Eden Foreclosed? Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy (Freud and Buber) on Dreaming and Identification [1]

Bettina Bergo, Université de Montréal

Introductory Remarks: the Jewish People does not Dream

This paper takes up an argument advanced by Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy to the effect that "the Jewish people does not dream."[2] Coming from two non-Jewish philosophers and immediately implying a psychological intuition, we would be justified in wondering what such a claim could possibly mean. Is not much of Jewish literature, from the miraculous feats of the Marahal of Prague to the Bal Shem Tov, a literature of dreams? Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy would likely acknowledge this; however, they are working at a different level. They are examining a characteristic of Jewish religious life from the point of view of the creation of a "we" and the implications it has for the life and psyche of the Jewish person. Thus, if dreaming and phantasy exemplify what psychoanalysis called "identification"— an individual and social phenomenon ingredient in the formation of the self, and one that bedeviled Freud as he traced its origins in culture— and if the first identification requires a true "other" (that Freud identified with the Father),[3] then the argument follows that Jews do not "dream." That is, they do not dream–identify, because the "Father" with whom they would identify is unfigurable.

> [W]e understand this expression on two levels: 1. This people does not identify with the Father in the oneiric mode, or in the mode of an immediate adhesion to the *figure* (or phantasm, or phantom) of the Father. [Nevertheless], if it is the people and the religion of the Father, then [this must be] in an *other* sense, call it as "vigil" and as "vigilant". 2. This people— or its "analysis"—escapes the royal road of psychoanalysis (i.e. that of dreams) up to a certain point. It requires, as Freud's *Moses* put it, importing

(*Eintragung*) the concept of the unconscious into collective psychology and, consequently, a re-thinking of that concept (PJNRP, 194; 59).[4]

I propose to explore the meaning of identification in light of foundation myths and with regard to what could be called the Jewish innovation, i.e., the foreclosure on representation. Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy understand "foreclosure" informally, as an act of symbolic exclusion. Unlike Lacan's famous *forclusion*, they do not insist that what is shut out never reaches consciousness.[5] Instead, they emphasize that foreclosure reorganizes what is imaginable for a given community and that this in turn influences both ritual and memory. Moreover, the foreclosure of representation has surprising effects on the way we envision our identity, as I will show by reading Martin Buber on Genesis 3 (the tree of knowledge).[6] Throughout, I will be comparing Buber's reading with Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy's arguments concerning mythic identifications. As a part of their larger project, which rethinks the unconscious as affectivity independently of positive or formal representations, Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy explore the conjoined origins of psychic and social structures in their work *L'inconscient est destructuré comme un affect* [The Unconscious is de-structured like an Affect].

Why would a culture foreclose identifications? What is it about religious life that engages identification in ways potentially dangerous to individuals and the community itself? Freud argued that proto-laws like taboos mirror psychic functions like foreclosures, whether these bear on representations, bodies or on symbolic territories.[7] As Lévi-Strauss discovered, what holds these exclusions together under a common concept is that they operate like the taboo on incest. That is, a negative normativity always goes together with a positive "performativity". Negatively, the so-called foreclosure of representation prevents identification with "fathers" understood as powers personified in oneiric images or ritual

practices entailing ecstatic fusion.[8] Of course, such identifications extend from cults of the ancestors to animism, and hero-god myths. At the aesthetic level, it is clearly present in art and poetry.

Paradoxically, foreclosures on representation may actually motivate attempts at alternate forms of representation.[9] That is, in response to the pressure of foreclosure, alternative representations may actually escape *mimetic* gestures, such as those that imitate or incarnate the "ancestor" or the "god", etc. These would then be situated at a different level, that of metaphors or laws (cf. Exodus 3: 4-6 since, arguably, in the impossibility of imitation of the God, something like his law or his teaching becomes the central existential concern). There would thus be mimetic and differential representations. The latter does the work of what Jacques Derrida called the "trace" and I am here calling "differential representation" those narrative operations by which a trace (recounted or drawn) opens up any metaphoric "surface" on which it is set, by introducing a simple difference (Genesis 1: 4-7). Once introduced, this difference alters the surface or the narrative context, and with it the subject perceiving it understands that the context and the "author" of the trace cannot be reduced to each other.[10] As we will see, the foreclosure on dreaming, explored by Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, is wonderfully illustrated by Buber's reading of Genesis 3, wherein eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil—and with it Adam and Eve's expulsion from the Garden—exemplifies both the foreclosure of identification and the introduction of a differentiating trace. Buber's reading bears out Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy's claim that the Jewish innovation was to introduce a hermeneutic doubling (with the voice of the narrator and its occasional irony, for example)into the narratives of its myths, creating a religion largely devoid of ancestor cults, animism, ecstatic fusion, and semi-divine heroes (OB, 15; BGB 611).

Viewed from without, Judaism—almost an anti-religion—forecloses identification with fathers in the mode of phantasy, which is his primary mode. This means that, in the culture and thinking structured by the Torah and the Talmud, a limit inaugurates a self-conscious human dimension. The limit separates humanity as a whole from divinity, despite eventual communication, trials or gifts. Moreover, this limit, sketched clearly in the myth of the Garden, establishes mortality—as *de facto* death and as separation from God at the heart of Judaism as its symbolic institution of the community.

While this limit may not be unique to Jewish monotheism, it runs through the rabbinic reception of the Torah. Some historical interpretations have argued that this separation made Jewish cultural and religious survival possible.[11] Be that as it may, the limit breaks with religions (whether polytheistic or henotheistic) in which gods are conceived on a human model, where ancestors influence community decisions, and humans accede to divinity by rites, deeds, or upon the death of heroes. In the Jewish beginning, then, is a limit. The limit sets the activity of separation in motion and opens to an ordered creation of new combinations, like a cultural geometry. In many biblical narratives, we are clearly confronted with practical and conceptual limits on phantasied identifications of different sorts, the same identifications by which Greek tragedy conceived the incipience of the human political community out of human sacrifices that restored peace between the gods and humans, or by concluding the struggle between heroes and *Anankè* or necessity, natural or divine. From the Judaic limit arose a sociality and a politics of a different sort. It was structured neither by mythic nor totemic social identifications. More importantly, it escaped problems arising from conflicting paternal identifications.[12]

Buber's Biblical Humanism

In contrast to "Greek humanism," Martin Buber defined the rebirth of the Jewish community textually, as a "Biblical humanism" (1933, 1941).[13] This rebirth is expressed in a tone redolent of Nietzsche (whom Buber read carefully), as "the rebirth of its normative primal forces." These forces are located in the capacity to hear the paradoxical word of the Jewish Bible, which is paradoxical because it encompasses universality (as the possibility of identification for the nations) *and* particularity (which draws on the resources sustained by the separation and the religious-cultural wealth of historic enactment through ritual). What Buber called the "paradoxical word" is at once transcription, trace, and voice; a speaking-to that is always repetition, which is why one midrash argues the Torah had to exist prior the creation of the world. Biblical humanism is for Buber a calling for Jews. But while Greek humanism has roots in religious and mythical thought, Jewish humanism introduces the additional foreclosure of a transcendence based on the "immediate adhesion to the figure" or representational image of a great Other. This anti-fetishistic strategy makes it appear as if anti-religious.

Buber illustrates what it means to hear the paradoxical word in his reading of Genesis 3 in an essay entitled "The Tree of Knowledge" dating from 1953 (OB, 14-21; BGB, 610-617). There, he rethinks what he called "life forces" in the 1930's but in an exegetical context. In the Garden narrative of Genesis 3, the *original* force that is the will-to-know finds itself definitively limited without in turn engendering reactive forces. Alert to its predictable ability to expand, Buber calls the will-to-know a "human demonism."[14] The great challenge is to disable that will without disabling a love of knowledge or engendering new forces in a reactive will (be that of humans or of Yahweh).

For Buber, the core intuition of the Garden narrative lies in thinking mortality prior to sexuality.[15] The "Tree of Knowledge" stages the meaning of the will-to-know for a finite,

created being. Even in our Garden humans, this will-to-know aims at omniscience, a crucial aspect of our will-to-power. Without urging that we disabuse ourselves of the idea of truth as monolithic, Buber recalls that for created beings, "truth" in its highest instantiation is knowledge of the opposed poles of the world's being. Although translations of the Bible have expressed this as "knowledge of good and evil," we should initially avoid reading normativity into this. For Buber, omniscience means knowledge of worldly binaries like fullness and lack, hope and despair, fusion and dissociation—those mobile elements that form the grammar of myths and a frame for cultural identities.

Buber unfolds his conception of finite truth on the premise that human experience is disjunctive. Forces we unleash, and forces that act upon us, can set us into a position of "yes-saying" *or* into one of "no-saying", whereby we are either open to transcendence-in-separation or distance ourselves from it: "Namely the immutable difference and distance that exists between God and man, irrespective of the primal fact of the latter's 'likeness' to God" (BGB, 613; OB, 18). Buber is not interested in the question of the ontology of sin, or in "the fall of man." Yes-saying "can present itself to the experience and perception of man, while [he is] in the no-position." This would mean to feel and to know oneself separated from the good or from God. But "not [so,] the no in the yes-position" (BGB, 614; OB, 19). Humans realize this "when [man] recognizes a condition in which he finds himself whenever he has transgressed the command of God, as the "evil" and the one he has thereby lost and which…is inaccessible to him, as the good" (BGB, 614; OB, 19). The so-called no and the yes positions are existential and moral, individual and collective. In themselves, they are not exclusive to Judaism.

Knowledge of and movement between the two positions may be historical states, but they are preeminently existential and sapiential, as illustrated by the narrative of Adam and

Eve. Following their expulsion from the Garden, the narrative continues unfolding, only now, as "a process in the world," in human existence (BGB, 614; OB, 19):

> …at this point, the process in the human soul becomes a process in the world. Through the knowledge of oppositeness [*Erkennen der Gegensätzlichkeit*], the opposites which are always latently present in creation break out into actual reality; they become existent…. [The] first humans, as soon as they have eaten of the fruit, 'know' that they are naked…they feel the natural state of unclothedness in which they find themselves to be an ill or an evil…and by this very feeling, they make it so… (BGB, 614; OB, 19, trans. mod.)

The "knowledge" Adam and Eve gained about the binaries that structure existence, understood as processual, is a human knowledge determined by finite time and space, and shaped by the actions we take in regard to our value judgments. In God, Buber argues, these opposites stand together, which shows us their ontological status in light of the divine: "He encompasses them, as He is absolutely superior to them; He has direct intercourse with them [er geht mit ihnen unmittelbar um]" (BGB, 614; OB, 18). This is because so-called "God" is *not* a being in the sense of a creation; perhaps not a being at all. There is no purposive unfolding or "becoming" in Buber's reading of the Other here, though it is possible to speculate about a dialectic of forces in creation.

Humans are the agents and sites of this dialectic of created being. The decisive separation between humans and God lies in the *mode* by which the opposed forces and positions in existence comes into view. For Buber, when the narrator of Genesis 3 has God say that man "is become as one of us, to know good and evil" (OB, 20), the narrator ironizes that man now knows existence as such, yet, because he is finite, cannot help but unleash a dynamic of new reactive forces ("in dieser kläglichen Wirkung der großen

Magie des Wie-Gott-Werdens wird die Ironie des Erzählers augenscheinlich" (BGB, 615)). This knowledge is not creative, because it is the knowledge of a finite creature situated in space and time; the language "become as one of us" combines irony with a rueful compassion.[16] For, the ambitious creature could not grasp its new "unlike-likeness," any more than it could hold fast to the "yes" and the "no" positions at the same time. This "unlike-likeness" expresses a hiatus between the creator and the created, finitude and infinity. In the Garden narrative lies the discovery of the meaning of finitude, the human *historical* condition that admits only unlike repetitions, fabulation, and myths of identity. What it cannot do is to leap over the hiatus.

Cyclical and linear according to its modes, mortality engages humans in a history and a care for the succession of generations. The fact of mortality—and notably the fact that Adam and Eve are expelled from the Garden *before* they can eat from the Tree of Life (Genesis 3:22)—argues that it is a good thing for a creature in pursuit of omniscience to remain mortal, since nothing else can stop it from willing to leap over its limitations.

Humans thus ate from only one of the two trees in the Garden. Adam and Eve were driven out before they could consume the fruit of the Tree of Life; for, a finite creature that eats its way to eternal life is demonry, Buber argues. "Demonry" expresses the idea of a being that could live out its *conatus* and drives eternally, remaining in the no-position, denying its lack of control over its birth and death, and never able to hold together the opposed forces unleashed, in mortal terms, by will to power.

According to this logic, while human mortality is tragic (notably in the form of the death of the other, as Levinas has observed), it is also redemptive through human history, and there are things to do on Earth, from building society to deepening our understanding of the Law. Hence, the gentle irony of the expulsion from Eden:. "For [man], as the being

driven round amid opposites, [death] may become a haven, the knowledge of which brings comfort," writes Buber (BGB, 616; OB, 21).

> This stern benefaction is preceded by the passing of sentence [the announcement of tragedy is inscribed in the act of justice]. It announces no radical alteration of that which already exists; it is only that all things are drawn into the atmosphere of [mortal] oppositeness [die Atmosphäre der Gegensätzlichkeit]….From the *seat* [Sitz], which had been made ready for him, man is sent out upon a *path* [Weg], his own…into the world's history… (BGB, 617; OB, 21)

In the transmutation of humans' status from static to dynamic, death becomes the source of time's value and inaugurates the reckoning of a hitherto absurd notion called "history". No thinking, philosophical or religious, that fails to address death as limit and institution, can grasp, in a way that is free from phantasmatic identification (with God or the immortals), the significance of human sociality, and the necessity of a pragmatic limitation of the drives.[17] We might say that, for the Greeks too, the political problem *par excellence* was that of limiting the coalescence of disparate drives within a group or within a tyrant. Plato's mythic body of the tyrannical ruler (*Republic*, 588c-589a), with its multiple heads, replays the difficulty of limiting drives and their inevitable conflict in the absence of the foreclosure of mythic identifications, whether through philosophy or through a symbolic injunction (Genesis 3: 24). After all, the multiple heads represent the different avatars of the tyrant for different groups, all of which must be held in thrall to the sole figure of the tyrant. However, lacking the limitation on identifications, the tyrant finds himself in contradiction with himself, and the momentary stasis he achieves dissolves into warring factions. Of course, the limitation has to be flexible enough to avoid a complete divorce between the life energies carried by those so-called drives and their beneficial sublimations.

Buber argues that the sources of Genesis 3 come from other religions—including the Avestic stories of the jealousy of the gods. But Genesis 3's innovation becomes obvious within the logic of monotheism: How could the one God be jealous of his creation, when that God is *not* conceived on the model of mortal humanity? This God thus would escape human understanding, arising as it does in the movement of textual inscription (as the trace that produces differences) and later, in the sociality deployed through the expulsion into history. A further dimension of sociality is unfolded in the prophetic call to justice in the name of God. By contrast, anthropomorphic conceptions of gods entail human-like responses on their part (jealousy, anger, repentance). But this modeling of identification—wherein the gods look and act like us, send our contemplation back to us and thereby celebrate a collective self-sacralization that vitiates the existential limits set by our death and that of the other person. If there is no "knowledge" either of death or of the other as such, then the endless repetition of rebirths, ancestor or totemic worship, and anthropomorphic divinities suggests that this limit called death is not so serious. Life is reborn out of life, cyclically; through the hero or the semi-divine figures, humans pass between "here below" and the heavens above with assurance. Nevertheless, there appears to be a profound anxiety in the "Dionysian" passage of limits, physical and metaphysical, and this has implications for the work done by monotheism in relation to other practices of the sacred. The inscription of a limit, enacted in and as a given community set under foreclosure (from the Garden and in mortality), takes the place of phantasy identifications, Dionysian dreaming, and practices of sacred fusion. In Genesis, the separation implicit in the narrator's irony: "man is become as one of us"—an irony that arises from the implicit negation that this suggests[18]—reiterates the oppositions of existence, understood from the perspective of mortal beings. What is finite cannot become infinite without monstrosity. The infinite (God, trace or voice) knows,

but is not subject to the forces that structure finite life itself: space-time, historicality, and the demonry or drive quality of willing-to-know and to-be-infinite.

Identification as Incorporation and the Transformation of the Voice

When Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy claim that "the Jewish people does not dream," they are carrying Buber's meditation on finitude and the dialectic of forces a step further. Buber understood that a thoroughgoing identification with the God (or the mythic Father) could only be phantasmatic. Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy explore the implications of the foreclosure of such identifications in light of cultural sublimation.. With the containment or limitation of phantasmatic identification, a different "law" becomes possible. Like all laws, this law brings about differences (minimally, the legal and the illegal). Culturally and historically, it gives the repetition of events a different quality, an ethico-gestural quality in which no one stands above the "law" because no one, be they shaman or seer, ascends to or otherwise incarnates the transcendental object. I do not mean that there is no ethical normativity in cultures whose religious practices ritually enact phantasmatic identifications. However, this enactment has implications for their conceptions of time and the cosmos. It is enough to say, for now, that following the new or different law is not the same as identifying phantasmatically with the Father, because the limitation set on identification gives us a law that is now open to human completion in history. It therefore becomes open to the community, as every member of that community brings a new interpretation of it to the group.[19] The complete comprehension of the law becomes a regulative, and social, ideal.[20] But *this* infinite is neither fusional (i.e., I incarnate the law) nor vertical (i.e., I rise to the God). It ramifies.

The second consequence of "not dreaming" is the limitation set on imaginary elaborations on the immortality of the soul and the survival of the dead. Nothing eradicates the memory and desire that immortalize an ancestor, but his fetishization may be subverted if it is subject to questioning, or worse to irony. This entails the symbolic limitation of repetitions that, in mythic logics like that of the totemic father, become tragic because they enact an enduring malaise tied to agonizing loss, like a ghost whose law and words insist, determining the destiny of the group. For example, when we look at the repetition compulsion of Freud's "Wolf Man," we find that each male authority incarnates and repeats the Wolf Man's subjugation by his father. So much for the psychological level; but we should recall the tragic conviction characteristic of Greek tragedy: Whatever you do, whether it is to avenge my name or to escape that responsibility, you shall only repeat the course of events that is your fate.[21] These illustrations show the widespread operation, and phantasmatic efficacy of the "not-quite-dead" (parents, ancestors, heroes; all objects of identification) in their relation to the living, who can only lose their own lives in that "infernal" relation. The symbolic foreclosure of such immortalities makes possible the creation of a community that is not defined by identifications such as "we are x being," or "we carry within us, as our destiny, Him who was our Father."

Together, the formal abandonment of ancestor cults, spectral forces taken as presences—and the non-figurability of God (iconically or in name)—forces the *work of finitude* to take place. It does so by way of three factors: (1) the task of continuous interpretation; (2) the configuration of a full if dia-chronous time as repeating holy days that inflect the past into the future, without destroying everyday time; and finally, (3) through a messianic temporality of generations to come, in which a promise of justice persists as it changes (along with the conditions of pardon and return), though never taking form as

"*parousia*" or fulfilled presence. These result from the foreclosure that Nancy and Lacoue-Labarthe present in shorthand as "Jews not dreaming." There is a dialectic between them.

In "The Tree of Knowledge" Buber insists that it was no punishment to be banished from the Garden of Eden. Yet his claim seems strange. In the Garden, did Adam not walk with God? Was Adam not both creature *and* adult (only to find himself relegated to a kind of infancy and serfdom after his expulsion)? Of course, his peculiar temporality remains an open question. Be that as it may, Adam is initially more than human and less than human—like a phantasy. In fact, he is there, in this figuration of pre-human time, curiously less a "being", less "existent" than when he "becomes" finite. Garden humans are at once inbreathed dust (המדא ;סדא) *and* immortals (provided they do not sin). Other immortals or semi-mortals show up in Genesis, and their commerce with humans is also catastrophic (the Nephilim, Genesis 6: 1-5). However, if to be human is to be possessed of a finite temporality without being wholly condemned by it, and if the beginnings of one's humanity are accompanied by a *logos* that is reason and communication, then how could the Garden Creature—though he had names for animals—grasp that existence "is" in the mode of "finite becoming"? It could not mean much to Adam and Even to envision eating something forbidden, something that would make them "like" God. However, clearly, becoming like God was desirable, just as the fruits of the Tree were appetizing. Now, psychoanalysis teaches that *incorporation* or object cathexis is the material ground of any identification, but Adam and Eve understood neither finitude nor identification and its dangers. The Garden beings knew neither the desire that characterizes creatures with sexuate bodies, nor the difference between them and that voice called Elohim, and certainly not the separation that identification denies.[22]

Perhaps expulsion was better than an act of mercy (since mortality, which became the property of humans when they could not eat of the Tree of Life, was a boon given their contradictory "divine" knowledge). It was a better than mere mercy, because the narrative expulsion forced the creation of a fledgling community that took shape through a dialectic of identification and dis-identification which, as we indicated, permitted an alternative (and less meta-physical) conception of social existence. The foreclosure of identification, as the first premise of negative "theology", is coextensive with a social *logos* of human interrelations, coming to pass in the presence of an unfigurable "transformer": the present-absent Third party (Elohim/Yahweh).

This third party is exemplified both in the unknowable One and in the Law itself. Indeed, what is exemplified are two types of diremption: that between humans and their creator; that between humans and the (interpretable) structures of value and preference (Law). But the Third party has a third sense as well. It is exemplified by the absent mythical narrator of Genesis, about whom Buber argues that "he" was aware of the irony implicit in the origin that was the expulsion from the Garden.[23] The *human* genesis is thus *not* the creation of Adam, but the coming-into-humanity-as-finite of the two proto-humans, thanks to the "magical" increase in their "knowledge," brought about by the crudest mode of assimilation-identification: eating. This magical increase of knowledge is the beginning of the knowledge of becoming—which lies both within and without human powers. As magic, this will be foreclosed; hence, the expulsion. Now, the knowledge of becoming is that of coming into and passing out of being, birth and death—preeminently, the death of the other person. So it was hardly tragic that the pair could not eat of the tree of Eternal Life, because possessing the *knowledge* of death is the only way through which humans grasp *non*-becoming, *stasis*, and correlatively, eternity as privation (life lost) *and* promise (hope of a life afterward).

Without this ethical knowledge (since my knowledge of death is always that of the other person), the Garden Adam is more infinite than finite, undecidably mortal and immortal, as I indicated. For human beings, who are *born* rather than created, there is more value in knowing *that* one dies than in *possessing* immortality with no understanding of becoming or mortality. Thus the narrative voice of Genesis stands in the position of the Third party: "In this lamentable effect of the great magic of becoming like God, the narrator's irony becomes apparent; an irony whose source was obviously great suffering through the nature of man," as Buber observes (BGB 615; OB, 19).

Nakedness and Becoming

The immediate, perceptible consequence for Adam and Eve of their eating the fruit of knowledge was a paltry discovery: their reciprocal nakedness. Against any "wild psychoanalysis," Buber writes that the "recognition of this fact, the only recorded consequence of the magical partaking, cannot be adequately explained on the basis of sexuality, although without the latter it is, of course, inconceivable" (BGB, 615; OB, 19). His arguments in this text imply that the expulsion was a divine second thought—not the direct consequence of eating the fruit—as though God sought to protect them from the deadly combination of shame, and the *hubris* of knowledge, not to mention the expansion of this combination into eternity. At the moment when their eyes are opened, it is not clear what the consequences of their act will be. The serpent promised god-likeness. But Eve, Buber tells us, first "intensified [*verschärft*] God's prohibition" with her surprising response to the serpent, "touch it not, else you must die" (BGB, 610; OB, 15).[24] Since it was not clear what god-likeness *or* death might be, what could it mean that Eve intensified the prohibition? Interestingly, she did not simply mimic the injunction since, when Adam received it, Eve had

not yet been created. And again, if to die means to disappear or to cease to be, then this too remains only an abstract possibility for creatures whose bodies are suspended in the *nunc stans* of the Garden. The vertiginous play of perspectives here between the demonic, the divine, and the "Adamic" opens conundrums that can be worked out only after the introduction of a foreclosure. That is, following the separation that is figured simultaneously as a decision of the absent Father (the voice, see Genesis 3: 19), and as the expulsion from paradise into finite space-time.

The immediate outcome is nakedness. The first nakedness, however, was that of the serpent itself, "the serpent was naked, more [naked] than any living thing of the field that YHWH/Adonai/Elohim had created" (Genesis 3: 1). But Adam and Eve's nakedness is less that of a state that excites desire than an "unnatural uncoveredness" that elicits shame. Is this also the nakedness of the serpent? I will return to that question. Of course, the all-too-human exposure, in nakedness and shame is unthinkable in a non-domesticated animal, even one that speaks and walks around the Garden. Still, shame is neither guilt nor sin. It is closer to phenomenological descriptions of those affective moments in which "we are unable to make others forget our basic nudity."[25] Fundamental nudity belongs to the finitude of human flesh and this deepens the irony Buber attributed to the narrative voice. Having become "as gods," our new, divinized (or de-divinized?) beings have become more human, shamefaced, and exposed to each other, as well as to the absent One who always saw them naked—at least until the moment he lost sight of Adam's whereabouts![26] If it is divine to suffer in one's exposure, then Adam and Eve have become more divine. If it is not divine to suffer in this way, then their knowledge has brought them only into the "demonic" state that more readily typifies the human (and serpentine) condition, and which Freud referred to as a condition governed by *Triebe* (drives). The act of consumption, understood as *Verkörperung*

or incorporation, is in mythic logic a mimetic act that repeats a sacrificial rite that devours and perpetuates an ancestor or totem animal as the divinity. Here, incorporation through consumption leads to "knowledge" and, had Adam and Eve eaten of the Tree of Life, this would have led to their incarnation—really, to the parodic *mimesis*—of the Father himself.[27]

The consequence of *Verkörperung* is wonderfully described in Freud's *Totem and Taboo* (1913) and in *Moses and Monotheism* (1939). There, anxiety and shame arise from the transgression that denudes, strips bare. But the transgression, which is always a kind of murder, or at least usurpation, brings about a perverse equalization—whether this be the creation of a band of brothers (who have eliminated the father, as in *Totem and Taboo*), or two humans who come "to know" what the Father alone knew (without knowing in quite the way he did). It is remarkable that the first textual illustration of the uncrossable separation between being and becoming, infinity and finitude, is repeated through a host of biblical narratives from the Deluge (Genesis 6: 1), to the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11: 1),—as though this lesson required repetition in variation, because it belonged to a complex gesture of ethical, social, and political importance.

A perplexity remains with the *re*-cognition implicit in seeing the other as naked. What role does this recognition play in the origin of a human subject? To answer this question, another one must first be explored: How is existence, understood as change and becoming, known to the creature who ate the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge? To understand this, I need to make an etymological detour. Thereafter, I will return to the connection between Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, Buber, and Freud.

Erum: Being Naked, Yet Shrewd

Before the events described in Genesis 3, Adam and Eve are characterized as "*Arummim*."[28] *Arummim* is the plural of "*Arum*" ("naked" or "smooth") for which a

recognized alternative spelling is "*Erum*." It is said at the end of Genesis 2 that these two beings who were "one flesh," "felt no shame."[29] From the opening of chapter 3, the *Arum* theme unfolds in all its equivocity; and this, by way of superlatives. "Now the serpent was the shrewdest of all the wild beasts that the Lord God had made" (Genesis 3: 1, in the King James translation). "Shrewdest", here, means simultaneously "most naked", "fleshly", because without fur or feathers, *and* "crafty", "cunning", "cautious" or "prudent". *Erum* associates *all* these connotations. Because it is the naked "wild beast" that speaks to Eve, we might say that in matters of knowledge and morality, the serpent was more readily the interlocutor of the "humans" than the humans were to each other, or even to God. The serpent was clearly shrewder than the two innocents, and some commentaries argue that it must have gone about upright, since the curse placed on it was what obliged it to slither about on its belly (Genesis 3: 14). Thinking this way, the serpent becomes simultaneously proto-human in its reason and its nakedness (it would have been the most naked of the featherless bipeds), and *better* than human in its synthetic knowledge of the meaning of death and "divine perception."[30] It occupies what may be a standard position in mythic logic of the third party that knows more than mortals and sets itself in opposition to the omniscience of the divinity.

The acquisition of knowledge by humans results in the curse on the serpent itself— and its demotion to the rank of something worse than cattle (Genesis 3: 14). The curse on Adam is in fact a curse upon the ground over which he moved (and of which he is made), which he would have henceforth to toil. In the case of the serpent, the curse is set directly upon its being and on its body (it slithers henceforth on its abdomen). In the case of the humans, it is a curse on the nature of the *work* that the new humans have to perform and on their relationship to each other. The difference between these two curses is crucial, because

if religion arises, as Hermann Cohen pointed out, contemporaneous with reason and with the essence of the Law, then there existed an upright being that spoke and knew, and yet was not clearly comparable to humans *or* to angels: the serpent, incarnation of a polysemic "smoothness". The one thing this creature lacked was that it was not explicitly created "after our likeness" (Genesis 1: 26). This means that a being could exist who knew and spoke, yet was apparently less divine than those two who initially did *not* know the forces of life and could not communicate with the refinement that such knowledge procured. In fairness, it is only in Genesis 3: 22—i.e., after the pronouncement of God's threefold curse—that the tradition integrated the second aspect of the Eden allegory: the presence of *two* forbidden trees.

If we pursue the question of nakedness this time in light of the shame that Adam and Eve did not initially feel, then we find another interpretive path. This one Buber opens through his analysis of the meaning of "knowledge of good and evil." If "good and evil" amount to Being, or better, to Life, understood as omnipresent binaristic forces (pain and pleasure, benefit and discomfort, fullness and emptiness), then this knowledge may well be possessed *affectively* before it is represented as an object of reason.[31] In other words, we stand in relation to what-is through our various modes of sensibility and affectivity. So far as these open us to existence, it is not absurd to consider them "attunements," like Heidegger's *Stimmungen*, among which are joy, boredom, and *Angst*[32]—and to which Levinas will add enjoyment, shame, fatigue, and nausea. These affective attunements, whatever their number, can only be suspected of our early "humans", Adam and Eve. If anything, what we find is delight and the *apatheia* that receives imperatives without fear or pondering. After that comes the shame that fears evil; shame before a God (or Father) transformed, and anxiety— something like the anxiety of responsibility. Even here, these modes of "knowing" have little

representational content outside the perception of an enduring *lack*. There is nothing elaborately moral present here. Yet the spectacle of their nudity is also not an aesthetic one, no judgment of beauty or ugliness accompanies it. Stricken with mortality, the flesh has not so much become ugly as its vulnerability elicits shame and redoubled anxiety. Sexuality, moreover, is henceforth "socialized", that is, subject to knowledge which itself has received the sanction of the law (i.e., the taboo). The haste with which Adam and Eve cloaked themselves in leaves, and retreated to a position of invisibility, which alone could assure some restoration of their lost wholeness, implies that the divine third party has consequently become more fixed, more explicitly seeing, and potentially punitive (we are seeing things, now, through their eyes). The "God" who now sees them as naked, always saw them thus, only now *they* realize it. What must have been his perplexity to find the two suddenly striving for invisibility and hiding!

The sad irony is that this God not only must now evict his creatures, he must institute a symbol of foreclosure. That is the function of the "fiery ever-turning sword," which guards the Tree of Life from the creatures' eventual return (Genesis 3: 24). Henceforth, Adam and Eve will see the third precisely as a Third: as separated, whole, the source of a law revealed to them in reason and shame. By virtue of separation-foreclosure, they also see in each other a third party ("and I will put enmity between thee and the woman," Genesis 3: 15), i.e., a being outside the I-thou binary. To be the other, in the sense of I and thou, a human being must be a naked face, a gaze, and an interruption of the same forces of which he has become aware.[33] But to be the Other is also to be a Third; one perhaps like-me, yet who is not like-me—and above all who judges me and my other. At this point, Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy's reflection points us in a direction that runs directly parallel with Buber's thought.

The Psychoanalytic Counter-Narrative: The Birth of Anxiety in Transgression and Traumatism

For Freud, anxiety was "the paradigm of affect" (PJNRP). This is true despite the important changes he introduced into his arguments about its meaning.[3435] Thus, by 1926, the mature Freud conceived the "subject" of psychoanalysis by integrating his first topic (primary and secondary processes) into the second one (i.e., the *Ich, Es,* and *Über-ich*). In so doing, he inverted his early conception of anxiety as a sign of repression having encountered a plethora of cases where anxiety signaled no discernible *Verdrängung*. Freud then argued that anxiety was more than the affective symptom of a host of developmental processes and pathology. Anxiety preceded repression in its origin, and it could exist independently of it. As the neuro-physiological turmoil of the neonate, anxiety even preceded the formation of the Ego. It arose as the *physiological* reaction to the danger of suffocation. Freud's 1933 "New Introductory Lectures," which present psychoanalysis in its final form, define anxiety as a reaction to traumata, the first of which was birth itself.[36] Trauma anxiety will repeat over the course of the emergence of the Ego, and continue afterward, thanks to the retroactive intensification of earlier incidents that carry on into the present. This is where *Moses and Monotheism* takes it up. There, trauma anxiety is extended to the prehistory of the species itself:

> …mankind as a whole also passed through conflicts of a sexual-aggressive nature, which left permanent traces, but which were for the most part warded off and forgotten; later, after a *long period of latency*, they came to life again and created phenomena similar in structure and tendency to neurotic symptoms…the phenomena of religion. (MAM, 101)

In humans' prehistory—which is also the history figured in Buber's study of the myth of expulsion—the primary symbolic anxiety ("permanent traces") arose from the trauma experienced by the sons following their transgression, putatively, the violent elimination of the dominant male (Freud called him the *Urvater*). Cultural recurrence thus parallels the repetition-intensification of trauma, as found in individual neuroses.[37] This logic also contains an inexpungible nostalgia for the strange innocence in which the Third party ("God") is near but does not judge us. This is an innocence destroyed by the will to know and by the realization of mortality, which the Garden allegory figures as the expulsion.

We can interpret Freud's "permanent traces" as ingrained developmental memories or as the transmission of acculturated affects. Yet more important is the ongoing return of a repressed trace. Despite Freud's embrace of recapitulation theory ("ontogenesis reproduces phylogenesis") and his occasional Lamarckianism, it is *historic* transmission that is at stake. By historic transmission, I mean the passing on of cultural history, concentrated in parables and myths, as well as the transmission brought about by the repetition of behaviors engendered by a malaise in a family or a society. The remarkable thing here is that the people who would ultimately become "Jews" embodied the force and the desire that instituted the law of the Third in a monotheistic form. By Freud's account (working from archeological material),[38] it was the Jews who revived the religion of the Father-God and with it, the foreclosures figured by the Garden and normalized in the Mosaic proscriptions. In this respect, they had an original claim to the status of "not dreaming". Monotheism forecloses with peculiar power identifications with God and heroes, such as those we see in polytheism. According to the psychoanalytical account, the early Hebrews enacted what had become their cultural unconscious, by confronting the reforms proposed by their own priests, who were anxious to modify the absolute monotheism and embrace a more natural, almost imperial volcano-

God called Yahweh. Anxiety would thus have persisted among the people like a demand that the unattainable Third be revived *in all his distance* (distance is an effect of foreclosure). Whether this anxiety was due primarily to Freud's "structure" or "return of the repressed"— here reenacted in the intent to murder Moses (Exodus 4: 24)—or to the loss of the privilege of election by the one God, is unclear. What is clear is that the foreclosure of acts of anthropomorphic instating (e.g., a plurality of gods, divinized ancestors, sacred entities and forces that figure human passions) characterizes the monotheism that Moses supposedly taught to a people who then preserved, unconsciously, his founding intuition.

If we follow Freud's speculation about the Egyptian Moses and those nomads who perpetuated his abstract god, we confront a circle of origins: was it a psycho-social repetition that motivated the demand to reinstitute this monotheism? If so, we should accept the hypothesis of Moses's own murder (and the persistence of guilt attaching to his memory). Or was it some anxiety, embedded in the popular imagination, that motivated the restitution of an all-powerful, absent One who, despite his distance from humans, elected one people from among the nations? If election-in-distance does diminish *Angst*—about mortality, or facing political and cultural threats—then why was this "option" not more prominent among the mythic choices made by early peoples? Was this rarity due to the psychic impact of the foreclosure on identification? Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy abbreviate this foreclosure as being placed simply "on dreaming." But it applies to virtually every form of fetishization and hypostatization.[39] If we follow the parallelism Freud drew between the rites and narratives of religions, the practices of re-enactment, partial remembering, and the transference characteristic of neuroses, we encounter yet another circle. This is the circle of anxiety itself. If anxiety is a privileged bridge between sensation and affectivity (mechanistic sensation and "spiritual" emotion), then anxiety holds the body-mind parallelism in place, in what amounts

to a discontinuous proximity (sensation is not affect, and conversely; but affect often accompanies sensation). Of course, anxiety also evinces cultural aspects: an entire cultural group can be beset with, and transmit, its anxiety.

In Freud's second topic, the primacy of this curious sensation-affect expresses the impossibility of positing an *archē* for the Ego, since there is at least one pre-egoïc affect that evolves with the emerging Ego and only later appears to belong to the Ego. But the difficulty of stating when precisely "I" am there, when the Ego that inhabits its name takes form, was not Freud's intuition alone. Even if it was not thematized clinically, the narrative of the Garden and the expulsion *also* concerns the difficult *archē* of the human. Moreover, the perplexing, archetypal murder of the powerful male—who, in perishing, returns to haunt the sons and elicit from them a rejection of violence and inauguration of "legal" foreclosures— presents a comparable anxiety structure, albeit at a different level. This discontinuous repetition, like the repetitions of anxiety in the individual, seems to be the only affective "structure" thinkable in the absence of identifiable origins. If the earliest stages of social existence emerge thanks to the expulsion from paradise into mortality, foreclosure, and nakedness, then this sociability must be enhanced by an additional gesture—purely human this time—whereby the sons (of Adam) re-cognize that they are also brothers. That is, they come with difficulty to realize that they are not simply individuals elected by the father, but can also form a pact amongst each other.

Freud and Buber: The Work of Foreclosure

We thus face two circles of origin and two hypotheses about Judaism. Buber's reading of Genesis illustrates an initial foreclosure that will be repeated over the history of the Jewish people. Freud's Moses sketches the psychological history of a God, or Father, occupying a unique structure of the Third party (sole legislator, unknowable, alone in

electing his chosen), by virtue of foreclosures recorded in the people's narrative *and* carried by that people like a permanent mnemonic trace. The point of intersection of the two readings, Buber and Freud's (and with Freud, Lacoue-Labarthe *et al.*), lies precisely in the work performed by foreclosure. Of course, the Genesis narrative and the story of Moses belong to two different layers of Jewish history. And the proscriptions on magic, representation, and polytheism stand in a certain tension to Freud's reading of *Verkörperung*, the primitive identification consisting of incorporations that pass from eating the apple all the way to totemic meals and, ultimately, to the Christian Eucharist. For Adam and Eve, eating the proscribed fruit is closer to magical consumption than it is to murder. In Freud's reconstruction, the two are connected through survivals of ancient cannibalism (MAM, 103). To my mind, the connection has more to do with the incomprehensible but sensed outcome (by Adam and Eve) of this consumption. To become "as one of us" is, for a creature, to supplant its creator. Nevertheless, following the logic of foreclosure, the incorporation that elicited expulsion puts an end to such "dreaming" (the Garden is as much a dream as is the divinization of beings, garden or worldly ones).

If we consider the two levels of drives, in a self and in a group (or a culture)—something Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy's work encourages—then we understand their claim for the work of foreclosure. At an individual level, Freud pushes Buber's arguments by insisting that anxiety is the affect in which inside and outside, man and God, paradise and society, blur. Such indistinctions additionally evoke anxiety and must be limited.[40] On the other hand, Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy argue that the sociality of ethnic and political identifications is actually superposed on a more originary sociality through the logic of repetition. Again, murder can be compared with the taboo on the Tree of Life, because murder—of the paradigmatic strong male and as a deliberate act—entails "the social

comprehension (or 'incomprehension') of death. It is itself the ambivalence of dis-sociation: the appearance of an Ego *in its disappearance*, the relation that arises *from the lack of a relation*" (PJNRP, 70; 205). According to Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, the deliberate sacrifice or murder of this Father turns on the knowledge that death is final, and it is what happens to *others*, leaving behind it the survivors whose act and new status forge the new pact uniting those who reassemble under a nascent "social contract". Eating of the Tree of Knowledge is also decided in the affective indeterminacy of anxiety (i.e., Eve knew neither what knowledge of all things would mean nor what death was), with a peculiarly social outcome: the succession of generations, or human history. The sociality of the brothers forged by murder is ambiguous and unforeseen. However, it must rest on some earlier social life thanks to which the choice can actually be made to forego election by the strongest male for the sake of a more horizontal organization.

Murder (and perhaps expulsion) thus bespeaks something like a will to sociability, which congeals in the refusal of tyranny, natural or political. This will and this act restore what the expulsion from the Garden made possible, a "primitive horde" (MAM, 114). Both murder and expulsion evince the *aporia* of origins, with the primitive horde standing in a circular relationship to the ancient "Father." And it is curious that, in all but a brief essay he sent to Ferenczi, Freud maintained (in *Totem and Taboo* [1912] and in *Moses and Monotheism* [1939]) that in the beginning was the strong male[41]—who nevertheless lorded it over "the whole horde," itself *already* in existence, if unreflectively (MAM, 102).[42]

Freud's published works de-emphasized the original horde in favor of the community under a strong male. He did not reckon with something like the group consciousness of a social identity, because the proverbial sons are defined in light of one who was not really their biological father (paternity being a causality they did not know), but

simply their tyrant. Whatever the circumstances of their survival, however, Freud does argue that it was the expulsion of the sons that introduced them to a new, and unstable, "state of nature". He observes, "they [the parricides] were forced to live in small communities" (MAM, 103). These small communities were presumably without strong males, at least for a time. All of that was insufficient to transform what Freud refers to as "sons" into "brothers." Only the overcoming of the father and the partaking of his body assured that further evolution. "The cannibalistic act thus becomes comprehensible as an attempt to assure one's identification with the father by incorporating a part of him" (MAM, 103).

Chiasmatic, the two levels of sociality—that of the tyrant and that of the brothers—take shape through a decisive act of vengeance following the *initial* expulsion by the Father. If the sociality of the brothers, post-sacrifice, in no way protects them against the returns of the Father, a vague consciousness of the threat of judgment and murder persists; and when a father-substitute returns, as he will, it will likely be as a father-son, i.e., as a "mortal", already marked by the possibility of murder. The innovation of Jesus—really, that of Paul—carries a trace of the foreclosure of the position of absolute Father. If this innovation revives a "phantasy of salvation" (MAM, 110), it carries with it henotheistic ambiguities (Jesus, man-God next to the Father), which the expulsion from the Garden had foreclosed. To be sure, the messianic supplement is found first in the Hebrew prophets, but it is transformed in Paul's Father-Son synthesis, which Freud suspected was the only remaining mode of return for the Father. If this is the unique return of the erstwhile Father (MAM, 111), then it is such because it is the effect of a mnemonic trace, something like a cultural *impensé* that has no need to be transmitted in a naïve Lamarckian fashion.[43] As a blurring of divine and human, the new-old Father, who is also a Son, reopens the possibility of fusional or fetishistic

identifications. These are identifications similar to those we find in myths and epics peopled by semi-divine heroes. And there begins the worst conundrum.

Oedipus and Moses: Paradoxes of Paternity

When Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy argue that Oedipus might replace Moses as "history's only real Father, a father who accepts himself as such" (PJNRP, 70; 205), they are resisting Freud's vector-like logic of repetition, whose paradox is to have posited an origin (archaic murder), despite its dating from a time immemorial. Instead, Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy emphasize that one becomes a father only in becoming *conscious* that one has sacrificed or murdered one's own father, their claim being that Moses was an *unconscious* father. Now, one becomes conscious only through the repetition the similar, through whose social traces a certain awareness congeals, initially as a shared affect, then through actions. Through the work of repetition (and resistance in psychoanalytic theory), they argue that only the recognition of repressed violence opens to a sociality able to identify itself as ethnicity or as a micro-polis. This parallels Freud's theme of *Durcharbeitung*, working or talking through a neurotic condition (i.e., our condition as human beings). Yet the mature Freud saw something different in "the return of the father-son" avatar. He speculated that the source of Christian anti-Semitism lay precisely in a certain Christian notion of recognition: Christians had "murdered God; as against the Jews who, at least according to a standard version of the story of Moses, would not admit that they murdered God (as the archetype of God, the primeval father, and his reincarnations)" (MAM, 115).

Thus, *either* one forecloses access to God *ab initio*, and unravels the structure of identification (i.e., identification as "occupying the place of the other," which implies murder, latency, revivification of a memory, and the repetition of identification), *or* one reenacts the process, thereby reopening the ancient dilemmas. That is the choice, unless

recognition of the murder *also* forecloses identification. Clearly, it does this—selectively. The case of Oedipus is interesting as a "hero" who, inhabiting the monstrosity of his flaw (to defy Ἀνάγκη or natural necessity, and fail at it), presaged the end of the repetitions by his disappearance *en route* to Colonnus.

Tragedy, Irony, and the *Witz*

Is the return of the son the condition *sine qua non* of socio-ethnic "paternity"? Or does the son represent a supplementary acquisition, which makes fatherhood simultaneously social and temporal through the continuity and stabilization of generations? Clearly, for Freud, the depth, which "in the Jewish religion resulted from the murder of its founder" (MAM, 118), is not shared by Islam (and presumably not by Paul's Christianity of resurrection, either). That sets Freud apart from Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy's claims for Oedipus' superiority to, or equality with Moses. Does not the essential force of catharsis, which the representation of Oedipus enables, turn on identification with him, however tormented? It would seem that this identification is not fetishistic. But if Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy are right in suggesting that Freud glimpsed a model of deferred identification in "the Jewish story" (PJNRP, 194), this is because the Jewish story he had in mind, as the model of Jewish social identification, carried irony. It was thus related to the *Witz* about which he wrote during the "triumphalist" period of psychoanalysis (1905-1915). The *Witz* expresses a particular sort of social identification in which the author of the joke is a member of his or her target group. The ironic or comedic quality comes from this group's collective personality; it is a *Sammlungsperson*, from which the joker is able to take some distance. The *Witz* short-circuits a direct or vectorial *mimesis* by preserving distance. It does this, thanks precisely to the proximity-distance of the satirist and his or her object. In this gesture of self-ironization, a distinct or deferred identification takes place, which opens to

thought. Humor is thus like the irony that Buber observed of the narrator of Genesis; the distancing effects are similar.[44]

The ironic tone of the narrative voice in Genesis 3 brought about a comparable distance and return. There is no way to identify fetishistically with the Father when confronting the Third party who is Elohim/Adonai. For Buber, the expulsion from the Garden opens to a history that is human first, and becoming-a-people, second; that is, the first "murder" (by incorporation), followed by foreclosure (by expulsion), recapitulates an original sociality (unmediated identification with an indeterminate entity: a divine voice), only to open to the new social structures of kin and tribe (of brothers). All too human, we suppose. However, as Freud adds in regard to Moses—and the Gospels—these are stories told about Jews among Jews (MAM, 117).

Unmediated fusional identification was not the lot of the Jews, who returned to the monotheism of Moses, after the sacerdotal compromise in their religious practices (1350 and 1215 BCE, in MAM, 75, 85). Forces among the people presumably impelled this return, which was the revival of their original "obscure and incomplete tradition" of radical monotheism (MAM, 89). For Freud, this is the return of the repressed, but it differs from such returns in Greek tragedy. Something more is underway, however, as this "repressed" contains a unique stimulus toward ethical norms and self-respect. At the heart of the return-restoration of the primeval Father[45] is a temporal lag that Freud compares to latency in individuals' psychosexual development. This latency separates subjects from the thrall of the drives as from their initial identifications (MAM, 100-1). Now, the value of developmental latency parallels the (latent) time of discovery essential to the *Witz*. The surprise of the joke lies in the sudden discovery that the addressor has cloaked himself with a story, of which he is the part standing in for the whole or the *Sammlungsperson*, which is also the comic object.

In Buber's reading of Genesis 3, the loss of the father is figured spatially first, as it occurs thanks to the expulsion, which orders space into sacred and profane sites while instituting the repeating and self-differentiating time of generations. This temporality must be understood on two levels. First, because it is anything but the "all at once" time Buber attributes to divine knowledge, diachronic time is social *and* biological. It echoes the time of the narrative itself. In an ironic sense—made possible by the repetition imperative characteristic of the narrative (to be told and retold)—it is always the time of the Garden, always the time of foreclosure. Here, the foreclosure *is* the narrative (moment) that recounts (and incorporates) its incipience as a narrative ("I am telling you this story because I am, like you, a part of the generations begun thanks to the expulsion"). Second, if the temporality of ethnic sociality is unleashed by a traumatic loss, we have learned, through Freud, that trauma may be exogenic or endogenic in origin, but it will persist as though it were each time exogenic—like the incursion or imprinting of an external force.

Whether we consider the trauma of the murder of the Father or that of the expulsion and foreclosure of immortality, the anxiety that characterizes the return of the repressed inaugurates a strange urge for self-identification. For, anxiety is similarly characterized by a repeating time that has no origin. After mistaking anxiety for a mere symptom, Freud acknowledged that anxiety precedes the consolidation of the Ego, and its recurrence isolates the Ego, as though its identifications could never fully ground it. Anxiety repeats the trauma of an origin at which the Ego had not yet developed. With each repetition, anxiety changes by virtue of its attachment to different objects. As Freud argued in *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926), through the repetitions of anxiety "a danger-situation" is "a recognized, remembered, expected situation of helplessness."[46] But the shock it repeats proves immemorial, because indefinitely retraceable. "It is unrecognizable because it consists of

ever-changing cathexes (*Besetzung*) that can be "recognized" only by being displaced…disfigured (*ent-stellt*). And it is immemorial, because the 'actual' situation of helplessness resists the bifurcation into past and future that is the condition of memory and anticipation."[47] Identification flowing from anxiety might prove fetishistic or ironic, in its origin and its repetitions, however, it reflects a striving to stabilize the anxious Ego.

Anarchism and the Circle of Origin, or: *Why* the Jewish People does not Dream

The complex of repetition and displacement with no determinate *archē* characterizes the latency and recurrence found in Freud's hypothesis of the *Vatermord*. The displacement that encourages recognition corresponds to a prohibition that excludes mimetic attributions (becoming "as gods"). The circle of origin, replaying itself and lacking a fixed starting point, is thus preserved. Almost despite himself, Freud discerned a circle of origin in anxiety and in the murder of the father. I believe he would have appreciated Buber's glimpsing it in the situation of presence-absence and transgression, which occasioned the (ironic) expulsion. More important than a *de facto* murder of a powerful male, which, Freud insisted, occurs in every culture, is the social and contractual impetus (Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy call it a "social drive") that motivates the weaker males to associate in opposition to the proto-father. No accident, then, that Freud pursued his study of Moses and of the phenomena of identification together, even as he protested his ineptitude in the dubious domain of 19th century mass psychology, "where we do not feel at home" (MAM, 87).[48] In all three cases, the an-archy of the narrative origin comes to light. But this circle and these displacements in repetition are significant. The danger (of loss and traumatism) to which anxiety reacts is real, even if irrecoverable. But it cannot be "self-identical."[49] So too, the danger that the return of the repressed implies for individual and "social" psyches. Eating from the Tree of eternal life would have destroyed this time of repetition, which is the time of mortality—there is no

time of eternity that is narratively meaningful (short perhaps of death). Sense requires the self-structuring of narrative acts. The first principle, spatialized as the Garden, serves as the site of humans' unconscious proximity to divinity, which Buber called the "yes position". But this principle is a null site without traces. There is no initial trace of separation here for two reasons: first, the paternal commands in the Garden are as incomprehensible to the proto-humans as the "father" is (until he judges, he is almost their companion, a present-absent voice). Second, there is no viable "subject" and the object (God) is unfigurable, though not thanks to any prohibition on representation.

Value judgments are incomprehensible to beings that live beyond good and evil in undifferentiated communion with Buber's "yes" and "all." But the irony of a beginning that is not really a beginning, precisely here, is unmistakable. Our first humans are physical adults who, when they lose their spiritual status as children (with no need for adulthood so long as they are "in God"), enter into an adulthood without fullness, in which desire is fragmented (i.e., they are exposed, naked, ashamed; the earth from which they are made is cursed). That is why the expulsion—which Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy call the stuff of "maternal identification"[50]—inaugurates a *history*. And this history recapitulates narratively a pre-history that was pre-narrative without presence, dialogical and semiotic (Adam's naming animals) without reflective judgment or evaluations. This later development supposes a more substantive, figurable alterity to which an Ego could oppose itself.

Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy present their own version of this insight. "That the subject *might be born* [*naisse*] (rather than being constituted, or structured, in a word, posited for itself) means that it is deferred indefinitely. Moreover, the anxiety of this birth is also the phylogenetic event, or element, par excellence: if anxiety repeats, it is not through heredity…The community of [human] birth is the anxiety of the dissociation of identity"

(PJNRP, 65; 200). This deferral at the heart of the "birth" of the subject corresponds to a kind of social unfolding in which ethnic or tribal identity stands under a double question. In Moses's case, the question is that of identification. For the Mosaic monotheistic tradition, identity is won through the return of repressed (latent and forgotten) material, in which election (ethical identification) *and* its refusal (in the murder of Moses) assure social identification and a distance from fusional identity. In the case of Buber's Adam and Eve, the acquired supplement of knowledge from the Tree changes little about their condition. They do not come "to know" all things, because they cannot "know" as gods do, in the eternal now. That said, this supplement forces them and their progeny to reenact the condition (will to knowledge) *as well as* the nostalgia for an unconsciousness of it. All of this with more or less anxiety and awareness.

Conversely, the foreclosure—whether it takes the form of expulsion or the taboos on violence and the creation of pacts—inaugurates sociality within finitude rather than in the dream life of fusion with the eternal. According to Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy this is why the Jewish people "does not dream." The vigil they preferred to the idea of phantasmatic identification resembles Buber's vigil, which consists of listening to the voice in the biblical word, rather than representing or imbibing it. On the other hand, the return of the primeval father in "mass psychology" suggests that early identifications, even if temporarily neutralized by trauma (murder) and latency, persist to such an extent that when the son returns, he will return *in some guise* of the father. This complicates the trajectory of identification, emphasizing that foreclosure is never enduring.

"If there was no such leader [among the colonized Jews], then Christ was the heir to an unfulfilled wish-fantasy; if there was such a leader, then the Christ was his successor and his reincarnation" (MAM, 111). Taken together, the foreclosure of dreaming and

identification, and the return of the repressed murder, suggest that no religion that follows Mosaic monotheism can be simply a "son-religion" (*Ibid.*). While Freud can say that Paul's innovation consisted in reinstating the universality of Judaism, at the price of abolishing a restriction (called the Law!, MAM, 112), it remains that the repetition that took the form of Christianity created a contradiction. To obtain universality, that "one characteristic of the old Aton religion," election and its sign (circumcision) had to be sublimated. If we read this with Freud's observations on the Jewish *Witz*, that would suggest that Paul's innovation did not leave Jewish sensibility unaffected. Election had long had an ethical signification, but election by an *unreachable* father held open the possibility of irony and necessitated the codification of practices through which identification was not magically obtained, but socially organized. Enter the paradoxical son, and election proceeds according to a "pneumatic" principle, justified by corporeal resurrection at the end of time.

Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy approached the difficulties of identification from the perspective of time and affectivity. For them, the foreclosure of dreaming gives rise to anxiety which, in Buber, would be a vigil. As they argue: "The affection [being-affected] that constitutes identity only takes place in the withdrawal of identity. [But] withdrawal does not mean absence, that is, a presence simply removed. No foregoing identity here can be removed. To withdraw is not to disappear and, properly speaking, it *is* no modality of being [*et ce n'*est *à proprement parler aucun mode d'être*]." What does this mean, if not to assert that "withdrawal is like an act of appearing, disappearing[?] Not only of appearing *in* disappearing, but of appearing *as* a disappearing, in the event of disappearing itself" (PJNRP 66; 201). And that is precisely how anxiety repeats, like Alice in Wonderland's Cheshire Cat and its appearing-disappearing grin.

Identity is neither simply an intentional movement nor an affective vector. It is a real event without being one that is "objective"; that is, if to be an event means that something has "to be" as a thing or an entity. Our authors give it a term that is metaphoric in inception, but literal in operation: "inscription" (PJNRP, 66; 201). "Inscription" denotes traces left behind in some material. That it might be read or accessible to deciphering is not the primary condition of inscription. Inscription should instead be understood as the process of in-scribing, like the "writing" of trauma in or on a body that suffers and develops paralysis or anesthetic points. Here, what is "initial form" need never be repeated identically in order to recur. To be sure, there is a difference between the tragic irony of the expulsion and a traumatized body. However, both carry with them a yearning for wholeness and a resistance (to death, and to an inaugural event, whether creation or birth)—although this wholeness disappears under foreclosure. These paradoxical events suppose fragments of narratives even as they unravel when we take them up and examine their structure. Now, Buber's interpretation of Genesis 3 was motivated by his vision of the renewal of Judaism.[51] Freud's reading of Moses both defends Jewish specificity and sets it into an open-ended "phylogenesis" of trauma, whose densest instance is the Jewish one. This is because, without promising salvation, it labors under the contradictory strains of a community of brothers, the struggle against the return of the primeval Father, and the ongoing discussion of what it means to set justice in the space left open by his disappearance (MAM, 116).[52] Perhaps renewal is not a vindication, but both require a decisively historic sensibility. Consonant with the drive to incorporate knowledge of good and evil and to abjure mortality is the profound anxiety that accompanies the passage from dreaming to non-dreaming. Sometimes this anxiety engenders strategies for surpassing the trauma of an origin deferred. Although Paul resurrected the Father by transforming the Son into a son-father, messianic tendencies in

Judaism have opened onto other apostasies. Sabbataianism celebrated another such son-father, whose paternal *function* was promulgated by his self-styled "prophet", Nathan of Gaza.[53] Buber's concern to harness the forces for renewal (MAM, 118), which embrace ethical election while refusing identifications that include mimesis and incorporation (including the phantasy of incorporating the maternal breast, which precedes identification with the father), depend on narrative transmission (including a narrative "unconscious" that repeats itself silently in words). Yet this carries no historical assurance with it. The challenge lies in the recognition of the paradoxes of identity, and a symbolic order (stories, maxims, myths) apt to make possible the re-enactment, without fetishism, of social ties rooted in (deferred) identification.

---

[1] A version of this essay first appeared in Gregory Kaplan and William B. Parsons, eds., *Disciplining Freud on Religion: Perspectives from the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010).

[2] Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy, "Le people juif ne rêve pas" in Adélie and Jean-Jacques Rassial, eds., *La psychanalyse est-elle une histoire juive? Colloque de Montpellier, B'nai B'rith* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1981). Hereafter cited in the text as PJNRP. A shorter English version appeared as "The Unconscious Is Destructed like an Affect (Part I of "The Jewish People Does Not Dream", Brian Holmes, trans., *The Stanford Literature Review,* 6, 1989, pp. 191-209. Both pages are cited, where appropriate.

[3] Capitalizing the "Father" here signifies that the first identification is relational, with a being as much phantasmatic as phenomenal. The Father, as we know, introduces the differentiation and separation into the mother-child pair if only by being that which causes the mother's attention and desire to triangulate. Any idea of identification with the mother would have to be later, although Freud wrestled with this question in 1923. Prior to that time, the mother is imbibed, introjected. Also see note 20.

[4] Translation modified.

[5] I am grateful to Dominique Scarfone, author of *Oublier Freud? Mémoire pour la psychanalyse* (Montreal, 1999), for his remarks on "forclusion" (foreclosure): "Lacan used 'forclusion' to translate Freud's *Verwerfung*. This term appears most prominently in the Wolf Man case, and it seems to refer to some 'radical rejection', in Wolf Man, of the very idea of castration. Not repression, but the utter *eradication* of something that, being so drastically suppressed, comes back from without, in the form of the famous hallucination of the cut finger. Lacan then used 'forclusion' in the specific context of the psychoses with the famous 'forclusion du nom du père' (foreclosure the name of the father). 'Forclusion' thus has such a radical meaning that it *becomes paradoxical*: it is difficult even to think of this concept much less to think of it as a positive 'defense mechanism', since we cannot easily conceive of the complete erasure of *any* signifier; some trace, a gap at least, will remain." It is the paradoxical quality of what is radically repressed, yet also analytically re-constructible, on which Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy base their interpretation, here.

[6] Martin Buber, "Bilder von Gut und Böse" in *Werke*: *Erster Band Schriften zur Philosophie* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1962), pp.607-650. Abbreviated in the text as BGB. In English, *On the Bible, Eighteen Studies*, Nahum N. Glatzer, ed., (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2000), pp. 14-21. Abbreviated in the text as OB.

[7] See for example, Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, Katherine Jones, trans., (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 104ff. In German, "Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion" in *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. XVI (Frankfurt: S. Fischer Verlag, 1950), pp. 101-246.

[8] I am not addressing, here, the various mystical practices whose *telos* is *devekuth,* or mystical union with divinity; that dimension of Judaism exceeds the scope of this paper.

[9] See Marie-Lise Roux's essay "*La contrainte à la représentation*" in *Revue française de psychanalyse Psychanalyse et préhistoire*, A. Fine, R. Perron, and F. Sacco, eds., (Paris: PUF, 1994), pp. 31-9.

[10] A similar phenomenon is found in psychoanalytic therapy with schizophrenics, for whom it is essential that their fusion with imaginary figures be opened up to admit a third, differentiating element: the analyst or the community.

[11] See Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Antichrist" in *Twilight of the Idols/The Antichrist*, R. J. Hollingdale, trans., (London: Penguin Books, 1990), §§25-26. Nietzsche's argument follows Julius Wellhausen to the effect that, in order to survive the destruction of the first temple, Jews made their god unattainable. If Yahweh began as a typically national god, it would be transformed gradually into a sovereign beyond humanity and history itself. "The old God *could* no longer do what he formerly could. One should have let him go. What happened? One altered the conception of him: at this price one retained him. Yahweh, the God of 'justice'—no longer, at one with Israel; [no longer] an expression of national self-confidence..." While many of Wellhausen's theses have been contested, the argument about the evolution of Yahweh appears valid. Cf. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israëls*, Berlin, 1895, pp. 423ff.

[12] I will not attempt to determine the degree of difference between Jewish monotheism (which, as Buber recognized, also had its mythic narratives and heroes) and other religions, whether monotheistic or not.

[13] Martin Buber, "Biblischer Humanismus" in *Werke*: *Zweiter Band: Schriften zur Bibel* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964), pp.1087-1092. Abbreviated in the text as BH. In English, "Biblical Humanism," *On the Bible, Eighteen Studies*, pp. 211-6. Abbreviated in the text as OB.

[14] We should contrast human demonism with what Buber calls 'divine demonism' when, in his "Der Glaube der Propheten" (1945), he comments on a passage from the J manuscript in which all distance between Yahweh and Moses disappears as Yahweh seeks to make Moses into his "Blutsbräutigam." In this "most ancient revelation of grace, what will become the separation of the trace begins with its antithesis "blutmäßig Angelobten, Angetrauten freizugeben [betrothed by blood, and trusted to be set free]" (cf. Exodus 4: 24-26). Here separation requires an initial *trial* as in polytheistic religions. See "Heiliges Ereignis" in Buber, *Werke II*, p. 290 and OB, p. 72.

[15] Emmanuel Levinas echoes this rabbinic insight in "And God created Woman" in *Du Sacré au Saint; cinq nouvelles lectures talmudiques* (Paris: Minuit, 1977), pp. 122-48. In English, *Nine Talmudic Readings*, trans., Annette Aronowicz, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 161-77.

[16] Where Buber speaks of irony, Freud sees the roots of the "Jewish joke" and, with an insight different from both of them, Hermann Cohen argues that irony or humor grasps both the hiatus between the ought and the is, and humans' forgetfulness of this. Humor and irony would thus represent an attitude of compassion *and* social ethical feeling (cf. Robert Gibbs, "Seeing the Unique God: Humor and the Sublime in Jewish Aesthetics" in *Man and God in Hermann Cohen's Philosophy*, G. Gigliotti, I. Kajon, and A. Poma, eds., (Padua, Italy: Cedam, 2003), pp. 219-232, see esp. 222).

[17] Marc Richir, "Affectivité sauvage, affectivité humaine : *animalité et tyrannie*" in *Épokhè 6 : L'animal politique*, Miguel Abensour and Étienne Tassin, eds. (Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 1996), pp. 75-115.

[18] Irony is also due to the metonymic process at work in the claim that knowledge of good and evil, which is but one aspect of being "like" God, is attained, while the other aspect, God's incomprehensibility in transcendence, remains beyond the knowledge of good and evil. Indeed, it is as though Buber's Adam and Eve understood that eating of the Tree of good and evil were only part of a greater act of becoming like God—that process of phantasmatic identification that the serpent awakens (does the serpent not represent a logic of repetition in which the finite is made infinite through cycles of return)—they would have gotten around to the fruit of the Tree of eternal life sooner or later. This "second tree" would represent the perfection of the creature that could only mean its ceasing to be a creature (death), or its becoming the creator of itself.

[19] See Gershom Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism*, Ralph Mannheim, trans., (New York: Schocken Books, 1996), p. 65.

[20] To specify (fusional) identification with the Father: In an Oedipal triangle, it is the father term that, like a trace, brings about differentiation and distanciation between the child and the mother (cf. the expulsion as

the foreclosure of God-with-Adam in the Garden as together and unindividuated). Freud struggled with the question of whether there was, for the infant, an original "identification" with the mother. Prior to the emergence of the Oedipal "drama", the infant's relation with the mother consisted of a fusional "object investment". However, by 1923, in "The Ego and the Id," things had become more complicated. Freud there ventures that "a direct, immediate identification [with the breast], more precocious than any object identification," exists in the child's "personal prehistory," in part for developmental reasons and in part because of the fundamental bisexuality of all children. Freud thus ends up equating, in 1923, fusional object investments with identification itself in the initial stages of infantile development. In such cases, foreclosure of "identification" with the mother would amount to the first *bona fide* foreclosure. In the Garden narrative, this would correspond to the foreclosure on *fusional identification* with God. But this foreclosure proves insufficient; the distance between humans and God must be better marked out. Hence, the institution of "God" as the divine law in the aftermath of the expulsion from the Garden prolongs and develops the initial foreclosure (cf. Exodus 3: 3-7; 3: 14-15). It is identification with the Father that now becomes impossible, and this is presaged in an ironic vein with the naked serpent's emphatic: "you will not die, you will not die, for Elohim knows that the day you eat from it your eyes will open and you will be like Elohim" [Genesis 3: 4]. If the two foreclosures are conceived as equi-primordial, then identification itself must be parsed into: identification with the mother proceeding from fusion (breast-food-comfort) and identification with the father (phallus-protection-castration). Whether we think of two foreclosures or one, Freud is attempting, in 1923, to explain the plasticity of our choices of love objects. Given his conviction that all infants have a polymorphic sexuality, we can assume that both identifications will be found once the child reaches the Oedipal stage. The lesson of the Eden myth is that one cannot recreate or re-enact the archaic scheme of mother-child fusionality. Later, in the story of Moses, we see the foreclosure of identification with the Father writ large, and the clear emergence of law as hermeneutic difference.

[21] The Rat Man died in World War I (with and for his military "fathers") on the battlefield—in the same milieu in which he encountered the first, devastating repetition of his father.

[22] Genesis 3 begins with an extended comparative: following the nudity of the human pair, "the serpent was naked, more than any living being that YHVH/Adonai/Elohim had made" (all the versions agree on this). Beyond the etymological correlations between "serpent", "clever", and "naked", it is clear that the primordial nakedness—as understood as both vulnerability of the flesh and something like the new visibility of the genitals—belongs to the serpent and is somehow paralleled in the outcome, for Adam and Eve, of eating of the fruit of the Tree. Thanks to Thierry Gendron-Dugré for this insight.

[23] This irony is not bitter; it would be destroyed if the expulsion were tragic, that is, if it were somehow the goal or perfection of finite creatures actually to become omniscient *and* temporally in-finite. See Buber BGB, 615 and OB, 19.

[24] The nature of this intensification is unclear since Eve is only repeating the command that Adonai / Elohim gives to Adam in Genesis 2:17. In fact, he says: "Yes, on the day where you eat of it, you will die, you will die." My translation from André Chouraqui, *La Bible*, (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1989). Drawn from the Tanakh and the last edition of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

[25] Emmanuel Levinas, *On Escape / De l'évasion*, Bettina Bergo, trans., (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 64. Levinas adds: "[Shame] is related to everything we would like to hide and that we cannot bury or cover up. The timid man who is all arms and legs is ultimately incapable of covering the nakedness of his physical presence with his moral person." The idea of a moral person covering a carnal being is related to the haste with which Adam and Eve construct loincloths.

[26] Psychoanalyst Alain Didier-Weill argues, in *Les trois temps de la loi*, that it is absurd to suppose that God literally "lost sight" of where Adam was hiding. He proposes something consonant with Buber's notion of the "yes" and "no" positions. Firstly, it is interesting that Adam hid himself; but the verses convey that Adam's anguish arose *with God's question* to him: "Where are you?" Thus, Didier-Weill argues, "because he believed he knew 'where' he was, Adam [thereby] learns that he is not there where he could be: whereas he believed, in effect, that he was there where he was hidden, behind his tree, he discovers, in anguish, two things: for one, that this hiding place is not really one, under God's gaze and, for another, that, despite that gaze which means to him 'I know where you are', God nevertheless asks him, 'Where are you?'" This dual insight (deductively attributable to Adam) shifts the meaning of the 'place of hiding' to a sort of null site, such that for humans, there might be some metaphoric site at, or in which the Other (or the Father) cannot clearly see 'where' one stands. Is this a place of desire or is it, as Didier-Weill suggests, a part of ourselves that remains ignorant of what "we" want, supposing that in that ignorance as

well, "the Other does not know where I am"? The important point is the invisible, metaphoric 'point' created in this perplexing moment. For a short-lived instant, filled with anxiety, "that the Other might not know where I am provides the ego with the illusion of mastery by which he believes he is 'there' where he is hiding from the gaze." Thus "the specular hiding place where Adam was concealed draws its consistency or solidity only from its disavowed unawareness: 'It is because the Other does not know where I am that I can remain where I am hidden'." But this is precisely what cannot continue, and the Other, who thus irrupts into what recent psychoanalysis calls the "real" (or *is* the "real"), makes it all too clear that I am not so much hidden as I simply no longer know *where* I am. This explains the anguish that God's call produces in Adam. *Les trois temps de la loi*: *Le commandement sidérant, l'injonction du surmoi et l'invocation musicale* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1995), pp. 200-202.

[27] In psychoanalytic interpretations, the Father is there prior to the biological father, in the figure of a powerful domineering male who polarizes the community and evokes the ire of less powerful males.

[28] Tanakh, p. 6.

[29] "בּוֹשׁ" pronounced alternately "buwsh" or "boosh," is a primitive root; properly, to pale, i.e. by implication to be ashamed; also (by implication) to be disappointed or delayed—(be, or put to shame, be or cause to be confounded). Clearly, shame without the consciousness of fault or sin takes a meaning weaker than shame after the transgression. The present shame is closer to Levinas's description.

[30] It was a reversal that humans, after expulsion, should strike at the serpent's head—the seat of its "reason"—while all it could do was lunge at their feet. Where, after all, did the serpent *first* strike, if not at Eve's imagination?

[31] What is radically original in the fact of being human is the way in which the human posits, before itself, the world in its autonomy. But we must add that: "to be-facing-the-world is not thinkable if there is not already a 'behavior-towards-it-qua-world', which is to say, the sketch of a relational behavior." See Gabriel Marcel, "L'anthropologie philosophique de Martin Buber " in *Martin Buber : L'homme et le philosophe*, Gabriel Marcel, Emmanuel Levinas et André Lacocque, Eds., (Brussels: l'Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1968), p. 26. The phrases in single quotes are from Buber's "*Schriften zur Philosophie* " in *Werke*, (Heidelberg: Kösel & Lambert Schneider Verlag, 1962), p. 414, my translation. Thanks to Gabriel Malenfant for this citation.

[32] As we know, Heidegger derives much of his insight into the *Stimmung* called *Angst* from Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard provides the first existentialist interpretation of the anxiety Adam felt in the Garden. This anxiety was due to his affective awareness that he 'was able'. What precisely he was able to do was unclear to him, and thus produced anxiety.

[33] For Freud, writing between 1935 and 1936 (the unpublished third essay of his *Moses and Monotheism*), the emergence of the Third into consciousness, as separated and as omnipresent, could only have come to pass with a primordial transgression, like a murder. For Freud, influenced by Darwin and themes from Jung, the insistence of a species memory in human beings could erupt out of latency from time to time, much the way a neurosis erupts in an individual following a period of latency. This would be a trans-cultural, trans-historic repetition scheme. If Moses was indeed the high priest of the monotheistic Egyptian monarch, Ikhnaton, and if he prolonged the survival of Egyptian monotheism by introducing the notion of being chosen *as well as the foreclosures on mimetic representation we find in Judaism*, then it could only be his murder (a murder that repeated a gesture dating from primeval times) that drove both his memory and the power of his teaching into latency. See Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, Essay 3, "Moses, His People, and Monotheistic Religion" [written before March 1938], p. 102ff. For the discussion of prehistoric memory, repetition, and neurosis, see *Ibid*, pp. 107-115. The evidence for the murder of Moses, Freud finds in the work of Ernst Sellin, but also in Goethe's *Israel in der Wüste*, vol. VII, cf. *Moses, Op. cit.*, p. 114.

[34] Between 1894 and 1895, when he was still tied to neurology and a theory of energetics, Freud wrote the never-published *Outline for a Scientific Psychology*. There and in his work with Josef Breuer (*Studies on Hysteria*, 1895), he had encountered anxiety in such a variety of forms that he attempted to reduce it to a mechanistic model: anxiety signaled excesses produced by endogenous and exogenous stimuli, invariably seeking release through the musculature (in movement). As he developed his psychoanalysis, anxiety came to light as the primary symptom of the polymorphic neurosis that Freud had encountered in Charcot's clinic at the Salpêtrière, "epileptoid hysteria". In his first *topos* (i.e., primary and secondary processes), anxiety was the sign of repression and its energetic "price".

[35] Sigmund Freud, "Letter to Fliess No. 75," in James Strachey and Anna Freud, eds. *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. I [1886-1899]: "Pre-psychoanalytic Publications" (London: Hogarth Press, 1966), p. 269.

[36] The incipience of anxiety would be the auto-intoxication of the neonate, upon its severance from the mother's body, and as yet without a developed Ego.

37 Freud writes: "Early trauma—defense—outbreak of the neurosis—partial return of the repressed material…I will invite the reader to…assume that in the history of human species, something happened similar to the events in the life of the individual" (MAM, 101).

[38] MAM, pp. 42-49.

[39] This does not exclude the anthropomorphic qualities of Elohim/Adonai and of Yahweh. The "one" God may appear given to a host of passions, but that God nevertheless is neither "known" nor imitable, in part because the moral pendant of his affects is not questionable the way the Greek gods' judgments can be. We should keep in mind that the narratives of Genesis are not the sole material to which Nancy et al are referring; they have in mind the Torah and certain Talmudic discussions.

[40] Samuel Weber, *The Legend of Freud: Expanded Edition* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), p. 88. "The ambiguity of the problem is already clearly inscribed in the passage cited [from Freud]: the danger that the psyche confronts *approaches it from without* ('eine *von aussen nahende…*Gefahr'); but the 'excitation' that constitutes the immediate form of that danger *arises from within*, endogenically'. The difficulty of reconciling these two assertions will be to explain just how the psyche can 'notice' (*merkt*) a danger that is both exogenic in origin and endogenic in operation."

[41] A document by Freud that was only discovered in 1985, among Ferenczi's papers, suggests that Freud was anything but sure about this order of priority. The document dates from 1915; it would therefore be a supplement to the arguments in *Totem and Taboo* (cf. Jean Laplanche, *Nouveaux fondements pour la psychanalyse*, (Paris: PUF, 1994), Chapt. 1. In English, *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*, David Macey, trans., (New York: Blackwell Publishers, 1989).

[42] "All primeval men, including…all our ancestors, underwent the fate I shall now describe….The strong male was the master and father of the whole horde, unlimited in his power, which he used brutally. All females were his property…The fate of the sons was a hard one; if they excited the father's jealousy, they were killed or castrated or driven out. They were forced to live in small communities and to provide themselves with wives by stealing them from others. Then one or the other son might succeed in attaining a situation similar to that of the father in the original horde" (MAM, 102-3).

[43] See Laplanche's discussion of Freud as neither Lamarckian nor Darwinian; in Jean Laplanche, *Loc. Cit*.

[44] Buber understood this clearly. He recounts the story of Isaac, son of Yekel of Cracow who, because of a dream, travels to Prague to unearth a treasure. Once there, he encounters the captain of the guard who, for his part, had dreamed that he was to go to Cracow in order to find a treasure under the furnace of one Isaac, son of Yekel: "In that city, where half the Jews are called Isaac, and the other half, Yekel, I can see myself entering the houses, one after another, turning them upside down!" Buber casts irony on the one who would not listen to his dream, the more so that Isaac went home with enough treasure to rebuild the *Shul.* But this is not the "perfectly asocial" dream described by Freud in his study of the *Witz.* It is rather the "perhaps" of the dreamed message; the irony that, if one paid it heed, one might come off enriched. See Buber, *Le chemin de l'homme d'après la doctrine hassidique* (*Der Weg des Menschen nach der chassidischen Lehre*), Wolfgang Heumann, trans., (Monaco: du Rocher, 1989), pp. 49-56.

[45] Freud will write: "The restoration of the primeval father of his historical rights marked a great progress, but, the other parts the prehistoric tragedy also clamored for recognition. How this process was set in motion, it is not easy to say" (MAM, 109). Then, making a surprisingly Nietzschean inference, Freud adds: "It seems that a growing feeling of guiltiness had seized the Jewish people—and perhaps the whole civilization of that time—as a precursor of the return of the repressed material" (*Ibid.*). Note here that the original event is described as a tragedy. It is in the repetition that the tragedy is transformed, at least in the Jewish case. And it is transformed diversely: for Christians, into soteriology; for Muslims, a heroic monotheism; other religions remained closer to ancestor worship. The relationship between tragedy and irony is, clearly, over-determined.

[46] Freud, "Inhibitions, Symptoms, and Anxiety" in *Standard Edition*, (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-74), p. 92.

[47] Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

[48] Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy argue that Freud, holding fast to a logic of identity—of the Ego that, however torn between the instances through which it takes shape in the second Topic, retains consistency as a subject—and to his entrenched "archeophilia" (attachment to a principle of origins), missed the quality of Jewish identity as a "path that would lead [him and us] *beyond* the identity principle" (195, my italics). They suggest that this explains "the failure, or at least…the suspension of the analysis of identification in Freud" (196)—a failure that went beyond his unease with *Volkspsychologie.*

[49] Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

[50] Speaking of the totemic meal, or incorporation—which Freud insists is of the dead father—our authors venture: "But what is really dissociated, and incorporated, is a food that repeats the common maternal substance. Freud notes this…without *seeing*…that in its most "regressive", most "internal" moment, in the moment of *assimilation* which brings the clan members together [repetitively]—and which dis-sociates them—the clan's identification is an identification with the Mother." While "at most we may speak of the maternal substance [here]"…[m]aternal unity is separation, expulsion. This primordial indivision is what it is—maternal—[ultimately] through division alone" (PJNRP, 67; 202).

[51] In a succinct study of his intellectual development, Pnina Levinson (Heidelberg) reminds us that, long emphasizing the difference between religiosity or faith, and religion, Buber was not concerned that biblical stories like this one were fables or myths, as such. The "demythification" popular among Christian theologians of his time (Bultmann) conferred no additional legitimacy to his Judaism. The Bible taught—notably through the prophets, but also globally—the lesson of *Teshuva*: conversion, return to justice, and a new sense of what it means *to be a Jew*. Cf. P. N. Levinson*,* "Martin Buber: Sa vision du judaïsme dans la dialectique prêtre-prophète " in *Martin Buber : Dialogue et voix prophétique, Colloque international Martin Buber 30-31 octobre 1978* (Strasbourg : Centre de recherches et d'études hébraïques, Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg/ Paris : ISTINA, 1980), pp. 113ff.

[52] The question of justice is in fact tied to what the Jews *did indeed admit*, contrary to the Christian accusation of admitting no murder: i.e., the idea of castration, as sign, pact, and radical foreclosure.

[53] This was the centuries-long movement inaugurated by the life and "disappearance" of Sabbatai Tsvi, the 17th century "messiah". See Gershom Scholem's immense study, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah* (Princeton: Bollingen Press, 1976).