

Giustino De Michele

Nature and Idiom

Note on the Genealogy of Some of the Underlying Options of Jacques Derrida's Seminars (between Heidegger and Nietzsche)^{1*}

What does “world” mean? What does “*bêtise*” mean?

These two semantic questions, raised by Derrida in *The Beast and the Sovereign*, intersect one of the main motives of this seminar. Namely, the concern for the limit between bestiality and sovereignty, between the proper of man and the improper, as it were, of the beast. This limit is traditionally determined as one between different modalities of expression. This is so if one holds the experience of language to be exemplarily representative of experience in general. Thus, the limit between beast and sovereign is a limit between modalities of experience: modalities of the being there of what is there, modalities according to which what is given gives itself.

Such is a limit, or a contrast, between configurations of nature.

Such contrast opposes Heidegger to Derrida. Their respective conceptions of expression – “poetry” and “literature”, if one wants – confront one another as conceptions of nature. Of this contrast, thanks to the publication of earlier Derrida's seminars (*La question de l'Être et l'Histoire*, and especially *La vie la mort*)², it is possible to appreciate the persistence and the genealogy in the latter's work. In what follows we will limit our task to situating and sketching out the emergence of it in Derrida's last seminar.

I.

The second year of *The Beast and the Sovereign* begins with the staging of the said contrast. The matter in question is the world. What does “world” mean?

For Heidegger this notion must be determined starting from three famous theses: the stone is wordless (*weltlos*). The animal is poor in world (*weltarm*). Man is word-forming (*weltbildend*). In this

1 * <https://doi.org/10.24361/Performa.2020.12.3>

2 Jacques Derrida: *Heidegger. La question de l'Être et l'Histoire*, séminaire 1964-65, Paris, Galilée, 2013; id.: *La vie la mort*, séminaire 1975-76, Paris, Seuil, 2019.

context, the world is defined as “the manifestness (*Offenbarkeit*) of beings as such in their entirety”³.

According to Heidegger, man has a world. Such world is not an objective totality, a collection of objects. It is rather the process or the dynamic structure of an upspring *as* world. It is, or is traversed by the thrust that produces it, that pushes it forward. This thrust, this springing *is physis*. Nature⁴.

And this springing or growing is pushed by the force, by the “predominance” that Heidegger names *Walten*. *Walten* is the force of the growing which defines *physis*. Or, *physis* is the *Walten* of everything: of the world, of everything that is, springing *as such* in its entirety⁵. Therefore man, the *Dasein* that has the world, does not have it because he owns it, but because, in his turn, is traversed by such growing or springing *of* the world. Traversed by this *forming* spring which defines him, accordingly, as *weltbildend*. It is as if – not in the stone, not in the animal, but – in the *Dasein* which can affect itself by virtue of it, the *Walten* could affect itself. Or even recognise itself. This auto-affection is the exposition, the taking place of the emergence of something *as such* in that domain in which something *can* emerge as such: that is, not as an object, but as being⁶. The domain, the residence of this nostalgic auto-affection is *logos*: the thinking word. Poetry, *Dichtung*.

“There is no world”. “We are *weltlos*”⁷. With three words Derrida annihilates this meditation. Such formulations by Derrida refer on the one side to another conception of poetry, of the poem, such he had put forward in *Béliers*, writing after Paul Celan. But on the other side, in the context of the seminar, they answer the following question: “what do beasts and men have in common?”⁸ In common, says Derrida, all living beings have a world, but under the form of not having a world. All the living: this means that “no animal or human individual inhabits the same world as another”. Nor the same world as itself, in fact, since the world is lacking. The finite modality of life, that Derrida calls *survie*, does not have a world. It is world-less or world-lacking. *Survie* is “*en mal de monde*”.

Derrida’s contrast to Heidegger’s perspective on nature and on the force that animates it is quite unsurprising: such force is at odds with the weak force of the trace, the force of production and tradition

of a world that arrives to being, or to itself, only while effacing itself, while disseminating, while forget-

3 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, volume II, seminar 2002-03, trans. Geoffrey Bennington, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 2010, 219; see Jacques Derrida: *Séminaire. La bête et le souverain*, volume II, 2002-03, Paris, Galilée, 2009, 306: “la manifestété (*Offenbarkeit*) de l’étant en tant que tel en son entier”.

4 “Remember that for Heidegger [...] *physis* is not yet objective nature but the whole of the originary world in its appearing and in its originary growing [*poussée originnaire*]”, Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 12.

5 “*Walten* is dominant, governing power, as self-formed sovereignty, as autonomous, autarcic [sic] force, commanding and forming itself, of the totality of beings, beings in their entirety, everything that is. *Physis* is the *Walten* of everything, which depends, as *Walten*, only on itself, which forms itself sovereignly, as power, receiving its form and its image [reference to the *Bilden*, the *Weltbilden* which is the proper to man], its figure of domination, from itself” (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 39), *ibid.* “Heidegger’s definition of *logos* will always depend tightly on this thinking of *Walten*” (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 42); as well as the “enigmatic [value of] proximity that [thus] becomes the principle of orientation of thought” (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 63).

6 “*Dasein* is defined by the drive to questioning, and by a questioning that goes to the heart of the whole of beings as such, to the heart of the whole, of the totality of what is, and therefore of the world” (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 107).

7 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 9.

8 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 8.

ting itself. By contrary the *Walten*, the spring of growing nature, is an “originarily sovereign power”⁹. Of course, for Heidegger this is not the force of an imperturbable essence, but of a conflict, of *polemos*. But, of a *polemos* as *logos*: a *union* in conflict. This force holds the conflict together. On this force depend Heidegger’s conception of the world, that of ontological difference, the privilege accorded to the value of gathering and of fidelity in memory, a conception of *logos* and therefore the characteristics or faculties that define the proper of *Dasein*: i.e. the access to the essence of beings and to death *as such*. What the animal is deprived of, being poor in world, is this opening, this gathering breaching that the *Walten* brings forward. This springing force that holds together the opening by which essence manifests does not traverse the beast. Which is therefore stupefied, bored in its dumbness. Encircled, dominated by the circuits of its vital programs. By the glass cage of behaviour.

In the last sessions of his seminar Derrida pursues a reading of these motives which inquires language as the place where the *Walten* manifests. From the offspring, *prayer* is at stake¹⁰. Derrida moves off from a passage of Heidegger’s seminar on *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, where the latter quotes Aristotle’s *On Interpretation* and the classical distinction between apophantic and non-apophantic *logos*. Apophantic *logos* is a kind of discourse or proposition that can be true or false and which *shows*, exposes, says Heidegger, what is such as it is. Instead, a non-apophantic *logos*, such as prayer, cannot be true or false.

Heidegger excludes bluntly prayer from the core of his argument. This exclusion is very troublesome for Derrida, according to whom every question and affirmation, every search for or exposure of the essence *presupposes* a performativity that precedes the opposition of true and false as well as any intentionality, a performativity not defined by truth, one that does not mean anything, *qui ne veut rien dire*.

Would prayer be animal?

For Heidegger this is not the case. The animal is *alogon*. It cannot mean or signify anything. Instead any *logos*, apophantic or not, insofar as it is signifying (*sémantikos*) is founded on convention (*synthéké*). Signifying means “bringing together”: such faculty depends on a power of gathering which produces the signifier and the signified altogether, which permits the thinking exposition of a signification. Heidegger translates Aristotle’s *synthéké* into his *als-Struktur*: the possibility to access being as such. Since the beast is incapable to signify conventionally, it cannot “transcend”, says Heidegger, the torpor in which it is inhibited¹¹. More: the beast has no access to the shared transcendence which is a primary feature of the *syn-thetic* nature of *logos*. The *logos* puts together into the opening in which being manifests; and *therefore* it produces discourse. As a corollary, if a beast is not political this is so on an ontological basis. A beast is not properly put together (with others) by *logos*.

9 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 39.

10 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 202.

11 “The animal does not transcend, as does *Dasein*, and the movement of transcendence is indeed that on the basis of which one has a world as totality of beings as such” (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 226).

At the end of Heidegger's reinterpretation of Aristotle one thing rests assured. The beast cannot signify, it has no *logos* whatsoever, and therefore "it can neither speak, nor pray, nor lie"¹². Nevertheless, prayer holds an instable position here: it is the middle term of a shifting or limping analogy¹³ between animal and man. Not animal, it is not properly the proper of man. Heidegger excludes prayer from his consideration since prayer is not concerned by true and false, and most of all by *aletheia*: by truth as un-veiling, by the withdrawal from dissimulation (*Entbergen*) that takes place in or with apophantic *logos*. Derrida insists on this exclusion of prayer as opposed to the apophantic specificity: to withdraw from concealment, this is a faculty, a power, and demands a force. For Heidegger this force is force itself, *Walten* as the power in language to harbour the exposure of beings as such. To access beings as such means to withdraw them from an instrumental, objectal condition and to bring them forward in their relation to being. *Walten* is precisely what *produces* the conciliation in difference (*Austrag*) between being and beings: "c'est dans l'Austrag que ça waltet"¹⁴, muses Derrida. *Walten* is the force that holds together and exposes ontological difference. At the same time, it is in Poetry that it *waltet*. *Walten* is the force of the production of truth in Poetry¹⁵. And Poetry harbours being.

This tautology expresses all of Heidegger's "logocentrism". Logocentrism is here a model of performativity, a thought or hope concerning the possibility of performativity which is one with a conception of *physis* – and *a fortiori* of history.

Let us get back to the prayer. Is it animal? "No doubt".

According to Derrida one could not deny that beasts do have access to some kind of convention, of "synthesis". And on the other hand his criticism of logocentrism implies that man does *not* access things as such. There is no "as such" but perspective, impure. Prayer is exemplary in this respect: a) it is neither true nor false, and properly speaking it does not *signify* anything; b) it is impossible to purify the semantic discourse from the pragmatic layer to which it belongs; c) it is not foreclosed to beasts. This passage of Derrida's is peculiar: in several occasions he assimilates prayer to demand for forgiveness. Pardon, repenting, guilty exposition, *modesty*: Derrida does not deny such movements to beasts¹⁶. "There is, no

12 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 229.

13 We thus interpret what in *De l'esprit*, Paris, Galilée, 1987, 81, Derrida defines as the "*analogie décalée*" between *Dasein*'s and animal's privations, between Heidegger's *Entbehnung* and *Privation*. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby render the expression into "discrepant analogy" (*Of Spirit*, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1989, 51). Leonard Lawlor translates it into "staggered analogy" (*This Is Not Sufficient*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2007, *passim*).

14 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 256.

15 "The *als*, the *als-Struktur* that distinguishes man from the animal is thus indeed what the violence of *Walten* makes possible. And one will not be surprised to recognize this same violence in the *Gewalttätigkeit des dichterischen Sagens*, in the violence of poetic saying, *des denkerischen Entwurfs*, the project of thinking, the thinking project, *des bauenden Bildens*, the edifying image (and the *Weltbilden* of the world for man, as man himself, unlike for the animal, is also a *Bilden*), and finally, what I would have liked to analyze more closely here of *des staatschaffenden Handelns*, the action that creates states" (Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 289, commenting on Heidegger's *Introduction to Metaphysics*).

16 See Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 231, editors' note: Derrida refers to the 1st, 4th, 8th sessions of his EHESS 1997-98 seminar *Le Parjure et le Pardon*, published by the Éditions du Seuil in November 2019. See also *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, New York, Fordham University Press, 2008, 60.

doubt, an animal thank you or mercy”, “*Il y a sans doute un ‘mercy’ de la bête*”¹⁷.

Precisely while suggesting that a beastly language of pardon and repenting exists¹⁸, Derrida associates forgiveness and *Zusage*. That is, according to Derrida’s critical interpretation, to Heidegger’s notion of a passive acquiescence: a passive performance that one cannot but consent to when entering the realm of language, of signification. A passive affirmation preceding every question. So there is animal pardon, belonging to the order of *Zusage*. And it is radically different from the sovereign “pardon” that the *Walten* gives (*Walten vergibt*) when it produces the issue or the conciliation (*Austrag*) of ontological difference¹⁹.

So for Derrida this non-apophantic *logos* or layer of *logos* opens a breach: it entails another model of performativity, and another conception of *physis*.

II.

Derrida exposes the elements of such conception in the very last session of the seminar.

For finite living beings there is no world, “*il n’y a pas de monde*”:

“radical dissemination [without a common semantic horizon], i.e. the absence of a common world, the irremediable solitude without salvation of the living being, depends first on the absence without recourse of any world, i.e. of any common meaning of the word ‘world’, in sum of any common meaning at all. This can, I admit, look like a lot of apocalyptic statements, but it is also the very tissue, the unwoven tissue [*tissu sans tissage*], the ever unsewn and torn tissue of our most constant and quotidian

17 Jacques Derrida: “Pardonner: l’impardonnable et l’imprescriptible” (1997), in Marie-Louise Mallet and Ginette Michaud (eds.): *Jacques Derrida*, Paris, L’Herne, 2004, 558. See Jacques Derrida: “To Forgive: The Unforgivable and the Imprescriptible”, trans. Elizabeth Rottenberg, in John D. Caputo, Mark Dooley, Michael J. Scanlon (eds.): *Questioning God*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2001, 47-8: “we know that it would be very imprudent to deny all animality access to forms of sociality in which guilt, and therefore procedures of reparation, even of mercy – begged or granted – are implicated in a very differentiated way. There is no doubt an animal thank you or mercy. You know that certain animals are just as capable of manifesting what can be interpreted as an act of war, an aggressive accusation, as they are capable of manifesting guilt, shame, discomfort, regret, anxiety in the face of punishment, and so forth. I am sure you have seen shameful animals, animals giving all the signs of ‘feeling guilty’, thus of remorse and regret, and animals fearing judgment or punishment, animals hiding or exposing themselves to reproach or chastisement. One also knows that in the often-overloaded symbolism of combat or war, of fights between animals, well, that movements and even rites of reconciliation, of the interruption of hostility, of peace, even of mercy, of mercy begged and granted, are possible. The moment an animal is, I would say, at the mercy of another, it can admit to being defeated and make signs that put it at the mercy of the other who then sovereignly grants it its life unharmed as a sign of peace. Certain animals make war and peace. Not all, not always, but neither do men. So, without confusing everything and without erasing all sorts of ruptures that arise with the articulation of a verbal language, one cannot deny this possibility, even this necessity of extra-verbal forgiveness, even un-human [*anhumain*] forgiveness”.

18 See Frans De Waal, *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1989.

19 See *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 254–6 and 282–3, where Derrida sketches a difficult reading of *Walten* “in” *Austrag*. Derrida comments upon the following passage from Martin Heidegger: *Identität und Differenz*, Pfullingen, Verlag Günther Neske, 1957, 63: “*Im Austrag waltet Lichtung des sich verhüllend Verschließenden, welches Walten das Aus- und Zueinander von Überkommnis und Ankunft vergibt*”. Trans. Joan Stambaugh, *Identity and Difference*, New York, Harper & Row, 1969, 65: “Within this perdurance there prevails a dearing of what veils and closes itself off – and this its prevalence bestows the being apart, and the being toward each other, of overwhelming and arrival”.

experience”²⁰.

This thesis is ontological as well as semantic: there is no reference to “world”.

For this radical solipsism there is neither world, nor “world”: the unities of language and of the word are shattered. Every being, either a signified or a signifier, is not only idiomatic, radically singular, but also inconsistent in its being one. Idiom is neither semantic nor polysemous, but disseminated. We are facing a sort of radical Cratylism, which is the only coherent perspective for the mobilism of *différance*. We, (“we”, so as to speak) share “no intelligible language”, no contract or *synthéké*, but only “an agreement inherited over millennia between living beings who are more or less anguished by illness, death and war...” Of course, one can confer a shared sense to the word and experience named “world”, but “there seems to be in this refined utilitarian nominalism nothing more than an animal ruse of life, a life common to the beast and the sovereign”²¹.

The world is an idea in the Kantian sense, a fiction: it is as if (*comme si, als ob*) there were a world, some world. This fiction is healthy, even necessary, but pure, without alibi, without truth. *The sense (of the world) is an animal ruse of life.*

Thus Derrida reinscribes Kant’s teleologism and regulative idealism “in the service of a Nietzschean-type perspective and perspectivism”²². Derrida says to evoke this perspectivism “at least by analogy, for the moment”. But in the sixth session of the first year of the seminar he had embraced this perspective in a resolute fashion. In this context the French idiom “*bêtise*” undergoes the same semantic analysis as “world”, and turns out as well as not having a referent. In fact, as we have seen, such lack of reference is generalized. Derrida exposes this condition, characterising significance in general, human and beastly alike, by designating his use of his language (his French, his *bêtise*); better still, by letting this use be designated by itself. The primacy of pragmatics on semantics, of contextual historicity and of the living investment in signifying production *over* essence, sense, substance – this primacy is not proper to man. Life, as ruse, expresses itself in context: “the difference [here the one among different nuances of *bêtise*] can be felt and marked only in the concrete, situated, contextualized implementation, in the idiom of each situation and each individual”²³. And since the context is impossible to saturate, this produces “a *shibboleth* effect” that “operates within”, à l’intérieur of language: a constitutive untranslatability. As Derrida says in *Aporias*, “*il y va d’un certain pas*”: of the step and pace, of the style “of the strolling man or animal” de “*l’homme ou de l’animal marchant*”²⁴.

We share no “intelligible” language: this means that the ruse of life does not run through apop-

20 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 266.

21 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 267.

22 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. II, 270.

23 Jacques Derrida, *The Beast and the Sovereign*, volume I, seminar 2001-02, trans. Geoffrey Bennington, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 2009, 170.

24 Jacques Derrida: *Aporias*, trans. Thomas Dutoit, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1993, 9 (trans. mod.); see Jacques Derrida: *Apories*, Paris, Galilée, 1993, 27.

hantic *logos*, but rather, as it were, through apophatic resources²⁵; and that these *feign, fashion* the former, such as a regulative ideal. This does not mean that silence will take us there where voice cannot: to essence. Rather, that some gesturality, that some *idiotic* pragmatics inhabits every voice and speech. This apophasis is not a *via negativa*, a path beyond finite conditions, but one that winds up *at* these conditions. And since these are what impedes – or disproves – access to essence, this access simply proves impossible, or the quest for it senseless. But the path that unfolds upon them is *not* negative. Rather affirmative: of finitude, contextuality, materiality, etc.

III.

It is by working on the meanings of “*bêtise*”, and on the title of his seminar, that Derrida exposes the genealogy of this conception. Such is an exposition which is always and only affirmed “in action”, so to speak: producing itself in the act of its own description. Let us recall, like Derrida does, the “*last criterion*” of his operation: “to keep bringing us back to this first site of decision as to the immense question of the living” and “of the relation between what is proper to the so-called animal living being and what is proper to the so-called human living being, namely the experience of language, sign, or speech, of manifestation and comprehension, interpretation, etc.”²⁶.

What does “*bêtise*” mean?

Let us have Derrida reel off for us some of the meanings of this vocabulary entry.

a) *Bêtise* maybe “the proper to man, [...] the proper appropriating itself, the proper *positing* itself, the proper appropriated to itself, *autoposited*, the appropriation or the fantasy of the proper, wherever it comes about”²⁷. In this description we recognise the figure, sketched in the seminar, of the virile fetish of erection. But also the definition of the *Walten* and of every sovereign mastery.

b) But *bêtise* is not proper to man, not limited to it. It comes about *everywhere*. Therefore:

“at bottom what is irreducibly *bête* [...] is life pure and simple, which is both infinitely *bête* and cunning [*rusée*]: it is the living in life itself which outplays the opposition between *bêtise* and its supposed contrary, both in what is called man and in what is called the animal. Nietzsche is doubtless one of the most eloquent witnesses on this theme”²⁸.

Life, as concerns every living being, is *bête*. Meaning, sense, sovereignty, the proper, are its ruse.

c) Therefore, the use of every lexicon and first of all of *bêtise* “is not constative but performative”, and “depends upon an incalculable number of conditions that makes it impossible to master such per-

25 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 168.

26 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 176.

27 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 139.

28 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 176.

formative”. By using a phenomenological distinction which he had highlighted forty years before, in his introduction to Husserl’s *Origin of Geometry*, Derrida concludes that the lexicon of *bêtise* – which is to say the lexicon of life – is composed by bound or enchained significations. This is so because no “free, detached, unbound” ideality, no transcendent rule exists which would permit to saturate the incalculable context of the evaluations upon which every *logos* dwells²⁹.

d) *Bêtise* and its lexicon, then, are not “free”: they do not respond properly or freely. They are also, consequently, intimately *reactional*:

“A meaning the ideality of which is bound determines a language that participates as much in reaction [...] as in response. If meaning remains linked to a determinate situation, a war-like or polemical pragmatics, for example, an engagement and a vital investment (of whatever nature: libidinal, hunting, or seductive), to a relation of forces, then the distinction between reaction and response loses its rigor and decidability”³⁰.

e) *Bêtise*, the beast together with its lexicon are always strategically situated, chained, grabbed in the perspective of a vital investment, of an *orexis* and of its force. But this is not the sovereign force of *Walten*. It is always a differential force, resulting from the integration of a differential element which has no unity nor totality: from a will to power (or simply from some *puissance*). Such a conception of force is also implied by the logic of the unconscious and by the hypothesis of “drives to power that are essentially divisible”³¹.

“If one does not wish to invoke Freud’s authority and discursivity, it suffices to admit that the living being is divisible and constituted by a multiplicity of agencies, forces and intensities that are sometimes in tension or even in contradiction” (181), and which “is bound to localize – or localize itself within – different agencies, of which some resist others, oppress or suppress others, trying to implement and have what we shall call, so as to not forget La Fontaine, the reason of the strongest prevail”³².

What is here implied is a *physiology* of sovereignty founded on dissimulation, on a fictional and auto-fictional power, on a fabulous performativity which also informs the parade of the majestic erection of the sovereign, as well as his legitimating tropes.

f) *Bêtise* is also the origin of the poetical:

“the fact that the context (the pragmatic situation) determines in such a constraining fashion each time the meaning of the word *bête* or *bêtise* means that the privilege of the idiom, which can be the privilege of poetry, [...] the privilege of the unique event of lan-

29 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 177–178.

30 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 179.

31 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 291.

32 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 183.

guage that one calls for example poetic invention – this doesn't merely mean the poem, it also means a certain contamination by what we attribute to so-called reactive or reactional animality"³³.

The poem is animal. At least, not otherwise than animal or bestial.

By the example of expression, and of a presently enacted expression, *bêtise*, another conception of nature and of idiom is therefore sketched. Between or *entre* the sovereign and the beast. Heidegger proposed a perspective that tied together: 1) *logos*, 2) *Walten*, 3) *Dasein*. Derrida responds with a perspective that ties together: 1) a bound idiom, one that does not mean anything; 2) a physiology of a will to power or of a drive for domination that designate their own failure or impasse while applying to themselves; 3) the *bestial ruse* of finite living beings.

INDEX

John D. CAPUTO, Mark DOOLEY, Michael J. SCANLON (eds.): *Questioning God*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvz937hx>

Jacques DERRIDA: *Heidegger. La question de l'Être et l'Histoire*. Séminaire 1964-65. Paris, Galilée, 2013.

Jacques DERRIDA : *La vie la mort*. Séminaire 1975-76. Paris, Seuil, 2019.

Jacques DERRIDA: *La bête et le souverain*. Séminaire 2002-03. Vol. I-II. Edition établie par Michel Lisse, Marie-Louise Mallet et Ginette Michaud. Paris, Galilée, 2008, 2010.

Jacques DERRIDA: *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Volume II. Seminar 2002-03. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Jacques DERRIDA: *Le Parjure et le Pardon*. Séminaire 1997-98. Paris, Editions du Seuil, 2019.

Jacques DERRIDA: Pardonner: l'impardonnable et l'imprescriptible (1997). In Marie-Louise Mallet and Ginette Michaud (eds.): *Jacques Derrida*, Paris, L'Herne, 2004.

Jacques DERRIDA: To Forgive: The Unforgivable and the Imprescriptible. Trans. Elizabeth Rottenberg. In: John D. Caputo, Mark Dooley, Michael J. Scanlon (eds.): *Questioning God*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvz937hx.5>

Jacques DERRIDA: *Apories*, Paris, Galilée, 1993.

Jacques DERRIDA: *Aporias*. Trans. Thomas Dutoit. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1993.

Jacques Derrida: *Of Spirit*. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

33 Jacques Derrida: *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. I, 337.

Jacques DERRIDA: *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. New York, Fordham University Press, 2008.

Martin HEIDEGGER: *Identität und Differenz*. Pfullingen, Verlag Günther Neske, 1957.

Martin HEIDEGGER: *Identity and Difference*. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. New York, Harper & Row, 1969.

Leonard LAWLOR: *This Is Not Sufficient*. New York, Columbia University Press, 2007.

Marie-Louise MALLET and Ginette MICHAUD (eds.): *Jacques Derrida*, Paris, L'Herne, 2004.

Frans De WAAL: *Peacemaking Among Primates*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1989.