegger’s first students and friends long ago emphasized the importance of the concept of facticity in the formation of Heidegger’s thought. As early as 1927, in a work that appeared as the second half of the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Phänomenologische Forschung* in which the first edition of *Being and Time* was published, the mathematician and philosopher Oskar Becker wrote, “Heidegger gives the name of ontology to the hermeneutics of facticity, that is, the interpretation of human Dasein.”¹⁰ Becker is referring here to the title of Heidegger’s 1923 summer-semester course held in Freiburg, “Ontology, or Hermeneutics of Facticity.”¹¹ What does this title mean? In what sense is ontology, the doctrine of Being, a doctrine of facticity?

The references to Husserl and Sartre that one finds in philosophical dictionaries under the heading “Facticity” are misleading here, for Heidegger’s use of the term is fundamentally different from theirs. Heidegger distinguishes Dasein’s *Faktizität* from *Tatsächlichkeit*, the simple factuality of intraworldly beings. At the start of his *Ideas*, Husserl defines the *Tatsächlichkeit* of the objects of experience. These objects, Husserl writes, appear as things found at determinate points in space and time that pos-

sess a certain content of reality but that, considered in their essence, could also be elsewhere and otherwise. Husserl thus insists on contingency (*Zufälligkeit*) as an essential characteristic of factuality. For Heidegger, by contrast, the proper trait of facticity is not *Zufälligkeit* but *Verfallenheit*. Everything is complicated, in Heidegger, by the fact that Dasein is not simply, as in Sartre, thrown into the “there” of a given contingency; instead, Dasein must rather itself be its “there,” be the “there” (*Da*) of Being. Once again, the difference in modes of Being is decisive here.

The origin of the Heideggerian use of the term “facticity” is most likely to be found not in Husserl but in Augustine, who writes that *facticia est anima*,¹² “the human soul is *facticia*,” in the sense that it was “made” by God. In Latin, *facticius* is opposed to *nativus*; it means *qui non sponte fit*, what is not natural, what did not come into Being by itself (“what is made by hand and not by nature,” as one finds in the dictionaries). The term must be understood in all its force, for it is the same adjective that Augustine uses to designate pagan idols, in a sense that seems to correspond perfectly to our term “fetish”: *genus facticiorum deorum*, the nature of “factual” gods.

If one wants to understand the development of the concept of facticity in Heidegger’s thought, one should not forget this origin of the word, which ties it to the semantic sphere of non-originaryity and making. What is important here is that for Heidegger, this experience of facticity, of a constitutive non-originaryity, is precisely the original experience of philosophy, the only legitimate point of departure for thinking.

One of the first appearances of this meaning of the term *faktisch* is to be found (as far as one can judge from the present state of Heidegger’s *Gesamtausgabe*) in the 1921 summer course on Augustine and Neoplatonism, which Otto Pöggeler and Oskar Becker have summarized.¹³ Here Heidegger seeks to show that primitive Christian faith (as opposed to Neoplatonic metaphysics, which conceives of Being as a *stets Vorhandenes* and considers *fruitio dei*,¹⁴ consequently, to be the rapture of an eternal presence) was an experience of life in its facticity and essential restlessness (*Unruhe*). As an example of this “factual experience of life” (*faktische Lebenserfahrung*), Heidegger analyzes a passage from chapter 23 of Book 10 of the *Confessions*, where Augustine questions man’s relation to truth:

I have known many men who wished to deceive, but none who wished to be deceived. . . . Because they hate to be deceived themselves, but are glad if they can deceive others, they love the truth when it reveals itself but hate it when

it reveals them [*cum se ipsa indicat . . . cum eos ipsos indicat*]. They reap their just reward, for those who do not wish to stand condemned by the truth find themselves unmasked against their will and also find that truth is veiled for them. This is precisely the behaviour of the human heart. In its blind inertia, in its abject shame, it loves to lie concealed, yet it wishes that nothing should be concealed from it [*latere vult se autem ut lateat aliquid non vult*]. Its reward is just the opposite of its desire, for it cannot conceal itself from the truth, but truth remains hidden in it [*ipse non lateat veritatem, ipsum autem veritas lateat*].¹⁵

What interests Heidegger here as a mark of factual experience is this dialectic of concealment and unconcealment, this double movement by which whoever wants to know everything while remaining concealed in knowledge is known by a knowledge that is concealed from him. Facticity is the condition of what remains concealed in its opening, of what is exposed by its very retreat. From the beginning, facticity is thus characterized by the same cobelonging of concealment and unconcealment that, for Heidegger, marks the experience of the truth of Being.

The same movement, the same restlessness of facticity was at the center of Heidegger's lectures for the Freiburg winter course of 1921–22, which bore the title "Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle." This course was to a large degree dedicated to the analysis of what Heidegger later called "factual life" (*das faktische Leben*), which still later would become Dasein. In the lectures Heidegger begins by describing the original and irreducible character of facticity for thought:

[The determinations of factual life] are not indifferent qualities that can be harmlessly established, as when I say, "this thing is red." They are alive in facticity, that is, they enclose factual possibilities of which they can never be freed—never, thank God [*God sei Dank nie*]. As a consequence, to the degree that it is authentic, a philosophical interpretation directed toward what is most important [*die Hauptsache*] in philosophy, facticity, is itself factual; and it is factual in such a way that, as philosophico-factual, it radically gives itself possibilities of decision and thus itself. But it can do so only if it exists, in the guise of its Dasein [*wenn sie da ist—in der Weise ihres Daseins*].¹⁶

Far from signifying the immobility of a factual situation (as in Sartre or Husserl), facticity designates the "character of Being" (*Seinscharakter*) and "e-motion" (*Bewegtheit*) proper to life. The analysis Heidegger sketches here constitutes a kind of prehistory of the analytic of Dasein¹⁷ and the

self-transcendence of Being-in-the-world, whose fundamental determinations are all to be found here under different names. For factical life is never in the world as a simple object: "the e-motion [of factical life] is such that, as movement, it gives itself, in itself, to itself; it is the e-motion of factical life that constitutes factical life, such that factical life, insofar as it lives in the world, does not properly speaking produce its movement but, rather, lives in the world as the *in-which* [*worin*], the *of-which* [*worauf*] and the *for-which* [*wofür*] of life."¹⁸

Heidegger calls the "fundamental movement" (*Grundbewegung*) of facticity *Ruinanz* (from the Latin *ruina*, "tumbling," "fall"). This is the first appearance of the concept that will become *die Verfallenheit*, "falling," in *Being and Time*. *Ruinanz* presents the same intertwining of the proper and the improper, the *spontaneous* and the *factitious*, as the "thrownness" (*Geworfenheit*) of Dasein: "a movement that produces itself and that, nevertheless, does not produce itself, producing the emptiness in which it moves; for its emptiness is the possibility of movement."¹⁹ And Heidegger likens facticity, insofar as it expresses the fundamental structure of life, to Aristotle's concept of *kinēsis*.²⁰

What had not yet found definite expression in the courses at the start of the 1920s takes on, in *Being and Time*, the theoretical form that has become familiar to us today. Heidegger introduces the concept of facticity as early as §12, when he defines the "basic constitution" (*Grundverfassung*) of Dasein. To situate this concept correctly, one must, above all, place it in the context of a distinction between modes of Being. Being-in-the-world, Heidegger says, is not the property of a "present-at-hand" being (*ein Vorhandenes*) such as, for example, a corporeal thing (*Körperding*) that is in another thing of the same mode, like water in a glass or clothes in a wardrobe. Instead, Being-in-the-world expresses the very structure of Dasein; it concerns an "existential" and not a "categorical." Two worldless (*weltlose*) beings can certainly be beside each other (one thus says, for example, that the chair is near the wall), and we can even say that one touches the other. But to speak of touching in the proper sense of the word, for the chair to be truly near the wall (in the sense of Being-already-alongside-the-world), the chair would have to be able to encounter the wall.

How do matters stand with Dasein, who is not "worldless"? It is important to grasp the conceptual difficulty at issue here. It goes without saying that if Dasein were simply an intraworldly being, it could en-

counter neither the being it is nor other beings. On the other hand, however, if Dasein were deprived of all factuality, how could it encounter anything? To be near beings, to have a world, Dasein must so to speak be a "fact" (*Faktum*) without being factual (*Vorhandenes*); it must both be a "fact" (*Faktum*) and have a world. It is here that Heidegger introduces the notion of facticity:

Dasein itself . . . [is] present-at-hand "in" the world, or, more exactly, *can* with some right and within certain limits be *taken* as merely present-at-hand. To do this, one must completely disregard or just not see the existential state of Being-in [*In-Sein*]. This latter kind of presence-at-hand becomes accessible not by disregarding Dasein's specific structures but only by understanding them in advance. Dasein understands its ownmost Being in the sense of a certain "factual Being-present-at-hand" [*tatsächlichen Vorhandenseins*]. And yet the factuality [*Tatsächlichkeit*] of the fact [*Tatsache*] of one's own Dasein is at bottom quite different ontologically from the factual occurrence of some kind of mineral, for example. Whenever Dasein is, it is as a Fact; and the factuality of such a Fact is what we shall call Dasein's *facticity*. This is a definite way of Being [*Seinsbestimmtheit*], and it has a complicated structure which cannot even be grasped *as a problem* until Dasein's basic existential states have been worked out. The concept of "facticity" implies that an entity "within-the-world" has Being-in-the-world in such a way that it can understand itself as bound up in its "destiny" with the Being of those entities which it encounters within its own world.²¹

As far as form is concerned, facticity presents us with the paradox of an existential that is also a categorial and a "fact" (*Faktum*) that is not factual. Neither "present-at-hand" (*vorhanden*) nor "ready-to-hand" (*zuhanden*), neither pure presence nor object of use, facticity is a specific mode of Being, one whose conceptualization marks Heidegger's reformulation of the question of Being in an essential manner. It should not be forgotten that this reformulation is above all a new articulation of the modes of Being.

The clearest presentation of the characteristics of facticity is to be found in §29 of *Being and Time*, which is devoted to the analysis of "state-of-mind" (*Befindlichkeit*) and "moods" (*Stimmungen*). An opening that precedes all knowledge and all lived experience (*Erlebnis*) takes place in the "state-of-mind": *die primäre Entdeckung der Welt*, "the original disclosure of the world." But what characterizes this disclosure is not the full light of the origin but precisely irreducible facticity and opacity. Through

its “moods,” Dasein is brought before other beings and, above all, before what it itself is; but since it does not bring itself there by itself, it is irremediably delivered over to what already confronts it and gazes upon it as an inexorable enigma:

In having a mood, Dasein is always disclosed moodwise as that entity to which it has been delivered over in its Being; and in this way it has been delivered over to the Being which, in existing, it has to be. “To be disclosed” does not mean “to be known as this sort of thing.” . . . The pure “that it is” shows itself, but the “whence” and the “whither” remain in darkness. . . . This characteristic of Dasein’s Being—this “that it is”—is veiled in its “whence” and “whither,” yet disclosed in itself all the more unveiledly; we call it the “thrownness” of this entity into its “there.” The expression “thrownness” is meant to suggest the *facticity of its being delivered over*. . . . *Facticity is not the factuality of the factum brutum of something present-at-hand, but a characteristic of Dasein’s Being—one which has been taken up into existence, even if proximally it has been thrust aside [abgedrängt].*²²

Let us pause to consider the traits of this facticity, this factual being-thrown (we have seen that Heidegger leads “thrownness” back to facticity). Its origin and characteristic structure as a category organizing the analytic of Dasein have rarely been considered.

The first trait of facticity is *die ausweichende Abkehr*, “evasive turning-away.” Dasein’s openness delivers it over to something that it cannot escape but that nevertheless eludes it and remains inaccessible to it in its constant distraction: “the first essential characteristic of states-of-mind [is] that *they disclose Dasein in its thrownness, and—proximally and for the most part—in the manner of an evasive turning-away.*”²³

A kind of original repression thus belongs to this character of Dasein’s Being. The term Heidegger uses, “repressed” (*abgedrängt*), designates something that has been displaced, pushed back, but not completely effaced, something that remains present in the form of its retreat, as in Freudian “repression” (*Verdrängung*).²⁴ But Heidegger expresses the most essential trait of facticity, the trait from which all others derive, in a form that has many variations, even though it remains constant in its conceptual core: “Dasein is delivered over to the being that it is and must be,” “Dasein is and must be its own ‘there,’” “Dasein is each time its possibility,” “Dasein is the being whose Being is at issue for it in its very Being.” What do these formulas mean as expressions of facticity?

Heidegger’s 1928 Marburg summer-semester lectures (which often con-

tain invaluable commentaries on certain crucial passages in *Being and Time*) explain the matter in absolutely unambiguous terms: "By it [the term 'Dasein'] we designate the being for which its own proper mode of Being in a definite sense is not indifferent," [*Dasein*] *bedeutet das Seiende, dem seine eigene Weise zu sein in einem bestimmten Sinne ungleichgültig ist.*²⁵

Dasein must be its way of Being, its manner, its "guise," we could say, using a word that corresponds etymologically and semantically to the German *Weise*.²⁶ We must reflect on this paradoxical formulation, which for Heidegger marks the original experience of Being, without which both the repetition of the "question of Being" (*Seinsfrage*) and the relation between essence and existence sketched in §9 of *Being and Time* remain absolutely unintelligible. Here the two fundamental determinations of classical ontology—*existentia* and *essentia*, *quod est* and *quid est*, *Daß-sein* and *Wassein*--are abbreviated into a constellation charged with tension. For Dasein (insofar as it is and must be its own "there"), existence and essence, "Being" and "Being such," *on* and *poion* are as inseparable as they are for the soul in Plato's Seventh Letter (343 b-c).

The "essence" of Dasein lies in its existence. The characteristics that can be exhibited in this entity are not, therefore, present-at-hand "properties" of some present-at-hand entity with particular properties; they are in each case possible ways for it to be, and no more than that. All the Being-as-it-is [*So-sein*] which this entity possesses is primarily Being.²⁷

"All the Being-as-it-is [*So-sein*] which this entity possesses is primarily Being": one must think here not so much of the definition of the ontological status of God (*Deus est suum esse*, "God is his Being")²⁸ as of Schelling's positive philosophy and his concept of *das Seyende-Sein*, "being Being," where the verb "to be" also has a transitive sense; Dasein must be its being-such, it must "existentiate" its essence and "essentialize" its existence.²⁹

As a "character of Being" (*Seinscharakter*), facticity thus expresses Dasein's original ontological character. If Heidegger can simultaneously pose the question of the meaning of Being anew and distance himself from ontology, it is because the Being at issue in *Being and Time* has the character of facticity from the beginning. This is why for Dasein, quality, *Sosein*, is not a "property" but solely a "possible guise" (*mögliche Weise*) to be (a formula that must be heard in accordance with the same ontological contraction that is expressed in Nicholas of Cusa's *possest*). Original opening

is produced in this factical movement, in which Dasein must be its *Weise*, its fashion of Being, and in which Being and its guise are both distinguishable and the same. The term “fashion” must be heard here in its etymological sense (from *factio, facere*) and in the sense that the word has in Old French: “face,” like the English “face.” Dasein is factical, since it must be its face, its fashion, its manner—at once what reveals it and that into which it is irreparably thrown.

It is here that one must see the root of *ausweichende Abkehr*, “evasive turning-away,” and of the impropriety constitutive of Dasein. It is because it must be its guise that Dasein remains disguised—hidden away in what opens it, concealed in what exposes it, and darkened by its own light. Such is the factical dimension of this “lighting” (*Lichtung*), which is truly something like a *lucus a non lucendo*.³⁰

Here it is possible to see the full sense in which Heidegger’s ontology is a hermeneutics of facticity. Facticity is not added to Dasein; it is inscribed in its very structure of Being. Here we are in the presence of something that could be defined, with an oxymoron, as “original facticity” or *Urfaktizität*. And it is precisely such an “original facticity” that the 1928 summer lectures call *transzendente Zerstreuung*, “transcendental distraction, dispersion, or dissemination,” or *ursprüngliche Streuung*, “original dispersion.” I do not want to dwell on these passages, which have already been analyzed by Jacques Derrida.³¹ It suffices to recall that here Heidegger sketches the figure of an original facticity that constitutes *die innere Möglichkeit für die faktische Zerstreuung in die Leiblichkeit und damit in die Geschlechtlichkeit*, “the intrinsic possibility for being factically dispersed into bodiliness and thus into sexuality.”³²

Facticity and Fetishism

How are we to understand this original facticity? Is *Weise* something like a mask that Dasein must assume? Is it here that a Heideggerian ethics finds its proper place?

Here the terms “factual” and “facticity” show their pertinence. The German adjective *faktisch*, like the French *factice*, appeared relatively late in the European lexicon: the German in the second half of the eighteenth century, the French a little earlier. But both terms are, in fact, erudite forms, based on the Latin, which hark back to ancient linguistic history. Thirteenth-century French, in accordance with its phonological laws,

thus formed a number of terms on the basis of the Latin *faticius*, such as the adjective *faitis* (or *faitiche*, *fetiz*) and the noun *faitisseté*. At the same time, German, perhaps by borrowing the French term, formed the adjective *feit*. *Faitis*, like its German counterpart, *feit*, simply means “beautiful, pretty.” In particular, it is used in conformity with its etymological origin to designate that which, in a human body, seems made by design, fashioned with skill, made-for, and which thereby attracts desire and love.³³ It is as if the Being-such of a being, its guise or manner, were separated from it in a kind of paradoxical self-transcendence. It is in the context of this semantic history that one must situate the appearance of the term “fetish” (in German, *Fetisch*). Dictionaries inform us that the term entered into European languages in the late seventeenth century by means of the Portuguese *feitiço*. But the word is in fact morphologically identical to the French *faitis*, which, through the borrowing from the Portuguese, is thus in some way resurrected.

An analysis of the term’s meaning in its Freudian and Marxian senses is particularly instructive from this point of view. Let us recall that for Marx, the fetish character of the commodity, what makes it inappropriable, consists not in its artificial character but rather in the fact that in it a product of human labor is given both a use value and an exchange value. In the same way, for Freud, the fetish is not an inauthentic object. Instead, it is both the presence of something and the sign of its absence; it is and is not an object. And it is as such that it irresistibly attracts desire without ever being able to satisfy it.

One could say that in this sense the structure of Dasein is marked by a kind of original fetishism, *Urfetischismus*³⁴ or *Urfaktizität*, on account of which Dasein cannot ever appropriate the being it is, the being to which it is irreparably consigned. Neither something “present-at-hand” (*Vorhandenes*) nor something “ready-to-hand” (*Zuhandenes*), neither exchange value nor use value, Being—which must be its manners of Being—exists in facticity. But for this very reason, its “guises” (*Weisen*) are not simulacra that it could, as a free subject, assume or not assume. From the beginning, they belong to its existence and originally constitute its *ēthos*.³⁵

The Proper and the Improper

This is the perspective from which we must read the unresolved dialectic of *eigentlich* and *uneigentlich*, the proper and the improper, to

which Heidegger devotes some of the most beautiful pages of *Being and Time*. We know that Heidegger always specified that the words *eigentlich* and *uneigentlich* are to be heard in the etymological sense of “proper” and “improper.” On account of its facticity, Dasein’s opening is marked by an original impropriety; it is constitutively divided into “propriety” (*Eigentlichkeit*) and “impropriety” (*Uneigentlichkeit*). Heidegger often emphasizes that the dimension of impropriety and everydayness of the “They” (*das Man*) is not something derivative into which Dasein would fall by accident; on the contrary, impropriety is as originary as propriety. Heidegger obstinately reaffirms the original character of this cobelonging: “Because Dasein is essentially falling, its state of Being is such that it is in ‘untruth.’”³⁶

At times, Heidegger seems to retreat from the radicality of this thesis, fighting against himself to maintain a primacy of the proper and the true. But an attentive analysis shows not only that the co-originary of the proper and the improper is never disavowed, but even that several passages could be said to imply a primacy of the improper. Whenever *Being and Time* seeks to seize hold of the experience of the proper (as, for example, in proper Being-toward-death), it does so solely by means of an analysis of impropriety (for example, factual Being-toward-death). The factual link between these two dimensions of Dasein is so intimate and original that Heidegger writes, “*authentic* existence is not something which floats above falling everydayness; existentially, it is only a modified way in which such everydayness is seized upon.”³⁷ And on the subject of proper decision, he states, “resoluteness appropriates untruth authentically.”³⁸

Authentic existence has no content other than inauthentic existence; the proper is nothing other than the apprehension of the improper. We must reflect on the inevitable character of the improper that is implied in these formulations. Even in proper Being-toward-death and proper decision, Dasein seizes hold of its impropriety alone, mastering an alienation and becoming attentive to a distraction. Such is the originary status of facticity. But what does it mean to seize hold of impropriety? How is it possible to appropriate untruth properly? If one does not reflect on these questions and merely attributes to Heidegger a simple primacy of the proper, one will not only fail to understand the deepest intention of the analytic of Dasein; one will equally bar access to the thought of the *Ereignis*, which constitutes the key word of Heidegger’s later thought and

which has its “original history” (*Urgeschichte*), in Benjamin’s sense of the term, in the dialectic of the proper and the improper.

Theory of Passions

Let us now return, after this long detour, to the problem of love that was our point of departure. An attentive analysis shows that the statement that Heidegger’s thought is “without love” (*ohne Liebe*) is not only inexact from a philosophical point of view but also imprecise on the philological level. Several texts could be invoked here. I would like to pause to consider the two that strike me as the most important.

Almost ten years after the end of his relationship with Hannah Arendt, in the 1936 lecture course on Nietzsche entitled “The Will to Power as Art,” Heidegger thematically treated the problem of love in several very dense pages in which he sketched an altogether singular theory of the passions. He begins by withdrawing passions from the domain of psychology by defining them as “the basic modes that constitute Dasein . . . the ways man confronts the *Da*, the openness and concealment of beings, in which he stands.”³⁹ Immediately afterward, he clearly distinguishes love and hate from other feelings, positing them as passions (*Leidenschaften*) as opposed to simple affects (*Affekte*). While affects such as anger and joy are born and die away in us spontaneously, love and hate, as passions, are always already present and traverse our Being from the beginning. This is why we speak of “nurturing hatred” but not of “nurturing anger” (*ein Zorn wird genährt*).⁴⁰ We must cite at least the decisive passage on passion:

Because hate traverses [*durchzieht*] our Being more originally, it has a cohesive power; like love, hate brings an original closure [*eine ursprüngliche Geschlossenheit*] and perdurance to our essential Being. . . . But the persistent closure that comes to Dasein through hate does not close it off and bind it. Rather, it grants vision and premeditation. The angry man loses the power of reflection. He who hates intensifies reflection and rumination to the point of “hardboiled” malice. Hate is never blind; it is perspicacious. Only anger is blind. Love is never blind: it is perspicacious. Only infatuation [*Verliebtheit*] is blind, fickle, and susceptible—an affect, not a passion [*ein Affekt, keine Leidenschaft*]. To passion belongs a reaching out and opening up of oneself [*das weit Ausgreifende, sich Öffnende*]. Such reaching out occurs even in hate, since the hated one is pursued everywhere relentlessly. But such reaching out [*Aus-*

griff) in passion does not simply lift us up and away beyond ourselves. It gathers our essential Being to its proper ground [*auf seinem eigentlichen Grund*], it exposes our ground for the first time in so gathering, so that the passion is that through which and in which we take hold of ourselves [*in uns selbst Fuß fassen*] and achieve lucid mastery of the beings around us and within us [*hellsichtig des Seiende um uns und in uns mächtig werden*].⁴¹

Hatred and love are thus the two *Grundweisen*, the two fundamental guises or manners, through which Dasein experiences the *Da*, the opening and retreat of the being that it is and must be. In love and hate, as opposed to affects (which are blind to the very thing they reveal and which, like *Stimmungen*, are only uncovered in distraction), man establishes himself more deeply in that into which he is thrown, appropriating his very facticity and thus gathering together and opening his own ground. It is therefore not an accident that hatred, with its “original closure,” is given a primordial rank alongside love (like evil in Heidegger’s course on Schelling and fury [*das Grimmige*] in his “Letter on Humanism”): the dimension at issue here is the original opening of Dasein, in which “there come[s] from Being itself the assignment [*Zuweisung*] of those directions [*Weisungen*] that must become law and rule for man.”⁴²

Potentia Passiva

This original status of love (more precisely, of passion) is reaffirmed in a passage in the “Letter on Humanism” whose importance here cannot be overestimated. In this text, “to love” (*lieben*) is likened to *mögen* (which means both “to want” and “to be able”), and *mögen* is identified with Being in a context in which the category of potentiality-possibility is considered in an entirely new fashion:

To embrace a “thing” or a “person” in its essence means to love it [*sie lieben*], to favor it [*sie mögen*]. Thought in a more originary way, such favoring [*mögen*] means to bestow essence as a gift. Such favoring is the proper essence of enabling [*Vermögen*], which not only can achieve this or that but also can let something essentially unfold [*wesen*] in its provenance, that is, let it be. It is on the “strength” [*kraft*] of such enabling by favoring that something is properly able to be. This enabling is what is properly “possible” [*das eigentlich Mögliche*], that whose essence resides in favoring. . . . Being is the enabling-favoring, the “may be.” As the element, Being is the “quiet power” of the favoring-enabling, that is, of the possible. Of course, our words *möglich* and

Möglichkeit, under the dominance of “logic” and “metaphysics,” are thought solely in contrast to “actuality”; that is, they are thought on the basis of a definite—the metaphysical—interpretation of Being as *actus* and *potentia*, a distinction identified with the one between *existentia* and *potentia*. When I speak of the “quiet power of the possible” I do not mean the *possibile* of a merely represented *possibilitas*, nor *potentia* as the *essentia* of an *actus* of *existentia*; rather, I mean Being itself.⁴³

To understand the thematic unity evoked here, it must be considered with respect to the problem of freedom as it is presented in the last pages of “On the Essence of Reasons.” Once again, the dimension of facticity (better: of original or transcendental facticity) is essential: “For Dasein, to exist means to behave toward being [*Seiendes*] while situated in the midst of being [*Seiendes*]. It means to behave toward being that is not like Dasein, toward itself and toward being like itself, so that what is at issue in its situated behaving is the capacity to be [*Seinskönnen*] of Dasein itself. The project of world outstrips the possible; the Why arises in this outstripping.”⁴⁴

Freedom thus reveals Dasein in its essence to be “capable of being, with possibilities that gape open before its finite choice, that is, in its destiny.”⁴⁵ Insofar as it exists factically (that is, insofar as it must be its manners of Being), Dasein always exists in the mode of the possible: in the excess of possibilities with respect to beings and, at the same time, in a lack of possibilities with respect to them, since its possibilities appear as radical incapacities in the face of the very being to which it is always already consigned.

This cobelonging of capacity and incapacity is analyzed in a passage in the 1928 summer lecture course, which anticipates the themes of “On the Essence of Reasons” in urging the superiority of the category of the possible over the category of the real:

Insofar . . . as freedom (taken transcendently) constitutes the essence of Dasein, Dasein, as existing, is always, in essence, necessarily “further” than any given factual being. On the basis of this upswing, Dasein is, in each case, beyond beings, as we say, but it is beyond in such a way that it, first of all, experiences beings in their resistance, against which transcending Dasein is powerless. The powerlessness is metaphysical, i.e., to be understood as essential; it cannot be removed by reference to the conquest of nature, to technology, which rages about in the “world” today like an unshackled beast; for this domination of nature is the real proof for the metaphysical powerlessness of

Dasein, which can only attain freedom in its history. . . . Only because, in our factual intentional comportment toward beings of every sort, we, outstripping in advance, return to and arrive at beings from possibilities, only for this reason can we let beings themselves be what and how they are. And the converse is true. Because Dasein, as factically existing, transcending already, in each case, encounters beings and because, with transcendence and world-entry, the powerlessness, understood metaphysically, is manifest, for this reason Dasein, which can be powerless (metaphysically) only as free, must hold itself to the condition of the possibility of powerlessness, to the freedom to ground. And it is for this reason that we essentially place every being, as being, into question regarding its ground. We inquire into the why in our comportment toward beings of every sort, because in ourselves possibility is higher than actuality, because with Dasein itself this being-higher becomes existent.⁴⁶

The passage on *mögen* (and its relation to love) in the “Letter on Humanism” must be read in close relation to this primacy of possibility. The *potentia* at issue here is essentially *potentia passiva*, the *dynamis tou paskhein* whose secret solidarity with active potentiality (*dynamis tou poiein*) Heidegger emphasized in his 1931 lecture course on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*. All potentiality (*dynamis*), Heidegger writes in his interpretation of Aristotle, is impotentiality (*adynamia*), and all capacity (*dynamis*) is essentially passivity (*dekhesthai*).⁴⁷ But this impotentiality is the place of an original event (*Urgeschehen*) that determines Dasein’s Being and opens the abyss of its freedom: “What does not stand within the power of freedom is *that* Dasein is a self by virtue of its possibility—a factual self because it is free—and *that* transcendence comes about as a primordial happening. This sort of powerlessness (thrownness) is not due to the fact that being infects Dasein; rather, it defines the very Being of Dasein as such.”⁴⁸

Passion, *potentia passiva*, is therefore the most radical experience of possibility at issue in Dasein: a capacity that is capable not only of *potentiality* (the manners of Being that are in fact possible) but also, and above all, of *impotentiality*. This is why for Dasein, the experience of freedom coincides with the experience of impotentiality, which is situated at the level of the original facticity or “original dispersion” (*ursprüngliche Streuung*), which, according to the 1928 summer course, constitutes the “inner possibility” of Dasein’s factual dispersion.

As passive potentiality and *Mögen*, passion is capable of its own impotentiality; it lets be not only the possible but also the impossible, thus

gathering together Dasein in its ground, to open it and, possibly, to allow it to master what exists in it and around it. In this sense, the “immobile force of the possible” is essentially passion, passive potentiality: *mögen* (to be able) is *lieben* (to love).

But how can such mastery take place if it appropriates not a thing but simply impotentiality and impropriety? How is it possible to be capable not of possibility and potentiality but of an impossibility and impotentiality? What is freedom that is above all passion?

The Passion of Facticity

Here the problem of love, as passion, shows its proximity to that of the *Ereignis*, which constitutes the central motif of Heidegger’s thought from the 1940s onward. Love, as passion of facticity, may be what makes it possible to cast light on the concept of the *Ereignis*. We know that Heidegger explains the word *Ereignis* on the basis of the term *eigen* and understands it as “appropriation,” situating it with respect to *Being and Time*’s dialectic of *eigentlich* and *uneigentlich*. But here it is a matter of an appropriation in which what is appropriated is neither something foreign that must become proper nor something dark that must be illuminated. What is appropriated here and brought not to light but to “lighting” (*Lichtung*) is solely an expropriation, an occultation as such. “Appropriation is in itself *expropriation*. This word contains in a manner commensurate with Appropriation the early Greek *lēthē* in the sense of concealing” (*Das Ereignis ist in ihm selbst Enteignis, in welches Wort die frühgriechische lêthê im Sinne des Verbergens ereignishaft aufgenommen ist*).⁴⁹ The thought of the *Ereignis* is thus “not an extinguishing of the oblivion of Being, but placing oneself in it and standing within it. Thus the awakening [*erwachen*] from the oblivion of Being to the oblivion of Being is the unawakening [*entwachen*] into Appropriation.”⁵⁰ What now takes place is that concealment no longer conceals itself but becomes “the attention of thinking” (*die Verbergung sich nicht verbirgt, ihr gilt vielmehr das Aufmerksam des Denkens*).⁵¹

What do these enigmatic sentences mean? If what human beings must appropriate here is not a hidden thing but the very fact of hiddenness, Dasein’s very impropriety and facticity, then “to appropriate it” can only be *to be properly improper*, to abandon oneself to the inappropriable. Withdrawal, *lēthē*, must come to thinking as such; facticity must show itself in its concealment and opacity.

The thought of the *Ereignis*, insofar as it is the end of the history of Being, is therefore in a certain sense also a repetition and completion of the thought of facticity that, in the early Heidegger, marked the reformulation of the “question of Being” (*Seinsfrage*). Here it is an issue not simply of the many manners (*Weisen*) of Dasein’s factual existence but of the original facticity (or transcendental dispersion) that constitutes its “inner possibility” (*innere Möglichkeit*). The *Mögen* of this *Möglichkeit* is neither potentiality nor actuality, neither essence nor existence; it is, rather, an impotentiality whose passion, in freedom, opens the ground of Dasein. In the *Ereignis*, original facticity no longer retreats, either in distracted dispersion or historical destiny, but is instead appropriated in its very distraction and borne in its *lēthē*.

The dialectic of the proper and the improper thus reaches its end. Dasein no longer has to be its own *Da* and no longer has to be its own *Weisen*: by now, it definitively inhabits them in the mode of the “dwelling” (*Wohnen*) that in §12 of *Being and Time* characterized Dasein’s Being-in (*In-Sein*).

In the word *Ereignis*, we should therefore hear the Latin *assuescere*, “ac-customing,” on the condition of thinking the “suus” in this term, the “self” (*se*) that constitutes its core. And if one remembers that the origin of Dasein’s destinal character was (according to §9 of *Being and Time*) its “having to be,” it is also possible to understand why the *Ereignis* is without destiny, *geschickslos*. Here Being (the possible) has truly exhausted its historical possibilities, and Dasein, who is capable of its own incapacity, attains its own extreme manner: the *immobile* force of the possible.

This does not mean that all facticity is abolished and that all e-motion is effaced. “The lack of destiny of Appropriation does not mean that it has no ‘e-motion’ [*Bewegtheit*]. Rather, it means that the manner of movement most proper to Appropriation, turning toward us in withdrawal [*Zuwendung in Entzug*], first shows itself as what is to be thought.”⁵² This is the sense of the *Gelassenheit*, the “abandonment,” that a late text defines as *die Offenheit für das Geheimnis*, “the openness to the mystery”:⁵³ *Gelassenheit* is the e-motion of the *Ereignis*, the eternally nonepochal opening to the “ancient something [*Uralte*] which conceals itself in the word *a-lētheia*.”⁵⁴

We may now approach a provisional definition of love. What man introduces into the world, his “proper,” is not simply the light and opening of knowledge but above all the opening to concealment and opacity. *Alētheia*, truth, is the safeguard of *lēthē*, nontruth; memory, the safeguard

of oblivion; light, the safeguard of darkness. It is only in the insistence of this abandonment, in this safeguarding, which is forgetful of everything, that something like knowledge and attention can become possible.

Love suffers all of this (in the etymological sense of the word passion, *pati*, *paskhein*). Love is the *passion of facticity* in which man bears this nonbelonging and darkness, appropriating (*adsuefacit*) them while guarding them as such. Love is thus not, as the dialectic of desire suggests, the affirmation of the self in the negation of the loved object; it is, instead, the passion and exposition of facticity itself and of the irreducible impropriety of beings. *In love, the lover and the beloved come to light in their concealment, in an eternal facticity beyond Being.* (This is perhaps what Hannah Arendt means when, in a text written with her first husband in 1930, she cites Rilke, saying that love “is the possibility for each to veil his destiny to the other.”)

Just as in *Ereignis*, the appropriation of the improper signifies the end both of the history of Being and of the history of epochal sendings, so in love the dialectic of the proper and the improper reaches its end. This, finally, is why there is no sense in distinguishing between authentic love and inauthentic love, heavenly love and *pandemios* love, the love of God and self-love. Lovers bear the impropriety of love to the end so that the proper can emerge as the appropriation of the free incapacity that passion brings to its end. Lovers go to the limit of the improper in a mad and demonic promiscuity; they dwell in carnality and amorous discourse, in forever-new regions of impropriety and facticity, to the point of revealing their essential abyss. Human beings do not originally dwell in the proper; yet they do not (according to the facile suggestion of contemporary nihilism) inhabit the improper and the ungrounded. Rather, *human beings are those who fall properly in love with the improper, who—unique among living beings—are capable of their own incapacity.*

This is why if it is true that, according to Jean-Luc Nancy’s beautiful phrase, love is that of which we are not masters, that which we never reach but which is always happening to us, it is also true that man can appropriate this incapacity and that, to cite Hölderlin’s words to Casimir Ulrich Böhlendorff, *der freie Gebrauch des Eigenen das Schwerste ist*, the free use of the proper is the most difficult task.

§12 *The Passion of Facticity*

1. W. Koepps, *Merimna und Agape, Seeberg Festschrift* (1929).
2. Ludwig Binswanger, *Grundformen und Erkenntnis menschlichen Daseins* (Zurich: M. Niehans, 1942).
3. Karl Jaspers, *Notizen zu Martin Heidegger* (Munich: Piper, 1978), p. 34.
4. Karl Löwith, "Phänomenologische Ontologie und protestantische Theologie," in Otto Pöggeler, ed., *Heidegger: Perspektiven zur Deutung seines Werkes* (Köln: Kiepenheuer and Witsch, 1970), p. 76.
5. See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt: For the Love of the World* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 247.
6. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 492; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1928), p. 139.
7. Martin Heidegger, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), p. 134; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 26: *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1978), p. 169.
8. Ibid., English pp. 130–31; original pp. 163–64.
9. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 88; original in Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, p. 61.
10. Oskar Becker, "Mathematische Existenz, Untersuchung zur Logik und Ontologie mathematischer Phänomene," *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Phänomenologische Forschung* 7 (1927): 621.
11. In Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* (vol. 62), the title of the course appears as "Ontologie: Phänomenologische Hermeneutik der Faktizität." According to the note on p. 72 of *Sein und Zeit* (*Being and Time*, p. 490), Heidegger was already concerned with "the hermeneutics of facticity" in his 1919–20 winter semester lectures.
12. See the entry under *facticius* in the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* and the entry under *factio* in Ernout-Meillet's etymological dictionary.
13. Otto Pöggeler, *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers* (Pfullingen: Neske, 1963), pp. 36–45. See also Oskar Becker, *Dasein und Dawesen* (Pfullingen: Neske, 1963), and K. Lehmann, "Christliche Geschichtserfahrung und ontologische Frage beim jungen Heidegger," in Pöggeler, ed., *Heidegger: Perspektiven*, pp. 140–68. [Since the first publication of the present essay, Heidegger's 1921 lecture course has been published in Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 60: *Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1995), pp. 160–299, under the title "Augustinus und der Neuplatonismus."—Ed.]
14. The Augustinian opposition between *uti* (using something with a view to other ends) and *frui* (enjoying something for itself) is important for the prehistory of the distinction between *Vorhandenheit*, "present-at-handness," and

Zuhandenheit, “ready-to-handness,” in Heidegger’s *Being and Time*. As we will see, Dasein’s facticity is opposed both to *Vorhandenheit* and to *Zuhandenheit* and therefore cannot properly speaking be the object of either a *frui* or an *uti*.

15. Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin (London: Penguin Books, 1961), pp. 229–30.

16. Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 61: *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles: Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1985), p. 99.

17. See the observations in H. Tietjen, “Philosophie und Faktizität,” *Heidegger Studies* 2 (1986).

18. Heidegger, *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles*, p. 130.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

20. Heidegger, “Problem der Faktizität—‘kinesis’-Problem” (Problem of facticity, *kinesis*-problem), *ibid.*, p. 117. If one recalls the fundamental role that *kinesis*, according to Heidegger, played in Aristotle’s thought (in his seminars at Le Thor, Heidegger still spoke of *kinesis* as the fundamental experience of Aristotle’s thought), one can also evaluate the central place of facticity in the thought of the early Heidegger.

21. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 82; original in Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, pp. 55–56.

22. *Ibid.*, English p. 174; original pp. 134–46.

23. *Ibid.*, English p. 175; original p. 136.

24. The analogy is, of course, purely formal. But the fact that Heideggerian ontology coincides with the territory of psychology is important for its position in the history of the “question of Being” (*Seinsfrage*).

25. Heidegger, *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, p. 136; original in Heidegger, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik*, p. 171.

26. The word *Weise* (which derives from the same root as the German *wissen* and the Latin *videre*) must be considered as a *terminus technicus* of Heidegger’s thought. In his 1921–22 winter lectures, Heidegger plays on all the possible meanings of the verb *weisen* and its derivations: “Leben bekommt jeweils eine Grundweisung und es wächst in eine solche hinein. . . . Bezugssinn je in einer Weise ist in sich ein Weisen und hat in sich eine Weisung, die das Leben sich gibt, die es erfährt: Unterweisung.” Heidegger, *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles*, p. 98.

27. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 67; original in Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, p. 42.

28. In the “Letter on Humanism,” Heidegger explicitly refutes this interpretation of the *essentia/existentia* relation: “It would be the ultimate error if one wished to explain the sentence about man’s ek-sistent essence as if it were the secularized transference to human beings of a thought that Christian theology

expresses about God (*Deus est suum esse*); for ek-sistence is not the realization of an essence nor does ek-sistence itself even effect and posit what is essential" (in Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell [New York: Harper San Francisco, 1977], p. 207; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 9: *Wegmarken* [Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1976], pp. 158–59). Another passage in the same text shows that the relation between existence and essence remained a fundamental question in Heidegger's thought even after *Being and Time*. "In *Being and Time* no statement about the relation of *essentia* and *existentia* can yet be expressed since there it is still a question of preparing something precursory" (*Basic Writings*, p. 209; original in *Wegmarken*, p. 329).

29. A genealogy of the contraction of *essentia* and *existentia* effected by Heidegger would show that this relation has often been conceived in the history of philosophy as something far more complex than a simple opposition. Without discussing Plato (who in the Seventh Letter explicitly states that *on* and *poion* are indissociable), we may consider Aristotle's *ti en einai* from the same perspective. Moreover, the notion of Stoic substance, *idios poion*, implies precisely the paradox of a "being-such" (*poion*) that would be proper. Victor Goldschmidt thus shows that the "manners of Being" (*pos ekhein*) do not constitute an extrinsic determination of substance but instead reveal substance and exemplify it (they "do its gymnastics," according to Epictetus's beautiful image). The relation between Spinoza's definition of *causa sui* (*cuius essentia involvit existentiam*) and Heidegger's determination of Dasein (*das Wesen des Daseins liegt in seiner Existenz*) remains to be considered.

30. The observation is L. Amoroso's; see his "La *Lichtung* di Heidegger come *lucus a non lucendo*," in *Il pensiero debole*, ed. Gianni Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1983), pp. 137–63.

31. See Jacques Derrida, "Geschlecht," in *Martin Heidegger: Cahiers de l'Herne* (Paris: Éditions de l'Herne, 1983), pp. 571–96.

32. Heidegger, *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, p. 137; original in Heidegger, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik*, p. 173. In the same text, Heidegger relates Dasein's facticity to its spatiality (*Räumlichkeit*). If one considers that the word *Streuung* derives from the same root as the Latin *sternere* (*stratum*), which refers to extension and horizontality, it is possible to see in this *ursprüngliche Streuung* one of the reasons for the irreducibility of Dasein's spatiality to its temporality, which is affirmed at the end of "Zeit und Sein" ("On Time and Being").

33. One thus reads "Faitisse estoit et avenante / je ne sais femme plus plaisante," in the *Romance of the Rose*; "voiz comme elles se chaucent bien et faitissement," in Jean de Meun; "votre gens corps votre beauté faictisse," in Baudes; "ils ont doubz regard et beaulté / et jeunesse et faitischeré," in Gaces. But the true meaning of the word *faitis* can best be seen in Villon's text, in which

he writes, "Hanches charnues, / eslevées, propres, faictisses / à tenir amoureuses lisses."

34. The word *Urfetischismus* is obviously to be taken in an ontological, and not a psychological, sense. It is because facticity originally belongs to *Dasein* that it can encounter something like a fetish in the strict sense of the term. On the status of the fetish in §17 of *Being and Time*, see Werner Hamacher's important observations in "Peut-être la question," in *Les fins de l'homme: A partir du travail de Jacques Derrida* (Paris: Galilée, 1981), pp. 353–54.

35. "*Dasein* exists factically. We shall inquire whether existentiality and facticity have an ontological unity, or whether facticity belongs essentially to existentiality" (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 225); "*Das Dasein* existiert faktisch. Gefragt wird nach der ontologischen Einheit von Existentialität und Faktizität, bzw. der wesenhaften Zugehörigkeit dieser zu jener" (Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, p. 181).

36. Ibid., English p. 264; original p. 222.

37. Ibid., English p. 224; original p. 179.

38. Ibid., English p. 345; original p. 299.

39. Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche: The Will to Power as Art*, trans. David Farrell Krell, p. 45; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche*, vol. 1 (Pfullingen: Neske, 1961), p. 55.

40. Ibid., English p. 47; original p. 58.

41. Ibid., English pp. 47–48; original pp. 58–59.

42. Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, p. 238; original in *Wegmarken*, pp. 360–61.

43. Ibid., English p. 196; original pp. 316–17.

44. Martin Heidegger, *The Essence of Reasons* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1969), p. 115; original in *Wegmarken*, pp. 168–69.

45. Ibid., English p. 129; original p. 174.

46. Heidegger, *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, pp. 215–16; original in Heidegger, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik*, pp. 279–80.

47. Martin Heidegger, *Aristotle's Metaphysics Omega 1–3*, trans. Walter Brogan and Peter Warnek (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), p. 94; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 33: *Aristoteles; Metaphysik Theta 1–3: Vom Wesen und Wirklichkeit der Kraft* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1981), p. 114.

48. Heidegger, *Essence of Reasons*, pp. 129–31; original in Heidegger, *Wegmarken*, p. 175.

49. Martin Heidegger, *On Time and Being*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 41; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Zur Sache des Denkens* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1969), p. 44.

50. Ibid., English p. 30; original p. 32. The thought expressed here is so disconcerting that the English, French, and Italian translators did not want to admit what is, nevertheless, clear: namely, that the word *entwachen* in this context

cannot mean the same thing as *erwachen*. In this passage, Heidegger establishes an opposition that is perfectly symmetrical with that between *Enteignis* and *Ereignis*.

51. Ibid., English p. 41; original p. 44.

52. Ibid.

53. Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. John N. Anderson and E. Hans Freund (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 56; the original is in Martin Heidegger, *Gelassenheit* (Pfullingen: Neske, 1959), p. 24.

54. Heidegger, *On Time and Being*, p. 24; original in Heidegger, *Zur Sache des Denkens*, p. 25.

§13 *Pardes*

1. Jacques Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), pp. 26–27; the original is in Jacques Derrida, *Marges de la philosophie* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1972), p. 28.

2. Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 42–43, 46; the original is in Jacques Derrida, *Positions* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1972), pp. 58–72.

3. Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*, pp. 65–66; original in Derrida, *Marges de la philosophie*, pp. 75–77.

4. Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), p. 61; the original is in Jacques Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Minuit, 1967), p. 90.

5. Philippe de Rouilhan, *Frege: Les paradoxes de la représentation* (Paris: Minuit, 1988).

6. *The Wittgenstein Reader*, ed. Anthony Kenny (London: Blackwell, 1994), p. 14; the original is in Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, prop. 4.121, in his *Werkausgabe*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984), p. 33; and Jean-Claude Milner, *Introduction à une science du langage* (Paris: Seuil, 1990), p. 332.

7. *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, vol. 8: *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, trans. W. S. Hett (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 166–67.

8. Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Stephen MacKenna (London: Penguin Books, 1991), pp. 99–100.

§14 *Absolute Immanence*

1. This text has been reprinted in Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), 4: 763.

2. Ibid., p. 774.
3. Ibid., p. 776.
4. Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno, "Satzzeichen," *Akzente* 6 (1956).
5. Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues* (Paris: Flammarion, 1977), p. 73.
6. J. H. Masméjan, *Traité de la ponctuation* (Paris, 1781).
7. Gilles Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 112; the original is in Gilles Deleuze, *Critique et Clinique* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1993), p. 141.
8. Gilles Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ... ," *Philosophie* 47 (1995): 6.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 4.
11. Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, trans. Mark Lester with Charles Stivala, ed. Constantin V. Boundas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), p. 98; the original is in Gilles Deleuze, *Logique du sens* (Paris: Minuit, 1973), p. 132.
12. Ibid., English p. 105; original p. 143.
13. The history of the relations between Heidegger and Deleuze—through Blanchot, for example, and the often unacknowledged Heideggerian dimension of contemporary French philosophy—remains to be written. In any case, however, it is certain that the Heidegger of Deleuze is altogether different from the Heidegger of Lévinas and Derrida.
14. Gilles Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy*, trans. Martin Joughin (New York: Zone Books, 1990), p. 67; the original is in Gilles Deleuze, *Spinoza et le problème de l'expression* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1986), p. 58.
15. Ibid., English p. 172; original p. 156.
16. Ibid., English p. 180; original p. 164.
17. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 45; the original is in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* (Paris: Minuit, 1991), p. 47.
18. Ibid., English p. 46–47; original pp. 48–49.
19. Ibid., English p. 40; original p. 40.
20. Ibid., English pp. 59–60; original p. 59.
21. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ... ," p. 4.
22. Ibid., p. 5.
23. Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 443.
24. Ibid., pp. 444–45.
25. Ibid., pp. 446–47.
26. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ... ," p. 5.

27. Pierre Maine de Biran, *Mémoire sur la décomposition de la pensée*, in *Œuvres*, vol. 3 (Paris: Vrin, 1988), p. 388.
28. Ibid., p. 370.
29. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ...," p. 5.
30. Ibid., p. 6.
31. Aristotle, *De anima*, 413 a 20–b 10, in *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, vol. 8: *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, trans. W. S. Hett (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986), pp. 74–75.
32. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 144–45; the original is in *La volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), pp. 190–91.
33. Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault*, trans. Séan Hand (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), p. 92; the original is in Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1986), p. 95.
34. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ...," p. 5.
35. Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* p. 213; original in Deleuze and Guattari, *Qu'est-ce-que la philosophie?* p. 201.
36. Ibid., English p. 342; original p. 342.
37. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ...," p. 4.
38. Spinoza, *Opera*, ed. Carl Gebhardt (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1925), 3: 361.
39. Ibid.
40. See Victor Goldschmidt, *Le système stoïcien et l'idée du temps* (Paris: Vrin, 1969), pp. 22–23. Deleuze cites this passage in *Logic of Sense*, p. 147; original in his *Logique du sens*, p. 198.
41. Aristotle, *De anima*, 416 b 12–20. The Greek text is in *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, 8: 92.
42. When Aristotle defines the intellect (*nous*) by its capacity to think itself, it is important to remember that he has already considered a self-referential paradigm, as we have seen, in his discussion of nutritive life and its power of self-preservation. In a certain sense, thought's thinking itself has its archetype in nutritive life's self-preservation.
43. Émile Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek (Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1971), p. 252; the original is in Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1 (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), pp. 292–93.
44. Deleuze, "Immanence: Une vie ...," p. 6.
45. Harry A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 325.
46. The term *acquiescentia* is registered in the *Thesaurus* of neither Estienne nor Teubner. As to the ablative construction of *acquiescere* with *in* (in the sense, Estienne specifies, of *acquiescere in re aliqua, aut in aliquo homine, cum quadam*

animi voluptate, quieteque consistere et oblectari in re aliqua, in qua prius in dubio aut solitudine anima fuisset), it is never used with the reflexive pronoun.

§15 *Bartleby, or On Contingency*

1. A different translation of this passage can be found in *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, trans. Hippocrates G. Apostle (Grinnell, Iowa: The Peripatetic Press, 1979), p. 209.
2. Herman Melville, "Bartleby the Scrivener," in *Billy Budd, Sailor and Other Stories*, ed. Harold Beaver (London: Penguin Books, 1985), p. 73.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 88–89.
4. Gilles Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), pp. 73–74; the original is in Gilles Deleuze, *Critique et clinique* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1993), p. 95.
5. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. R. D. Hicks, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 488.
6. Melville, "Bartleby the Scrivener," p. 89.
7. "I' vo come colui ch' è fuor di vita / che pare, a chi lo sguarda, ch' omo / sia fatto di rame o di pietra o di legno / che si conduca solo per maestria."
8. *Aristotle in Twenty-Three Volumes*, vol. 19: *The Nichomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), 1139 b 6–10 (p. 331).
9. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*, trans. E. M. Huggard (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951), p. 372.
10. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (London: Penguin, 1954), p. 139.
11. Melville, "Bartleby the Scrivener," p. 99.
12. *Ibid.*

Index of Names

- Abelard, Peter, 11, 173
 Abu Ma'shar, 92, 97
 Abulafia, Abraham, 245, 246
 Acosta, Uriel, 237
 Adler, Cyrus, 91
 Adorno, Theodor Wiesengrund, 140,
 144, 222-223, 300n
 Aeschylus, 118
 Agamben, Giorgio, 1-21, 275n-277n,
 279n-281n, 291n
 Akhmatova, Anna, 177
 Albert the Great, 216, 251
 Alexander of Aphrodisias, 215, 245
 Almeric of Bène, 206
 Ammonius, 10, 277n
 Amoroso, L., 297n
 Andrae, 281n
 Anselm of Canterbury, St., 41-42
 Antisthenes, 3, 69, 107
 Anton, Hans, 82
 Apel, Karl-Otto, 43
 Arendt, Hannah, 185, 198, 204
 Aristotle, 1, 2, 8-11, 14-18, 23, 31-33, 36-38,
 43, 59-60, 62, 64, 69, 73, 75, 107-109,
 119-120, 166, 177-184, 190-191, 201,
 214-216, 230-233, 236-237, 243-247,
 249-251, 253, 262, 264, 266-268, 275n-
 276n, 279n, 281n, 288n, 294n, 296n-
 297n, 299n, 301n-302n
 Arnim, Jacob von, 277n
 Ast, Friedrich, 27
 Atticus, 244
 Augustine, St., 8-9, 49, 185-187, 189,
 277n-278n, 281n, 295n-296n
 Aulus Gellius, 278n
 Avicenna (Ibn Sina), 246, 260, 263
 Baal Shem, 165
 Bacchylides, 135
 Bachofen, Ludwig, 148
 Badiou, Alain, 221
 Barwick, Karl, 277n
 Baudelaire, Charles, 139-140
 Baudes, 297n
 Becker, Oskar, 188-189, 295n
 Bede the Venerable, 214
 Benjamin, Walter, 1, 5, 13, 21-22, 48-61,
 74, 77, 80-82, 103, 138-174, 198, 207,
 267-268, 275n-276n, 279n-283n,
 291n-293n
 Bentley, Richard, 27
 Benveniste, Émile, 21, 76, 100-102, 237,
 280n, 301n
 Bernard, Claude, 233
 Bertram, Ernst, 81
 Bichat, Xavier, 220, 231-232
 Bing, Gertrud, 95, 287n
 Binswanger, Ludwig, 90, 295n

- Blanchot, Maurice, 113, 300n
 Blanqui, Louis Auguste, 115, 267-268
 Boas, Franz, 91
 Böhlendorff, Casimir Ulrich, 204
 Böhme, Jakob, 253
 Botticelli, Sandro, 90, 97
 Brecht, Bertolt, 142
 Bréhier, Émile, 9-10, 277n
 Brod, Max, 173
 Buber, Martin, 54-55
 Burckhardt, Jakob, 286n
 Burkert, Walter, 136
 Burnet, John, 7, 32
- Cacciari, Massimo, 113, 172, 294n
 Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, 80
 Camillo, Giulio, 96, 286n
 Campanella, Tommaso, 173
 Canguilhem, Georges, 220-221
 Carnap, Rudolf, 4, 69, 213
 Carroll, Lewis, 3, 69, 213, 276n
 Cassiotlorus, 214, 244
 Cassirer, Ernst, 284n
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 260, 302n
 Celan, Paul, 5, 115, 276n, 289n
 Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, 223
 Chomsky, Noam, 101
 Chrysippus, 235
 Claudel, Paul, 224
 Cleanthus, 235
 Cohen, Hermann, 41, 156
 Cohen, Isaac, 146
 Cohn, Julia, 140, 142
 Condillac, Etienne Bonnot de, 230, 260
 Contini, Gianfranco, 77
 Corbin, Henry, 127, 145, 147, 292n
 Cummings, E. E., 255
 Cushing, Frank Hamilton, 91
- D**amascius, 112-113, 288n
Dante (Dante Alighieri), 22, 50-51, 73-74, 80, 109, 135, 236, 260, 281n, 288n
David of Dinant, 253
Deleuze, Gilles, 13, 19, 220-239, 255, 270, 279n-280n, 300n-302n
- D**errida, Jacques, 3, 20, 57, 172, 174, 195, 205-219, 239, 294n, 297n, 299n-300n
 Descartes, René, 225
Diaghilev, Serge, 83
Dickens, Charles, 228-229, 300n
Diogenes Laertius, 19, 256, 278n, 280n, 302n
Dionysius Thrax, 223
Dostoevsky, Fyodor, 243
Dumézil, Georges, 100
Duncan, Isadora, 83
Dürer, Albrecht, 94, 285n
- Eliahu Cohen Itamary of Smirne, Rabbi, 164-165, 294n
 Elie, Hubert, 278n
 Epictetus, 235, 297n
 Ewald, François, 235
- Fénéon, Félix, 77
 Festus Pompeius, 136
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 114, 228
 Ficino, Marsilio, 32, 276n
 Finlay, J. N., 279n
 Firzralph, Richard, 263
 Flaubert, Gustave, 243
 Foucault, Michel, 220-221, 231-232, 235, 238-239, 299n-301n
 Frege, Gottlob, 4, 6, 70, 213, 279n
 Freud, Sigmund, 167, 193, 196, 262
 Fuchs, Eduard, 153
 Fuld, Werner, 291n
- Gaces Brulé, 297n
 Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 43-44, 56-57, 282n
 Galileo, 65, 75
 Gaunilo, 42-43
 George, Stefan, 81-82, 85, 283n
 Ghazali, 249
 Ginzburg, Carlo, 287n
 Giotto, 141
 Gödel, Kurt, 214
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 59, 79, 83-84, 148-149, 156, 287n, 291n

- Gogol, Nicolai Vasilevich, 243
 Goldschmidt, Victor, 279n, 297n, 301n
 Gombrich, Ernst H., 93, 284n-287n
 Gregory of Rimini, 11
 Guattari, Félix, 300n-301n
 Gundolf, Friedrich, 8r
- Hadot, Pierre, 278n
 Hamacher, Werner, 280n, 298n
 Hartmann, Nicolai, 187
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 255
 Hegel, Gottfried Wilhelm Friedrich, 28,
 44, 63, 109-11, 116-137, 154, 178, 289n-
 291n
 Heidegger, Martin, 4, 18, 28, 44, 56, 63-
 64, 72, 74, 82, 106, 116-137, 139, 145,
 185-204, 208, 214, 222, 225, 239, 260,
 276n, 280n, 286n, 288n, 290n, 295n-
 299n
 Heraclitus, 117-118
 Hering, Ewald, 93
 Hitler, Adolf, 81
 Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, 1, 275n
 Hölderlin, Friedrich, 38, 113-115, 118, 204,
 243, 288n-289n
 Homer, 181
 Hurwitz, Sigmund, 173
 Husserl, Edmund, 28, 186, 188-190, 225,
 227, 239, 279n
- Ibn Arabi, 247, 253
 Idel, Moshe, 165, 246
 Isidore of Seville, 49, 214, 243, 278n,
 281n
- Jakobson, Roman, 21, 280n
 Jarry, Alfred, 225
 Jaspers, Karl, 185, 295n
 Jaworski, Philippe, 19, 255, 280n
 Jean de Meun, 297n
 Jesi, Furio, 168, 294n
 John, St., 40
 John Duns Scotus, 262-263
 John of Salisbury, 278n
 John Scotus Eriugena, 252
- Jolivet, Jean, 278n
 Jung, Carl Gustav, 286n
- Kafka, Franz, 80, 82, 105, 149, 153-154,
 160, 169, 171-174, 243, 257, 270, 280n
 Kant, Immanuel, 28, 56, 102, 113, 121,
 208, 214, 222, 225, 227, 233, 239
 Karsten, Herman Thomas, 27
 Kemp, W., 103
 Kerényi, Karl, 100
 Klausner, Joseph, 166-167, 294n
 Klee, Paul, 139-142, 144
 Klein, Robert, 284n
 Kleist, Heinrich von, 77-78, 80, 260
 Koepps, W., 185, 295n
 Kojève, Alexandre, 63
 Kommerell, Max, 22, 77-85, 283n
 Kraus, Karl, 92, 141-142, 148-150, 152
 Kripke, Saul, 70-71
- Lacan, Jacques, 75
 Lacis, Asja, 140
 Lamprecht, Karl, 91
 Lehmann, K., 295n
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 74, 209,
 233, 257-259, 261, 263, 265-266, 302n
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 99-100, 102, 285n,
 287n
 Levinas, Emmanuel, 227, 239, 300n
 Libera, Alain de, 279n
 Locke, John, 244
 Lohmann, Johannes, 119
 Löwith, Karl, 185, 208, 222, 295n
 Lütti, Walter, 259
 Luther, Martin, 173
- Maimonides, 252
 Maine de Biran, Pierre, 228, 230, 301n
 Mallarmé, Stéphane, 43
 Marx, Karl, 56, 125, 154, 196
 Masméjan, J. H., 222
 Mates, Benson, 277n-278n
 Matternklott, Gert, 283n
 Matthew, St., 167
 Mauss, Marcel, 100

- Meiners, Christoph, 27
 Meinong, Alexius von, 11-13, 279n
 Melville, Herman, 19-21, 243-271, 302n
 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 227
 Mesnil, Jacques, 285n
 Meuli, Karl, 136
 Michelangelo (Michelangelo Buonarroti), 99
 Milner, Jean-Claude, 3-4, 62-76, 213, 275n-276n, 282n-283n, 299n
 Mooney, James, 91
 Moses Cordovero, 164, 294n
 Moses of Leon, 206, 291n
 Mowinckel, Siegmund, 166, 168, 294n
 Mussolini, Benito, 95

 Nachmanides, 164
 Nancy, Jean-Luc, 113, 162, 204, 288n
 Nicholas of Cusa, 110, 194, 288n
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 83, 96-98, 155, 198, 225, 239, 267-268, 286n, 302n
 Nuchelmans, Gabriel, 278n

 Panofsky, Erwin, 98-99, 141, 285n, 287n
 Parnet, Claire, 300n
 Pascal, Blaise, 185-186
 Pascoli, Giovanni, 83
 Pasquali, Giorgio, 30, 91, 284n-285n
 Paul, Jean (Johann Paul Friedrich Richter), 79, 83
 Paul, St., 39-40, 126, 167, 269-270
 Pinborg, Jan, 277n
 Pinhas of Koretz, Rabbi, 165, 294n
 Plato, 1, 5-10, 21, 27-38, 46-47, 58-59, 62, 68-69, 71, 105-109, 111, 127, 141, 149, 194, 217-218, 227, 275n-276n, 281n, 288n, 297n
 Plotinus, 107, 120, 217, 288n, 299n
 Plutarch, 141
 Pöggeler, Otto, 189, 295n
 Preuss, Konrad Theodor, 149
 Proclus, 13, 111-113, 279n, 288n
 Proust, Marcel, 22, 80, 82-83, 158

 Puder, M., 208, 222
 Pyrrho, 256

 Reach, K., 4, 69, 213, 276n, 283n
 Rijk, E. M. de, 278n
 Rilke, Rainer Maria, 83, 204
 Rimbaud, Arthur, 260
 Rivière, Jacques, 77
 Roscelin, 42
 Rosenzweig, Franz, 55
 Rouilhan, Philippe de, 213, 276n, 299n
 Russell, Bertrand, 12, 214, 279n
 Ruyer, Raymond, 233

 Sapir, Edward, 100
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 188-190, 224-225
 Sassetti, Francesco, 97
 Saussure, Ferdinand de, 6, 76, 101, 103
 Saxl, Fritz, 284n-285n, 287n
 Scheler, Max, 186-187
 Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph, 128, 194, 199
 Schlegel, Friedrich, 156
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 43, 96
 Schmitt, Carl, 112, 161-162, 293n
 Scholem, Gershom, 57, 81, 138-147, 149, 153, 163-166, 169-171, 173, 245, 282n, 291n-294n
 Schubert, Andreas, 278n-279n
 Semon, Richard, 93-94
 Seneca, 10, 277n
 Sextus Empiricus, 10, 20, 256-257, 278n, 280n, 302n
 Shabbatai Zevi, 167
 Sinclair, Isaak von, 114-115, 289n
 Socrates, 148
 Sophocles, 38, 243
 Souilhé, Joseph, 7, 32
 Spinoza, Baruch, 1, 35, 120, 209, 226-227, 234, 236-237, 239, 297n, 301n
 Spitzer, Leo, 92-93, 100, 285n-286n
 Stauffenberg, Claus von, 82
 Strauss, Leo, 161

- Tarski, Alfred, 214
Themistius, 181
Traube, Ludwig, 92, 285n
Twardowski, K., 279n

Usener, Hermann, 91, 100

Vajda, Georges, 29311
Valentin, Karl, 255
Valéry, Paul, 60, 100, 287n
Valla, Lorenzo, 265
Varro, 3, 49-50, 120, 275n, 278n, 281n
Vignoli, Tiro, 91, 284n
Villon, François, 297n

Walser, Robert, 82, 243, 259-260
Warburg, Aby, 83-84, 89-103, 284n-287n
Weinberg, Kurt, 172, 294n
William of Ockham, 208
Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, 97
Wind, Edgar, 287n
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 3-4, 14, 40-41, 43, 46, 50, 68-69, 108, 177, 261, 264, 275n, 281n, 288n, 299n
Wolff, Christian, 258, 262
Wolfson, Harry Austryn, 236-237, 30111
Wolters, Friedrich, 81-82
Wyneken, Gustav, 81

Yates, Frances, 286n
Young-Bruehl, Elisabeth, 295n

Zamenhof, Ludwig, 55

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Agamben, Giorgio, 1942–

Potentialities : collected essays in philosophy / Giorgio Agamben ; edited and translated with an introduction by Daniel Heller-Roazen

p. cm. — (Meridian: crossing aesthetics)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8047-3277-9 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-8047-3278-7 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Aesthetics, Modern—20th century. 2. Language and languages—Philosophy. 3. History—Philosophy. I. Heller-Roazen, Daniel. II. Title. III. Meridian (Stanford, Calif.)

BH201.A395 1999

195—dc21

99-039449

☞ This book is printed on acid-free, archival-quality paper.

●riginal printing 1999

Last figure below indicates year of this printing:

08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 00 99

Typeset by Robert C. Ehle in 9/11 Adobe Garamond