



**A University of Sussex PhD thesis**

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

# **Phenomenology and Sleep**

**Patrick Simon Moffett Levy**

PhD Philosophy

University of Sussex

November 2016

University of Sussex  
Patrick Simon Moffett Levy  
PhD Philosophy

## Phenomenology and Sleep

### **Abstract**

This thesis identifies, in Nancy's *The Fall of Sleep*, a crucial critique of phenomenology. A criticism that demarcates, or limits, phenomenology in declaring: "There is no phenomenology of sleep". Taking-up this challenge, we consider a number of ways that phenomenologists have, and could, approach sleep. Our thesis, however, does not simply offer possible responses to the problem but also finds, in these answers, important insights into the essence of the charge itself. Sleep and phenomenology are found to be mutually de-limiting – each binds the other, whilst offering foundational insights *into* its counterpart. Fundamentally, we bring phenomenologies of sleep, as opposed to simply phenomenology, into dialogue with this, Nancean, critique of phenomenology and with Nancy's account of sleep itself. We describe the distinctly different slumbering interpretations of sleep present, and conspicuously absent, in the work of: Husserl, Heidegger, and Levinas. Part I, after initially elaborating the challenge, presents a direct Husserlian counter, via a recent reconstituting of Husserl's late notes on sleep. The strengths and weaknesses of this phenomenological investigation sharpens the problem of sleep and leads us to pull back from consciousness-centred accounts. Part II, in contrast, develops our own hypothetical Heideggerian answer. This Part, the longest, uses Heidegger's existential and comparative analytics to ask 'Does Dasein sleep?' This question reveals internal ambiguities of sleep – positioned *between* existence, life, and death. Part III withdraws from Heideggerian thinking through Levinas's incisive, and early, interpretation of sleep. This Levinasian retracting opens the possibility of returning to Nancy's challenge and corresponding description of sleep. Now this radical account is located in relation to, and in communication with, the somnological-phenomenological findings we have awakened in our thesis. The thesis ends by indicating a possible, future, return back *from* sleep *to* phenomenology – a dream, still hazy from sleep, of a somnolent phenomenology.

# Contents

Dedication .....	1
Acknowledgements .....	2
Part I: A Somnolent Challenge and a Husserlian Reply .....	4
Chapter 1: Introduction – (Re)awakening the Question of Sleep .....	5
I: Sleep, Phenomenology, and the ‘Somnolent Turn’ .....	5
II: Noumenology, Self, and the Sleeping Thing-in-itself – Nancy’s Challenge to Phenomenology .....	10
III: One step forward in two steps back .....	13
IV: Outline of the thesis .....	17
Chapter 2: ‘The Inner Night’ or ‘Dissolution of the Self’? A Critical Reading of Nicolas de Warren’s ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’ .....	19
I: Introduction .....	19
II: Excursus: Limitations or Omissions .....	23
III: Time-Consciousness and the Metaphor of Sleep .....	26
IV: Affectivity, Imagination, and Sleep .....	32
V: “No one puts himself to sleep: sleep comes from elsewhere” .....	39
Part II: Does Dasein Sleep? .....	47
Introduction .....	48

Chapter 3: ‘How did you sleep?’ Moods, Sleep, and the Existential Analytic .....	59
I: Sleeping Attunements and Attunements of Sleep .....	59
II: Disposition, Moods and Sleep .....	66
III: Sleep and the Existential Unity of Dasein .....	71
IV: Corey Anton and the Dream of a Heideggerian Account of Dreamless Sleep.....	79
Chapter 4: Sleep, World Poverty and the Animal (Sleeping) Within .....	93
I: The Animal’s Somnolent Trail.....	93
II: Transposition.....	104
III: Captivation [ <i>Benommenheit</i> ] .....	112
IV: Openness, Elimination and the Animal’s Disinhibiting Ring [ <i>Enthemmungsring</i> ] .....	124
V: Conclusions, Self-Objections and Incomplete Analyses .....	134
VI: Conclusions and Controversies .....	151
Part III: Falling from Phenomenology to Sleep and Back Again .....	166
Chapter 5: Levinas, Nancy, and the Dream of a Somnolent Phenomenology.....	167
I: Introduction .....	167
II: From Sleep to the Existent – Levinas, Sleep, and the Promise of Escape.....	170

III: "...but there will be a reawakening."	178
IV: Before the Fall	181
V: Falling	183
VI: Lost <i>in</i> the World of Night: Dreaming <i>from</i> a Somnolent World	187
VII: From Insomnia to a World without Sleep	194
VIII: Experiencing, Ex-isting, Entering and Leaving Sleep	200
IX: The Blind Spot [ <i>Tache</i> ] of Sleep, or Notes Towards a Somnolent Phenomenology	208
Bibliography	213

Dedicated to

Cai ap Leslie (1989 – 2007),

Alan L. Small (1937 – 2012),

and

Hugh (David) Prysor-Jones (1949 – 2015)

## Acknowledgements

Roughly 1,530 “sleeps” have contributed to this thesis. Yet, if this thesis shows anything it should show that this arbitrary number can do no justice to the debt we owe our sleep. I, most of all, must acknowledge this debt. One, I am certain, I will never finish repaying.

However, the waking have also contributed so much to this thesis and none more so than my supervisors Paul Davies and Tanja Staehler. They have welcomed, encouraged, questioned, pushed, and supported me through the good times and the bad. Upon my arrival at Sussex after telling a fellow graduate student who my new supervisors were they responded – ‘Oh! You got the dream team!’ This has stayed with me over the years and it accurately summarises how lucky I have been. Thank you both!

My experience at Sussex was shaped, not only by my excellent supervisors, but also by the great community which welcomed me so well and have shaped so many of my ideas, beliefs and experiences over these last four years. In particular, I would like to thank: Gabriel Martin, Dimitri Kladiskakis, Tim Carter, Ezra Cohen, Gavin Osbourne, Richard Weir, Christos Hadjioannou, Jana Elsen, Murat Celic, Phil Homburg, Robb Dunphy, Jacob Berkson, Huw Rees, David Martinez Rojas, Mike Lewis, Arthur Willemse, Alex Elliott, Mahon O’Brien, Elaine Finbarr O’Connell, Tony Booth, Gordon Finlayson, Will Rees, Alexandra Popescu, and Jakub Kowalewski. Better friends, drinking and debating companions could not be wished for!

Life is not only philosophy and I have been fortunate to live, in Brighton, with some of the best and most supportive housemates and, I hope, life-long friends that anyone could wish for. Thanks and more go to: Maxine Sherman, Gemma Anderson, Alex Stell, James Waterfield, Tali Morelos-Juárez, and Huw Rees (again)!

I would also like to thank the philosophy faculty at the University of Dundee for making me so welcome in the last few months of the writing of this thesis and for the great opportunity of teaching with them. In particular, thank you: Dominic Smith, Ashley Woodward, and Oisín Keohane.



I am extremely lucky to have many great friends who have never stopped supporting me, believing in me and this thesis, and, most importantly, distracting me when I needed to forget about philosophy, sleep and research for just a moment. Thank you: Jamie Horder, Ian Moore, Danny Montgomery, Iain Cooper, Matthew Hutton, Aaron and Emmett Casley, Jack Fraser, Seferin James, Helen Keyes, Mark Donohoe, Stephen Cadwell, and Siobhán Purcell.

Without a doubt I would never have got even close to submitting this thesis without the support of my family. My parents, Jo Moffett-Levy and David Levy, may have believed I was destined to be a lawyer when they noted my penchant for questions and arguments as a child, yet they have done nothing but encourage my channelling of such behaviour into philosophy. I cannot imagine more interested and caring parents – no matter how obscure the thematic of my work! My sister, Lydia, has always believed in me – without her I would not have chosen to do the undergraduate degree I did let alone got to end of a PhD! Lastly, my aunt Mary, who has welcomed me into her home in these last months of the PhD. Thank you for all the support, advice, and, of course, delicious food.

The last words of thanks must be to my love, Vanessa Smer Barreto. Without you I might have finished this thesis – though probably not – but I would not have known truly *why* I was finishing it. The abstract truth of sleep is all well and good but without you, to share that sleep with, what would it truly have meant?

## **Part I: A Somnolent Challenge and a Husserlian Reply**

There is no phenomenology of sleep, for it shows of itself only its disappearance, its burrowing and its concealment. – Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Fall of Sleep*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, translated by Charlotte Mandell, 2009, Fordham University Press, New York, p. 13

## Chapter 1 – Introduction – (Re)awakening the Question of Sleep

The meaning of the analyses of sleep, the dream, the unconscious, the past: not then to seek some inductive and dispersed solution to these problems, one by one; there are no separate solutions, the solution is philosophical (not psychological). – Merleau-Ponty<sup>2</sup>

Sleep, perhaps, has never been philosophical. – Nancy<sup>3</sup>

### I: Sleep, Phenomenology, and the ‘Somnolent Turn’

This work attempts to hold together these two quotations and to describe – without dissolving – the somnolent tensions involved in any searching *for*, and *after*, sleep. Merleau-Ponty, in his lectures on *Institution and Passivity*, calls for a philosophical “solution”, a solution which is not a list of “separate solutions” but a whole. This quotation, in demanding a unified solution to the problem of *passivity*, offers us both a position from which we may distinguish our subsequent analyses, and a hint at what may be at stake in these discussions. Merleau-Ponty has, correctly, struck on the fact that these topics of analyses, and for our purposes sleep in particular, demand something other than “inductive and dispersed” solutions – the sleeper is not *just* a participant in a psychological experiment. In this sense Merleau-Ponty affirms, wholeheartedly, the problem of sleep, as a philosophical problem. However, as is clear from his dismissal of “separate solutions”, we, in opening this thesis on the phenomenology of sleep, must take our distance from him.<sup>4</sup> Whereas Merleau-Ponty demands an answer to the puzzles passivity and its facets be offered as a unity, we here insist that such a unity cannot be presupposed at the *origin* of sleep. Such a presupposition would, necessarily, position sleep within a unity of *wakefulness*. In this sense, the philosophical problem of sleep – and what is at stake in our investigations from, and after, it – is doubled. Sleep becomes more than just an object of study, albeit a problematic and resistant one, for the waking

---

<sup>2</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Institution and Passivity*, Translated by Leonard Lawlor. Evanston: Northwestern Univ Press, 2010. p. 164.

<sup>3</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. ‘Identity and Trembling’ in *The Birth of Presence*, Translated by Brian Holmes. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993. p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> As this thesis progresses towards its closing consideration of the work of Nancy on sleep this distance will begin to close as the separation of sleep from related phenomena and questions comes under increased pressure.

philosopher. It takes on an existential element in the string of questions ‘*who* sleeps?’, ‘*who* wakes?’, and ‘*for* whom are these questions available?’

Thus the problem of sleep becomes all the more significant and intractable – what relationships with sleep, with the sleeper, are presupposed when, and *before*, the waking philosopher seeks *after* the *essence* of sleep? As the temporal prepositions, ‘before’ and ‘after’, indicate, from *when*, and furthermore *where*, is such investigating initiated? These temporal and spatial concerns reoccur throughout this thesis. The stakes, and the problem, of this investigation thus returns us to the perennial question of the philosopher – how to begin? Only after a good night’s sleep for certain, but how are we to take these words “sleep”, “night” and “good”, when so articulated? Or, in other words, how are we to awaken this question in its somnolent form? How are we to remember the forgotten question of sleep?

A number of recent attempts have been made to return to a consideration of sleep within the humanities. In a lecture at Goldsmiths College, University of London, in 2013 Matthew Fuller suggested, tentatively, that we might be beginning to see a “somnolent turn”.<sup>5</sup> Fuller supports this contention by listing Jonathan Crary’s, 2013, *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*<sup>6</sup>, Simon J. Williams’, 2011, *The Politics of Sleep: Governing (Un)consciousness in the Late Modern Age*<sup>7</sup>, and Kenton Kroker’s, 2007, *The Sleep of Others and the Transformation of Sleep Research*.<sup>8</sup> We might, by way of returning us to the question of sleep as a problem for *philosophy*, offer our own list of recent attempts to address the question(s) of sleep. Corey Anton’s, 2006, ‘Dreamless Sleep and the Whole of Human Life: An Ontological Exposition’<sup>9</sup>, Jean-Luc Nancy’s, 2007, *Tombe de sommeil*, published in English as *The Fall of Sleep* in 2009<sup>10</sup>, and Nicolas

---

<sup>5</sup> Fuller, Matthew. ‘Deep Sleep’, a lecture given as part of Goldsmiths’ ‘Objects and Relations: Visual Cultures Public Programme’, Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2013.

<sup>6</sup> Crary, Jonathan. *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*. New York: Verso, 2013

<sup>7</sup> Williams, Simon J. *The Politics of Sleep: Governing (Un)consciousness in the Late Modern Age*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

<sup>8</sup> Kroker, Kenton. *The Sleep of Others and the Transformation of Sleep Research*. Toronto [Ont.]: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Anton, Corey. ‘Dreamless Sleep and the Whole of Human Life: An Ontological Exposition’, *Human Studies*, 29, pp. 181 – 202, Springer 2006.

<sup>10</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Tombe de sommeil*. 2006, Éditions Galilée, 9, rue Linné, 75005 Paris. Translated as *The Fall of Sleep*.

de Warren's, 2010, 'The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep'<sup>11</sup>. Such a list is, naturally, incomplete and selective.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, these three pieces amount to, Heideggerian (Anton) and Husserlian (de Warren), phenomenological engagements with sleep, and to the temporal and conceptual surrounding of *the* pivotal recent work of philosophy on sleep – Nancy's *The Fall of Sleep*. Of course, interest in sleep and its philosophical implications has not been restricted to sociological and philosophical accounts. The medical humanities, to name but one other field, have also recently begun to recognise the need for a comprehensive investigating of sleep and its attendant, pathological and routine phenomena.<sup>13</sup>

In opening, more concretely, the distance we earlier announced between our means of approaching sleep and that demanded by Merleau-Ponty, we must move away from such disparate and wakeful considerations of sleep. The reason for this narrowing, or sharpening, of the problem of sleep is the desire to avoid any inadvertent smuggling of wakeful (pre/post)conceptions into our description of sleep. This move away from those relations and interconnections between sleep and waking and towards sleep *itself* – whatever that might be – allows us to begin to isolate, and remove, those *everyday* notions which privilege the wakeful over the sleeping. Step by step, withdrawal by withdrawal, this process will return us to the problem of sleep, the problem of sleep without waking.<sup>14</sup>

To return to, and clarify, the second of the quotations with which we began this chapter – the central problem of sleep is not that philosophy has *ignored* it but rather that it has methodically incorporated it *into* wakefulness without allowing the somnolent things themselves to appear. The worry is *not* that we must avoid converting the 'content of sleep' into the 'content of waking life' – otherwise no wakeful analysis of sleep would

---

<sup>11</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. 'The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep', in *On Time – New Contributions to the Husserlian Phenomenology of Time*, ed. Lohmar, D. and Yamaguchi, I. *Phaenomenologica*, 2010, Springer.

<sup>12</sup> To name but one further, and missing, example Simon Morgan Wortham's, 2013, *The Poetics of Sleep*, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013) could also be considered part of this recent renewal of philosophical interest.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, the 'Sleep, Agency, Activity' roundtable at Durham University, 8<sup>th</sup> May 2014 jointly organised by the Centre for Medical Humanities and the Durham University Modern Languages department. A review of the event can be found here: <http://centreformedicalhumanities.org/sleep-agency-activity-roundtable-discussion-durham-university-8th-may-2014-review/>.

<sup>14</sup> That this phrase, 'sleep, without waking', already indicates precisely one possible *end* of sleep – death – and *not* sleep itself perhaps already indicates the limits of this method of approach. We return to this question in the final chapter.

be possible at all – it is rather that we must return to an awareness of this process of transformation and of what it presupposes. Here the motivation for turning to phenomenology in an attempt to unravel this problem becomes clear – ‘what phenomenology is presupposed in our theoretical unpacking of sleep?’ Yet, as we consider below, phenomenologists are far from exempt from this wakeful tendency to cover over sleep, to cover up the sleeper. Heidegger, for example, in his description of how Dasein encounters time within the world seems to demonstrate the way that sleep all too often retracts from view:

Concern makes use of the ‘Being-ready-to-hand’ of the sun, which sheds forth light and warmth. The sun dates time which is interpreted in concern. In terms of this dating arises the ‘most natural’ measure of time—the day.<sup>15</sup>

Not ‘night and day’ but the singular “the day.” Of course, Heidegger will not remain with this “‘most natural’ measure of time” but the question must, nonetheless, be asked ‘can this point of origin – the day, wakefulness – acknowledge and grant sleep its place, time, and identity?’

In 1997 the French journal *Alter, Revue de Phénoménologie* named its fifth edition *Veille, sommeil, rêve*.<sup>16</sup> This title, in its tripartite interconnecting of waking, sleep, and dreams, illustrates that if we are to narrow our focus onto sleep we will require more than a wariness about the influence of waking presuppositions on our attempts to offer a phenomenology of sleep. The philosopher like anyone else is easily distracted from sleep. We turn away from the call of sleep and focus on something more edifying, something more illuminated – probably, these days a phone or computer screen. However, this turning away is not simply a feature of the insomniac present, it also characterises our post-sleep fascination with, our own, dreams. Anton, in his article on “dreamless sleep”,<sup>17</sup> argues that “Western scholarly thought tends to reduce sleep to the experience of dreaming.”<sup>18</sup> Citing Descartes and Heidegger as evidence for this claim Anton suggests

---

<sup>15</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, translated by John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson. New York: Harper, 1962, p. 465 [412 – 413]

<sup>16</sup> *Veille, sommeil, rêve*, *Alter revue de Phénoménologie*, No. 5/1997 – Éditions Alter, groupe de recherche en phénoménologie, ENS de Fontenay-Saint-Cloud, 31, avenue Lombart

<sup>17</sup> Anton, Corey. ‘Dreamless’, *passim*

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*, p. 183

that the “fascinating, mysteriously engaging, and often vivid” nature of dreams pulls us away from considering sleep itself, Anton’s *dreamless sleep*.<sup>19</sup>

The examples of Descartes and Heidegger are useful. Most are familiar with Descartes invoking of the possibility of dreaming in the opening pages of the ‘Meditations’ but many miss that his wording makes of *sleep* a mere carrier, or container, for dreams – “on many occasions I have in sleep been deceived”.<sup>20</sup> This presumption allows and facilitates an all too quick slip between sleeping and dreaming, between the sleeper and the dreamer. However, more surprising is that Heidegger, who often situates his own thinking as a rejection of Cartesian structures and themes, seems, in his 1928 lecture course on Leibniz *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, to make just the same slip. The quotation Anton offers merits repeating in full here – we will return to the relationship between world and the sleeper in Part II:

...a single and common world belongs to the awake, but each of the sleeping turns to his own world. Here world is related to being awake and sleeping, as basic modes proper to factual Dasein. Awakeness is a condition of Dasein in which beings manifest themselves for everyone as one and the same within the same world-character; beings manifest themselves in a thorough-going harmony accessible to everyone and binding for everyone. In sleep, on the contrary, self-manifesting beings have their own peculiar world-character for the individual, in each case a completely different way in which they world.<sup>21</sup>

For Anton, this quotation illustrates the false dichotomy between wakefulness and dreaming sleep – a dichotomy that covers over dreamless sleep and brings with it other implications: sleep as “individual” or isolated, for example.<sup>22</sup>

The dominance of the wakeful and our fascination with dreams and dreaming sleep illustrate the challenge for any philosophy of sleep *itself*. However, they also show why this neglect of sleep offers a specific opening to phenomenology. The history of phenomenology can be seen as a slow movement away from the conscious, wakeful,

---

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.* We return to the question of sleep, dreams, and dreamlessness later in this introductory chapter.

<sup>20</sup> Descartes, René. ‘Meditations on First Philosophy’, in *Key Philosophical Writings*, translated by E. S. Haldane and G. R. T. Ross, p. 135. 1997 Wordsworth Editions, Ware, Hertfordshire, UK.

<sup>21</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, Translated by Michael Heim, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984, p. 172. Heidegger is interpreting Heraclitus fragment 89.

<sup>22</sup> This issue and the question of sleep’s relationship to separation, being-with, and community appears often in the following chapters and is one of the main reasons for the central role this thesis grants Nancy’s thinking.

subject and into the realm of the body, of bodily phenomena. It is to be hoped that by tracing this movement, which must not, of course, be assumed to be a progression, we may also approach the movement of sleep itself.<sup>23</sup> It is to this *shared* movement and to the challenge contained within it that we now turn – to, that is, Nancy’s *The Fall of Sleep*.

## **II: Noumenology, Self, and the Sleeping-Thing-in-Itself – Nancy’s Somnolent Challenge to Phenomenology**

As this Part’s epigraph demonstrates Nancy’s account of sleep presents a specific challenge to phenomenology, to the phenomenologist. This challenge must be reiterated not only here but repeatedly, like the repetitive rhythm of sleep, throughout what follows: “There is no phenomenology of sleep, for it shows of itself only its disappearance, its burrowing and its concealment.”<sup>24</sup> This pronouncement, announcing the end and limit of phenomenology at the edge of sleep, itself appears in the middle of the third chapter of Nancy’s *The Fall of Sleep*, ‘Self from Absence to Self’. It marks not only the limit of phenomenology but also “the possibility, further and stronger than any phenomenality, of a deposition of intentions and aims as well as the fulfillment of sense.”<sup>25</sup> In other words, Nancy does not here announce the end of his somnolent sojourn – his attempt to touch on, and tarry with, sleep. He does not mark an absolute limit beyond which we the wakeful reader, limited in that wakefulness, may never pass.

Whilst we must defer the majority of our engagement with what follows this end of phenomenology for Nancy – with, that is, his own account of sleep – until our final chapter and closing sections, we can here consider what leads him to such a definitive closing off of phenomenology. If we are to evaluate the meaning, sense, and validity of this prohibiting of any somnolent phenomenology we must reflect on the immediate stages of Nancy’s text preceding this ban. We must work back from this “absence”, of phenomenology, to a consideration of the “self [*soi*]” which sleeps.<sup>26</sup>

Nancy’s challenge draws plausibility from the proximity between sleeping and

---

<sup>23</sup> The question of *movement* and its relationship to sleep reappears repeatedly throughout this thesis.

<sup>24</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 13

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*, *passim*



blacking-out, fainting. The phrase, blacking-out, suggests the uniformity and indistinctness of the Hegelian “night in which... all cows are black”.<sup>27</sup> A night without *appearance*. “Sleep does not authorize the analysis of any form of appearance whatsoever, since it shows itself to itself as this appearance that appears only as non-appearing, as returning all appearing on itself and in itself, allowing the waking phenomenologist approaching the bed to perceive nothing but the appearance of its disappearance, the attestation of its retreat.”<sup>28</sup> Yet, surely, a response is immediately evident: blacking-out, fainting, or being anesthetized, may indeed amount to such a dramatic severing of the stream of appearances but sleep seems an altogether more complicated phenomenon. It is, after all, precisely the question of sleep’s status as a phenomenon that we are here discussing. In particular, sleep offers dreams which, one might think, do nothing but appear, and often disappear just as quickly. Nancy, unsurprisingly, is not convinced – *if*, and much might be said to stand or fall on the plausibility of this conjunction, “the sleeping *self*” dreams “of itself” then it happens “according to an appearing that leaves no room for a distinction between being and appearing.”<sup>29</sup> This has been clarified earlier in *The Fall of Sleep* with the observation that subjectivity, insofar as we can use that word, is, in dreaming, mingled with its world – it “does not distinguish itself... from what it sees, hears, and perceives in general.”<sup>30</sup>

Thus we have two claims, or aspects of a single assertion, about the standard caveat that sleep lacks content *except for dreams*. Firstly, that this content cannot be said to *appear* in the sense in which we use it when waking, and, secondly, that this content is not appearance *for a subject*, it is not separable from a subject. These two directions of Nancy’s critique can be developed as relating to the two aspects of phenomenology – the priority of the world as phenomenally given and the constitution of this world by an egoic consciousness. Furthermore, Nancy’s point is not, and must not be mistaken for, the contention that sleep is *contentless*, *simple* absence. In fact, later in his somnolent investigations Nancy will make the following striking claim:

What the sleeper sees is this eclipsed thing. He sees the eclipse itself: not the fiery

---

<sup>27</sup> Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, Translated by A.V. Miller, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1977, ‘Preface’, p. 9

<sup>28</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 13

<sup>29</sup> *ibid*

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*, pp. 7 – 8

ring around it, but the perfectly dark heart of the eclipse of being.<sup>31</sup>

This “eclipsed thing” is, and here he returns to Kantian formulations, nothing but the “Kantian *thing*”, the ‘thing-in-itself’.<sup>32</sup> The sleeper, so Nancy claims, is beyond phenomenology and phenomenological analysis because it is “as *in self* as the Kantian *thing* can be, that is the being-there, posited, the very position independent of all appearance and all appearing.”<sup>33</sup> In sleep, and the sleeper, Nancy finds, not the nothingness of an abyss, but rather the *self* of the thing-in-itself. We need not grant such an interpretation of Kant to see the rhetorical power it holds in regards to any phenomenological engagement with sleep.

Nancy is, here, following in the footsteps of a long tradition of seeing sleep as a turning *in*, a return to the self. Where Nancy differs from this tradition and many others is in denying that this sinking back into the self [*soi*] means a maintaining of the “I” [*je*]. Further to his dismissal of the special status of sleep and dreams Nancy denies that the supposed “consent of the “I,” which... usually assents to sleep and desires it” can be retained during the fall into sleep, into self.<sup>34</sup> With this “losing of its consent” so too goes “being one’s own”, “self-ness [*propriété de soi*],” this is the loss of properness and properties.<sup>35</sup> This insistent fall to the thing-in-itself, for Nancy, “demands the dissipating of questioning and the anxiety that animates it. “Who am I?” disintegrates in the fall of sleep, for this fall carries me toward the absence of questions, toward the unconditional and indubitable affirmation—alien to any system of doubt, to any condition of identification—of a being-in-self [*être-à-soi*] that tolerates no unpacking, no analysis of its structure.”<sup>36</sup> Here it is that the true challenge of sleep appears, in all its lack of appearing. A challenge that is not just to phenomenology, but to all “system[s] of doubt”, to all philosophy and its questioning. As Nancy himself had put it twenty one years earlier in ‘Identity and Trembling’ “Sleep, perhaps, has never been philosophical.”<sup>37</sup> Our recent questions, which were supposed to raise existential as well as somnolent concerns, seem now unable to gain purchase.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*, p. 24

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*, p. 13

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*, p. 12

<sup>35</sup> *ibid*

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*

<sup>37</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. ‘Identity and Trembling’ in *The Birth of Presence*, p. 13

<sup>38</sup> ‘Who sleeps?’, ‘who wakes?’, and ‘for whom are these questions available?’, see p. 6, above.

Phenomenology cannot, à la the natural sciences, dismiss the question of the first-personal perspective and seek after the sleep of some other, some set of qualities to be studied. As such, phenomenology appears hamstrung: it can either project over the sleeper a phenomenological tapestry, or eiderdown, *from* waking; or, it can accept the limits of phenomenology and announce with, surely false, certainty that sleep, *like death*, should be seen as the edge of phenomenological life and that this should be unproblematic. Of course, it might be thought that other answers, other approaches, other hopes of a phenomenology of sleep remain. It is to these that we now turn.

### III: One step forwards in two steps back

How best to begin a phenomenology *of sleep*? The question of beginning, of birth, of awakening, has been our focus already. We have seen that to begin *from* sleep, as every day's everyday endeavours must, does not automatically grant the philosophies of the day a hold, or a grasp, on that which they implicitly assume. Yet, all investigations must limit their scope and this one has proposed to do so by stepping back from the question of philosophy's engagement with sleep, from somnolent philosophy, and instead focusing on phenomenology and its means of approaching, touching, or even accounting for, sleep. Why phenomenology? Having elaborated Nancy's critique of phenomenology's access to sleep we might believe that we would be better served by turning to other fields of research when it comes to sleep – psychoanalysis, or neuroscience, to name just two examples.

Our reason for insisting on phenomenology itself begins from a mere appearance, a somnolent semblance of similarity, an apparent analogy of form.<sup>39</sup> Sleep withdraws from waking and from the commitments of the day. It pulls back from the worries, beliefs, and conceptual structures which frame our waking lives. The sleeper, stripped bare of such, is both more vulnerable and innocent than the waking self whilst also being more free. But free for what *ends*? The end of sleep announces one of two things: the return of

---

<sup>39</sup> This very "insistence", which might seem so wakeful, so demanding, in fact, also calls from sleep. The nagging insistence to *return* to sleep. The *need* and *desire* to put aside other questions and, essentially, other explanations and shift from the vertical to the horizontal. We return to this shift in Parts II and III.

waking life, or the end of life, an end *before waking*. This dual end, this ambiguous *telos*, of sleep will both hamper and fuel our analysis in what follows. However, pulling back from this question of ends for now,<sup>40</sup> we can see the structural similarity which returns us, insistently but gently, to phenomenology. Phenomenology begins with its own withdrawing, with its own stepping away from established commitments and frames of reference. The suspensions of Husserlian phenomenology, of phenomenology at its birth, are at once both like the *fall to sleep* and unlike it.

This formal similarity can be broken down into at least two connections and one point of difference. First, the suspension in sleep and the phenomenological suspensions share a temporariness which is significant in both cases. The sleeper is not a permanent and static being separable in space from other such entities. Instead sleep connects to us through space – we are coextended with the sleeper – whilst differing in time. This interplay of somnolent-wakeful space and somnolent|wakeful time is without permanence and fixity – it truly is a *play* of difference. In the case of the phenomenologist the suspension, with which they begin, is also impermanent, fleeting and easily slips away again. The practicing phenomenologist must, like Husserl, return time and again to the reduction, to suspension. This brings us to the second point of similarity between sleep and the opening gambits of phenomenology – they are both incomplete. To begin with phenomenology this time, let us cite the often quoted lines from Merleau-Ponty's 'Preface' to his *Phenomenology of Perception*:

The most important lesson which the reduction teaches us is the impossibility of a complete reduction. This is why Husserl always wonders anew about the possibility of the reduction. If we were absolute spirit, the reduction would not be problematic.<sup>41</sup>

This lesson, the most important according to Merleau-Ponty, is itself applicable to sleep. This may at first appear counter-intuitive – surely sleep is complete exactly in the two situations which amount to its *ends* named above: reawakening and death. However, through the course of this thesis we will argue that such a sharp de-limiting of sleep's borders does not stand up to scrutiny. The sleeper is not quite so isolated as first

---

<sup>40</sup> The question of the ends of sleep raises inevitably the issue of what would be appropriate ends, or goals, for any phenomenology of sleep.

<sup>41</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, Translated by D.A. Landes. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2012, pp. lxxvii – lxxviii

impressions suggest.

However, to get a better initial idea of what is meant by this incompleteness of sleep, this never being finished, it is helpful to turn to the point of contrast between sleep and phenomenological procedures of suspension. In the latter case these are, at least in the Husserlian model, *performed* suspensions. One undertakes the reductions, it is a project, even if it is a necessarily incomplete one. However, in the case of sleep one might doubt that it even amounts to a project without end – a journey without a destination. In an important sense, the sense which has motivated our *who*-centred questions above, sleep is not something *we* perform, it is not an *act* or an undertaking *for me*. As our investigations continue these two points of similarity and one of difference can be seen as underlying the more concrete engagements with phenomenological philosophy and with sleep.

Such an apparent and unstable proximity between sleep and the phenomenological practice of suspension suggests our own preferred method of initiating this testing of the limits of Nancy's ban on, or limiting of, the phenomenology of sleep. We propose to begin with two suspensions, with the withdrawing of two fascinating questions. These suspensions will allow us to approach the *phenomenon* of sleep without distraction, without being drawn out beforehand into questions which, perhaps only superficially, relate to but are not central to our somnolent concerns. The two suspensions can both be understood as the suspension of questions of relation. They are the suspension of, firstly, the question of sleep's relationship with dreams and, secondly, the question of sleep's relationship with the body.

We have already discussed why we might wish to avoid the thorny question of how dreams relate to sleep: are they *within* sleep, *between* it and waking, or simply projected back over it *from* waking – to consider just one beginning of the many puzzles that our night-time reveries raise. However, Nancy too seems to validate this phenomenological procedure of pulling back, withdrawing, from our standard conjoining of the questioning of sleep with that of dreams. As we saw above, Nancy is dismissive of the typical move to return to the play of appearances through appeal to the apparitions of REM sleep. Importantly, this suspension, like the *epoché*, does not take-up a position on sleep's relationship with dreaming, it does not decide beforehand whether this

relationship is fundamental, auxiliary, internal, external, somnolent or wakeful. Our proposed suspension is of the question of this relationship itself.

The second proposed suspension, with which this thesis takes its beginning, is the suspension of the question of sleep's relationship to the body. Sleep is often taken as a 'bodily phenomenon', as a concern that would not trouble us if we were immaterial, if "we were absolute mind".<sup>42</sup> In fact, in Christian theology those granted access to heaven will neither eat nor sleep again. This permanent insomnia, the reward of the faithful, is indicative of the way in which the Judaeo-Christian tradition has strongly associated our *need* for sleep with our material fallenness. The question remains, of course, what exactly the truth of this association is. However, once again this suspension is not a taking of one side against another in this debate – in the questioning of sleep's relationship to the body. Instead, here as in the case of dreams, our suspension is of the question in its entirety not of a particular answer to it.

The consequences of these initial phenomenological manoeuvres are twofold. Firstly, they allow us to limit the scope of our investigations. They hold us back from leaping into the discussions of dreams and scepticism with Descartes and later, from the Anglo-American tradition, Norman Malcolm and many others.<sup>43</sup> They keep us, too, from a substantial engagement with the psychoanalytic work of Freud and his followers.<sup>44</sup> Likewise, the withdrawal from the body allows us to fend off the cries of 'but we know what sleep does to the brain' from the ever insistent neuroscientist. Though, consequently, it also requires us to hold off from any sustained engagement with the nuanced and fascinating phenomenology of the body offered throughout the work of Merleau-Ponty. As such these suspensions limit, without closing down completely, the question of sleep – they separate it. In so doing they directly contradict the demand made by Merleau-Ponty in our opening quotation for a unified philosophical solution to the problem of passivity.

---

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*

<sup>43</sup> Malcolm, Norman. *Dreaming*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1959. This book and the articles which Malcolm published around it spawned an entire genre of post-Wittgensteinian responses to the Cartesian discussion of dreams.

<sup>44</sup> For our purposes this works both to limit our discussion of Freud and psychoanalysis as such, and also to prevent a potentially distracting detour through Nancy's early work on Lacan and its relation to his sustained interest in sleep. In particular, his 1973 *Le titre de la lettre*, published as *The Title of the Letter* in English (Jean-Luc Nancy and Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe. *The Title of the Letter. A Reading of Lacan*. Translated by Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

Yet, and here we remain in close proximity to Merleau-Ponty, these suspensions share in the most important lesson of the phenomenological reduction – they illustrate “the impossibility of a complete reduction.”<sup>45</sup> These reductions will not, and cannot, mitigate against the very possibility of all relations between sleep, dreams and the body. In fact, and here we take our initial starting point from Nancy rather than from the phenomenological tradition, it will be a fundamental feature of this thesis to observe – but without the detachment of an unconcerned observer – the falling, or slipping, away of these suspensions. The incompleteness and temporary nature of our double suspensions is here shown to amount to their finitude. It is indeed a question of finitude. Nonetheless, we cannot here prescribe in advance a finite response to the question of sleep without first undertaking just such a response. However much these suspensions fall away they offer a point of contact with both phenomenology and with the sleeper. They grant us a place to begin our somnolent sojourn. Here we find the wherewithal to, like Nancy, “Never... shrink from a challenge”, to take on some of his “temerity” and to throw “caution” to the wind in tracing this fall to, through, or out of, a phenomenology of sleep.<sup>46</sup>

#### IV: Outline of the thesis

This thesis traces a series of actual and possible phenomenological responses to Nancy’s somnolent challenge. It reconstructs a phenomenology of sleep, in diverse guises and with varying degrees of success – there is as much to be learned from the limitations of such accounts as from their successes. The thesis is divided into three distinct parts. Part I establishes the problem for any phenomenology of sleep as articulated in Nancy’s *The Fall of Sleep* (Chapter 1) before offering a specific, Husserlian, response via Nicolas de Warren’s article ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’ (Chapter 2). This initial testing of the limits of Nancy’s claims establishes what is at stake in, and the demands on, any Husserlian phenomenology of sleep. Part II, the largest of this thesis, leaves the actual and targeted response of de Warren and his tentative somnolent phenomenology for the hypothetical question ‘does Dasein sleep?’ This question, and the move to the consideration of Heideggerian thought, takes us both a step

---

<sup>45</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. xv

<sup>46</sup> Derrida, Jacques. *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*, Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005.p. 43

further from phenomenology as a topic for historical examination and a step closer towards treating it as a living philosophy. Tracking the surprising absence of sleep in Heidegger's *Being and Time* (Chapter 3) we turn to his deferred treatment of the question of life in the influential 1929/30 lecture course *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*. This step away from the absence of sleep and on to a potential, and yet bound, presence allows us to undertake a hypothetical and speculative Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep through the development of a revealing and concealing somnological-zoological analogy (Chapter 4). This following of Heidegger along his animal paths and the opening up of a somnolent track within, and yet also out of, his thinking reminds us that sleep is Janus-faced and looks not just towards the passivity of death but also to the movement and activity of life.

The final part, Part III, begins by establishing a distance from our hypothetical Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep via Levinas's intriguing account of sleep. In Levinas's early post-war texts, *Existence and Existents* and *Time and the Other*, we encounter a new question, the question of the alterity of sleep. This turn to sleep's alterity offers another phenomenological means of approaching sleep – one which aims to *begin* from the sleeper rather than subtract back from waking life to sleep. In this way, we encounter a Levinasian demand, never fully articulated or followed, to initiate philosophy from the somnolent. However, this encounter returns us to Nancy's effort to undertake exactly this and allows us to, in the closing sections of this thesis, explore the striking points of contact and distance between Nancy and his phenomenological predecessors (Chapter 5). In the final analysis this thesis throws into relief these moments of contact, these moments when sleep, phenomenology, and Nancy's work touch but without ever becoming a singular, unified, object.



## Chapter 2

# **‘The Inner Night’ or ‘Dissolution of the Self’? A Critical Reading of Nicolas de Warren’s ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’**

The truly difficult questions are the questions we continually postpone, and never truly face.<sup>1</sup>

### **I: Introduction**

This epigraph both applies to the question of our thesis, the question of sleep, and frames the debate explored in this chapter. The question of sleep has not only been repeatedly postponed and side-lined in the history of philosophy but even on those, rare, occasions when it has been addressed such accounts often treat sleep as a derivative and secondary concern, they fail to “truly face” the question head-on. Such partial and secondary treatments of sleep tend to demote the importance of sleep in relation to waking life and in so doing to presuppose answers to, rather than engage with, the problem of sleep. Sleep, as it often does in everyday life, slips into the hazy background *milieu* of lived-experiences.

Yet a phenomenological topic or question which cannot find its origins in the writings of Edmund Husserl is simply not looking hard enough. Husserl wrote so prodigiously that we should not be surprised to discover sleep did not evade his attention. However, given the nature of Husserl’s phenomenology – an examination of the essential *structures* and genetic processes of *givenness* for the unity of *consciousness* – we might, nonetheless, be surprised at how close it came to doing so. Husserl postponed any sustained discussion of sleep until the 1930s, relatively late in his philosophical career and, even then, these late fragments on sleep are just that: fragments; short, “preliminary”, and never published as part of any larger project.<sup>2</sup> Postpone the question Husserl surely did, but to what degree did his work on sleep truly face-up to sleep, and furthermore, to

---

<sup>1</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’, p. 276

<sup>2</sup> “...the problem of sleep did not entirely escape Husserl’s attention, even though, in those manuscripts in which the problem of sleep is explicitly addressed – for example, in manuscript D-14 – Husserl’s phenomenology of sleep remained in a preliminary stage of formation.” *ibid*, p. 286

what extent *could* it do so? This chapter will undertake to assess these questions through a close reading of Nicolas de Warren's, intriguing article 'The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep', which is itself a direct response to the challenge from Nancy with which we have introduced this thesis.

One of the many strengths of de Warren's article is that it provides an overview of Husserl's concrete pronouncements on sleep as well as an account of their context within Husserl's mature phenomenology. Not content to merely describe Husserl's contribution to the phenomenology of sleep, de Warren also aims to use this preliminary work as a foundation for a complete phenomenological description of sleep. This grander task matches our own, although he explicitly excludes this goal from the scope of this, particular, article: "...I make no pretense to develop a complete phenomenological account of sleep".<sup>3</sup>

Already de Warren's approach to sleep shares another key feature with our own. It takes seriously the *problem* of sleep and as such rules out any *direct* phenomenology of sleep without this closing off any, and all, phenomenology of sleep. Such an "indirect approach" to sleep emerges out of de Warren's opening discussion of the limits of our access to sleep: "we never, strictly speaking, *experience* our own condition of being asleep, that we are never conscious of being asleep while we sleep, but only experience sleep in the transitions of falling asleep and awakenings".<sup>4</sup> The role of these transitions will remain central to de Warren's proto-phenomenology of sleep. Yet it is in Husserl's metaphorical use of sleep, in his phenomenology of time-consciousness, that de Warren finds his avenue of approach to sleep itself. Metaphors afford us a means of discussing one set of concepts in terms only directly applicable to another. In this way de Warren acknowledges the privileged position of waking for the philosopher and yet gains a rich literary and philosophical reservoir for the investigating of sleep. "Whether in literary prose, in philosophical discourse or in ordinary talk, the condition of sleep is commonly characterized as a distance or retreat; as a state of rest and relaxation; as an absence of

---

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, p. 276. The question of completeness and sleep is a particularly interesting one. Specifically, the implicit assumptions that de Warren makes about the nature of sleep by claiming the ability to offer only a partial account of sleep will be considered below.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*, p. 274

differentiation; as a depth or submersion; as a state of non-being.”<sup>5</sup> Whilst, of course, not an exhaustive list of the metaphorical engagements with sleep, de Warren, nonetheless, finds here one way of beginning an indirect phenomenology of sleep.

To further explore de Warren’s approach to sleep it is necessary to contrast it with the view he ascribes to Jean-Luc Nancy.

If sleep is the condition in which nothing appears to me – in which I am not even for myself – is a phenomenology of sleep possible? In Jean-Luc Nancy’s words: “*Il n’y a pas de phenomenology du sommeil, car il ne montre de soi qui sa disparition, son enfouissement et sa dérobade.*” [“There does not exist a phenomenology of sleep since the self shows of itself only in its disappearance, its fleeting and its absence.”]<sup>6</sup>

Nancy dismisses any phenomenological account of sleep whatsoever. De Warren explains this dismissal by reference to the Sartrean distinction between *pour soi* and *en soi*, or self and non-self. For Nancy, sleep collapses this distinction and thus prevents *anything* ‘appearing’ for *anyone*. This, de Warren points out, rests on Nancy’s “conception of sleep as the complete absence of any experience”.<sup>7</sup> The central point of Nancy’s argument, which de Warren will take issue with, is that in sleep the self is, however temporarily, dissolved – “[t]he self does not retire *to* itself, but retires *from* itself in succumbing, or falling, into its own self-oblivion.”<sup>8</sup> De Warren reads Nancy, as we did in our previous chapter, as describing the sleeper as a “‘thing in itself’”, as lacking “any relation to anything else, including itself.”<sup>9</sup>

It is this understanding of sleep that drives the refusal of any phenomenology of sleep and against which de Warren develops his alternative, Husserlian, account. De

---

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* In the thesis we will follow the thread of many of these metaphorical accounts of sleep. In particular, we will – following Nancy – highlight sleep’s connections with water and the sea which de Warren’s pair “depth or submersion” suggests. In this context compare Derrida’s claim, in his ‘Introduction’ to Husserl’s *Origin of Geometry*, translated by John P Leavey. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1989: “Husserl prefers the value of *interiority* to that of *profundity* or depth, interiority being related to the penetration of internal, intrinsic (*inner*), i.e., essential (*wesentlich*), sense.” See, note 109, p. 101. We will have reason to return to this in our conclusion to this chapter.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.* De Warren’s translation. Charlotte Mandell’s translation we already know: “There is no phenomenology of sleep, for it shows of itself only its disappearance, its burrowing and its concealment.” – Nancy, Jean-Luc – *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 13.

<sup>7</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’, p. 274

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, p. 275

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*

Warren acknowledges in the opening pages of his article, as we have above, the intuitive weight of Nancy's view of sleep as a dissipation of self. However, "Strictly speaking, if a phenomenology of sleep were impossible, the metaphorical meaning of sleep within phenomenological descriptions would remain without traction."<sup>10</sup> That our metaphorical descriptions of sleep seem apt at all – and it seems from their historical staying power that they do – would suggest that we have some minimal access to sleep. The absolute divide between the waking self and sleep, which Nancy describes, would surely prevent even this mediated, metaphor justifying, opening into sleep, and thus into the phenomenology of sleep.

It is, however, not obviously convincing that sleep being accessible to metaphorical description automatically equates to sleep being accessible to phenomenological description. Furthermore, Nancy, given the style of *The Fall of Sleep*, would surely not deny such metaphorical access to sleep. Thus the question becomes the move from indirect access to indirect *phenomenological* access. In other words, the disagreement, at least at this early stage in our assessment of de Warren's article, appears to revolve around what would qualify as a *phenomenology* of sleep. By the end of this chapter we will, with de Warren, have identified *one* possible way of ascertaining this. Yet, the core contrast between Nancy and de Warren rests, primordially, not on a terminological or methodological question but rather a constitutive or topological one, on where one places the sleeper in relation to the waking self, or, as we will see, in relation to *consciousness*. Nancy sees sleep as dissolving the self and thus a radical break or difference between the waking and sleeping selves. In contrast, de Warren argues that sleep and waking are both fundamentally *within* consciousness, a position he unearths from Husserl's mature writings.

De Warren begins by considering Husserl's *specific* metaphorical use of sleep in his phenomenology of time-consciousness. With this in hand he moves on to discuss the specific fragments on sleep from manuscript D-14, and then, lastly, offers his own extension of Husserl's phenomenology of sleep, through a comparison with the imagination. These three moves each clarify further both Husserl's and de Warren's understanding of sleep and where these differ from Nancy's. In what follows we trace

---

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*

each stage of de Warren's argument in turn before considering the implications for the debate between Nancy and de Warren and, lastly, the connotations of this debate, more broadly, for sleep and a phenomenology thereof. However, before this tracking of de Warren's course, a brief excursus, on that which de Warren explicitly excludes from his article, is required.

## II: Excursus: Limitations or Omissions?

The quotation with which this chapter opens amounts, in its context in de Warren's article, to an acknowledgement that many questions concerning and surrounding sleep will be excluded from 'The Inner Night'. Any piece of work, let alone a journal article, must place limits on its scope and at the end of de Warren's introduction we are furnished with his own. Three questions, or groups of questions, will be excluded from consideration, of which we will consider the two most significant to us. We must now briefly consider to what degree, if any, these explicit limits may guide us as we consider de Warren's argument in more detail in what follows.

Firstly, de Warren, is:

...concerned exclusively with dreamless or profound sleep. The phenomenological constitution of dreams and other manifest occurrences during sleep – somnambulism, nightmares, sleep talking, etc. – represent "higher order" problems of constitution that are here excluded.<sup>11</sup>

Dreams have, so we have argued, long been the misguided focus of discussions of sleep. With this in mind de Warren's decision to exclude dreams and all other 'sleep phenomena' from his consideration of sleep is surely to be applauded. Not only does such a decision shift the focus back onto the neglected heart of sleep but it also raises the essential problematic of the relationship between this aspect of sleep and those very phenomena which tend to have been treated in, relative, isolation – dreams etc. De Warren's description of these phenomena as "higher order" advances the view that the neglected heart of sleep – the abyss of sleep – is prior to, or more primordial than, dreams.

---

<sup>11</sup> *ibid*, p. 276

However, importantly, this decision to focus on *dreamless* sleep is not equivalent to the suspension of the question of the relation between sleep and dreams we offered in our previous Chapter.<sup>12</sup> De Warren, in contrast, implicitly delimits that relationship by claiming that it *is* possible to isolate ‘dream-less sleep’ from ‘dream-full sleep’. One might wonder whether, conversely, this impinging relationship that dreams seem to demonstrate on the other – negative – side of sleep is not mirrored in the other direction. To clarify, perhaps the constitution of sleep, as a whole, is such that the negative heart of sleep cannot be conceived without these “higher order” phenomena which de Warren is here excluding from his article. This holistic and interconnected conception of sleep would militate against a sharp separation between two distinct parts of sleep and thus prevent a clear exclusion of dreams from de Warren’s article. Furthermore, as we will see, de Warren’s own argument might in fact benefit from the inclusion of dreams and other ‘sleep phenomena’.

There is a more general concern about this category of “dreamless or profound sleep”. In presuming the possibility of this exemption de Warren must show that one of the common metaphorical descriptions of sleep, which he himself cites, “as an absence of differentiation” is mistaken.<sup>13</sup> For if sleep indeed constitutes an inner night where differentiation fails then it makes no sense to talk of *different* types of sleep such as dreamless, ‘disturbed’, or content-full, sleep. De Warren cites Hegel as saying “sleep is the condition in which the soul is plunged in its unity without difference...”.<sup>14</sup> If sleep *is* a condition *within* which differentiation is impossible then we must ask how one could distinguish between different types of sleep without this surpassing the definitional constraint? If this is correct it would seem to demonstrate that de Warren holds a hidden premise that sleep does not amount to the dissolution of self and other as Nancy argues. Yet to presume thus, prior to arguing, suggests that de Warren is narrowing the scope of the debate between the two positions – by excluding dreams from his article – in an unjustified manner.

There are at least two replies open to de Warren. Firstly, he might argue that phenomenologically we clearly do distinguish between those periods of sleep which

---

<sup>12</sup> See Ch 1, Sc. III, above.

<sup>13</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’, p. 274

<sup>14</sup> *ibid*, p. 274 – citing Hegel, *Encyclopedia*, Sc. 398

contain dreams and those which do not. Thus any description of sleep which prescribed against distinctions of type of sleep would be phenomenologically bankrupt. Alternatively, de Warren might argue that the indistinguishable character of sleep is of a specific concept of sleep – one which we *in fact* never undergo. This “absolute sleep” is the sleep which Hegel has in mind and is what de Warren will call “the limit of falling asleep.”<sup>15</sup> “In the *absolute of sleep*, all the cows are indeed black” but in falling asleep – a process which for de Warren will come to include all states which we in fact pass through during times when ordinary language describes us as ‘being asleep’ – some cows are black and some have white spots.<sup>16</sup> De Warren will argue the latter of these options whilst using the former phenomenological claim to support his contention about the distinction between the actual processes of ‘falling asleep’, which we experience nightly, and the limit condition for these – ‘absolute sleep’. We return to this issue below.

Secondly, de Warren “makes no pretense to develop a complete phenomenological account of sleep” and will not assess all metaphorical uses of sleep.<sup>17</sup> These are, of course, reasonable limitations and yet, nonetheless, they raise specific questions about what follows. At this stage we need only sketch the concerns that arise from such constraints. Much of de Warren’s following argument will rest on his contention that sleep is temporary.<sup>18</sup> Whilst we will more critically discuss this claim later it is important at this stage to recognise that sleep’s supposed temporary nature can only be established by at the very least a ‘conceptual framing’ of sleep. Such a ‘conceptual framing’ amounts to the delimiting of the borders or limits of sleep so as to distinguish as clearly as possible between what is to be taken as sleep and what is not. This is not to argue that de Warren must provide a *complete* account of sleep but rather that his later claims will rely on a comprehensive conceptual circumnavigation – though not a conceptual filling in – of sleep. Furthermore, this temporary nature of sleep is particularly related to one of the specific metaphorical descriptions of sleep which de Warren excludes from the discussion – sleep as a temporary death. In note 7 de Warren excludes the

---

<sup>15</sup> *ibid*, p. 292

<sup>16</sup> *ibid*, p. 274

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, p. 276

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*, p. 283 and pp. 286 – 8, for example.

relationship between sleep and death from consideration.<sup>19</sup> This particular exclusion, along with the other two, is called into question through the following discussion.

### III: Time-consciousness and the Metaphor of Sleep

We should begin, with the second section of de Warren's article, in sketching Husserl's philosophy of time-consciousness. It is important to note that Husserl's understanding of time-consciousness developed and changed significantly as his phenomenology shifted from what he himself called a 'static phenomenological method' to a 'genetic phenomenology' or 'phenomenology of genesis'.<sup>20</sup> Specifically, Husserl's appreciation of the centrality of time-consciousness for the constitution of consciousness itself developed out of his initial – static – interest in what he called 'time-objects' – de Warren uses the example of a melody. Within a melody every note has its own givenness in the 'now-phase' but that is not the limit of its givenness. Every note is given emptily in protention before its original presentation in its 'now-phase' and is retained in retentive consciousness after its 'now-phase' has passed. One can think of this as the logical extension of Husserl's concept of apperception over time. Some objects – like melodies – show quite clearly that what is intuitively given to us phenomenologically is not reducible to a 'snap-shot' or moment in time. More is revealed phenomenologically than the mere now, just as more is revealed when we see a book than merely the front cover. This in turn led Husserl to see that any "perceptual act of consciousness possesses an internal architecture of three non-independent forms of temporal apprehension: retention, original presentation, and protention."<sup>21</sup> De Warren is quick to point out that these forms of temporal apprehension are related in the "passage or sinking away" of the now – the flow of time.<sup>22</sup> These forms are all intuitive but in different ways. Original presentation provides the presence of the now which is then given in retentive consciousness as a now-phase which is "just-past" – essentially this is not a remembered representation of the original presentation but rather another, different, form of intuitive

---

<sup>19</sup> *ibid*, p. 294, Note 7 – "We cannot pursue here the added complication in Husserl's characterization of retentive consciousness and the constitution of the past of introducing the metaphor of *the dead* as equivalent, in its descriptive value, to the metaphor of sleep."

<sup>20</sup> See Husserl's 'Section 4. On Static and Genetic Phenomenological method', *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis*, translated by Steinbock, A. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pp. 624 – 648

<sup>21</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. 'The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep', p. 277

<sup>22</sup> *ibid*



givenness – and which was prefigured by protention as a “now-phase as not-yet-given, as given in an empty manner, or “emptily” in character.”<sup>23</sup>

From this time-object orientated account Husserl came to see that “the possibility of consciousness as such, as intentionality, is temporal through and through, and, in this regard, constituted in time-consciousness.”<sup>24</sup> This key shift in Husserl’s thinking will be of essential importance for de Warren’s argument. To see why, let us consider the corresponding noematic and noetic sides of time-consciousness. De Warren shows these two sides of Husserl’s philosophy of time-consciousness thus: “Husserl specifies that along with the necessary retention of an earlier now-phase as just-past, consciousness *retains itself*...”<sup>25</sup> This ‘self-retaining’ of consciousness involves preserving the now-phase of each time-object and thus we have a “double-intentionality of retentive consciousness”.<sup>26</sup> On the noematic side, that which is given temporally, we have cross-intentionality. Whereas on the noetic side, that of the act of consciousness as receiving givenness, we have length-intentionality. If the former involves a crossing-out, modification, of the original presentation of a now-phase into a now-phase as just-past then the latter establishes “a “stretch-continuum” in which different phases of consciousness, along with their nested intentional correlations, over-lap in the mode of sedimentation.”<sup>27</sup>

It is this length-intentionality which underpins Husserl’s shift from static phenomenology to genetic. It is necessary to understand how this process of sedimentation of lengthwise retentive consciousness connects to the distinction between self and other. It is precisely this “stretch-continuum” which allows the unification of a pole of consciousness over time. If Husserl had only cross-intentionality then he would be unable to account for the most fundamental feature of (the noetic side of) time-consciousness – that temporal intervals, and in fact all experiences, are given *for* one unified pole of consciousness. Time-consciousness is individualising. Thus time-consciousness, as genesis, amounts to the condition for the possibility of any unified consciousness. For de Warren, this “*constitutive function*” of retentive consciousness is

---

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*, p. 278

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*

<sup>27</sup> *ibid*

of the utmost importance.<sup>28</sup> The relationship between time-consciousness and self-consciousness is far from simple in Husserl's work. Yet, for de Warren, and for our us, it is enough to see that this relationship avoids certain difficulties as well as "establishing the sense in which the past *transcends* consciousness of the now, and, in this temporal transcendence, of how consciousness transcends itself."<sup>29</sup>

It is in retentive consciousness that the process of sedimentation or the "de-presentification" of the intuitive fullness and "living presence" of an original presentation" occurs and it is here that Husserl introduces the metaphor of sleep.<sup>30</sup>

Husserl relies on an array of characterizations to describe this function of retentive consciousness as "de-presentification:" going to sleep, sinking into a depth, emptying of intuitive affectivity and vivacity, and erasing all differentiation.<sup>31</sup>

De Warren sees Husserl as using these metaphors to describe the transformative process of "de-presentification" that we undergo within time-consciousness from the intuitive fullness of the "original presentation" through the givenness, in "near retention", of the now-phase as just-past / no longer, to "the undifferentiated unity of far retention... which extinguishes all differentiations".<sup>32</sup> Husserl's aim is to describe the three stages of present, just-past but still "within the arc of living present",<sup>33</sup> and the past proper – still within consciousness: the past remains through sedimentation. This results in two stages of retentive consciousness – "near retention" and "far retention". Husserl's metaphorical use of sleep is thus the description of this *process of transformation* within retentive consciousness from near retention – "falling asleep" – to far retention – "being asleep".

It is here that de Warren's argument proper, through Husserl's metaphorical use of falling asleep and being asleep, opens. He argues that Husserl places the metaphors of wakefulness, falling asleep, and being asleep "*within* the over-arching wakeful life of consciousness".<sup>34</sup> We can now see that these three correspond to three stages of time-

---

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*, p. 279

<sup>29</sup> *ibid*

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*, p. 280

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*, quoting Husserl, *Hua XI*, 288 [422-423]

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*, p. 281

consciousness – original presentation, near retention, and far retention, respectively – however, it is essential to understand that this metaphorical use of sleep to describe the sedimentation of the present into the past operates at a number of levels for de Warren. This “sinking into the “realm of the dead” or “dormant horizontal sphere”” operates on both the noematic *and* the noetic sides of life.<sup>35</sup> In retentional consciousness we have a process of slipping away not only of the intuitive fullness of the given but also “the self-givenness of consciousness for itself.”<sup>36</sup> Fundamentally the distinction between the metaphor of the “realm of the dead” and the “dormant horizontal sphere” allows Husserl to distinguish the sedimentation of consciousness from its dissolution or destruction.

First, however, another aspect of the metaphorical use of sleep shows itself: sleep is not something which comes from outside of consciousness for Husserl but rather is – just as we saw when considering the relationship between time-consciousness and self-consciousness above – an aspect of the constitutive function of retentional consciousness.

In the over-lapping running off of consciousness along the length-wise intentionality of (self)-retention, consciousness *covers over* its own accomplishment of the living present. The metaphor of sedimentation means a “covering over” or “self-forgetting” of consciousness: consciousness “de-presentifies” itself in its own temporal self-constitution.<sup>37</sup>

This connecting of the process of retention with the constitution of self-consciousness through the metaphor of sleep shows that for Husserl, and for de Warren, sleep is essentially an active and internal part of the process of self-constitution which consciousness develops. In giving sleep – as a metaphorical device – such primacy in the constituting of consciousness Husserl brings to light what de Warren calls “an original difference, and tension, between the *self-abstention and self-presence* of consciousness.”<sup>38</sup> This internalising of sleep – which is a hallmark of all three of de Warren’s Husserlian descriptions of sleep – has the notable advantage that it accounts for what might be called the horizontal presence of sleep as absent. That is that it shows sleep as always with us, as that which we – as waking consciousness within the day – have come from and are on our way to. This, always, sits alongside, and in tension with, the

---

<sup>35</sup> *ibid*,

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*

wakefulness of life, or, in other words our openness to the world and to ourselves. Reminding us of retention's constitutive role in self-consciousness shows, for de Warren, that "the falling asleep of consciousness, as a characterization of retentional consciousness, does not intrude onto an already constituted wakeful sphere from the outside."<sup>39</sup>

As mentioned above, Husserl's use of the metaphor of being asleep cannot be conflated with a complete submersion in the "realm of the dead". Far retention does not amount to the loss of the past but rather the sedimentation of the living present as past and thus the constituting of consciousness. In far retention consciousness *creates*, through a process of covering-over and self-forgetting, a past for itself. "In this regard, the metaphor of sleep defines the sense in which the past that I have become is "unconscious" without being beyond the reach of consciousness."<sup>40</sup> In elaborating this point, de Warren uses the example of locking your front door, forgetting whether you have locked the door and rushing back to check. Through far retentional consciousness we put our past to sleep as a past which is not annihilated – we might remember that we have locked the door – but which is still not directly conscious for us in contrast to the manner in which the now of the present is, it is temporarily lost or put into stasis. It is to this question, the question of memory and the sedimented past, that we must move in order to clarify one of the most important aspects of Husserl's metaphorical uses of sleep.

De Warren describes two functions of far retention. The first Husserl called "original association" and amounts to the passive association of the past with a present experience such as seeing something as familiar or resuming an activity after an interruption. This associating of past with present requires that the past – whilst not held present for consciousness – is still available to us. This tacit knowledge, that far retention allows, underpins the very possibility of remembrance which is itself the second function Husserl gave far retention – "remembrance presupposes the dual service of near and far retentions."<sup>41</sup> This shows, according to de Warren, that sleep is used metaphorically as constituting "the possibility of *return*".<sup>42</sup> As we will see this ties in with his key

---

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, p. 282

<sup>40</sup> *ibid*

<sup>41</sup> *ibid*, p. 283

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*

characterisation of sleep as temporary and, as such, as constituting the possibility of a return to waking life. This conception of sleep is in turn used, metaphorically by Husserl, to found the description of remembrance as an “awakening”.<sup>43</sup>

Remembrance is for Husserl operative on both the noematic and noetic registers in that what is remembered is not merely the givenness of the noematic object of experience but also the act of experience itself – the consciousness, or self, of the past. This return to presence of the self resembles waking in that we are brought back not only to the world but also to ourselves. For de Warren and Husserl, the self that does the remembering must be the unifying pole of consciousness which we each individually are, whilst the world may have changed quite dramatically in contrast. This is summarised by de Warren thus: “Remembrance is an awakening – consciousness is once again “alive” and “given,” as if a particular act of consciousness regained its consciousness, not in its original form or characterization, but in a reproduced form, as given again in a now that it no longer calls its own.”<sup>44</sup> This shows that despite the retaining of a co-identity between these two temporally distinct selves there nonetheless is an essential difference between the regained consciousness and the consciousness which undertakes the remembrance itself. Such a difference demonstrates that the possibility of remembrance is not only based on the passive sedimentation of the past through retention but also on an active *act* of remembrance in the present. “Remembrance is based on the consciousness of a difference, or distance, between the remembered past (self) and the self that remembers; the difference between the remembering consciousness that is *literally* awake and the metaphorical re-awakening of a past consciousness.”<sup>45</sup> This clarifies Husserl’s use of the metaphors of sleep and waking as being placed within or “situated within a wakeful consciousness as such.”<sup>46</sup>

De Warren closes Section II of ‘The Inner Night’ with an exploration of what is meant by “wakeful consciousness as such”. Perhaps most importantly this type of wakeful consciousness must be distinguished from the metaphorical use of waking which Husserl uses in relation to sleep, retention, and remembrance. Furthermore, Husserl is explicit in

---

<sup>43</sup> See, for example, *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis*.

<sup>44</sup> De Warren, Nicolas. ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’, p. 284

<sup>45</sup> *ibid*

<sup>46</sup> *ibid*. It is worth noting that the intriguing connection between memory and dreams is excluded from analysis here by de Warren. Can the suspension of dreams be maintained when faced by such questions?

contrasting ‘waking consciousness’ with attention. Whereas attention is directed towards objects and may be more or less acute, wakefulness as such is “the openness of consciousness to experience as such”.<sup>47</sup> However, the two most important features of this wakeful consciousness – to which de Warren will return – are; its *independence*, as opposed to mere distinctness, from attention and that it is a “form of time-consciousness.”<sup>48</sup> We may lack attention completely whilst still being a wakeful consciousness. Yet, wakefulness still constitutes a form of time-consciousness – and thus constitutes the self-other distinction – in that it “is a consciousness of the temporal duration of experience – the experience of intervals, not only of objects in time, but of consciousness itself to the extent that consciousness itself comes to pass, and is intrinsically self-conscious of its temporality, in the registering of the temporal duration of objects.”<sup>49</sup> This is what Husserl calls “a living toward” and thus we may see how temporal objects supervene on this wakeful consciousness as such. However, not only temporal objects but also all other, subordinate, aspects of time-consciousness rely on this basic level of wakefulness for Husserl. In the following section we will follow de Warren’s analysis of the place of sleep, as a type of time-consciousness, within the overarching structure of time-consciousness already described.

#### IV: Affectivity, Imagination and Sleep

Our proceeding assessment of Husserl’s philosophy of time-consciousness has already shown how the importance of time-consciousness altered for Husserl. Under the static phenomenological method time-consciousness is but one of many potential regions of consciousness which may be analysed, however, by the 1930s Husserl’s shift to genetic phenomenology had led him to see time-consciousness as foundational and constitutive of consciousness. His focus on the monadic unity of streaming consciousness, on the genesis of consciousness, led Husserl to regard the inclusion of the distinction between sleep and waking as “...a “necessary expansion” and “a correction” of his analysis of time-consciousness (D-14/3).”<sup>50</sup> This correction was the result of the realisation that sleep, and the gaps in memory which come with it, bring into question the *unity* of streaming

---

<sup>47</sup> *ibid*, p. 285

<sup>48</sup> *ibid*

<sup>49</sup> *ibid*

<sup>50</sup> *ibid*, p. 286

consciousness. “This problem of sleep, of how consciousness falls into sleep, is situated in the context of a reflection on the constitution of the life of consciousness as a whole, indeed, of consciousness as a life, in its self-constituting stream of temporality, which is constituted through alternating periods of sleep and wakefulness, of night and day.”<sup>51</sup> Husserl’s worry is that sleep might “present the *problem* of the *temporary interruption or suspension* of time-consciousness”.<sup>52</sup> Such an interruption threatens the unity of the whole of consciousness in that it raises the problem of what holds these separate temporal intervals together as one unified pole. As we saw in our introduction to this Chapter Husserl made a provisional attempt to explain this unity and of sleep itself in manuscript D-14. De Warren contrasts this attempt with what he calls the “master-metaphor” of sleep and waking which relates to the “constitution of time-consciousness in Husserl’s thinking.”<sup>53</sup> In the following section Husserl’s own, phenomenological, description of sleep will be elaborated, as will de Warren’s own proposed extension to it.

Husserl’s initial response is through the analogy of the chain. Just as a physical chain is composed of interlinked pieces, time-consciousness, for Husserl, only amounts to a unified whole in that “there is over-lap in the sense that earlier periods of wakefulness can be recalled in the form of remembrance.”<sup>54</sup> This ‘mediation’ of the past through remembrance offers an initial answer to the problem of sleep as a gap or suspension of consciousness. De Warren cites an extract from D-14 which he translates as: “Today has the remembrance of yesterday in itself, yesterday has the remembrance of the day before, etc. all of theme [sic] in mediation”.<sup>55</sup> This route is required for precisely the reasons de Warren offered at the beginning of his article – sleep itself “is not “lived through” or experienced.”<sup>56</sup> The analogy of the chain has the added advantage that it shows sleep to be “itself a temporary phenomenon”.<sup>57</sup> As we saw above this conception of sleep is extremely important at various points for de Warren.<sup>58</sup> Here the focus on the temporary nature of sleep shifts the discussion from what is sleep itself onto the neighbouring phenomena of falling asleep and waking-up.

---

<sup>51</sup> *ibid*, p. 287

<sup>52</sup> *ibid*, p. 287

<sup>53</sup> *ibid*

<sup>54</sup> *ibid*

<sup>55</sup> *ibid*, p. 294, note 11

<sup>56</sup> *ibid*, p. 288

<sup>57</sup> *ibid*

<sup>58</sup> See p. 25, above

We have to understand how consciousness falls asleep and awakens; and what kind of self-modification of temporality is sleep. Sleep becomes a central problem for Husserl due to his view of consciousness as fundamentally “self-constituting” *and* “consciousness through and through.”<sup>59</sup>

This problem – the problem of the *self*-modification of temporality in sleep – is clearly a result of genetic phenomenology’s return to the primacy of the “distinction between “Ich [ego] und Ichfremdes [and ego-foreign]” (D-14/7b).”<sup>60</sup>

The distinction between self and other – Sartre’s distinction between *pour soi* and *en soi* again – is for Husserl dependent on the constituting unity of time-consciousness. However, it is precisely *within* this distinction that Husserl’s own account of sleep – as de Warren finds it in D-14 – is developed. “Consciousness is being-affected” in that the constituted consciousness is not alone in the world but is rather amidst a plethora of “hyletic sensations” which, each to differing degrees, reach, or ‘call’, out to it.<sup>61</sup>

The world is not mute; it affects consciousness in different ways, clamouring for attention and engagement. It is... in heeding the call of affections, [that the ego] awakes to the world.<sup>62</sup>

De Warren takes this description of affectivity from the lectures on passive synthesis. However, the world is affective not in a regimented or orderly manner, rather “the basic structure... of affection is conflict.”<sup>63</sup> Sensations, for Husserl, “struggle for existence (“Kampf ums Dasein”)”, for intuitively our ‘attention’, and as such a “landscape” of saliences is constructed to which “an awakened ego (“wache Ich”)” may respond in different manners or not at all.<sup>64</sup> And yet, fundamentally, this is a “double concept” of affectivity (D-14/10b)” as it concerns the noematic force of affections and the noetic interest of the ego.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> *ibid*

<sup>60</sup> *ibid*

<sup>61</sup> *ibid*

<sup>62</sup> *ibid*

<sup>63</sup> *ibid*

<sup>64</sup> *ibid*, p. 289

<sup>65</sup> *ibid*



It is in relation to this ““double concept” of affectivity” that Husserl situates the sleeping and waking distinction drawn in D-14:

The distinction between sleep and being-awake is a “fundamental distinction in affectivity” (D-14/10b). Sleep and being-awake are two modes of affectivity, or being-affected.<sup>66</sup>

This, intuitive, connecting of the concepts of sleep and affectivity generates a second pair of definitions for waking and sleeping.<sup>67</sup> *Wachheit*, waking,<sup>68</sup> is defined by Husserl as the state of the ego when it is “constantly “answering” or “responding” to affections”.<sup>69</sup> This is contrasted with sleep which is the condition when “[a]ffections touch the ego, yet they are lacking in force.”<sup>70</sup> De Warren interprets this distinction thus:

In sleep, consciousness has insulated or immunized itself, not from affections *per se*, but from the force of affections. In this manner, the ego has a “distance” (“*Abständigkeit*”) towards the hyletic sensations, and, thus a distance from the world.<sup>71</sup>

Here we see the mature Husserl’s understanding of sleep from the noematic side, as reconstructed by de Warren, and, thus, we must now consider the noetic side – the interest of the ego in these affections.

Affection must, Husserl argues, include interest – the active ‘turning towards’ of the ego – as well as forceful affections. This ‘turning towards’, we must not forget, is not to be taken as some kind of reflective decision on the part of the ego – though these decisions would, themselves, be impossible without this aspect of consciousness. Instead it is our interests as such which form the nexus of interests we describe as a self or a system of values. Consider the phenomenon of unexpectedly hearing one’s name called out. In this instance the affective force is precisely the result of a nexus of interests that equate to the self being associated with, or named by, the sound just heard. One looks for the source precisely because it is of ‘interest’ – on this pre-theoretical and pre-cognitive level. “If we consider both sides of affection – force and interest – we are able to establish

---

<sup>66</sup> *ibid*

<sup>67</sup> As opposed to the metaphorical “definitions” of sleep and waking described in our previous section.

<sup>68</sup> The German has the advantage of meaning both wakefulness, or being-awake, *and* alertness.

<sup>69</sup> *ibid*

<sup>70</sup> *ibid*

<sup>71</sup> *ibid*

the sense in which sleep is not only the “forcelessness of affections” but also the “disinterestedness” of consciousness, not only for affections, but with regard to itself.”<sup>72</sup>

This disinterestedness of consciousness “with regard to itself” is key for understanding de Warren’s relationship to Nancy’s conception of sleep. However, it is also one of the essential steps which allow him to connect Husserl’s metaphorical use of sleep with the explanation of literal sleep through the structure of affectivity. This “double-sided” nature of sleep allows Husserl to see falling asleep as a process of ““letting go” or “sinking away” (“Sinken-Lassens”) [which] is a mode of my *entire* life of consciousness.”<sup>73</sup> However, such accounts of sleep – such as “allowing the world and myself to slip away and come to a rest”<sup>74</sup> – should once again remind us of the connection between metaphorical deployments of sleep and death, or even of suicide, *and* thus also of de Warren’s explicit exclusion of this relationship from consideration.

This understanding of falling asleep as a process of “sinking away” connects with Husserl’s metaphorical use of sleep to elucidate the process of sedimentation through retentive consciousness. The comparison goes further: just as the de-presentification process approaches a limit of undifferentiation and forcelessness so too does the process of falling asleep – as Husserl understands it in relation to affectivity. Falling asleep approaches the limit of forcelessness of affectivity as we have seen and as such a distinction emerges which rests at the heart of de Warren’s interpretation of Husserl’s phenomenology of sleep. This is the distinction between “absolute time-consciousness – the self-manifestation of the immanent stream of consciousness – and wakeful consciousness”.<sup>75</sup> As we saw above wakeful consciousness consists in an openness to the world and sensations as such.<sup>76</sup> In contrast to this Husserl describes the temporality of sleep as: ““forceless unawake temporalization” (“kraftlose unwacher [sic] Zeitigung”) (D-14/12a).”<sup>77</sup> Essentially both these forms of temporality operate *within* absolute time-consciousness for Husserl. In this sense “the temporalization of consciousness in its absolute self-constitution is more basic than the distinction between wakefulness and

---

<sup>72</sup> *ibid*, p. 291

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*

<sup>74</sup> *ibid*

<sup>75</sup> *ibid*, p. 290

<sup>76</sup> See p. 32, above and *ibid*, p. 285 and p. 289.

<sup>77</sup> *ibid*, p. 290

sleep”.<sup>78</sup> However: “Sleep is an affection of consciousness in which affections lack force, but also, self-affection of consciousness itself – its self-temporalization – must also lack force, and thus, in this sense, be seen as temporarily neutralized from within, as if consciousness absented itself from itself, that is, rendered itself immune to the affective force of its own self-affection.”<sup>79</sup> Thus it is within time-consciousness as such – absolute time-consciousness – that sleep and waking operate, just as, what de Warren called the “original difference, and tension, between the *self-abstention* and *self-presence* of consciousness”<sup>80</sup> operates through retentional consciousness *within* time-consciousness as a whole.

This “mirroring” of the sinking away of retentional consciousness and falling asleep as sinking away extends, according to de Warren, to the process – or “*transition*” – itself.<sup>81</sup> The transition is – as with near and far retention – between falling asleep and being asleep. De Warren’s claim is that *being asleep* is never an actualisable, or actual, mode of consciousness. Just as the process of sedimentation of far retention is not to be simply equated with the permanent loss or destruction of intuitive givenness, so too for Husserl and de Warren the loss of consciousness in sleep is temporary and partial. In this manner de Warren describes *being asleep* as an “ideal limit of complete self-abstention.”<sup>82</sup>

De Warren’s claimed reconstruction of Husserl’s phenomenology of sleep is based on extracts from fragment D-14 and, given the highly ambiguous nature of these fragments, it is useful to reproduce them in full here:

As Husserl writes: “Sleep itself is the limit of this mode, the limit of a complete relaxation of affection and lack of action, the relaxation of the will and its absence.” (D-14/22). In sleep, consciousness has become transformed into a “the limit of a wakeful mode of the will’s relaxation that is not directly experienced because every experience is itself in the mode of a wakeful activity.” (D-14/23).<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> *ibid*

<sup>79</sup> *ibid*, p. 291

<sup>80</sup> *ibid*, p. 281

<sup>81</sup> *ibid*, p. 292

<sup>82</sup> *ibid*

<sup>83</sup> *ibid*. In de Warren’s piece the fragments are reproduced with his translations provided in endnotes, here we have substituted those translations into his text.

We will return to these difficult quotations shortly, but for now it is enough to see that sleep is presented as a limit – an *ideal* limit. It is from this claim that de Warren’s most interesting and radical claim about sleep is made. Namely, that we “are never truly *entirely asleep much as we are never entirely awake*.”<sup>84</sup> As mentioned above,<sup>85</sup> de Warren is here precluding what he terms “absolute sleep” in favour of a constant “process of falling asleep”.<sup>86</sup> This appears to be a moment of extreme contrast between the Husserlian account of sleep and Nancy’s. Furthermore, it is here that the most fundamental problems with de Warren’s arguments begin to emerge. Before comparing these analyses let us consider de Warren’s parting words – his extension of Husserl’s preliminary phenomenology of sleep.

Husserl has, so de Warren argues, given us a structural account of sleep in relation to “de-presentification” and “self-abstention”.<sup>87</sup> However, what remains to be considered is the manner, or “how”, of the enacting of this structure and the related process in the case of sleep. De Warren’s proposed expanding of Husserlian phenomenology of sleep amounts to the suggestion that a fruitful comparison between the “function of “de-presentification” in the imagination and its temporality” and that in sleep might be possible.<sup>88</sup> In imagination we explicitly extract ourselves from the “original presentation” and construct an imaginary object – and an imaginary act of consciousness – merely out of retention and protention. In this sense imagination “is constituted in a “headless” temporalization.”<sup>89</sup> This is analogous with sleep in that imagination is a “modification of consciousness” which lacks “presence” and as such resembles the “more radical, or profound” de-presentification of consciousness in sleep.

We have the temporary suspension of the arc of the living present, but we still have the dimensions of *far retention and far protention*... ..when I awake and open my eyes, I find all of my yesterdays in far retention return to me as well as all my tomorrows there before me, as if, despite the self-oblivion from which I am just emerging, the unity of my life, as a project of temporalization that has been and still will be, returns to itself, but not from where I had, the evening before taken leave of myself.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> *ibid*

<sup>85</sup> See p. 25, above

<sup>86</sup> *ibid*

<sup>87</sup> *ibid*, p. 293

<sup>88</sup> *ibid*

<sup>89</sup> *ibid*

<sup>90</sup> *ibid*, pp. 293 – 4. An important worry is raised by this question which relates to the symmetrical relationship between retention and protention that de Warren suggests during this last stage of his argument.

In this, de Warren's last argument, the imagination's functioning as a modification of time-consciousness has the advantage that unlike sleep the imagination *has* received a significant amount of attention, in Husserl's work. So de Warren's method of slowly, piece by piece, developing the structure of sleep through various metaphors and analogies, progresses.

**V: "No one puts himself to sleep: sleep comes from elsewhere."<sup>91</sup>**

With de Warren's three strides towards a phenomenology of sleep outlined we can now draw out the core commitments of these arguments and compare them with Nancy's position. Such comparison leads us to, first of all, consider de Warren's explicit criticisms of Nancy's position and how they relate to his reconstruction of a Husserlian phenomenology of sleep.

De Warren's objections to Nancy's conception of sleep can be seen as threefold: the first is methodological; the second is – what I have been describing as – topological;<sup>92</sup> and the third is functional. The methodological objection from de Warren is that Nancy is too quick to proclaim a phenomenology of sleep impossible. The topological critique aims at Nancy's placing of sleep *outside* of consciousness and, fundamentally, the self-other distinction. Finally, the functional objection relates – in impinging on the topological worry – to the function of the concept of sleep and the specific question of 'how one wakes-up again from sleep?' Given its centrality and the clarity of the disagreement we will deal first with de Warren's topological concern.

Sleep's place – or the place of sleep – in relation to the constitution of self occupies the heart of the debate between Nancy and de Warren.<sup>93</sup> The title of our section demonstrates Nancy's view of sleep as coming from outside the self and as dissolving or dissipating the key separation between self and other through its operation. If sleep indeed

---

He has, in fact, insisted on the presence of both of these forms of time-consciousness in sleep through all three of his arguments. However, it is here that the absence of any sustained explication of far protention within sleep is most obvious.

<sup>91</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 29

<sup>92</sup> See p. 22, above

<sup>93</sup> The question of the place *of* sleep will continue to return throughout this thesis.

“comes from elsewhere”, and in so doing dispels the distinction between self and non-self, then we can quickly see why it is that de Warren is concerned. Husserlian phenomenology is committed to the thorough-going nature of consciousness and, all importantly, consciousness as “self-constituting”.<sup>94</sup> Sleep cannot act from the outside of consciousness – dissolving and reassembling it – and consciousness still be, exclusively, *self-constituting*.

We have already seen how, in his first approach to sleep, de Warren demonstrates that Husserl’s metaphorical use of sleep operates *within* the overarching framework of time-consciousness. Retentional consciousness is involved, as a key gear in a grander mechanism, in the self-constituting of consciousness as the unifying pole of experience and thus is not outside or prior to the self and non-self distinction. The sedimentation of lived experience through retentive consciousness is described, by Husserl, as falling asleep – precisely because it mirrors the *temporary* nature of sleep *and* it operates *within* the *self-constitution* of a consciousness. Consciousness constructs a history for itself which survives the tapering off of the living present and remains accessible through sedimentation, as opposed to dissipating or being destroyed. Of course, *this* process of de-presentification, metaphorical falling asleep, operates during literal waking consciousness.

But what of Husserl’s actual understanding of sleep as the temporary self-abstention from those ‘interests’ which make us ourselves, and thus from the field of forceful affections as well? “Nancy’s view of sleep as the condition in which the self has – temporarily – retired from itself is only possible when situated *within* the distinction of *pour soi* and *en soi*, or, in other words, *Ichlichkeit* [I-sensitivity] and *hylé* [traditionally matter, but for Husserl the noematic side of the phenomena].”<sup>95</sup> With sleep established as the loss of forceful affectivity *for consciousness* sleep is placed within consciousness. Thus the distinction between ‘waking consciousness’ and the “‘forceless unawake temporalization’” of sleep is situated *within* “absolute time-consciousness”.<sup>96</sup> “When Husserl speaks of “unwache Zeitigung” [un-awake temporalization] he means the expression “unwache” as equivalent to “lifeless” and “unconscious,” but not in the sense

---

<sup>94</sup> De Warren, Nicolas ‘The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep’ p. 288

<sup>95</sup> *ibid*, p. 286

<sup>96</sup> *ibid*, p. 290. Citing Husserl D-14/12a

of lacking consciousness, or, indeed, of lacking an intrinsic self-consciousness, but rather in the sense of without *force*.”<sup>97</sup> In what does this foundational absolute time-consciousness consist? Before considering this, however, we must see that this disagreement between Nancy and de Warren is not merely topological but also connects with the question of activity and passivity in sleep.

In moving into this interpretation of the debate between Nancy and de Warren we will, quite naturally, progress into an assessment of the benefits of each position. Nancy sees sleep as acting from without and as thus exerting an influence or power over us. In this regard, contrary to de Warren’s consciousness that “has insulated or immunized itself” from the world and from itself, Nancy sees the self as at the mercy of sleep.<sup>98</sup> This disagreement touches upon a core ambiguity at the heart of sleep.

My sleep – just as my death – is my own. No one can sleep another’s sleep for them. This, alongside the kind of language we use when discussing sleep, ‘how did you sleep?’, ‘I’m just going to sleep’, and ‘go get some sleep’, lends support to de Warren and Husserl’s conception of sleep in which we undertake, or partake in, the *act* of sleeping. This understanding of the sleeper also coheres with the internalising of sleep which we saw above – sleep is part of our *lives* in a manner which strikingly distinguishes it from death.<sup>99</sup> Nancy’s description of sleep risks, it seems, transforming sleep into an alien or intrusive force which comes over us from without – much as anthropomorphised portrayals of hooded and scythe wielding death do. This draws upon Nancy’s connecting of the notions of fall and sleep. One undergoes a fall, it happens to you, but you do not actively engage in falling.<sup>100</sup> This tellingly applies to sleep in that de Warren’s active picture of consciousness putting itself to sleep seems to diminish the affective phenomenological side of sleep. In this sense sleep displays a genuine and fundamental tension in that it is part of our lives and yet is not ‘lived through’ or actively partaken in as are the aspect of our waking lives.<sup>101</sup> The sleep walker walks but would we say that they *act* during such somnolent strolls?

---

<sup>97</sup> *ibid*, pp. 290 – 1

<sup>98</sup> *ibid*, p. 289

<sup>99</sup> The question of sleep and death returns like a revenant, and will continue to haunt our analyses.

<sup>100</sup> The interesting, and perhaps special, case of ‘falling’ in love deserves more consideration than we can here offer.

<sup>101</sup> This tension and the problematic of in what way sleep is *lived through* motivates our fourth chapter, which focuses on Heidegger, life and sleep.

This tension and how it relates to Nancy and de Warren's accounts of sleep is exacerbated in considering the third of de Warren's critiques of Nancy – the functional worry: 'how can Nancy's conception of sleep account for a return *from* sleep, for waking up.' De Warren's charge is that Nancy's conception of sleep – as external to, and a radical emptying out of, consciousness – leaves the self "*petrified* into the darkness of a "thing in itself."<sup>102</sup> If sleep consists in such a radical alterity from the waking self as Nancy suggests then de Warren's worry is quite simply this: 'what allows a return from such a state?' There are three important components of de Warren's alternative account of waking-up. His most direct response is a clear result of his internalising of sleep which we have discussed above:

Consciousness can only awaken on the condition that consciousness has put itself to sleep, taken in its *transcendental* significance: consciousness has constituted a *temporary* retirement from itself. This temporary character of sleep points to the phenomenological veracity of its constitution within absolute time-consciousness.<sup>103</sup>

This empowering of a transcendental consciousness over the subordinate stages of time-consciousness has advantages and disadvantages as seen above. However, two clear problems emerge from this extract. The first is what exactly should we take this "*transcendental*" consciousness to consist in, and furthermore, what allows it to return from, or *survive*, its self inflicted "self-oblivion"?

De Warren's answer to this worry is wrapped up with the other two components of his account of sleep's conceptual role. The first of these can be seen in his repeated insistence on the "temporary character of sleep". Sleep, metaphorically, constitutes for Husserl "the possibility of return"<sup>104</sup> and so de Warren may describe sleep as an "interval"<sup>105</sup> and thus as one component part of time-consciousness as such. In having a beginning and an end sleep constitutes a period, interval, or time *within* life.<sup>106</sup> Waking consciousness is promoted to the status of the norm of time-consciousness and this relies

---

<sup>102</sup> *ibid*, p. 292

<sup>103</sup> *ibid*, p. 293

<sup>104</sup> *ibid*, p. 283

<sup>105</sup> *ibid*, p. 287 – 8

<sup>106</sup> Here our insistence – in this Chapter's excursus – that de Warren undertake a conceptual framing of sleep finds support.



on the perceiving of sleep as a temporary absenting from the form of time-consciousness. What cannot be doubted is that this fits with our commonly held beliefs as *waking* philosophers but it is far from clear that sleep should be seen as temporary in any more primordial manner than waking consciousness exists temporarily between periods of factual absence, including, fundamentally, those *prior* to our birth and *after* the disappearance of our consciousness.

The last of de Warren responses to his functional worry draws on his interpretation of Husserl's D-14 fragments as describing *sleep itself* – being-asleep – as an “ideal limit”.<sup>107</sup> As such the “absolute sleep”, de Warren sees Nancy as seeking, is dismissed in favour of the constant interplay of falling-asleep and waking-up. In this manner for Husserl, according to de Warren, “we never reach sleep itself”.<sup>108</sup> The advantage of such an account is that it acknowledges the extent to which sleep is always with us whilst maintaining that the varying degrees of sleep never amount to a complete absenting of self. This latter claim is what allows him to see consciousness – absolute time-consciousness – as continuous across sleep and waking, and to describe sleep as the “possibility of a return”. For all the advantages of such a view one might see it as reducing the force or status of ‘sleep’ – the literal condition or process which we each live *through* – in parallel with de Warren's prioritising of waking time-consciousness.

Of course, just as the advantages of such an account are clear so too are its limitations. Surely any phenomenology of sleep which results in the claim that we never, in fact, actually *are* asleep – or reach the condition of “being-asleep” – is in a sense self-defeating. Though, it might be very quickly retorted, on de Warren's behalf, that he is not denying that we sleep but only that, *a la* Nancy, the concept of sleep be taken as a moment of radical nonconsciousness. Here the twin charges of triviality and counter-intuitivity appear to threaten de Warren's account. Let us draw into the picture the comparison between sleep and death, explicitly excluded from consideration by de Warren. Is not the demoting of ‘being-asleep’ into a conceptual limit which is never in fact actualised in life to implicitly equate ‘being-asleep’ with death? Such an implicit equating would be supported by the functional worry – ‘how does one wake-up again’? It would seem that de Warren's method of distinguishing sleep from death, in that the former is temporary

---

<sup>107</sup> *ibid.*, p. 292

<sup>108</sup> *ibid.*

whilst the latter permanent, is to equate fully asleep with death and then deny that we ever, whilst living, achieve such a state. Such a move risks being seen as either trivial – in that it denies that sleep and death are one and the same – or as counter-intuitive – in its claim that we never actually sleep. Had de Warren explicitly discussed the question of the relationship between sleep and death this problematic result of his account of sleep might have been brought to light.

This worry can be rephrased thus: each step de Warren takes closer to a Husserlian phenomenology sleep seems to correspondingly pull him further away from sleep *itself*. And a phenomenology which behaves in this way surely cannot be said to be adhering to Husserl's spiritual battle cry: "back to the things themselves". As we noted above the disagreement between Nancy and de Warren centres around the shift from metaphorical or figurative access to *phenomenological* access.<sup>109</sup> It is the price paid by de Warren for this shift which can be called into question. Is the drawing of sleep *into* phenomenology worth the price of acknowledging, or perhaps enforcing, a constitutively wakeful, or vigilant, absolute consciousness? For Husserl this is no price at all but merely the re-emergence of his conception of self – the monadic ipseity which allows him to say: 'yes, *I* slept last night.' Yet, for us, for those seeking to begin phenomenology, and philosophy, from sleep – to awaken a somnolent phenomenology from within the light entranced tradition of metaphysics and philosophical enquiry – such an account of sleep cannot have truly faced, that is begun in, or issued from, the sleeper. Instead it must stem from the imperious and ever watchful gaze of transcendental consciousness. And yet this very denial of sleep, which for Husserl and de Warren underpins the very possibility of sleep, will reappear in our later Chapters, in their archaeologies of somnolent phenomenology. In these Chapters to come we will examine those who, unlike Husserl and de Warren do not require a necessary prioritising of a *single transcendental consciousness*. We will, in short, follow phenomenology's steps away from consciousness in the hope that with these steps new insight into the radical finitude of sleep and its relationship to self may be brought, if not to consciousness, then at least into some form of relief – cast as a shadow in the hazy half-light of night.

---

<sup>109</sup> See p. 22, above.

This dispute, or risk, of de Warren's analysis is brought out by his most concrete description of sleep – sleep as temporary, as the “headless” gap between periods of waking. This claim has a peculiar circularity to it: without it sleep cannot be characterised as an interval *within* time-consciousness, and yet it this very universality of absolute time-consciousness which forms the unity, or continuity, against which sleep is seen as temporary at all. Furthermore, de Warren's account of sleep has focused predominantly on the relationship between sleep and far retention. This applies not just to Husserl's metaphorical use of sleep but also to the image of sleep as a *self-sedimenting* of the self and, perhaps most tellingly, de Warren's comparison of sleep with the “headless” temporalisation of imagination. Through the last of these de Warren argues that in sleep one loses the original presentification of life but retains far retention and far protention and as such absolute consciousness is also retained. However, de Warren has, at most, only succeeded in demonstrating how far retention operates in regard to sleep, far protention's operation is conspicuously absent. This would not be such a concern if it were not for the importance of the ‘temporary’ claim about sleep. Surely sleep's temporary nature must be based on not only the maintaining of an internal history for consciousness through a process of sedimentation but also the projecting of a future for this history through far protention. Furthermore, such a protentive side of sleep – our fall into sleep – would surely be marked by the fact, the fact of finitude across and within sleep, that sleep is never certainly temporary: we might die before we wake.<sup>110</sup> The worry is that the headless time-consciousness of sleep, as de Warren would have it, requires an equi-primordially between far retention and far protention which is not only lacking but might also call into question this very understanding of sleep.

To conclude, de Warren's reconstruction of a Husserlian phenomenology of sleep is impressively incisive. He not only succeeds in opening potential avenues for employing large swathes of Husserl's work in relation to sleep but he also identifies and interprets some of Husserl's explicit remarks on sleep, and suggests an intriguing extension of the account found in these. This is all grounded in a direct opposition to Nancy's radical notion of sleep as the dissolution of self and is directed towards a recognition not only of phenomenological access to sleep but also of sleep's essential position *within* our lives.

---

<sup>110</sup> This vulnerability of sleep, or the intertwining of sleep and death, will be returned to throughout this thesis but in most detail in our final sections in which we take-up, again, the discussion of Nancy's *The Fall of Sleep*.

Furthermore, ‘The Inner Night’, in the process of excavating a phenomenology of sleep from within Husserl’s late work, begins to disrupt any sharp delimitation between sleep and waking – the processes of *falling-asleep* and *waking-up* are neither restricted to literal times of sleep nor indeed to those of waking but cross, span and knit together this age old duality. This problematizing of the sleeping-waking distinction returns throughout this thesis.

However, de Warren’s commitment to the Husserlian foundations, from which his opposition to Nancy derives, brings with it problems of its own. In particular, his ascription to an ever vigilant transcendental consciousness which watches over the sleeper within – the ‘Inner’ of de Warren’s ‘The Inner Night’ – could be seen to itself result in his “never truly fac[ing]” the “truly difficult questions” of sleep *itself*.<sup>111</sup> The choice we are left with – between Nancy’s exile of phenomenology from sleep and de Warren’s banishing of *being* asleep from literal ‘sleep’ – may seem to some as no choice at all. However, if seen, instead, as two extreme poles on a spectrum of approaches to the relationship between sleep and phenomenology then we are well placed to consider those other possible accounts which lie either between these poles or, in fact, disrupt the foundations upon which such a dichotomy is based.

---

<sup>111</sup> *ibid*, p. 276

## Part II: Does Dasein Sleep?

We are not condemned to sustained flights of being, but are constantly refreshed by little holidays from ourselves. We are intermittent creatures, always falling to little ends and rising to little new beginnings. – Iris Murdoch, *The Black Prince*<sup>1</sup>

‘Whatever is sleeping’ is in a peculiar way absent and yet there. – Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Murdoch, Iris. *The Black Prince*, Vintage Books, London 2006, pp. 231 – 232

<sup>2</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, translated by William McNeill & Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995, p. 60

## Introduction – Heidegger’s somnolent path not taken

With Heidegger’s *Being and Time* phenomenology famously takes a new and controversial direction: *towards* fundamental ontology *through* the existential analytic. In the light of this existential analytic Heidegger’s silence on sleep, at least in *Being and Time*, might be seen as even more surprising than Husserl’s ponderous and belated engagement with sleep and the phenomenological problems associated with it. The existential analytic returns us to the everyday structures of life and to their existential significance. In light of this move from scientific disengaged enquiry towards engagement with and *in* the normalcy and minutiae of lived experience, the apparently ever wakeful nature of this lived experience is all the more striking. If we are indeed “not condemned to sustained flights of being” then Heidegger, at least in his middle work, appears to have missed this fundamental feature of our existence. Yet the interesting question is not *whether* Heidegger missed sleep out of the existential analytic but rather *why* he did, and *how* he could have.

Perhaps a clue can be found in the second of this Part’s epigrams: “‘*Whatever is sleeping*’ is in a peculiar way absent and yet there.”<sup>3</sup> *Whatever*, not *whoever*, sleeps in Heidegger’s questioning of sleep. Following on from this demonstrative presence of sleep in Heidegger’s work we might perform a small substitution upon this instance of engagement with sleep so as to state that ‘*Sleep* (itself) is in a peculiar way absent and yet there (in Heidegger’s work)’. This Part aims to bring out the peculiarity of this vacillation between presence and absence of sleep in Heidegger’s middle period. Furthermore, we may hope that in, initially, examining Heidegger’s curious, and frustratingly brief, analyses of being-asleep and being-awake we may catch a glimpse of, and begin to scout out pathways [*Wege*] or at the very least the marks of such [*Wegmarken*], through his thinking and towards a thoroughgoing phenomenology of sleep.<sup>4</sup>

How then can sleep be said to be, peculiarly or otherwise, absent from Heidegger’s philosophical work? By way of an initial answer to this we might turn to brute numerical

---

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, emphasis added

<sup>4</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. See also *Off the Beaten Track*, Edited and translated by Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Such marks, as we will see, may not be exclusively man made.

facts and point out that sleep is mentioned but once in *Being and Time* and even then it is imprisoned in quotation marks. We should be doubly wary of drawing any phenomenological account of sleep from this lone appearance of the word as Heidegger is here talking in a metaphorical manner, and does so in order to formulate a question. Specifically, a question designed to respond to the claim that Dasein is not always *aware* of its guilt and thus may not be primordially guilty: “or does not the primordial Being-guilty make itself known in the very fact that guilt is ‘asleep’?”<sup>5</sup>

Michel Haar also notes the absence of sleep from the existential analytic:

But cannot – indeed must not – these people occasionally stop, the one from blackening the pages, the other from hammering the footwear that he repairs? And not only in order to eat, sleep, or bring a stop to the most humbly productive activities, of which the analytic of Dasein breathes not a word...<sup>6</sup>

Of course, Haar is not alone in commenting on the odd silence that the existential analytic maintains with regard to seemingly important details of the everyday life of that “entity which each of us is himself and which includes inquiring as *one* of the possibilities of its Being”.<sup>7</sup> For example, Levinas – to whom we will turn in the opening sections of our next Part – took Heidegger to task for precisely those two occasions when we stop our *productive* engagements with the world and beings (and perhaps, in the latter case, even being) and eat or sleep our fill.<sup>8</sup> For defenders of Heidegger this silence must surely rest on his famous distinction between the ontic and the ontological or, more accurately, the existentiell and the existential. This appeal leads to a series of interconnected though not quite identical questions, questions which guide the progression of this Part. ‘Can sleep be reduced to an existentiell mode of Dasein’s being?’ ‘Does sleep operate under the same existentials as waking Dasein and require only alternative existentiell instantiations of these, or does something more radical occur in, or *to*, Dasein’s existence itself when we drift off?’ ‘Is there an existential significance to sleep, for Heidegger?’

---

<sup>5</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 332 [H286]. Though this appears to be *merely* a metaphorical use of the being-asleep being-awake dichotomy it is worth noting the rhetorical use sleep is put to here.

<sup>6</sup> Haar, Michel. *The Song of the Earth*, translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993, p. 18

<sup>7</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 27 [H7], *emphasis added*

<sup>8</sup> Though Haar makes no reference to Levinas in his book it seems plausible to suppose that he is here thinking of Levinas’s now famous analyses of nourishment, in *Totality and Infinity*, and sleep and insomnia in, amongst other places, *Existence and Existents*.

Returning to our initial thesis: that ‘sleep (itself) is in a peculiar way absent and yet there (in Heidegger’s work)’, what of the ‘and yet there’? Sleep is present in Heidegger’s philosophy in multiple ways. However, rather than enumerate all of these or provide examples of every use of the word in Heidegger’s canon we are better served, philosophically, by providing two prominent, and exemplary, examples of sleep’s presence in Heidegger’s work. Firstly, sleep is presupposed in some of Heidegger’s most important rhetorical and metaphorical moves. Secondly, we will consider one of Heidegger’s few actual engagements with the question of sleep in his 1929 to 1930 lecture series, his first after taking-on Husserl’s chair at Freiburg.<sup>9</sup> With these two engagements with sleep in hand, and, in fact, the very distinction between them problematized, we will be in a good position to question the ‘peculiarity’ of this absence-and-yet-presence of sleep in Heidegger’s work. Finally, the twin routes of inquiry this Part follows will be clarified.

Heidegger opens *Being and Time*, by harking back to a perplexity in the face of being:

But are we nowadays even perplexed at our inability to understand the expression ‘Being’? Not at all [*keineswegs*]. So first of all we must reawaken [*wecken*] an understanding for the meaning of this question.”<sup>10</sup>

This *reawakening* has been much discussed in the literature as, indeed, has been the forgetting of the question of the meaning of being that it presupposes. However, we might, in our turn, ask what is the significance of this for our understanding of sleep. Clearly, sleep is not explicitly invoked in such talk of awakening or reawakening but is rather conspicuously present in its absence. Without becoming bogged down in the details of this specific reawakening of that which sleeps, and its relationship to Heidegger’s fundamental question, we can nonetheless begin to see that sleep is at once related to forgetfulness, or forgetting, and thus, at least potentially, may be connected to Heidegger’s use of *aletheia* [ἀλήθεια], and, of course, it is used in a metaphorical sense.<sup>11</sup> This metaphorical sense of sleep is employed and examined at the beginning of Part One

---

<sup>9</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*

<sup>10</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 1 [H1]

<sup>11</sup> We are returned, as we were in examination of de Warren’s article, to the presence of the metaphor of sleep.



of *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* lecture course<sup>12</sup> and it is here that we find our second epigraph.<sup>13</sup>

Promising only that we have not forgotten about the connecting of sleep to forgetfulness, forgetting and *aletheia*, let us now look at the second of our provisional examples of sleep in Heidegger's work – his longest examination of sleep as phenomenon until 1966.<sup>14</sup> Once again, sleep appears by way of the need to awaken something. This time Heidegger seeks, on our behalf, to awaken *a* fundamental attunement [*Grundstimmung*] in our philosophising – this will famously turn out to be 'profound boredom', the fundamental attunement of our age, or at least of Heidegger's.<sup>15</sup> In Sections 16 and 17 of *FCM* we see both Heidegger's move back *from* the project of awakening such an attunement *to* the necessary notion of that which sleeps, *and*, all importantly, his subsequent withdrawal from this stepping back. As such here we have both Heidegger's fall into sleep, his sojourn within the realm of sleep, and his subsequent return to wakeful life. Thus the rhetorical, metaphorical, use of sleep and Heidegger's consideration of sleep itself are here intimately entwined.

Section 16 sub-section a) opens by considering, pre-theoretically, what we understand by attunements, or moods [*Stimmungen*]. They are "least of all" something we "invent" or "simply call up".<sup>16</sup> Rather attunements are that "into which we slip unawares".<sup>17</sup> We cannot summon up any attunement that takes our fancy and so Heidegger hypothesises that for an attunement to *be* for us, in our awareness, it must always "already be there".<sup>18</sup> Attunements are not created by us but rather we discover

---

<sup>12</sup> *FCM* from here on.

<sup>13</sup> It is worth noting that Heidegger had already employed this motif of awakening through similar terms in his earlier lecture courses – for example *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999, p. 12, and *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, Translated by Matthias Fritsch and Jennifer Anna Gosetti-Ferencei, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010, p. 134: "generates [*weckt*, and thus more accurately 'awakens'] astonishment" – as well as, of course, *Being and Time* as we have already shown. I am indebted to Paul J. Ennis for the former of these examples, and to Christos Hadjioannou for the latter.

<sup>14</sup> Heidegger would go on to discuss sleep in his *Heraclitus Seminar* with Eugen Fink, 1966/67. Here we can do little more than point towards this fascinating text, leaving it for a longer future analysis. As we have discussed in our introduction, sleep's very status as a phenomenon is uncertain. The word phenomenon stands, as such, as a preliminary place holder.

<sup>15</sup> "It is a matter of awakening *a* fundamental attunement which is to sustain our philosophizing, and not *the* fundamental attunement. Accordingly, there is not merely one single attunement, but several." - Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 59

<sup>16</sup> *ibid*, p. 59

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*

ourselves already in them, already attuned thus. Yet, this only displaces the problem by one step as we must now ask ‘how we are to discover, *ascertain*, these attunements?’ Many, Heidegger supposes, will see this as unproblematic – it is as simple as ascertaining whether the hammer is on the desk or not. However, on what ground does this faith in our ability to ascertain attunements, those of others or even our own, rest?<sup>19</sup> “It could be that it pertains to ascertaining an attunement not merely that one has the attunement, but that one is attuned in accord with it.”<sup>20</sup> Observation, “in the end” for Heidegger can do nothing for us when it comes to attunements and he “see[s] already that any so-called objective ascertaining of a fundamental attunement is... [an] impossible undertaking.”<sup>21</sup> Why impossible? To see this we must understand that for Heidegger, attunements are not *something* ‘out there’ in our perceptual fields upon which we might turn our gaze and thus ascertain – regardless of whether this is an external sensory gaze or an internal introspection – but rather the *tone* or *tune* of that very field, of that which is given to, and withheld from, us.<sup>22</sup>

Thus we shall not speak at all of ‘ascertaining’ a fundamental attunement in our philosophizing, but of *awakening* it. Awakening means making something wakeful, *letting* whatever is sleeping *become* wakeful.<sup>23</sup>

With this, characteristic, step back from ‘knowledge about’ and towards existential *letting be* Heidegger opens the question of sleep, or more exactly, the question of “‘Whatever is sleeping’”.<sup>24</sup> We have seen, in our opening quotation, that whatever is sleeping is both absent and yet there. In sub-section b) of Sc. 16 the “and yet there” shows that when “we awaken an attunement, this means that it is already there.”<sup>25</sup> This presence, this sleeping presence, is, necessarily a presence as absence. Whatever is sleeping is, Heidegger insists, both not-being-there and being-there – *Nicht-Da-sein* and *Da-sein*.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Though this very distinction, between the attunements of others and our own, will be problematized in Heidegger’s account of attunement.

<sup>20</sup> *ibid*, p. 60

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*

<sup>22</sup> As Heidegger goes on to make explicit seven pages later: “An attunement is a way, not merely a form or a mode, but a way [*Weise*] – in the sense of a melody that does not merely hover over the so-called proper being at hand of man, but that sets the *tone* for such being, i.e., attunes and determines the manner and way [*Art und Wie*] of his being.” - *ibid*, p. 67, *emphasis added*

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*, p. 60

<sup>24</sup> Not only characteristic in terms of withdrawing from the possibilities of propositional knowledge but also in the use of the metaphor of awaking.

<sup>25</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 60

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*. For our purposes it is enough to see, once again, the intertwining of Heidegger’s discussion of attunements – and thus a metaphorical use of the sleeping versus waking alternation – *Dasein*, and that of

Of course, we cannot, nor does Heidegger, simply leave such a seeming contradiction without comment. Instead, and intriguingly, it is here that he calls the principle of non-contradiction into question. Here “we must not only put in question this venerable principle of metaphysics, which is based on a quite specific conception of being, but also cause it to shatter [*erschüttern*] in its very foundations.”<sup>27</sup> That it is the possibility of sleep which “shatters” such a fundamental principle of metaphysics should not go unnoticed. It, in fact, offers us the first clues towards a questioning of the *truth* of sleep. A questioning which we will not begin in this Part but which could play an important part in any future, positive phenomenological discussion of sleep.

But have we not got carried away with all this talk of “shattering” and the overturning of the fundamental principles of metaphysics? Cannot this apparent contradiction be simply dispelled by considering sleep and waking through the commonplace dichotomy of unconsciousness and consciousness? Heidegger thinks not. However, it is this turn to consciousness and unconsciousness that allows Heidegger one of his first hints, in this Part of the lecture course, toward the, now infamous, ‘comparative examination’ to which we turn in Chapter 4.<sup>28</sup> After all “one must recall that the state of affairs [*die Sachlage*] here is quite different from the case of a stone.”<sup>29</sup> Whereas something is a property of the stone or not, in the case of entities like us Heidegger claims that things are not so straightforward; we “can have something and at the same time not have it, that is, not know of it.”<sup>30</sup> The unconscious, in this sense allows for something to be both there and yet not-there for Dasein. Importantly, this notion of the unconscious

---

sleep itself. As we will see all of these share a relation of non-equivalence to the traditional distinction between unconsciousness and consciousness.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid*, p. 61

<sup>28</sup> Simon Glendinning argues that this philosophical method can already be discerned in *Being and Time*: “We shall again choose the method of contrasting it [a primordial structure of Dasein’s being] with a relationship of Being which is essentially different ontologically – viz. Categorical – but which we express by the same linguistic means.” p. 81 [H55], cited in Glendinning, Simon. *On Being with Others – Heidegger, Derrida, Wittgenstein*, London: Routledge, 1998, Ch. 4, fn 4, p. 157. It is worth noting that whilst Glendinning is correct to point out that the method of ontological comparison is not something which sprang in Athenian fashion, fully formed, from Heidegger’s head in the winter of 1929, this does not, in itself, commend the equally misconceived view that *Being and Time* already demonstrates the enactment of such a method. Instead, the method enacts an alternative path from that undertaken in *Being and Time*. That Heidegger also saw this to be the case is made clear on pages 176 – 178 of *FCM*. “Yet all of these paths necessarily have their own specific limitations and difficulties. This is because each of these paths comes from without, that is, each one brings with it the principles and perspectives that are characteristic of ordinary understanding.” Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 178. We appeal to just this shift in method in moving from Chapter 3 to Chapter 4.

<sup>29</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 61

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*

and its content can be so conceived – as this “strange ‘at hand and yet at the same time not at hand’” – precisely because we *may* become “conscious of something unconscious.”<sup>31</sup> This seems a plausible account of sleep, for is not sleep understood – at least, traditionally, in distinction from death – as having the potential to *reawaken*? As we have seen Heidegger’s rhetorical move, namely, seeking that which is sleeping in order to understand how one can correctly awaken it, seems to implicitly rely on such a conception of sleep. Sleep would thus amount to an absence *of* consciousness teeming with the *potential for* consciousness.<sup>32</sup>

However, for Heidegger, consciousness and unconsciousness only “seems to be equivalent” to waking and sleeping.<sup>33</sup> In a few brilliant lines Heidegger points out that “the concept of the nonconscious... is much too broad” *and* that “sleep is not simply [cannot be reduced to] an absence of consciousness.”<sup>34</sup> Firstly, absence of consciousness seems to cover many more phenomena than just sleep. For example, fainting, anaesthetised unconsciousness, drunken stupor, and, of course, death. Asides from death, these examples amount to a reducing of ‘consciousness of’. Our intentional consciousness is stifled in such situations. It is this stifling of intentional consciousness which, in its proximity to sleep, leads us to equate sleep with nonconsciousness. However, as the essential example of death – that “difficult problem”<sup>35</sup> – shows, nonconsciousness cannot just equate to sleep for it must also include something which we have genuine interest, at least those of us who ever wish to sleep again without fear, in distinguishing from sleep. Secondly, Heidegger, like so many before him turns to dreams to show that consciousness is not truly exiled from sleep. The porous nature of sleep means that “a peculiar and in many cases extremely animated consciousness pertains precisely to sleep”.<sup>36</sup> Nonconsciousness is both too broad and too narrow a concept to be applied to sleep. This double rejection of nonconsciousness must remain in the back of our minds, and not unconsciously, during the interrogation of Heidegger to come.

---

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*

<sup>32</sup> Of course, Husserl’s question, which was discussed in our first chapter, on how, given such a conception of sleep, we ever wake-up again or return to our waking selves must be kept in mind at this point. Whenever Heidegger calls upon the word consciousness, which is comparatively rare in itself, we should keep an eye on Husserlian phenomenology and how Heidegger means to relate to or, more often, distance himself from it.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*

<sup>35</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, translated by Albert Hofstadter, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988, p. 273

<sup>36</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 61

Given Heidegger's famous withdrawal from philosophy's traditional focus on consciousness and the objects thereof we should not be surprised that he sees bringing attunements to consciousness as not only the wrong way to proceed but in fact as achieving "the contrary of an awakening. The attunement is thereby precisely destroyed, or at least not intensified, but weakened and altered."<sup>37</sup> This age old worry that we may not reproduce precisely in thought that which was previously distinct from it but instead alter our target in the process of bringing it to consciousness is, as the unfortunate pun illustrates, one which we, as interested in sleep, should be particularly awake, to.<sup>38</sup> One of the very difficulties of sleep is that we are never simultaneously sleeping and philosophising about sleep. Instead Heidegger reminds us that to "awaken an attunement means... to let it *become awake* and as such precisely to let it *be*."<sup>39</sup> Perhaps here a hint toward the somnolent pathway for which we are searching is offered through the similarity between this letting *be*, as distinct from a shaking awake, and not only a 'letting awake' but also a 'letting sleep'.<sup>40</sup>

This is almost exactly what Heidegger now does – he lets sleep be. Here, after perhaps two or three pages, more of a nap than a true sleep, Heidegger awakes from the question of sleep. After reminding us of both his positive – that whatever is to be awakened must already be there and yet not there – and negative – it cannot be treated through the dualism of consciousness and unconsciousness – results, we are told that the question of sleep must be dropped. Two reasons are given for this. First, it would "make the problem too complicated here at the outset".<sup>41</sup> And secondly, for "fundamental metaphysical reasons."<sup>42</sup> It is the nature of these fundamental metaphysical reasons which will guide us in what follows. Heidegger draws from the negative thesis, that unconsciousness does not equate to sleep, the further conclusion that we have already gone wrong in our very conception of man. So long, that is, as we define man as distinct

---

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*

<sup>38</sup> And yet perhaps, as Chapter 4 argues, we should instead be particularly *alive* to such worries. On our guards against mechanically steamrolling over the trembling and tiny, though no less essential, distinctions of life.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*

<sup>40</sup> David Farrell Krell goes some way towards unpacking this possibility in the following lines: "How does one cause a sleepyhead to stir? Or must one *let* the sleeper come round?" – Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992 p. 108

<sup>41</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 62

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*, p. 63

by virtue of having consciousness. Here we again see his famous critique of man as the rational animal.<sup>43</sup> However, in terms of sleep this has, for Heidegger the following further consequences:

...the task of clarifying such phenomena as sleeping and waking cannot be addressed extrinsically as one particular question. Rather, such clarification can occur only on the presupposition that we possess a fundamental conception of how a being must be structurally determined such that it can sleep or be awake. We do not say that the stone is asleep or awake. Yet what about the plant? Here already we are uncertain.<sup>44</sup>

‘What being is such that it may sleep?’ has come to take the place of the question ‘What is sleep?’ Heidegger’s insistence that this question – the fundamental question of our thesis – be put on hold until the differences between stones, plants, animals and humans can be ascertained, whilst frustrating, in fact, or so this Part will show, provides us with the fundamental directions, or *Wegmarken*, for any Heideggerian analysis of sleep.<sup>45</sup> With this withdrawing from “entering into the problem of sleep... [Heidegger attempts] to clarify on *another path* [*Wege*] what it means to awaken an attunement.”<sup>46</sup> However, before sketching this alternative path with which Heidegger continues his assessment of awakening attunements we must note Heidegger’s characteristic appeal to Aristotle, in this instance to Aristotle’s treatise ‘On Sleep’.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps more so than anything claimed about sleep so far what Heidegger recalls from Aristotle’s account, and recalls with great admiration, will guide our investigations in this chapter.

Aristotle’s first “remarkable” claim is that “sleep is an ἀκίνησις [akinesia, not-move, quiescence, or rest].”<sup>48</sup> This, of course, connects sleep to movement, kinesis, and essentially retains the negative status of sleep which we have already explored. This import of sleep, its status as a cancelling out, as an *a*-kinesia, will support the main thrust

---

<sup>43</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, *passim*, for example p. 74 [H48]. Also see the ‘Letter on Humanism’, in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill, pp. 239 – 276.

<sup>44</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 62. Note the similarity of the first couple of lines of this quotation to our first Chapter’s epigraph from Merleau-Ponty’s *Institution and Passivity*, see p. 5, above.

<sup>45</sup> “Such language testifies to the fact that in sleep human beings are inevitably bound up with the animal, vegetable, and mineral worlds. Already here, in the question of slumber and somnolence (93 – 94), those regions of being which by metonymy or synonymy we call *stone*, *animal*, and *man* come to the fore.” - Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 108

<sup>46</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 63

<sup>47</sup> Aristotle. ‘On Sleep’, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. J. Barnes, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1991, pp. 1004 – 1012 [453b12 – 458a32]

<sup>48</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 62

of our argument as found here whilst at the same time – in its similarity to Heidegger’s appeal to another Ancient Greek term which involves a negation, ἀλήθεια – also suggesting an alternative orientation to Heidegger’s thought, a somnolent undertow. To see how this claim will structure this Part we must consider that Heidegger juxtaposes this Aristotelian account of sleep with those based on consciousness and unconsciousness. Aristotle’s account, instead, describes sleep as “a δεσμός [desmos, bond, fetter, collar], a *being bound* [Gebundenheit], a peculiar way in which αἴσθησις [aisthēsis, perception] is bound. It is not only a way in which perception is bound but also our essence, in that it cannot take in other beings which it itself is not.”<sup>49</sup> Aisthēsis, broadly, understood as perception is, in sleep, bound. This bondage, it will be argued, is remarkable in its proximity to the daze of captivation [*Benommenheit*] which Heidegger reserves for the animal.<sup>50</sup>

Should Heidegger’s detour [*Umweg*] into the question of sleep, as found in the opening section of Part One of *FCM*, be characterised as but another of the “false trails [*Holzwege*] [or], paths which suddenly stop, which lead up a blind alley”?<sup>51</sup> Heidegger, as we saw above, certainly argued that the pathway we have undertaken in this thesis amounts to a false start, since it begins with a question “which cannot be addressed extrinsically as one particular question.”<sup>52</sup> And the questioning of sleep in Heidegger’s lecture course is clearly a path “which suddenly stop[s]”. But what is to stop us, accepting his strong claim about the necessarily non-extrinsic nature of inquiring after sleep, at least for now, and, nonetheless, taking Heidegger’s use of the term *Holzwege* in the different and later sense that he would go on to use it?

“Wood” is an old name for forest. In the wood there are paths, mostly overgrown, that come to an abrupt stop where the wood is untrodden. They are called *Holzwege*.

Each goes its separate way, though within the same forest. It often appears as if one is identical to another. But it only appears so.

Woodcutters and forest keepers know these paths. They know what it means to be on a *Holzweg*.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> *ibid*, pp. 62 – 63

<sup>50</sup> See all of Chapter 4 below, but Sc III in particular, pp. 124 – 134.

<sup>51</sup> *ibid*, p. 8

<sup>52</sup> *ibid*, p. 62. Here Heidegger’s similarity to Merleau-Ponty’s position, in *Institution and Passivity*, is striking.

<sup>53</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Off the Beaten Track*, p. v

This latter use of the term *Holzweg* does not mean merely a false path or a *dead* end but rather suggests an overgrown, covered over and dimly lit, pathway, one which comes “to an abrupt stop where the wood is untrodden”, a sleepy pathway certainly, but perhaps, also, a sleeping pathway, a pathway through and surrounded by life. Now we are at an appropriate stage to outline how, given the peculiar presence and absence of sleep in Heidegger’s philosophy, this Part progresses.

Taking our lead from what presence there is of sleep in Heidegger’s work, as well as following his own instructions that the question of sleep not be treated in isolation, we will attempt to discern two sets of pathmarks [*Wegmarken*] towards the awakening of a sleeping path through, and out of, Heidegger’s thought. These two sets of marks correspond to the two parts of his pivotal lecture series, *FCM*. As we have already indicated Heidegger’s initial description of sleep is intertwined and clearly connected with his notion of attunement, or mood. Following from this Chapter 3 opens by considering the complex relationship between sleep, moods or attunements [*Stimmungen*] and disposition [*Befindlichkeit*]. In so doing the relationship between sleep and the Dasein analytic more generally will begin to take shape. Chapter 3 ends with a consideration of Corey Anton’s ambitious, though flawed, attempt to expand the existential analytic to include sleep. With this very human set of marks towards a phenomenology of sleep discerned Chapter 4 turns to the sleepy pathmarks left by animals, that is, to Heidegger’s complex and controversial thesis that ‘the animal is poor in world’. Is the sleeper also ‘poor in world’? And how, if at all, does this poverty relate to the complex relationship between Da-sein and animal-being? With these two sets of clues unearthed this Part concludes via a consideration of the controversies surrounding this pivotal lecture course. Perhaps this end, our – as yet – un-awakened Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep, is neither a *Weg*, nor a *Holzweg*, but instead a *Keinesweg*, a ‘no way’ or *aporea* [ἀπορία]. We conclude by assessing this ‘no way’, this impasse to any future Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep.



## Chapter 3

### ‘How did you sleep?’ – Moods, sleep, and the existential analytic

The fact that moods can deteriorate and change over means simply that in every case Dasein always has some mood.<sup>1</sup>

#### I: Sleeping Attunements and Attunements of Sleep

By the beginning of Section 16, sub-section c) Heidegger has awakened from his brief engagement with the question of sleep and returned to “*another path*” towards understanding what it means to awaken a fundamental attunement. But *how* did Heidegger sleep? This question, which in its more everyday form we encounter as frequently as we meet others each morning, beyond pointing us back to the above analysis of Heidegger’s explicit account of sleep (with its positive and negative theses), pushes further the question of the relationship between sleep and attunement. Just as I may ask ‘how was the weekend?’, or ‘how is your mother doing?’ I may also ask ‘how did you sleep?’ However, our answers to these questions might be thought to differ in, fundamental, quality as well as in, less controversially, depth or quantity. ‘How did you sleep?’ seems to, in its mirroring of other similar questions, enquire after a content of sleep which appears missing. This content, whether lacking or present in abundance, must amount to the basic content, or tone, of Dasein’s Being-there – in other words, the manner in which Dasein is attuned, its mood. “Attunements are the fundamental ways in which we *find* ourselves *disposed* in such and such a way. Attunements are the ‘*how*’ [*Wie*] according to which one is in such and such a way.”<sup>2</sup> This allows us to formulate the following question: ‘what is the mood, or are the moods, of sleep?’

Before attempting to directly address this question, and its attendant related questions, we must return to the last sub-section of Section 16 of *FCM*. Here Heidegger explicitly lays out his alternative to thinking about attunements through the sleeping and awaking metaphor. His alternative route involves considering instances of not-being-

---

<sup>1</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 173 [H134]

<sup>2</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 67

there that operate whilst we are awake. We are asked to think of those times when we are simply ‘not-there’, whilst in company say. Those periods of ‘phasing out’, of withdrawal or absence, are couched in the there-being of our existence, as *Da-sein*.<sup>3</sup> Essentially, these, like sleep, cannot be put down to a shift from consciousness to unconsciousness but are, instead, prior to that distinction. Heidegger argues for this by suggesting that whilst absent we may still remain extremely conscious, of ourselves or of something else, for example. Madness too appears to demonstrate varying degrees of consciousness whilst always manifesting some form of being-away.

If attunement is both being-there and not-being-there, Heidegger need not appeal to sleep and waking at all to see that this ambiguity within the character of attunements is prior to the consciousness/ unconsciousness distinction rather than the result of it. “Yet man has the *potential* to be away in this manner only if his being has the character of being-*there* [*Da-sein*].”<sup>4</sup> This step away from sleep has the advantage, for Heidegger, that it pulls attunements away from binary ‘on versus off’ conceptions of our states of consciousness. We, traditionally, think of sleep and waking through such a binary distinction and Heidegger needs to show that being-away “is not something which happens arbitrarily from time to time, but is an essential characteristic of man’s very being”.<sup>5</sup> Of course, for our purposes this very conception of attunements when applied through the question of the attunements of sleep may have the converse effect of pushing our conception of sleep away from that very feature of it which, perhaps, led Heidegger to leave it behind.

Heidegger is determined to rescue attunements from the clutches of consciousness dominated accounts of man and return them to their rightful place: at the very core of our being. “*Attunement belongs to the being of man.*”<sup>6</sup> This shift to the essence of man was, as we saw, prefigured, for “fundamental metaphysical reasons”<sup>7</sup>, in the previous subsection of Section 16. Already there we saw that this move relied on the comparative analysis of man with the stone, and, later, with the animal. Attunements cannot be

---

<sup>3</sup> That Heidegger moves from sleep to such phenomena suggests a certain affinity which when developed through a preliminary phenomenological account of reverie, phasing-out and day-*dreaming*, would offer insight into the question of the delimiting of sleep and waking.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*, p. 63

<sup>5</sup> *ibid*

<sup>6</sup> *ibid*

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*

correctly discussed as though they were objects present-at-hand, or properties of something present-at-hand such as a stone. Thus the, apparent, contradiction of the being-there and not-being-there of attunements (as sleeping) is, initially, resolved by showing that the language of contradiction which trades in a particular type of presence and absence – that of the present-at-hand – is ill suited to describing human being, in its being. Resultantly, it is just as ill suited to discussing attunements – “if attunement indeed belongs to the being of man we may not speak of it or take it as though it were at hand or not at hand.”<sup>8</sup>

Yet, Heidegger is not blind to the appeal of the accounts of attunements which he is ruling out. He acknowledges that attunements have long been identified as “emotional states” and that psychology “has always distinguished between thinking, willing, and feeling.”<sup>9</sup> “Attunements – are they not like the utterly fleeting and ungraspable shadows of clouds flitting across the landscape?”<sup>10</sup> Surely they are “the third class of lived experience.”<sup>11</sup> And “merely... the adornment of our thinking and willing”.<sup>12</sup> However, the appeal of these ways of *thinking* about ‘feelings’ emanates from the already entrenched conception of man – as the rational animal – which they flesh out. Heidegger is insistent that this is not the correct way to understand human being and in Section 17 he offers his alternative account of attunements.

What, however, does all of this have to do with the relationship between sleep and attunement? As we have seen Heidegger’s move away from sleep allows him to challenge the relevance of consciousness to questions of attunement without arguing about the essence of sleep and also whilst moving towards an interrogation of the being of man as Dasein. And yet, before leaving sleep behind waking and sleeping are brought, for but a second, into contact with being-there and being-away: “Nor are being-there and being-away identical with waking and sleeping. Why we nevertheless rightly conceive of them in these terms will become apparent later.”<sup>13</sup> That these pairs of terms are not identical should not surprise us but the ambiguity in the last sentence must give us pause – indeed

---

<sup>8</sup> *ibid*, p. 64

<sup>9</sup> *ibid*

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*

<sup>11</sup> *ibid*

<sup>12</sup> *ibid*

<sup>13</sup> *ibid*, p. 63

this can only be said to “become apparent” in the closing paragraphs of the course.<sup>14</sup> Firstly, which way round should we take this final sentence? Do we rightly conceive of waking and sleeping in terms of being-there and being-away? Or should we rather conceive of being-there and being-away in terms of waking and sleeping? If the former, as Heidegger’s essentialist claims about Dasein’s being-away suggest – in “the end, this being-away pertains to the essence of being there [*Dasein*]”, then we must look to account for sleeping and waking within the horizon of Dasein’s special, attuned existence, as both being-there and being-away.<sup>15</sup> However, and this will relate to the undercurrent or somnolent path not travelled that we catch glimpses of throughout this Part, if Heidegger means that we must conceive of being-there and being-absent in terms of waking and sleeping then Heidegger’s choice to begin examining attunements through sleep was not merely accidental, was not merely a wrong turn down *a sleepy* Holzweg. Instead it indicates towards a conception of sleep which underpins the very possibility of attunement, and thus the possibility of Dasein.

Returning to the former interpretation what might we hope to learn about sleep by reading it through the lens of this new conception of our being which Heidegger offers in *Being and Time*? Though we already have many of the tools necessary, to begin this exploration of a Heideggerian account of sleep, let us now turn to Section 17 of *FCM* to find Heidegger’s explicitly positive account of attunement and with it some possible comparisons with sleep – remembering that attunements, as sleeping, are both being-there and not-being-there as we have seen in the previous section.

Attunement is the prior, oftentimes background, tone which structures our being as Dasein.

Thus we have the positive correlate of our first negative thesis, namely that attunement is not a particular being. In positive terms, attunement is a fundamental manner, the *fundamental way in which Dasein is as Dasein*.<sup>16</sup>

This identifying of attunements with our being as Dasein raises interesting questions about the status of sleep. To begin with this “first negative thesis, namely that attunement

---

<sup>14</sup> *ibid*, pp. 365 – 366. See p. 165, below.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid*

<sup>16</sup> *ibid*, p. 67

is not a particular being.” Applying, as this does, to the notion of properties of objects just as much as whole objects, we can see that any attunements of sleep must operate, as attunements, at a level of being where the rules of presence-at-hand are not appropriate. Following this through we can see that such attunements of sleep would not, presumably, be subject to the limits we might expect. For example, they need not be confined to at-hand periods of sleeping but may rather spread throughout Dasein, whether sleeping or awake. The rewards of such a notion of the moods of sleep are multiple and significant. Even at this early stage we can see that these moods of sleep might provide phenomenological access, during the day, of a sort, which we had previously thought impossible, that is: contemporaneous access to sleep. Sleep, Hypnos, intuitively indeed, is not strictly limited to the reign of his mother night, Nyx, but can and will wander even out into the light of the sun.

Before attempting to assess the conditions for the possibility of such attunements let us consider another three phenomenological results that might be garnered from the extension of attunements into the realm of Hypnos. Firstly, attunement is “*not at all ‘inside’ in some interiority, only to appear in the flash of an eye; but for this reason it is not at all outside either.*”<sup>17</sup> Heidegger uses the examples of grief, good humour and of a person who “puts a damper on everything” in order to show that attunement is not restricted to the individual and merely private but rather reaches out across our, often taken to be hermetically sealed, shells of interiority.<sup>18</sup> Attunement “imposes itself on everything” and is “but the way of our being there with one another.”<sup>19</sup> Now when applied to sleep this raises fascinating questions about the seemingly obvious privacy of sleep. If sleep is truly attuned, then sleep cannot be purely private. It might be argued that this should not surprise us given that sleep is not death *and* that the sleeper – perhaps all the more so given their questionable status as an agent – is archetypal of one who is affected (overcome). The question of the relationship between privacy and sleep is one which must, since long before Descartes, haunt any philosophical encounter with sleep.

Secondly, sleep’s secondary status, like that of attunements, which have been seen as “like the utterly fleeting and ungraspable shadows of clouds flitting across the

---

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, p. 66

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*

<sup>19</sup> *ibid*

landscape”<sup>20</sup>, is called into question by the suggestion of moods of sleep. “Rather because attunement is the originary way in which every Dasein is as it is, it is not what is most inconstant, but that which gives Dasein *subsistence and possibility* in its very foundations.”<sup>21</sup> If we have considered moods to be not even secondary but tertiary in relation to “thinking” and “willing” – “the third class of lived experience”<sup>22</sup> – then sleeping life certainly has also been given short-shrift when compared with the prioritising of wakeful life. Furthermore, if attunement takes on a new priority as “that which gives Dasein *subsistence and possibility*”, then so too surely do the attunements of sleep. Sleep, unlike wakeful reason and our wilful acting, now takes on a new significance. Once again, the significance of sleep opens a new face to us under this Heideggerian picture.

Lastly, and certainly most significantly for what will follow, attunements are forever with us – “we are never without attunement.”<sup>23</sup> This brief pronouncement echoes our Chapter’s epigraph from *Being and Time* in radicalising the second of Heidegger’s alterations to our understanding of attunements. Attunements, as prior to thinking and willing, are primary and essential to Dasein as existing. Heidegger is adamant that even in “that *lack of attunement* in which we are neither out of sorts nor in a ‘good’ mood” we are still attuned.<sup>24</sup> In fact, Heidegger goes further by making the following striking assertion: “And precisely *those* attunements to which we pay no heed at all, the attunements we least observe, those attunements which attune us in such a way that we feel as though there is no attunement there at all, as though we were not attuned in any way at all – these attunements are the most powerful.”<sup>25</sup> At least two points must be drawn out of this claim. Firstly, it could be held to contrast significantly with Heidegger’s earlier characterisation of moods in *Being and Time*. Whatever one says about existential anxiety’s [*Angst*] distance from the present-at-hand psychological anxiety treated by the ontic sciences we must still acknowledge that anxiety, as Heidegger describes it in *Being and Time*, is not something to which we may “pay no heed at all”. Anxiety overcomes and disrupts the usual flow of our everyday coping and as such cannot be ignored, whilst

---

<sup>20</sup> *ibid*, p. 64

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*, p. 67

<sup>22</sup> *ibid*, p. 64

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*, p. 68

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*

one is gripped by it that is, nor reintegrated into our lives (without converting it into *fear* or fears). This may relate to Heidegger's shift from anxiety to boredom in the three years between the publication of *Being and Time* and the lectures that make-up *FCM*.

Secondly, surely whatever would qualify as the attunement(s) of sleep would be exactly those "attunements we least observe", those which "feel as though there is no attunement there at all". This also suggests that such *attunements of sleep*, as opposed to the *sleeping attunements* with which Heidegger began this part of his lecture course, would be central to understanding "the grounds of our Dasein".<sup>26</sup> After all, "because it [attunement] leads us back into the grounds of our Dasein, the essence of attunement remains concealed or hidden from us".<sup>27</sup> In this way Heidegger reiterates the importance of sleeping attunements as the self-concealing pathmarks into the very ground of our being. Yet, for all this focus on the self-concealing of attunements, of their sleeping, Heidegger offers no account of the attunements of sleep themselves. Could it be that "precisely *those* attunements to which [he] pay[s] no heed at all, the attunements [he] least observe[s]... are the most powerful"?

When we combine this question with Heidegger's repeated – in *Being and Time* and *FCM* – claim "that in every case Dasein always has some mood" we find ourselves at a crossroads on the somnolent path of this Part. One way tests the limits of such an account of the attunements of sleep by sounding it against the analysis of animal modes of being found in Part Two of *FCM*. The other path, which will occupy us for the remainder of this Chapter, draws an alternative conclusion from the analyses of attunement offered above. This second way considers Heidegger's statement that Dasein is always in a mood as evidence *against* the possibility of attunements of sleep and in favour of Dasein being constitutively and existentially wakeful. In other words, *when Dasein is, the sleeper is not, and when the sleeper is, Dasein is not*. Two potential critiques of the existential analytic result. Either, Heidegger's analytic is incomplete in failing to offer an account of the specific character of the attunements of sleeping Dasein, or Heidegger fails to specify another limit to the scope of the analytic by pointing out that we are, with mundane regularity, stripped of our Dasein status. Does Heidegger not describe sleeping Dasein or does Dasein not actually sleep?

---

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*

<sup>27</sup> *ibid*

## II: Disposition, Moods and Sleep

The appeal of the second route and its attendant claim begins to become manifest if we return to Heidegger's account of attunement, translated as mood by Macquarrie and Robinson, as found in *Being and Time*. Specifically, if we consider the, by the time of *FCM*, dropped concept 'disposition' [*Befindlichkeit*] and its relationship to both attunements and the other existentials that Heidegger identifies.<sup>28</sup> Disposition is, on the side of Dasein's thrownness and facticity, that structure of Dasein's being, existential, which ontologically distinguishes it from the being of the present-at-hand. In this sense, we can see already that Heidegger, in *FCM*, will go on to employ the notion of attunement for the same purpose – to distinguish Dasein in its modes of being from that which is simply 'at-hand'. However, in *Being and Time*, a distinction is drawn between this existential structure, disposition, and the existentiell manifestations of it, moods or attunements [*Stimmungen*]. "Dasein's openness to the world is constituted existentially by the attunement of a disposition."<sup>29</sup> This openness will, of course, be of central interest to us in what follows. For now, it is enough to ask what this initial distinction between disposition and attunement signified in *Being and Time*.

Disposition, unlike attunement, is not specific or particular but is, rather, a fundamental feature of Dasein existence, as existence. It approaches and then veers away from the status of an essential property of the essence of Dasein. Approaches – for it is an empty structure which is both necessary and insufficient, without a corresponding attunement, for Dasein status. Yet, veers away, for as we know from our above discussion of attunements, as found in *FCM*, we go wrong if we discuss the modes of being of Dasein as if they follow the structures of 'at-handness' found in our theorising about the world. Instead, Dasein, as disposed, demonstrates its "thrownness", which is "meant to suggest the *facticity of its being delivered over*."<sup>30</sup> It is essential that this "facticity" is

---

<sup>28</sup> *Befindlichkeit* is, infamously, translated as 'state-of-mind' by Macquarrie and Robinson. 'Ontological disposition' is Richardson's preferred translation, see Richardson, W. *Heidegger – Through Phenomenology to Thought*, The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1963, and it seems to capture the important connotation of 'finding oneself *positioned or disposed thus*' without implying that we are talking about an internal 'state' as in the case of 'state-of-mind'. For brevity we leave the word 'ontological' implicit.

<sup>29</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 176 [H137], *translation modified*

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*, p. 174 [H135]



distinguished from the “*factuality of the factum brutum of something present-at-hand*”.<sup>31</sup>

Richardson clarifies this notion of facticity as follows:

Here distinguish the *fact* of There-being and its *how*. Both its origin and destiny remain obscure, but this much is clear: the irreducible fact that There-being already *is*, facticity. *Already* is! hence is not itself the author but the recipient of this facticity.<sup>32</sup>

How does this clarification of Heidegger’s terms help us in considering the possibility of attunements of sleep? We must now ask not whether during sleep Dasein *factually* is, but rather whether the *facticity* of Dasein in its disposedness applies during sleep? What Richardson calls the “fact that There-being [*Dasein*] *is*” seems to be, precisely in its difference from the factuality of our continued life whilst sleeping, which can be observed and reported by scientists in their sleep labs, at the very least disrupted in sleep. Perhaps even, as Nancy – following Hawthorne – suggests through the phrase “temporary death”, sleep is precisely an, however temporary, annulment of facticity.<sup>33</sup>

Put in another way: perhaps the facticity of waking Dasein indicates not only that Dasein always in its existence “*Already* is!” but also that it was always ‘*Already not!*’. Disposition seems to involve not only an always already present facticity but also a prior and primordial absence of facticity. Once again, this is not a question of the fact of consciousness and its absence, instead we are here questioning the manner in which sleep relates to that from which, or out of which, we are the recipients of “this facticity.” Facticity is for Heidegger *disclosed* in disposition and yet reading back from the descriptions of this facticity we must ask whether the sleeper also has: this facticity; facticity disclosed to it (which amounts to the same thing); and thus, disposition at all? This way of questioning points towards the central manner in which Richardson interprets Heidegger’s discussion of disposition – as “one component of” the “luminosity” of Dasein.<sup>34</sup> That is: in terms of Dasein’s disclosedness and of what is disclosed to Dasein in being disposed.

---

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*

<sup>32</sup> Richardson, William J. *Heidegger – Through Phenomenology to Thought*, p. 64

<sup>33</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, Ch. 8 ‘The Knell [*glas*] of a Temporary Death’, *passim*, but see p. 42 for Nancy’s interesting and controversial development of this idea. Nancy takes the title of this chapter, in its entirety, from Nathaniel Hawthorne’s “The Haunted Mind” in his *Twice Told Tales*. We return to Nancy’s discussion of sleep and death in our final chapter.

<sup>34</sup> Richardson, William J. *Heidegger – Through Phenomenology to Thought*, p. 64. This very word, “luminosity”, already suggests sleep’s contrast with Dasein as described by Heidegger. Consider the natural

Disposition discloses Dasein in its facticity and this raises difficult questions for any notion of the moods of sleep given that which they are supposed to spring from – the very facticity of being-there – might be thought lacking. But what else is disclosed in Dasein's disposition and to what degree does this match our emerging and limited phenomenology of sleep? This is where Heidegger, and we with him, must move from the existential structure of disposition to the necessary existentiell filling out of that structure by attunements. Heidegger delimits three specific ways in which attunements disclose. They disclose: (1) “*Dasein in its thrownness*”<sup>35</sup>; (2) “*Being-in-the-world as a whole*” which “*makes it possible first of all to direct oneself towards something*”<sup>36</sup>; and, (3) “*circumspective*” encountering, or the encountering of “*something that matters to us*.”<sup>37</sup> Of these three we have already considered one aspect of thrownness, our facticity, which we might think absent in the case of the sleeper. But what of the other two?

In the case of (2) Heidegger is explicit, as we saw above, that attunements are not to be taken as the darting traces of some illusory apparition luring us away from the clarity of reason but rather as that upon which any disclosure of the world, and our being-in-the-world, is possible. We just took this characteristic of attunements as evidence for distinguishing attunements from the private emotions of psychology, and much of philosophy, but now we might think that the demand that the attunements of the sleeper disclose the world and our being-in-the-world “*as a whole*” asks too much. Firstly, we must note that being-in-the-world necessarily includes, for Heidegger, being-with and as such, as noted above, the sleeper, *if attuned*, is disclosed as already involved with other Daseins. Why should this reiteration of what we found so promising above for the possibility of attunements of sleep tell against such a possibility here? Surely, *das Man*, the “dictatorship of the “they”” rules just as much over the bedroom, hammock or *chaise longue* as it does over the public square?<sup>38</sup> Yet, it can be easily conceded that *going to sleep* is just as interpersonal as any of our other *everyday* activities without reducing the apparent appeal of the notion that, to modify an old cliché, ‘everyone *sleeps* alone.’

---

statement ‘I’m not very *bright* when I wake-up.’ This brightness or luminosity which we may find reduced in temporal proximity to sleep might be thought to be missing completely *in* the deepest and *darkest* heart of sleep.

<sup>35</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 175 [H136]

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*, p. 176 [H137]

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*, p. 177 [H138]

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*, p. 164 [H126]

Following this final intuition, it might be thought that Heidegger's requirement that attunements disclose Dasein as interrelated in the necessary attunement of their dispositions should be seen as evidence against the sleeper being so attuned, and having disposition as an existential structure of their being. Furthermore, attunements disclosure of "*something that matters to us*", (3), seems to support the present direction of analysis. Heidegger has by this point in *Being and Time* already described *circumspection* as our everyday involvement with entities as ready-to-hand, in, for example, the well known case of the hammer. In what sense do the sleeper's attunements, if there be such, disclose entities of this kind, entities intertwined within "referential totalities"?<sup>39</sup> The challenge is to show how such disclosure of referential webs of meaning, significance and concern, could ever sit comfortably alongside the intuitive character of sleep as a 'laying aside of one's burdens' – "Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care".<sup>40</sup> Alongside, that is the intuition which underpins Michel Haar's appeal to sleep at all, as we found it in our Introduction.<sup>41</sup> One possible solution to this challenge might be the suggestion that in sleep these totalities are disclosed as meaningful and worthy of care *but our care for them itself is suspended*? The situation is not so simple.

Remembering that sleep cannot be merely a shift from consciousness to unconsciousness one sees that the sleeper's lack of *conscious* access to such totalities of reference does not equate to an *ontological* lack of access. In support of this point consider the everyday notion of 'sleep patterns'. We often awake at regular times, times which fit our waking lives and routines. Many will have experienced the odd sensation of having woken-up and then in that post-sleep haze subsequently hearing the blaring of the alarm, which we seem to have predicted, and thus made superfluous, within, across or throughout sleep. Of course, for much of human history alarm clocks were not available. Stories like sleeping beauty are notable precisely for playing on the distinction between healthy, *regular* and temporary, sleep and pathological, *indeterminate*, sleep.

---

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, pp. 106 – 107 [H75 – 76], p. 112 [H82]

<sup>40</sup> 'Macbeth', Act II, Scene II, p. 852, in Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962. Also cited by Nancy, Jean-Luc in *The Fall of Sleep*, Translated by Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009, p. 28

<sup>41</sup> Haar, Michel. *The Song of the Earth*, tr. Reginald Lilly, p. 18. See p. 49 above.

However, before weighing this as evidence – for the continuation of the disclosure, of at least “*something that matters to us*”, throughout sleep – an essential caveat is required. We spoke just now of conscious, unconscious and ontological *access* to referential totalities of beings whilst sleeping. We also suggested that sleep maintains the disclosure of such totalities whilst slackening or reducing to near nil our own *care* for those same totalities. However, for Heidegger the world and those entities within it are discovered already meaning-laden and as such referential totalities are not found and then considered meaningful or not by an individual Dasein. In fact, it is far from clear what a referential totality would be if we cared nothing for it. Consider the following: a referential totality, one surrounding an alarm clock say, always already includes not only the clock itself but also that it was constructed with a purpose and that such a purpose, aiding in waking us up at specified times, points towards other purposes, going to work, and so on and so forth. Such a web, indeed a web of meaning or significance, deprived of significance is no web at all.<sup>42</sup>

Of course, these webs of meaning make reference to other Daseins and thus to being-with. This acts as a reminder that our approach so far has attempted to analyse sleep’s relationship to disclosure one type of disclosure at a time, in relation to (1), (2), and (3) as identified above. Whatever the analytic virtues of such a method it also carries with it the risk that we forget the unity at the heart of Heidegger’s notion of disclosure. The unified character of disclosure becomes clear when we see that any access to meaningful totalities, (3), must also amount to access to being-in-the-world as a whole, (2), and thus to our own Dasein as factually thrown *into* such existence, (1). Before returning to the last of these Heideggerian terms, “existence”, it is necessary to consider

---

<sup>42</sup> Those suffering from severe depression perhaps offer a counter-example. The world and entities have lost their significance. However, the connections between entities have not been destroyed for them. They may struggle, more than a healthy person, to even *see* the fibres of such webs of reference, and yet fundamentally it is not so much a blindness to these connections from which they suffer but rather a lack of force or momentum which fails to carry them along such fibres. Indeed, the connections between sleep and depression are multiple and fascinating. Extreme lethargy and irregular sleep patterns suggest both that depression is not confined to the waking-self *and* that we seek refuge from such colourless existence in the embrace of sleep. Perhaps the proximity between the uniformity of a life deprived of significance and the dissolving of distinctions within sleep creates something like a vicious circle or feedback loop: as the life drains out of waking life there is less to draw us to the ‘world of the living’, as we sometimes call it, and less and less relief that sleep can offer as the difference between waking and sleeping dwindles.

another way in which our narrow consideration of Dasein and the question of sleep requires broadening.<sup>43</sup>

### III: Sleep and the Existential Unity of Dasein

We must extend our examination of sleep and Dasein to take into account the unity of the existentials of Dasein. These are the fundamental existential structures of Dasein's being and so far we have limited our discussion to the existential of disposition [*Befindlichkeit*]. Heidegger is clear, however, that disposition, whilst a fundamental structure of Dasein, is not the only such structure. Dasein is not only always already disposed:

Every understanding [*Verstehen*] has its mood [*Stimmung*]. Every disposition [*Befindlichkeit*] is one in which one understands [*verstehend*]. The understanding which one has in such a disposition has the character of falling [*Verfallens*]. The understanding which has its mood attuned [*gestimmte*] in falling, Articulates [*artikulierte*] itself with relation to its intelligibility in discourse [*Rede*].<sup>44</sup>

Alongside disposition Heidegger enumerates, in *Being and Time*, three other, equiprimordial, existentials: understanding [*Verstehen*], falling [*Verfallen*], and discourse [*Rede*]. The unity of these existential structures is announced just prior to the temporal interrogation of them, each in its turn, in Division II.<sup>45</sup> There Heidegger shows that each existential relates to a particular temporal priority situated within an ecstatic temporal unity. Put far too quickly the past, future and present relate to, respectively, disposition, understanding, and falling. However, these primary temporalisations of the

---

<sup>43</sup> "Existence" can be seen as the "other side" of Dasein's thrownness when compared with our, up until now, focus on facticity.

<sup>44</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 385 [H335], *translation altered*.

<sup>45</sup> In fact, the very order in which Heidegger discusses the respective temporal characters of these existentials should be seen as significant given that this amounts to his second turn around the hermeneutic spiral of the existential analytic and thus any alteration to the structure of the first – in Division I Heidegger describes first disposition, then understanding, then discourse and then, finally, falling, see Dv I, Ch. V – could indicate a shift in emphasis or priority. By way of beginning such a consideration of this shift in the ordering of the existentials we might suggest that Division I offers a consideration of disposition, which "temporalizes itself *primarily* in *having been*" (*ibid*, p. 390 [H340]), first, whereas Division II begins with the temporal analysis of understanding – and understanding "is *primarily* futural." (*ibid*, p. 387 [H337]) When this is seen alongside Heidegger opening Division II with his famous analysis of being-towards-death we might begin to suggest that Division II reverses Division I's prioritising of Dasein's facticity and instead analyses thrownness primarily in relation to its potentiality for existential projection.

existentials can always be either authentic or inauthentic. Thus Heidegger's own more detailed summary is as follows:

Understanding is grounded primarily in the future (whether in anticipation or in awaiting). Dispositions temporalize themselves primarily in having been (whether in repetition or in having forgotten). Falling has its temporal roots primarily in the Present (whether in making-present or in the moment of vision).<sup>46</sup>

Essentially almost within the same breath Heidegger reminds us that “in every case” such primary temporalisations, say of understanding in relation to the future, also involve the other two temporal characters, past “having been” and present “Present”.<sup>47</sup> In “*every ecstasis, temporality temporalizes itself as a whole*”, and thus temporalizing “does not signify that ecstases come in a ‘succession’”.<sup>48</sup>

What of the temporal ecstasis of discourse? With an eye on our overarching question it might be thought that the question of discourse, the existential structure which grounds Dasein's ability to “Articulate” its understanding intelligibly, would be one of the most important difficulties facing any account of sleeping Dasein. Discourse, we are told, “does not temporalize itself primarily in any definite ecstasis.”<sup>49</sup> It would appear to be the exception amongst the existentials. However, Heidegger is quick to add that “Factically, however, discourse expresses itself for the most part in language, and speaks proximally in the way of addressing itself to the ‘environment’ [*umwelt*] by talking about things concernfully; because of this, making-present has, of course, a privileged constitutive function.”<sup>50</sup> This would seem to position discourse alongside falling and, certainly, it is correct to see language as articulating itself, necessarily, out of Dasein as falling. However, it is essential to see that this inauthentic, factically common, mode of discourse is not akin to the primary ecstatic temporalisations of the other three existentials. Instead discourse “*in itself*” is temporal, since all talking about ..., of ..., or to ..., is grounded in the ecstatic unity of temporality.”<sup>51</sup> This unity, which we have just

---

<sup>46</sup> *ibid*, p. 401 [H349], *translation modified*. The first of each of the pairs of terms following each existential amount to its authentic temporalisation, whereas the second to its inauthentic, except in the final pair where this arrangement is reversed (making-present is inauthentic whereas the moment of vision is authentic).

<sup>47</sup> *ibid*, p. 401 [H350]

<sup>48</sup> *ibid*

<sup>49</sup> *ibid*, p. 400 [H349]

<sup>50</sup> *ibid*

<sup>51</sup> *ibid*

clarified above, shows that discourse is best seen as always disclosing the ecstatic unity rather than prioritising any particular dimension of temporality. As such, discourse is not confined to “making-present” but rather allows the possibility of insight into the ecstatic unity of Dasein in its existential structure.

With the existential and ecstatic unity of Dasein described we must now, once more, ask how sleep can fit into this comprehensive picture of Dasein’s being? We have, it would appear merely returned again to the crossroads in our somnolent questioning of the existential analytic, described above.<sup>52</sup> Our very return to such a division in potential analysis of sleep indicates the depth of an ambiguity at the heart of sleep, it is both within our lives, and thus might be thought part of Dasein, and yet also a break, a little holiday, from those lives. This ambiguity, and its relationship to the notion of ‘life’, will be discussed below. However, with our newly fleshed out account of the existential structure of Dasein we can now see that our partial questioning of the place of sleep within this structure through the possibility of moods of sleep was just that, necessarily, partial. Again we must decide between attempting to unearth a subterranean, hibernating, place of sleep within the existential analytic and its ecstatic temporality *or* arguing that such a possibility is structurally excluded by *Being and Time*’s existential analytic. What are the strengths of these two opposing positions?

To begin with the former approach. What then could amount to the existentiells of sleep? Starting, once again, with the attuning of sleeping Dasein’s disposition. The sleeping attunement could resemble what Heidegger calls ‘bare mood’. “The ‘bare mood’ discloses the “there” more primordially, but correspondingly it *closes* it *off* more stubbornly than any *not-perceiving*.”<sup>53</sup> The thought is that something like this ‘bare mood’, only more radically ‘closed off’, could amount to the attunement of sleep. Just as we often walk right past someone we know when in such a mood, and miss many other aspects of the world which we might wonder at when, later, they are recalled for us, so too in sleep are entities simply not there for perception. It often takes something quite startling to return us to waking and even with such a return it is far from clear that the source of our awakening is, itself, ‘there for perception’. If we return to Heidegger’s admiration for Aristotle’s account of sleep we found in *FCM*, there sleep as the closing

---

<sup>52</sup> See p. 65, above.

<sup>53</sup> *ibid*, p. 175 [H136]

off of perception is nuanced: sleep is “a peculiar way in which αἴσθησις [aisthēsis, perception] is bound. It is not only a way in which perception is bound but also our essence, in that it cannot take in other beings which it itself is not.”<sup>54</sup> The question is whether such connections with perception tell for or against the possibility of outlining an attunement of sleep? As we saw above attunements necessarily disclose and this disclosure of entities, the world and Dasein underpins all perception. Thus any attunement of sleep must be prior to, and the source of, all our perceptions whilst sleeping – in this case the peculiar lack of them.<sup>55</sup> Certainly this resembles the *more stubborn closing off* that Heidegger grants ‘bare mood’. However, the *binding* of perception, we are told in *FCM*, is also a *binding* of “our essence” and a cutting of us off from “other beings which” we ourselves are not. This sounds more like an annulment of the disclosure of attunement and disposition than a mode there of.<sup>56</sup>

Turning to sleeping Dasein’s understanding. Understanding for Heidegger fundamentally concerns projecting on the basis of our having found ourselves thrown into attunement. Thus, assuming that we are attuned in sleep as discussed in the first part of the last paragraph, any understanding of sleep must be *out* of a *closed off* and *turned inwards* mode of Dasein’s being. This turning inwards seems to sit well with the theories underlying psychoanalytic practices of dream interpretation. Dreams, the understandings of sleep, as windows to the soul, or inner self. Of course, such a conception of sleep and its understanding relies on dualistic notions of self and world which Heidegger spent the better part of his career criticising.

Let us return to his own account of understanding. Heidegger paid special attention to the etymology of his technical terms and so must we. Specifically, in the case of understanding [*Verstehen*] we are dealing with a word consisting of the prefix *Ver-* and the word *stehen*, ‘to stand’. In this instance the prefix functions to demonstrate the transition into a state.<sup>57</sup> In this sense it plays the same role as the English prefix ‘for-’

---

<sup>54</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, pp. 62 – 63

<sup>55</sup> Excepting, that is, dreams which are not straight-forwardly perceptual and certainly do not amount to the tide of perceptual content which floods over us in waking life.

<sup>56</sup> This connection between the closing off of entities and the binding of our essence in sleep will be discussed below in our examination of Heidegger’s account of the animal’s curiously bound, captivated, and benumbed, mode of being.

<sup>57</sup> Heidegger would certainly be uncomfortable about this word ‘state’ as it suggests a settled and isolated form whereas, as we will see momentarily, understanding is tied not to a settled moment in our lives but rather to our ever changing and fluctuating potentialities for being this way or that way. That this ambiguity



found in words such as forgiving, forgetting, formulating. However, it is the word *stehen*, ‘to stand’ that should interest us here. Heidegger is explicit about the connection between understanding and standing:

In German we say that someone can *vorstehen* something – literally, stand in front of or ahead of it, that is, stand at its head, administer, manage preside over it. This is equivalent to saying that he *versteht sich darauf*, understands in the sense of being skilled or expert at it [has the know-how of it]. The meaning of the term “understanding” [*Verstehen*] as defined above is intended to go back to this usage in ordinary language.<sup>58</sup>

This connection with *Vorstehen*, connects *Verstehen* with the ‘before’ or ‘in front of’ of the German *vor* and as such the connection between understanding, projection, and the future comes through clearly. However, Heidegger is more interested in demonstrating, here, that understanding, as he uses it, goes back to the skilful coping, or managing, that underpins all actions (think of walking as an underlying and yet essential way in which we skilfully cope in this way, and which involves a host of remarkably skilful actions which are only revealed as such in, following Dreyfus, so called ‘breakdown scenarios’).<sup>59</sup>

Fundamentally, the etymology of understanding, both its connection to standing and to skilfully reckoning with and managing of the world tells against the possibility of a somnolent existentiell understanding. Sleep usually amounts to a giving up of just that posture, standing, upon which our understanding stands. Sleep, in its bodily enactment, often amounts to a lying down and as such to a mirroring of the laying down of our burdens for which sleep is so often praised. We will return to this question of “posture” and “stance” below, as it is intimately tied to Heidegger’s separating of *Dasein* from animal life.<sup>60</sup> The thought is not so simple, nor so naïve, as the claim that the sleeper does not stand and thus the sleeper cannot *understand*. Instead the thought is closer to the

---

is fundamental to the word will be brought out in Chapter 4’s consideration of Heideggerian approaches to sleep, where we will consider the difficult prefix *Ver-* in more detail. See pp. 136 – 138, below.

<sup>58</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 276. *Italicised square brackets enclose the translator’s comments.*

<sup>59</sup> Dreyfus, L. Hubert. *Being-in-the-World*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991, Chapter 4, Section II, pp. 69 – 83, and *passim*.

<sup>60</sup> See, for example, Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, pp. 122 – 123. And, McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006, p. 38. “The honey that appears to a bee as its food may not appear to a cat at all – not even as something toward which it could be indifferent (for this would presuppose the cat being able to adopt a stance toward the honey, as well as the honey being given for the cat *as being honey*).”

reverse of this. The sleeper's lack of understanding, which amounts to being unable to *stand-up* to and through the possibilities of life, leads to their prone posture.<sup>61</sup> Here we see the beginnings of a Heideggerian take on the significance of sleep's bodily comportment.

We must interrogate the concept of skilful coping. Explicitly, whether the sleeper can be said to so *cope* with life. As Heidegger put it in his summer of 1927 Marburg lecture course *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*: "the Dasein, has its own being in a certain way under control, as it comports itself in this or that way toward its capacity to be, as it has already decided in this or that way for or against it."<sup>62</sup> Here we must recall our brief phenomenological sketch of waking-up just prior to one's alarm clock going off. At the time we saw it as indicating some kind of regularity and ordering over and through sleep. Now we might think to frame this within the structure of understanding as evidence in favour of Dasein status continuing throughout sleep along with the skilful coping involved in getting-up on time with relative regularity. In other words, if sleep can be regulated (patterned through having "already decided" to get up at such and such a time) then it cannot be beyond Dasein's understanding.

"To understand means, more precisely, *to project oneself upon a possibility*, in this *projection* to keep oneself at all times in a possibility."<sup>63</sup> This projecting *oneself* upon a possibility seems to support the notion of sleep's understanding as a skilful coping with waking-up, sleeping 'enough', and the like. This is due to the reasons *why* one awakes, regularly or less regularly, when one does. We awake in time for our job *because* we wish to be the kind of person who can be relied upon. We do not wish to lose our job as it is part of the larger scale projecting of our self onto possible modes of being. And thus sleep, like eating, drinking, working and chatting, fits neatly into our projects of understanding. Leaving aside, for now, both questions of pathological sleep – insomnia, night terrors and the like – and the essential discussion of in what *manner*, or *way*, we regulate sleep and thus project *across* it, what of the understanding *within* or *of* sleep. This distinction of inside and outside sleep *itself* might be thought suspiciously reminiscent of dualistic

---

<sup>61</sup> Polt, Richard. *Heidegger, An Introduction*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999, p. 68. "In order to do so, we have to be fit to *stand up* to what we are doing – we have to be capable and competent."

<sup>62</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 276

<sup>63</sup> *ibid*, p. 277

thinking. However, we must, like Heidegger himself, remember that understanding, as an existential structure of Dasein's being, cannot be temporary or partial. We, once more, ask 'what is the existentiell understanding of sleep?'

Returning to our alarm clock example. What would it mean, for Heidegger, to say that the sleeper "hears" the alarm clock? We must keep in mind that "Dasein hears, because it understands."<sup>64</sup> Yet does, phenomenologically, the sleeper hear *the alarm clock*, itself? That is to say do we, when asleep, hear anything *as* that thing? There are those moments when we awake and later realise what woke us, the drilling out in the road or the loud crash in the next room of our partner dropping something. Sometimes such sounds seem like they work themselves into our dreams *as* noises of quite different sorts. Fundamentally though the "experiences" of sleep are not tied into webs of reference or potentiality *as* an experience *of* this or that. Thus we might think that the projecting involved in understanding is denied to the sleeper precisely because the sleeper does not sleep *as* a philosopher sleeps or *as* a carpenter sleeps. Sleep, as Nancy points out,<sup>65</sup> is a great leveller and, intuitively, a losing of the "'as'-structure", that "structure of the explicitness of something that is understood."<sup>66</sup> We return to the significance of this 'as'-structure below.

What has been said so far shows that despite some seemingly promising connections between Heidegger's accounts of disposition and understanding, as encountered in and around *Being and Time*, and sleep, nonetheless it remains hard to imagine a sleeping Dasein. However, what of the two other existentials that Heidegger emphasises: falling and discourse? The former would appear to offer the best chance of fitting sleep into the existential analytic, whereas the latter seems to further point away from such a possibility. Falling, in keeping with Heidegger's metaphorical use of sleep as the other side of that which must be awakened, refers to the manner in which Dasein primarily hides its ownmost, authentic, character from itself and, in so hiding, loses, temporarily, this character. It is no coincidence that Nancy, a reader of Heidegger who has focused on Heidegger's *das Man*, is so interested in the connections between sleep

---

<sup>64</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 206 [H163]

<sup>65</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 17. "Sleep itself knows only equality, the measure common to all, which allows no differences or disparities. All sleepers fall into the same, identical and uniform sleep."

<sup>66</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 189 [H149]

and *falling*.<sup>67</sup> And what of discourse? Given that “*Discourse is existentially equiprimordial with disposition and understanding*” we might just as well explain sleep’s apparent silence in terms of discourse as we have attempted to with sleep’s lack of understanding and attunement within those existentials.<sup>68</sup> Heidegger does say that in “talking with one another, the person who keeps silent can ‘make one understand’ (that is, he can develop an understanding), and he can do so more authentically than the person who is never short of words.”<sup>69</sup> Yet does sleep’s silence ever have such a possibility? Is it not closer to the silence of the dumb individual? A “man [who] is dumb... has not proved that he can keep silence; indeed, he entirely lacks the possibility of proving anything of the sort.”<sup>70</sup> And what of the “silence” of the beasts and birds?<sup>71</sup> Can it truly be thought that sleep’s keeping silent, or sleep talking – that truly uncanny phenomenon, can be described as ‘developing an understanding’ and as stemming from the sleeper’s existential structure of discourse? Perhaps the most pressing question which results from this far too brief survey is how could sleep relate with Heidegger’s contentious notions of authenticity and inauthenticity? Could Dasein, even if it managed to rest its eyes, just for a moment, do so authentically?

In a moment we will turn to one commentators take on our question – does Dasein sleep? First, however, it is worth noting that sleep seems to pull in opposite directions with these two fundamental existentials of Dasein. With its proximity to falling, our falling away from ourselves, sleep seems constitutively inauthentic. Whereas the sleeper’s silence might be seen to connect with Heidegger’s *call of conscience* and its “uncanny mode of *keeping silent*”.<sup>72</sup>

Only in keeping silent does the conscience call; that is to say, the call comes from the soundlessness of uncanniness, and the Dasein which it summons is called back into the stillness of itself, and called back as something that is to become still. Only in reticence, therefore, is this silent discourse understood appropriately in wanting to have a conscience. It takes the words away from the common-sense idle talk of the “they”.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> See his *Being Singular Plural* (Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*, Translated by Robert Richardson and Anne E O’Byrne. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000) and, of course, *The Fall of Sleep*.

<sup>68</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 203 [H161]

<sup>69</sup> *ibid*, p. 208 [H164]

<sup>70</sup> *ibid*, p. 208 [H164 – 165]

<sup>71</sup> David F. Krell argues that for Heidegger, given his notion of the animal as captivated or benumbed, sees “*numb and dumb...* [as constituting] something more than a mere rhyme...”. *Daimon Life*, p. 17

<sup>72</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 322 [H277]

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*, p. 343 [H296]

Perhaps sleep's uncanny silence, its strange discourse, approaches the silence of the call of conscience and as such offers the possibility of authentic sleep and of a new account of Dasein's being. We must, for the moment, leave such considerations and count them as part of the somnolent undertow which we have already identified, a current which drags at Dasein despite, rather than through, Heidegger's existential analytic.

#### IV: Corey Anton's Dream of a Heideggerian Account of Dreamless Sleep

Corey Anton, in his fascinating and wide ranging article 'Dreamless Sleep and the Whole of Human Life: An Ontological Exposition', offers his own decisive take on the problem of sleep and the existential analytic. For Anton, Dasein does not sleep because the sleeper does not *exist*.

Can Dasein, as being-in-the-world, *be* its sleep? Is not sleep the very epitome of non-Dasein, the non-being-in-the-world that every one of us *is*? Taking Heidegger's distinctions of 'extants,' 'lives,' and 'exists' as a framework, it would seem more appropriate to argue that humans *live* but do not *exist* (Dasein, verb) while they sleep.<sup>74</sup>

Anton is here appealing to Heidegger's tripartite distinction between types of being as found in his last Marburg lecture course in the summer of 1928 *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*.<sup>75</sup> However, the reservation of the term *existence* for Dasein alone had already been made clear in *Being and Time*: "the term "existence", as a designation of Being, will be allotted *solely* to Dasein."<sup>76</sup> Anton's interest is drawn to the middle term of Heidegger's distinction: the category of 'life' and its relationship with sleep. We can

---

<sup>74</sup> Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep', p. 186

<sup>75</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, tr. Michael Heim. See p. 127: "A cat does not exist, but it lives...", and p. 169: "Now this is correct, it is not intrinsic to the essence of Dasein as such that it factually exist [*faktisch existiert*]; it is, however, precisely its essence that in each case this being can also not be extant. The cosmos can be without humans inhabiting the earth, and the cosmos was long before humans ever existed." It is, to say the least, intriguing that Heidegger here chooses *faktisch* over *tatsächlich*. Unfortunately this is concealed by its translation into English as "factually" rather than "factically". The same aberration from the accepted translation practice – as established by Macquarrie and Robinson on p. 82, footnote 1 of their translation of *Being and Time* – is noted at another point in *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, pp. 156 – 157 [199], by Raoni Padui in his 'From the Facticity of Dasein to the Facticity of Nature: Naturalism, Animality, and Metonotology', pp. 63 – 64.

<sup>76</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 67 [H42], *emphasis added*.

already see why our next Chapter must return to Heidegger's most extensive engagement with 'life' and 'nature' as found in Part Two of *FCM*.

Whilst Anton casts a wide philosophical net in the process of undertaking his "ontological exposition" of dreamless sleep – drawing on amongst others Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Husserl, Agamben, Straus, Jonas, Leder, James, Saint-Exupéry, and the Hindu Vendanta *The Upanishad* – his point of departure and much of the terminology of the argument are thoroughly Heideggerian. In fact, as we will see, Anton focuses his engagement with Heidegger on the specific problematic and narrative of the first three chapters of Division II of *Being and Time*. This makes an examination of Anton's article a logical continuation of our previous section's consideration of sleep's relationship with the existential structure of Dasein *as a whole*, a structure which is both motivating and problematized in the opening chapters of Division II. Anton picks out, in particular, the famous analyses of being-toward-death, and the "call of conscience", as well as Heidegger's notion of being-a-whole. Our assessment of Anton's argument will track these three concepts and his deployment of them. Anton's central focus can be discerned in his aim to disrupt an "awakist bias" which "fails to grasp how dreamless sleep is a complement and corrective to the generally accepted idea that death serves as sufficient grounding for disclosing a person's "being-a-whole.""<sup>77</sup> This awakist bias has already been discussed in Part I, as have the problems associated with delimiting *dreamless*, as opposed to other forms of, sleep.<sup>78</sup> Thus here we will focus on Anton's efforts to provide a "complement and corrective" to Heidegger's death analysis, and therefore to the existential analytic as a whole, and why he believes such to be necessary.

Anton points out that being-toward-death accomplishes, for Heidegger, two simultaneous modifications in Dasein's being. It "individuates Dasein from the they-self," and "offers to existence the authentic possibility of *being-a-whole*."<sup>79</sup> For Heidegger this relates to Dasein's ability to run ahead of itself and thus "resolutely reckon with" one's own finitude and therein one's possibilities in general, as a whole.<sup>80</sup> Anton's critique comes in relation to the second of these modifications – he is not convinced by

---

<sup>77</sup> Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep', p. 182

<sup>78</sup> See Part I, Ch. 1, Sc. III and Ch. 2, Sc. II.

<sup>79</sup> *ibid*, p. 187

<sup>80</sup> *ibid*

Heidegger's account of being-a-whole. In opening he seeks to specify what this notion cannot, for Heidegger, mean. Correctly, he identifies that being-a-whole must not be seen to equate with the sum or complete whole of Dasein taken as an object at-hand. Dasein is, as we know, never reducible to an objective, present-at-hand, entity, to something *extant* in other words. Heidegger spends considerable time elucidating Dasein's potentiality-for-being-a-whole as anticipatory resoluteness. However, for Anton, there must be another essential element to our understanding of being-a-whole: "an all-inclusiveness achieved by an ecstatic retention and recollection of *having-been* in total undifferentiation."<sup>81</sup> To understand this we must see that: "...Heidegger's exposition of death and Dasein's possibilities of being-a-whole needs to be complemented with a consideration of the authentic possibilities of being-toward-sleep. If we died but never slept, then perhaps Heidegger's appeal to death would be sufficient for an account of wholeness."<sup>82</sup>

Anton is appealing to is the same intuition that we turned to in our Introduction to this Part: namely, that Heidegger's account of Dasein is strikingly wakeful and thus appears to miss the existential significance of sleep. It is the specific manner in which Anton aims to correct this 'awakist' bias in the existential analytic that must interest us here. He begins by allowing that sleep, like death, can disclose. We discussed above the problems associated with allowing that sleep discloses in a truly Heideggerian sense. However, Anton does not see sleep as disclosing in any everyday sense but rather as, in contrast to death "which discloses the whole of my existence, Sleep discloses the whole of the life of which I, as existing, am a part."<sup>83</sup> Life, as a whole, is disclosed by sleep and this is compared and contrasted with death's disclosure of the whole of existence. Already this begins to demonstrate Anton's goal as being "corrective", as well as augmentative, in respect to the existential analytic.

Yet, it is in the two sub-sections *Recurrence of Sleep* and *Being-Toward-Sleep*, through their discussions of the differences and similarities between sleep and death, that we truly begin to see the significance of Anton's article for our purposes. In the former of these we see, after an initial surveying of the similarities and points of contact between

---

<sup>81</sup> *ibid*

<sup>82</sup> *ibid*

<sup>83</sup> *ibid*, pp. 187 – 188

sleep and death, the, by now familiar, claim that what separates sleep from death is that the one is repeated whereas the other is singular.

Just as people can reckon with their own death, they can understand that part of their being is other than “being-in-the-world.” Sleep is the re-occurring other side of *Dasein* (existence, awake or dreaming), for the dead cannot come back to life whereas the living wake-up daily.<sup>84</sup>

Anton is clear that this singularity of death is not due to death being taken as a singular factual event in each of our futures. That would be to conflate Heidegger’s notions of death and demise. Instead, citing Jonas, he shows how we are better served by thinking about death in the context of *Dasein*’s necessary *mortality*. The resulting claim in relation to sleep is that “Dreamless sleep is similar to death in that it too is a continued condition.”<sup>85</sup> It is worth noting that this chimes well with our earlier suggestions about sleep, in any possible Heideggerian model, not being reducible to an at-hand state of consciousness, given its proximity and relation to Heidegger’s account of attunements.<sup>86</sup>

It is on the back of this clarification of Heidegger’s notion of death that Anton stresses the dissimilarity between sleep and death and thus offers a provisional answer to some of the interconnected questions with which we began this Part – in particular by offering an account of the existential significance of sleep.<sup>87</sup> “But in significant contrast to death, sleep is the re-occurring experience of *having-been* undifferentiated.”<sup>88</sup> Essentially this contrast connects a temporal ecstasis to the intuitive distinction between sleep as repeated and death as singular. Death is always something we are being-towards, whilst sleep, as ‘*continued condition*’, is always something we are being-from.<sup>89</sup> Anton follows this by distinguishing the two “losses” involved in death and sleep. The former

---

<sup>84</sup> *ibid*, p. 188

<sup>85</sup> *ibid*

<sup>86</sup> However, and we will return to this and connected worries shortly, our use of the sleep’s proximity to attunements to suggest the possibility that sleep is not as confined to set periods of inactivity, as it is often taken to be, was itself based on Heidegger’s strong claims about the unique character of *Dasein*’s being. The question arises whether Anton’s claims for sleep can stand, situated as they are beyond or beneath existence, *Dasein* and the existential significance of beings. It is here that we must consider Heidegger’s account of captivation. See Ch. 4, Sc III, below.

<sup>87</sup> See p. 49, above.

<sup>88</sup> *ibid*

<sup>89</sup> Already this formulation illustrates the strain that Anton’s schema must undergo: are we never to sleep again, as Anton’s account suggests?



is, we are told, a loss of both existence *and* life, whereas the latter is merely a loss of existence. As such the loss in sleep may in fact be more accurately portrayed as a gain:

...in sleep we are able to lose hold of ourselves only to be incorporated into that whole which is more encompassing than any whole within existence. We furthermore have the capacity to bring that wholeness of sleep back into our awake lives, disclosing the whole of who we are as partly undifferentiated.<sup>90</sup>

As such Anton offers a way of taking Heidegger's very refusal of sleep for Dasein, which appeared as an exiling of sleep from the existential plane, as itself a granting of existential significance to sleep. Sleep, *as* beyond the existential, *is*, for Anton, existentially significant, significant for waking Dasein, and is such as being beyond, or below, the existential.<sup>91</sup>

Anton begins to outline the manner in which extra-existential sleep nonetheless carries existential significance in the subsection *Being-Toward-Sleep*. Here, drawing on Drew Leder's work in *The Absent Body*, we are told, in a manner that chimes with some of Nancy's pronouncements, that all "of us are indistinguishable while asleep".<sup>92</sup> Anton's appeal to sleep's dissolving of distinctions relates to the body and is supposed to offer us another important corrective to the existential analytic.

To fall asleep is therefore to let the body recess back to that impersonal who who is universally common to life (even non-Dasein beings). Is it not liberating as well as comforting to understand that, as alive, awakeness is always already less than the whole of our being?<sup>93</sup>

Putting aside Anton's vague gesturing at an emotional benefit to such an account, we can see that it is our body that allows or facilitates this "recessing back to that impersonal who" who we are, and all are, in sleep. This appeal to the body as the means of sleep's existential import not only reminds us of the often repeated associating of sleep with the body, in contradistinction with the mind, but also suggests potentially non-dualistic

---

<sup>90</sup> *ibid*, pp. 188 – 189

<sup>91</sup> We will, with Anton, return to the notion of the 'below' the existential in what follows.

<sup>92</sup> *ibid*, p. 189

<sup>93</sup> *ibid*.

interpretations of sleep's bodily aspect.<sup>94</sup> However, it is Anton's use of the 'who' question which acts as another extension of the Heideggerian account of sleep. As we saw in our opening quotation, Heidegger's explicit treatment of sleep is notable partly for its refusal to apply this Dasein specific question structure – the 'who' – to “‘whatever is sleeping’.”

“Existence is thus enmeshed and suspended in anonymous corporeality, and sleep discloses how, just as Dasein is its world existingly, the lived-body *is* its earthly ground livingly.”<sup>95</sup> Given this new somnolent disclosure Anton has described, being-toward-sleep becomes “the mode of existence that accepts that we are much more than our awake lives might lead us to believe.”<sup>96</sup> This addition, of being-toward-sleep, is key to both the existential significance of sleep according to Anton and to demonstrating two of the main problems with the *Heideggerian* phenomenology of sleep he is developing.

The first of these problems can be brought out through examining the way that Anton's use of the term 'being-toward-sleep' strains against his relating of sleep to the temporal ecstasis of *having-been* which we saw above. The true nature of this problem is not merely a terminological slip. In other words, Anton cannot deflect this problem by merely substituting the word *from* instead of *toward* into his formulation. In fact, such a move would merely highlight the problem further. Instead this 'slip' in using the *toward* motif conceals the uniformity of his reversal of the temporally ecstatic significance of death in his description of sleep. This, too simple, reversal fails to do justice to any phenomenology of sleep worth the name. To see why let us consider that Anton's schema, despite his chosen formula, requires us to reduce sleep's *existential* significance to a being-*from*-sleep whilst retaining death's as being-toward-death. What is lost in such an account is the ambiguous being-toward-sleep-or-death which seems just as essential as the other two that Anton allows for. That Anton's account should enforce such a separating out is surprising given that he begins these sections of his argument by commenting on the commonly held preference for dying in one's sleep.<sup>97</sup> Instead of taking this as an opportunity for examining the ambiguous interconnections of these two

---

<sup>94</sup> The spectre of a Merleau-Pontian bodily phenomenology of sleep, which was suspended in our introduction, makes itself felt here. Some of the, primarily Heideggerian, reasons for once again turning away from such an account, at least for now, become clear below – see pp. 135 – 136, below.

<sup>95</sup> *ibid*, pp. 189 – 190.

<sup>96</sup> *ibid*, p. 189

<sup>97</sup> *ibid*, p. 188

concepts, in their futurity, Anton treats this as but another feature of factual, ontic and “everyday language” and in doing so he prioritises his chosen Heideggerian conceptual structure at the cost of a more rigorous phenomenological interrogation of the relationship between sleep, death, and the future.

The second problem with Anton’s account once again appears a mere slip in his use of Heidegger’s terminology. We saw above that Anton characterised being-toward-sleep as that mode of existence that *accepts* that we are more than merely our waking existence and as such that brings about the existential significance of extra-existential sleep. This “moves out from the *recognition* that the living are all partly one”.<sup>98</sup> As such Anton describes being-toward-sleep, in distinction from *sleep*, as a cognitive accepting or recognising of the existential significance of sleep. However, this is to break with the analogy with being-toward-death as Heidegger’s account of such does not see it as a shift in any cognitive sense but rather *as* the existential significance of death, for each Dasein. Dasein *is* being-toward-death regardless of whether it flees from this possibility of its impossibility or resolutely faces up to its finitude. Anton appears to have run ahead of Heidegger in his use of the terminology of *Being and Time* and to do so here, at such a central part of that text, is to muddy the waters to an unacceptable degree. In order to clear these waters and to untangle Anton’s use of Heidegger we must turn to his discussion of the notions of the ‘call of conscience’ and, once again, ‘being-a-whole’.

It is at this point in the article, from the beginning of the section ‘Dreamless Sleep and the Whole of Human Life’, that Anton’s tone and terminology take a decidedly un-Heideggerian turn. For Anton this part of his article is seen as a fleshing out of the significance of being-toward-sleep.<sup>99</sup> However, these elaborations, in a sub-section confusingly entitled ‘Sleep as a Call of Conscience’, begin by suggesting a common misunderstanding about being-a-whole, in particular about the relationship between the notions of ‘whole’ and ‘nature’.

When we imagine that humans are one kind of thing and nature is something else, fictional lines of difference can appear as already given gulfs. We de-naturalize and misunderstand humanity as we de-humanize and misunderstand

---

<sup>98</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*.

<sup>99</sup> It is here that the implausibility of this formulation, as opposed to being-*from*-sleep, is demonstrably cemented.

nature. In either case, we attempt to grasp less than *the whole as it actually is*. ... [And as such] we cover over a great clue regarding the whole of who we are.<sup>100</sup>

Sleep, dreamless sleep, is taken by Anton as providing waking Dasein with a regular and much needed glimpse of its position *within* nature. However, this gambit leads to the necessary and fraught question of the relationship and shared, or otherwise, identity of the sleeper and the waking self. If waking is only part of some greater whole then what is this whole such that it can contain or conjoin such distinct facets of life?

Having set-up the intuitive impossibility of describing sleep as, even potentially, present for experience<sup>101</sup> Anton begins to explore the consequences for his analogy between Heideggerian death and sleep. Specifically, how can sleep, as is the case with death, be considered our ‘own-most’ possibility? For Anton, the loss of the I and all experience in dreamless sleep reveals, and here the temporal lopsidedness of his phenomenology of sleep reappears, that “sleep is our own-most without ever being presently mine.”<sup>102</sup> Since “there is no ‘I’ who obtains the sleep”,<sup>103</sup> we are left with an intensified problem as to how sleep can be considered as part of us and as such as existentially significant. Anton’s answer to this dilemma comes in the form of the notion of sleep as “the gap in experience which makes evident the meaning of consciousness”,<sup>104</sup> an idea which Anton lifts directly from H.W. Johnstone’s 1976 article ‘Sleep and Death’.<sup>105</sup>

Johnstone points out that a gap cannot be open ended, it must already have ended in order to be a gap at all. It is in this sense that Anton argues for sleep being, unlike death, a viable candidate for an existential gap. Such a “gap as gap can be noted only *after* the gap’s end”.<sup>106</sup> Using his distinction between own-most and ownership, or “mineness”, Anton then argues that “my sleep is not yet mine until I wake up”.<sup>107</sup> It is in building on this distinction that Anton takes a definite step away from Heidegger. Specifically, he

---

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, pp. 190 – 191

<sup>101</sup> In ‘Sleep as a Call of Conscience’ and the early stages of the following subsection: ‘Sleep as Clue to Our Shared Yet Own-Most Non-Existence’.

<sup>102</sup> *ibid*, p. 192

<sup>103</sup> *ibid*

<sup>104</sup> *ibid*

<sup>105</sup> Johnstone, H.W. ‘Sleep and Death’, *The Monist, An International Quarterly Journal of General Philosophical Inquiry* 59: 218 – 233.

<sup>106</sup> Anton, Corey. ‘Dreamless Sleep’, p. 192

<sup>107</sup> *ibid*

appeals to a distinction within intentionality and (self)consciousness common to both Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. This distinction is between consciousness which posits an “I” in addition to the mineness of experiences and those which do not. The former is described as variously as ‘thetic intentionality’ or ‘propositional self-consciousness’ by Sartre and as ‘intentionality of Act’ or simply ‘judgement’ by Merleau-Ponty. Conversely; the latter, is named ‘pre-thetic intentionality’ or ‘non-propositional self-consciousness’ by Sartre, and ‘operative intentionality’ by Merleau-Ponty. For Anton these distinctions within consciousness allow us to show that loss of ‘I’ need not lead to an exit from consciousness. Instead he sees both Merleau-Ponty and Sartre as holding to the priority of the latter type of consciousness, pre-thetic self-consciousness, as well as both taking this very priority from Heidegger’s philosophy. As noted this terminology is alien to Heidegger’s work and would be unacceptable to him for a number reasons. However, it is true that this historical interpretation does describe one way that the two French thinkers in question may have interpreted, at least for some time, Heidegger’s much trumpeted phenomenological privileging of practical engagement with the world over theoretical observation of it.<sup>108</sup>

Yet, it is the actual distance from Heideggerian thought, heralded by this shift away from his method and language, which must interest us. Sleep’s difference or separation from the practical network of references, meanings and intentional connections leads to its disqualification from even *pre-thetic* consciousness, for Anton.

In fact, because dreamless sleep stands in such contrast to both prereflective (i.e. operative) and reflective (i.e. thetic) intentionality, we need to explore the possibility of a different mode of consciousness – one which is not “self-consciousness” and which underlies both thetic and pre-thetic intentionalities. Admittedly this terminology is difficult but dreamless sleep does seem to reveal a mode of consciousness. But even here sleep does not comprise the whole such consciousness. Rather, it serves as the daily reminder, the necessary clue to the discovery, of precisely this mode of universally shared *non-thetic*, non-ecstatic consciousness.<sup>109</sup>

This broadening of the traditional notion of consciousness to include sleep bears significant resemblance to the Husserlian response to the problem of sleep we examined,

---

<sup>108</sup> The very turn, against Husserl for many commentators, which drew our attention to Heidegger’s potential phenomenology of sleep in the first place.

<sup>109</sup> *ibid.*, p. 193

through de Warren's work, in Chapter 2. Anton's proximity to a Husserlian account is further demonstrated in his appeal to a retentive, and protentive, web stretching out from waking existence and crossing through and over the existential gaps of dreamless sleep.<sup>110</sup> "Awake existence has an ecstatic character, meaning that retentions and protentions penetrate and intermingle with present awareness and this accounts for my experienced continuity; we wake up already partly connected to who we were *before* we fell asleep."<sup>111</sup> Once again the question of 'how *I* wake-up again' here leads to the expanding of the notion of consciousness so as to retain a guiding and stable thread through the apparent abyss of sleep.

Before returning to the problems with such one-sided phenomenological accounts of sleep let us follow Anton's thread a little further – what notion of consciousness, or of being-a-whole, can still operate over such disparate elements? We have already seen hints of Anton's route, and how it is strikingly dissimilar to both Heidegger's and Husserl's, in his earlier statements about the undifferentiated nature of sleep and humanity's position in relation to nature. In the subsection 'The Living Roots of Authentic Existence' some meat, though not much, is added to the skeletal ontology of sleep Anton has been constructing. It is here that Merleau-Ponty is put to work in discussing both the ability to "shut myself up in this anonymous life which subtends my personal one" and expanding on this notion of *anonymous* life.<sup>112</sup> This is followed by another appeal to Leder for a reminder of the continuation of "vegetative processes" during sleep.<sup>113</sup> In sleep we are, for Anton, as close as we come to being reduced to the "merely vegetative".<sup>114</sup> Remembering that sleep's distance from existence, and Dasein, is mediated, for Anton, by its existential significance we can now see why this vegetative life is not something which we leave behind completely each time we awake. Instead we "are *always* partly at the level of these modes of organic and impersonal consciousness."<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> As we will see in a moment this appeal to protention along with retention – just as in our first Chapter – takes much for granted and may not be justified. The privileging of the sleep of last night over that to come is repeated in Anton's leap out of the existential analytic.

<sup>111</sup> *ibid*

<sup>112</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 191. Cited by Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep', p. 194

<sup>113</sup> Cited by Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep', p. 195. (Leder, Drew. *The Absent Body*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990, p. 59)

<sup>114</sup> *ibid*

<sup>115</sup> *ibid*

At this point Anton draws on Jonas, Straus and Ernest Becker, to describe the unique characteristics of vegetal being which he wishes to compare with sleep. Specifically, he attempts to show that “when the living go to sleep they mimic and engage in what distantly resembles plant behavior.”<sup>116</sup> These thinkers all describe the necessary extensions *from* plant life *to* animal life, such as motility, desires, emotions, perceptions and individuation.<sup>117</sup> Of course, for Anton, it is the disruption of the last of these, individuation, which is of most significance in terms of his connecting of sleep with our ‘living roots’.

Yet, for our purposes this raises a number of questions which we will only return to in our concluding section of this Part – though they inform the entirety of our next Chapter. Specifically, we might wonder whether sleep’s secondary status to waking follows or precedes its association with plant-like behaviour. Furthermore, it may be necessary to sketch in outline what Heidegger’s notion of animal ‘behaviour’ would look like if adapted to account for plant *behaviour* as well as sleeping behaviour. Our soon to come consideration of Heidegger’s treatment of non-Dasein living beings will also need to hold in view the striking fact that his oft cited discussion of the animal’s poverty in world says virtually nothing about the status of the plant. Furthermore, it must be remembered that it is at exactly this point, plants that is, that, as far the question of what sleeps goes, “already we are uncertain.”<sup>118</sup> However, for Anton it is enough to show that though “we never literally become plants, lived-bodies always have sleep as both a condition and basic modality; evolutionarily speaking, we are unable to completely leave behind the radical anonymity of vegetative life.”<sup>119</sup>

With these somnolent roots described Anton makes a few passing comments about the vulnerability of the sleeper and our social self-exclusion in sleep before moving on to his ‘Concluding Remarks’. These remarks, like the rest of his article, stride at a dizzying pace down many dark paths, along which we cannot, and certainly would not

---

<sup>116</sup> *ibid*

<sup>117</sup> Methodologically this approach to describing animal life with its adding and subtracting of qualities sit in an uneasy relationship with Heidegger’s thought.

<sup>118</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 62. Michael Marder’s recent book *Plant-Thinking: A Philosophy of Vegetal Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013) would be a productive resource for such an extension of Heidegger’s animal account in the context of the question of the plant-like character of sleep. In particular, his deconstructive approach to western thought’s demoting of the plant’s way of being resembles our own defence of sleep’s unique mode of being.

<sup>119</sup> Anton, Corey. ‘Dreamless Sleep’, p. 195

wish to, follow. However, the abiding influence of this section of his thesis is Agamben and his important notion of “nutritive life” which Anton had already cited in an opening quotation.<sup>120</sup> It is this which amounts to the elusive *whole* which he has been attempting to describe in modifying Heidegger’s existential analytic. This is Anton’s response to a “critic, coming from an awakist bias” who argues that he is “making an error” as “you cannot claim a person is a whole, also claim that a person is part of a larger whole, and then further claim that the person also *is* the whole of that whole of which the person is a part.”<sup>121</sup> Eschewing any “super-ordinary transcendental ‘I’”, Anton’s response to such a critic is to turn to the “absolute whole of all wholes, that partless whole, the undifferentiated.”<sup>122</sup> This decidedly Eastern sounding<sup>123</sup> response to a hypothetical charge of inconsistency in fact relies heavily on his assigning of being-toward-sleep the role of holding together in dialogue the individuated whole “who is part of a whole” with the I “who necessarily already has slept,” and as such is “indistinguishable from the whole.”<sup>124</sup> “Authentically being-toward-sleep, we learn that the truth of humanity is that we are ambiguously both individuated *and* the undifferentiated.”<sup>125</sup>

So much turns on this notion of *authentic* being-toward-sleep that it is not surprising that in this notion dwells the weakest of Anton’s adaptations of Heidegger’s schema. Specifically, we must examine how Anton extends his account of being-toward-sleep to account for the necessity of a connected, and presumably fundamental, attunement for sleep. Anton’s suggestion is found back at the opening of his subsection ‘The Living Roots of Authentic Existence’: “If authentic being-toward-death dwells in angst, authentic being-toward-sleep opens humanity to the abiding joy of a more inclusive ground of being.”<sup>126</sup> This recalls two aspects of our preceding discussion. Firstly, our extended consideration of the difficulties involved in allowing attunements of sleep. And secondly, our first criticism of Anton’s use of the phrase being-*toward*-sleep as concealing an overly simple reversal of the temporal significance of death in describing sleep. It might be argued that our initial discussion of somnolent attunements could

---

<sup>120</sup> This is clear despite the fact that Anton does not cite Agamben in these ‘Concluding Remarks’.

<sup>121</sup> *ibid*, p. 197

<sup>122</sup> *ibid*

<sup>123</sup> Anton does indeed turn in his penultimate paragraph to the Mandukya Upanishad, part of Hindu Scripture.

<sup>124</sup> *ibid*

<sup>125</sup> *ibid*

<sup>126</sup> *ibid*, p. 194



perhaps be dismissed as overly concerned with actually present sleep as opposed to being-toward-sleep. However, even if this were accepted,<sup>127</sup> it would only strengthen the worry about Anton's temporal skewing of sleep's significance.

Joy, or "blissful comfort" as Anton calls it in the following lines, is supposed to enact the equivalent role for being-toward-sleep that Anxiety [*Angst*] does for being-toward-death. This choice makes it appear that Anton has taken the ancient Greek *opposition* of Hypnos and Thanatos in exclusion and forgotten not only that they were twin brothers but also all the rest of the pantheon of gods as well.<sup>128</sup> As suggested above sleep, and its significance, though related in interesting and complex ways to death is far from being simply its opposite. Temporally speaking this is made all the clearer by the suggestion of a far better candidate for such an opposition. Drew Leder, in *The Absent Body*, just after a subsection drawn on repeatedly by Anton, points out the following.

Each waking day is double-horizoned by sleep. Yet there is an even more global horizon to sleeping and waking alike, to all ecstatic recessive phenomena: life itself. The precondition of all my experience is that I have come into life and hence have undergone a gestation and birth. Yet this point of origination is marked by ineradicable absence.<sup>129</sup>

This ineradicable absence of birth, which Leder will later hold alongside a similar absence of the "prenatal body",<sup>130</sup> mirrors the limit character of death and, whilst there are many ways we might further nuance such a comparison between birth and death, its mere presence in Leder, and in such proximity to his work on sleep which Anton relies on so heavily, should cause us to question some of Anton's more outlandish claims about sleep's existential and ecstatic significance. Claims such as the following "The anticipatory resoluteness that is made possible by reckoning with our own-most death should be tempered by the joyful hope that comes from understanding the meaning of our dreamless sleep."<sup>131</sup> Sleep is far from obviously the merely positive source of joy for which we are supposed to hope. As stated above, sleep cannot be so easily untangled from death given that we are not only being-*from*-sleep and being-*toward*-sleep but also being-

---

<sup>127</sup> Which we are certainly not inclined to do.

<sup>128</sup> For example, Hermes is often associated with sleep in myths and this fascinating connection between the messenger god and sleep is one which we return to in our concluding section of this thesis.

<sup>129</sup> Leder, Drew. *The Absent Body*, p. 59

<sup>130</sup> *ibid*, p. 144

<sup>131</sup> Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep', p. 197

toward-sleep-*or*-death. Whether Anton means hope or reminiscence, as seems more likely, it is phenomenologically bankrupt to reduce sleep to such positivity in simple opposition to death's supposed negativity.

What then are we to conclude of Anton's efforts at providing an 'Ontological Exposition' of sleep? It is worth drawing at least three significant findings out of our analysis of this piece. First and foremost, the strength of the tension, or even incompatibility, between the existential analytic and sleep has been shown in two ways. Anton's own move out of *existential* analysis and into a consideration of the place of Dasein within life must be considered alongside the tensions, failures and necessary search for supplementary resources which plague such an attempt to spring out of the analytic and out of Heideggerian terminology. Secondly, such tensions centre around a difficulty with sleep common to both Husserlian and Heideggerian phenomenological accounts – the privileging of sleep's past and the postponing, sidelining, or ignoring of the sleep to come. Thirdly, the path Anton attempts to follow, *out* of Heideggerian analysis and toward sleep, may productively be considered *within* the context of Heidegger's own work which follows on from *Being and Time*. In particular, Anton's talk of 'nature', 'life' and 'vegetal being' suggest a return to the account of living beings which are not Dasein, a return found in *FCM*, and its infamous notion of poverty in world. Whilst Anton, returns to consciousness based accounts of sleep, we may productively hold firm with Heidegger for a little longer in considering a possible place for the sleeper alongside the famous tripartite distinction between the being of the stone, that of the animal (and the plant presumably), and that of Dasein.

## Chapter 4

### Sleep, World Poverty and the Animal (Sleeping) Within

#### I: The Animal's Somnolent Trail

We must follow Heidegger down an alternative path than the existential analytic if, that is, we still hope for a Heideggerian phenomenological approach to sleep. Returning to *FCM*, and keeping in mind what we have seen of Anton's problematic attempt to move out of existential analysis, we will now consider one of Heidegger's own such attempts – his method of comparative examination. If Dasein does not sleep – does not contain the sleeper – then what comparisons might or could Heidegger have drawn between wakeful Dasein and sleeping life? However, before assessing in detail the relevance to sleep of some of Heidegger's most philosophically controversial claims about the essence of life and animality, it will be helpful to show what, positively, leads us to hope for fruitful insights into sleep through comparative, over existential, analysis.

The reasons in favour of turning now to the comparative examination can be split into two types; those relating to the structure of our argument so far, and those internal to the examination as Heidegger conducts it. Whereas the latter of these reasons must take priority, if this Chapter is to remain an exercise in awakening slumbering *Heideggerian* insights into sleep from *within* Heidegger's work, it is nonetheless fitting that we begin with the former so as to show not only why we might turn to the comparative analysis but also why we do so *now*. In particular, it is necessary to ask why we now turn, with Heidegger, to the issue of 'world'? Part Two of *FCM*, and with it the comparative examination, is focused on approaching the meaning of world. So far in this thesis the question 'does the sleeper have a world?' has only been hinted at indirectly. Now, through Heidegger's comparative method, it moves to centre stage and, with it, we may hope to compare the relationship between Dasein and world, as being-in-the-world, with that of the sleeper and world. In this way our aim is to open Heidegger's revolutionary conception of world as a tool for any future phenomenology of sleep.

In light of this it is important that Heidegger himself, in Section 42,<sup>1</sup> situated this particular method of interrogating the meaning of world in relation to two of his previous attempts. These other two paths were undertaken in *On the Essence of Ground*<sup>2</sup> and in *Being and Time*.<sup>3</sup> The former, amounts, according to Heidegger, to a “*history of the word* ‘world’ and the historical development of the concept it contains.”<sup>4</sup> In contrast, the latter, approaches “*the phenomenon of world* by interpreting the way in which we at first and for the most part move about in our everyday world.”<sup>5</sup> Yet, in distinction to both of these methods, Heidegger’s comparative examination aims to elucidate the meaning of world by considering the relationship between world, Dasein, and those other entities with which we find ourselves as “part of the world: the animals and plants, the material things like the stone, for example.”<sup>6</sup> It is in this introduction and contextualising of the comparative examination that Heidegger presents us with the three, famous, theses which will drive the remainder of the lecture course: “[1.] the stone (material object) is *worldless*; [2.] the animal is *poor in world*; [3.] man is *world-forming*.”<sup>7</sup>

This brings us to another structurally internal reason why in this Chapter we now turn to the comparative examination: the intermediate position of sleep. Specifically, in contrast to Anton’s dualistic analysis of death and sleep through a strained Heideggerian framework, we might suggest that another application of Heideggerian terminology, one closer to our pre-philosophical intuitions about sleep, can be undertaken through the comparative method. As we discussed above, in criticising Anton, sleep does not sit comfortably in contradistinction with death but rather seems much closer to some intermediate place between the world of waking life and that final exile from the world that seems to characterise death.<sup>8</sup> Heidegger opens his comparative examination in the third chapter of Part Two of *FCM* with the following admission:

---

<sup>1</sup> And thus before the official beginning of the comparative examination in Chapter Three of Part Two, ‘The Beginning of the Comparative Examination, Taking the Intermediate Thesis That the Animal Is Poor in World as Our Point of Departure’.

<sup>2</sup> Heidegger, Martin. ‘On the Essence of Ground’, *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill, pp. 97 – 135

<sup>3</sup> However, it is worth remembering that “...there are other possible paths which we shall not introduce here.” Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 178

<sup>4</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 176

<sup>5</sup> *ibid*, p. 177

<sup>6</sup> *ibid*

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*

<sup>8</sup> Of course, there is the question of the after-life, but given that Heidegger acknowledges the naïveté of his initial constructing of these theses we might also make appeal to such in the hope that modifications to our own will follow in due course. We return to this question, albeit briefly, in discussing the penultimate

Initially, a comparative examination of this kind seems to proceed in an extremely naive manner, as if the three beings we have mentioned were three things of the same order, as if they were all on the same plane. We shall begin our comparative analysis by *starting from the middle*, that is, by asking what it means to say that *the animal is poor in world*. Thus we shall also constantly be looking to two sides at once...<sup>9</sup>

In this way we propose the following substituting of ‘the corpse’, ‘the sleeper’, and ‘(wakeful) Dasein’ into Heidegger’s initial “naive” theses: ‘[1s.] the corpse is *worldless*; [2s.] the sleeper is *poor in world*; [3s.] Dasein is *world-forming*.’ Putting on hold the question of the naïveté of such a reformulation, the advantages of this approach are multiple. Firstly, it places the sleeper within the limiting constraints of its relationship to the wakeful being and to that being which will never awake again – it reminds us that, when it comes to describing sleep, we must “constantly be looking to two sides at once”. As such it satisfies the implicit requirement which we may take from Heidegger’s claim that “such phenomena as sleeping and waking cannot be addressed extrinsically as one particular question.”<sup>10</sup> Furthermore such a method holds at bay the sort of problems associated with Anton’s account. Lastly, it seeks a starting point within sleep’s relationship to world as opposed to our previous efforts to fit sleep into the already discerned existential account of Dasein.<sup>11</sup>

Yet, perhaps the naïveté of this substituting amounts to a position which we have already undone in our earlier examination of Heidegger’s description of sleep in the context of attunements. Perhaps comparing the dead, the sleeping and the wakings’ relationships to world strays too close to a consciousness centred distinguishing of shifts in ‘state’.<sup>12</sup> Such an approach would differ significantly from Heidegger’s comparison between three modes of being often conceived as three types of entity. However, in turning to Heidegger’s own raising of the questions of life and access to the essence of life, in Section 43, we can see that actually our substitution remains remarkably close to

---

chapter of Nancy’s *The Fall of Sleep*, ‘The Knell of a Temporary Death’, in Part III, Sc VIII, see pp. 201 – 208, below.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid*, p. 185

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*, 62. See p. 56, above.

<sup>11</sup> In general, we may hope to avail ourselves of the comparative analytic for the following reason: “These comparative (*vergleichende*) considerations help to highlight both proximity and difference with respect to the different ways of Being in each case.” McNeill, William. *The Time of Life*, pp. 20 – 21.

<sup>12</sup> It is, arguably, an effort to keep at bay such common distinctions that has led so many to reject ‘state-of-mind’ as a translation of *Befindlichkeit*.

Heidegger's own three theses.<sup>13</sup> Sleep, unlike death, remains not just entangled with life but also *within* it, in this sense the affinity between the sleeper and the animal, in contrast to the corpse and the stone remains strong. Nonetheless, in what follows we must remain wary of slipping back into a covert taking of sleep and waking as distinctions within consciousness, as different states of Dasein. It can be argued, however, that precisely the substituting we have undertaken will aid in this resisting of consciousness centred accounts of sleep. If we are to truly move on from asking where sleep fits *within* Dasein then we must allow ourselves to ask the seemingly outlandish question of whether sleeping and waking are truly comfortably contained *within* one unified entity. Our use of the comparative examination begins just such a line of inquiry.

This tying of sleep with the problems and questioning of life, of course, also suggests a certain continuity with Anton and his raising of the problem of nature or of that living background which, he argued, underpins Dasein. Indeed, we will return to the question of nature and sleep in discussing Raoni Padui's 'From the Facticity of Dasein to the Facticity of Nature: Naturalism, Animality, and Metontology', in our conclusion. However, first an essential caveat to our somnolent theses must be considered.

Then again, we can only determine the animality of the animal if we are clear about what constitutes the *living character of a living being*, as distinct from the non-living being which does not even have the possibility of dying. A stone cannot be dead because it is never alive.<sup>14</sup>

This extract seems to highlight an important limit point to the analogy between Heidegger's three theses and our own. Surely 'the corpse', as having been alive, is different in essence from the stone. It still refers back to the question of life. The *reanimated* corpses of the zombies and vampires of horror stories are fearful to us, the living, in a particular way that the animated rocks (whether avalanches or the Wandering Rocks that Jason and his Argonauts skirted) are not. David Farrell Krell, whom we draw on throughout this Chapter, sees in this fleeting mention of the death of the animal a point of tension in Heidegger's account of the animal – for Krell, Heidegger never offers a full or persuasive answer to the question 'can the animal die'?<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, pp. 178 – 180

<sup>14</sup> *ibid*, p. 179

<sup>15</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*. See, for example p. 13: "For he openly confesses that he is unable to say anything about the way in which *death* intervenes in both animal and

Given that it seems correct to distinguish the corpse, or the dead, from the purely material entity, the stone say, this still need only show that our theses [1s – 3s], are not operating at the same level as Heidegger's [1 – 3]. Perhaps, instead, they operate a step further into the problem of life. In this sense we may hope that our own analyses may shed light not just on the relationship between sleep and world and between sleep and life, but also between life and world. With this hope established we must see that our caveat and subsequent relating of our somnolent theses to the question of life further relates to Heidegger's concern with the methodological difficulty of approaching life.<sup>16</sup> Section 45 – after some interesting discussion of the place of the middle thesis, the animal's world poverty, and the relationship between zoology and biology, on the one hand, and metaphysics, on the other – indicates the common pitfalls that the “intermediate position” of life raises.<sup>17</sup>

Throughout the long history of the problem of life we can observe how the attempt has been made either to interpret life – that is, the kind of being that pertains to animals and plants – from the perspective of man, or alternatively to explain life by means of laws adopted from the realm of material nature. Yet both of these erstwhile forms of explanation produce an inexplicable residue which in general is simply explained away. What is lacking in all this is insight into the necessary task of securing above all else *the essential nature of life in and of itself* and a resolute attempt to accomplish it.<sup>18</sup>

This begins what we have called above the internal, textual, reasons for our present turn to *FCM*. The problem of life is plagued by the dual risks of projection from the essence of man, anthropomorphism, and reduction to “the realm of material nature”, materialism or mechanism. These risks are strikingly analogous with the risk of reducing sleep to a subsidiary part of our waking identity or collapsing sleep into the anomalous negativity of death, unconsciousness, and coma. We, like Heidegger, may only hope for access to

---

human life. ... he also catches himself (or *almost* catches himself) reverting to the distinction between human dying and animal perishing, *Sterben* as opposed to *Verenden*, even though it has become clear to all that something very much like the nothing (*das Nichts*) shatters the ring of animal as well as human life.”

<sup>16</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 179

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, p. 192

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*, pp. 191 – 192

“the essential nature of” sleep, or life, if we, following Heidegger, remain “cockeyed”<sup>19</sup> and thus alert to the dangers on either side of us.<sup>20</sup>

The very structure and content of Sections 46 to 48 both demonstrates the risks that Heidegger has just highlighted and, essentially, also provides us with our clearest textual clue, or motivation, so far for pursuing a comparative analysis of sleep. Section 46 compares the second (the animal’s world poverty) and the third (man’s world-forming) theses, Section 47, the second and first (the stone’s worldlessness), and Section 48 attempts to hold together the apparently contradictory results from the two previous sections. By following Heidegger’s *preliminary* comparative examinations, as he sketches them in these final sections of Part Two, Chapter 3, we can both test the initial intuitive appeal of our sleep orientated theses [1s – 3s] and highlight the textual similarity with which Heidegger treats sleep, at the beginning of Part One, and animality, at the beginning of Part Two.

Section 46 amounts to an illustration that the poverty of the animal is meant as a “deprivation of world” as opposed to this poverty implying “poverty as opposed to richness”.<sup>21</sup> This calls for some unpacking. The latter understanding of poverty – as lesser in some hierarchy of world – would seem to be the intuitive reading of the animal’s poverty given the, then recent, research on “the *environmental world of the animal*” from J. von Uexküll.<sup>22</sup> This reading of poverty is based on the idea that our human world is “constantly extendable not only in its range... but also in respect to the manner in which we can penetrate ever more deeply in this penetrability.”<sup>23</sup> For Heidegger such an approach offers the corresponding “concept of world: world initially signifies the sum total of beings accessible to man or animals alike, variable as it is in range and depth of penetrability.”<sup>24</sup> However, “even a little reflection soon renders it questionable whether in fact poverty is necessarily and intrinsically of lesser significance with respect to

---

<sup>19</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, p. 115

<sup>20</sup> Whether this hope is true or merely a willow-o-the-wisp dangled before us on our journey through the comparative examination is a question we will return to in our exploration of the dispute between those critics of Heidegger’s comparative analysis and those, such as William McNeill in his *The Time of Life*, who seek to defend its originality and coherence.

<sup>21</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 193

<sup>22</sup> *ibid*, p. 192

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*, p. 193

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*



richness. The reverse might well be true.”<sup>25</sup> This resistance to understanding the animal as merely lower than the human on some uniform spectrum of world-penetrability leads Heidegger to remind us of the “discriminatory capacity of a falcon’s eye” and the superiority of “the canine sense of smell with our own”.<sup>26</sup> Yet, we are also treated to a surprising off-hand remark: “...man can sink lower than any animal. No animal can become depraved in the same way as man.”<sup>27</sup>

With the ‘poverty as lower on a spectrum’ model dismissed Heidegger asks where our notion of poverty, which is employed in his second thesis, stems from. For Heidegger, perhaps predictably given that this section should be seen as representing not only the positive comparison between man and beast but also the pitfall of defining the animal through projecting concepts applicable to man over the animal’s being, we must turn to the proper root of our human “concept of *poverty* [Armut]”.<sup>28</sup> Essentially, “being poor means *being deprived* [Entbehren]”.<sup>29</sup> But the particular nature of this deprivation, as with all other features of Dasein’s being, finds its meaning in our attunements or moods “*the way in which it is in a mood* [zu Mute] – *poverty in mood* [Ar-mut]”.<sup>30</sup> This foundation of our notion of poverty tends to get interpreted “in the more extended and weaker sense of ‘poor’ or meagre”, in talking of the poor or meagre flow of water in a stream, for example. Yet even here it is not merely a case of comparing what is less at one moment with what is more at another.”<sup>31</sup> Instead, Heidegger sees this understanding of poverty as based on a notion of insufficiency or lack and this notion, in its turn, as being rooted in a stronger sense of poverty. A poverty “...in the sense of *being in a mood of poverty* [Armmütigkeit] [and which] does not simply imply indifference with respect to what we possess. On the contrary, it represents that preeminent kind of having in which we seem not to have.”<sup>32</sup> This *having* of a mood of poverty structures the way Heidegger means his second thesis and the negative result of this section: that “the poverty in question does not express a purely quantitative difference.”<sup>33</sup> Along with, of course, a dismissal of the initial

---

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*, p. 194

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*

<sup>27</sup> *ibid*

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*, pp. 194 – 195

<sup>29</sup> *ibid*, p. 195

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

conception of world as a “sum total” of beings accessible to Dasein and other life combined.<sup>34</sup>

So far, so good for our claims about the sleeper’s poverty in world. Just as Heidegger understands the animal’s poverty in world via and through the human’s foundational mood of poverty so too did we open the substantive analyses of the previous Chapter by considering the application of attunement, the attunements of sleep, to sleep. The animal’s deprivation or lack is a lack *of* mood or attunement as sleep appears to be in our above analysis. Furthermore, this move away from a hierarchical and at-hand objective spectrum of world ‘wealth’ toward Heidegger’s foundational notion of poverty as deprivation holds at bay the pitfall of seeing the animal as merely quantitatively distinguished from our mode of being, and thus we may hope for a similar granting of a unique, and qualitatively distinct, mode of being to the sleeper.

However, with the opening of Section 47, our analogous somnolent theses seem to come under pressure. This section opens by pointing out that the apparent result of the previous section – “that ‘the animal is poor in world’ means something like ‘the animal is deprived of world’, ‘the animal has no world’” – does not sit well with “the relation between the second thesis and the first according to which the stone is worldless... because there no longer seems to be any distinction between them [the animal and the stone].”<sup>35</sup>

Being worldless and being poor in world both represent a kind of not-having of world. Poverty in world implies a deprivation of world. Worldlessness on the other hand is constitutive of the stone in the sense that the stone *cannot even be deprived* of something like world. Merely not having world is insufficient here.<sup>36</sup>

Whereas throughout Section 46 we could continue to understand sleep as a deprivation of world, a lack, when compared, though not along any single objective spectrum, with our waking access to world. Now a worry with this interpretation arises: it problematizes any straight forward distinguishing of the sleeper from the corpse. The corpse is, for us the living (and waking), *deprived* of world. It would seem that we cannot follow this Heideggerian step in claiming that the corpse “*cannot even be deprived*” of world. It

---

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*

<sup>35</sup> *ibid*

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*

stretches our phenomenological intuitions, arguably to breaking point, to claim, as Heidegger does about the stone that it “is beside the point to regard the fact that the... [corpse] has no access [to world] as some kind of lack.”<sup>37</sup>

Two necessarily tentative, at this stage in our tracing of the course of Heidegger’s comparative examination, responses. First, perhaps this only further demonstrates the “intricate entanglement [*Verschlingung*]”<sup>38</sup> of sleep and death and thus resists both Anton’s questionable distinctions and more generally what Krell calls, following Rilke “the error of drawing distinctions too sharply, too violently.”<sup>39</sup> Including tripartite distinctions. And second, that perhaps the error is not ours but rather Heidegger’s. In particular, Heidegger, in Section 46, appealed to the word deprivation without fully clarifying the meaning of this term, and arguably he will never fully clarify it. Perhaps, the qualitative, as opposed to quantitative, difference in being between waking and sleeping is not best conceived as a deprivation or lack of world.

However, the main thrust of this section remains applicable to our modified theses [1s – 3s] in that it offers a new definition<sup>40</sup> of world “as those beings which are in each case accessible and may be dealt with...”<sup>41</sup> This focus on the question of accessibility calls on the intuitive difference between the animal’s engagement with other entities and the manner in which the stone, whatever its proximity to other entities, never *has* entities as accessible to it.<sup>42</sup> In this sense, Heidegger’s distinction is essentially, as we pointed out above, between the *life* of the animal and the *materiality* of the stone. The sleeper, whatever their proximity to the corpse in terms of our intuition that they have been deprived of something, retains, or so we believe, the life that has been, forever, lost to the corpse. The corpse will *never feel* the sun on its skin whereas the gently drifting sleeper

---

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*, p. 197

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*, p. 199

<sup>39</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, p. 13. Krell is here referring to one of his introduction’s epigrams from Rainer Maria Rilke’s *Duino Elegy*, no. 1: “*Aber Lebendige machen alle den Fehler, / daß sie zu stark unterscheiden.* [Yet living beings all make the same / mistake – they distinguish too sharply.]” - cited on p. 1 of *Daimon Life*. One might be tempted to add the caveat, ‘but not when sleeping’.

<sup>40</sup> An unusual word for Heidegger, much like “proposition” and “thesis”. This, along with other features of this lecture course, must be kept in mind as we progress. They point toward the unique place of this text in Heidegger’s oeuvre.

<sup>41</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 196. It is worth noting that this definition of world retains something of Heidegger’s focus on *practical coping* or everyday *engagement* with the world which marked out his phenomenological approach to world in *Being and Time*.

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*, p. 197

is precisely lost *in* the warmth of a sunny summer holiday, soothed *into* sleep by the sun's rays.<sup>43</sup> However, following this sharp distinction between the animal and the material thing we swing back to the other comparative direction and hear of another temptation to be resisted.

...the lizard has its *own relation* to the rock, to the sun, and to a host of other things. One is tempted to suggest that what we identify as the rock and the sun are just lizard-things for the lizard, so to speak. When we say that the lizard is lying on the rock, we ought to cross out the word 'rock' in order to indicate that whatever the lizard is lying on is certainly given *in some way* for the lizard, and yet is not known to the lizard as a rock. If we cross out the word we do not simply mean to imply that something else is in question here or is taken as something else. Rather we imply that whatever it is is not accessible to it *as a being*.<sup>44</sup>

This crossing out, a manoeuvre that Derrida will play on, and with, in his *Of Spirit*, reminds us that the animal's access, given the qualitative difference in its being, could never be access to those beings *as they are for me*.<sup>45</sup> Surely the bed, often the most proximal entity to the sleeper, is precisely performatively crossed-out in the passage to sleep. Just as we "ought to cross out the word 'rock'" in the case of the lizard surely we must cross out the word ~~bed~~ in the case of the one who lays her head upon it. We must keep in mind not only this requirement that the sleeper's ~~world~~ be written "under erasure" but also that this is a step that Heidegger precisely does not take, he "ought to" by his own admission, but, at least in *FCM*, never does.<sup>46</sup>

This leads Heidegger to describe the limiting of animal access *to beings*. The as-structure, encountered above, re-emerges and begins to take centre stage. However, Section 47 ends with the reminder:

Even if the animal has access to beings in a different way from ourselves and within more narrowly circumscribed limits, it is still not entirely deprived of world. The animal has world. Thus absolute deprivation of world does not belong to the animal after all.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> *ibid*, pp. 196 – 197

<sup>44</sup> *ibid*, p. 198

<sup>45</sup> Derrida, Jacques. *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*, Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 53 – 56, and *passim*

<sup>46</sup> *ibid*, p. 53

<sup>47</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 199

And it is with this apparently contradictory finding that Heidegger begins the final section of his preparatory Chapter 3 before launching into the main content of the comparative examination proper.

If by the beginning of Section 48 Heidegger's "perplexity" about world and about life "has increased" then so too has our perplexity about the relationship between world and the sleeper.<sup>48</sup> Yet, it is the manner that this perplexity is described which enacts our final, textual, motivation for engaging in a comparative examination of Dasein, the sleeper, and the corpse. Heidegger owns his own cross-eyed position in acknowledging that when viewed from the perspective of comparison with the stone the animal seems to have access to things and thus also to world, whereas when compared with the apparently infinite wealth of the Dasein's world-relation the animal's deprivation is all too clear.

The animal thus reveals itself as a being which *both has and does not have world*. This is contradictory and thus logically impossible. But metaphysics and everything essential has a logic quite different from that of sound common understanding.<sup>49</sup>

It is precisely this *having and not having of world* which bares a striking resemblance to our epigram from Heidegger's fleeting engagement with sleep: "'Whatever is sleeping' is in a peculiar way absent and yet there."<sup>50</sup> Just as he opened Part One of the course with the apparent contradiction of sleep, now, at the opening of Part Two, we are presented with the "logically impossible" claim that the animal both has and does not have world.<sup>51</sup> This second contradiction may, in its *apparent* resolution later in the course, offer us clues as to possible resolutions to the first, and thus an outline to any possible Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep. But more generally this similarity in placement and in semantic structure 'intertwines' and 'entangles' the problem of '*whatever* is sleeping' and that of life, or more concretely that of the animal's relationship to world.

Having "identified the knot which we must first strive to undo", the animal's apparently contradictory relation to world, Heidegger can set out to "pursue it intricate

---

<sup>48</sup> *ibid*

<sup>49</sup> *ibid*

<sup>50</sup> *ibid*, p. 60

<sup>51</sup> Compare this off hand dismissal of the significance of contradiction with the manner in which sleep's being there and not-there caused the very principle of non-contradiction "to shatter [*erschüttern*] in its very foundations." - *ibid*, p. 61

entanglements”.<sup>52</sup> And we too can and must follow him along the twisting *Wege* of the comparative analysis, so long that is as we recognise that our way will, like his and necessarily, “no longer be able to proceed with the same naivety as we did before.”<sup>53</sup> The intuitive appeal and essential limits of both Heidegger’s theses and our own analogous application of his method have started to emerge. Furthermore, Heidegger’s double negative results from this first stage of the comparative examination must, just as much, apply to any feasible Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep – the sleeper cannot be “simply present at hand” nor may its world be understood as “simply a degree or species of the world of” *Dasein*.<sup>54</sup>

Holding these preliminary cautions in mind it will now be fruitful to test our analogous three theses, 1s – 3s, against the progression of Heidegger’s analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 of Part II of *FCM*. It will be useful to split this analysis into four stages all of which offer significant resources for considering sleep’s relationship with world, life (both waking and sleeping), *Dasein*, and the dead (and, essentially, death itself). These four stages, which map broadly onto the systematic progression of these chapters, are: (a) Heidegger’s initial deepening of the problem of philosophical access to animality through an investigation into the possibility of “transposing” oneself into various types of entities; (b) the animal’s behaviour as “captivation [*Benommenheit*]”; (c) the animal as surrounded by its “disinhibiting ring [*Enthemmungsring*]”; and (d), the self-confessed limits and conclusions of Heidegger’s analysis.<sup>55</sup> With these stages examined we close with a consideration of the various criticisms and defences of Heidegger’s treatment of the animal. This in turn will allow us to draw out potential consequences for potential future Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep.

## II: Transposition

---

<sup>52</sup> *ibid*, p. 199

<sup>53</sup> *ibid*

<sup>54</sup> *ibid*, p. 200

<sup>55</sup> These four stages miss out Heidegger’s early and extended treatment of the organism, as found in Sections 51 – 57. This is not because what Heidegger says there lacks either significance or relevance to sleep but rather because it is a primarily negative part of his analyses with much of the work based around dismissing previously held conceptions of ‘organ’ and ‘organism’. We will have need to draw on some of these sections in our following discussion of the various strengths and weaknesses of Heidegger’s account of the animal but for now we are safe in moving over it more swiftly than the rest of these two chapters.

Section 49, with its focus on the “*methodological question concerning the ability to transpose oneself into other beings*”, enacts a surprising, though temporary, stepping out of the “intermediate position”, which we have just emphasised as central to Heidegger’s analysis of the animal. It is this exceptional moment in the analysis that leads Rafael Winkler, in his fascinating article ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, to claim that this section, and the one following it, contain the “most dramatic moment in the entire course”.<sup>56</sup> Dramatic or not these sections allow Heidegger to address the question of *our* access *to* the animal as opposed to the animal’s access to world itself. Or so it would, at first, appear. And yet, Heidegger is swift to point out that the apparently methodological question, “*Can we transpose ourselves into an animal at all?*”, “is [in fact] a *substantive one*.”<sup>57</sup> Whereas, for Heidegger, every methodological question must be a substantive question about that inquired into, “here this is the case in a quite exceptional sense.”<sup>58</sup> Thus we are reminded that his *substantive problem*, the problem of world, is “precisely that of *accessibility itself*”.<sup>59</sup> This folding together of methodological and substantive questioning, of course, applies just as well to the question of the sleeper’s access and accessibility when considering their relationship to world. However, on a larger scale this collapsing of method and substantive findings should bring to mind the recurrent question of phenomenological access to sleep which has been a feature of our project from its inception. What access one deems possible to sleep is not a neutral question when it comes to the character or essence of sleep itself.

What then are the substantive results that Heidegger expects from his inquiring into the possibilities of transposition? Heidegger proposes to ask after the possibility of transposition in relation to the animal, the stone or material object, and into another human being. He hopes, in so doing, to “learn about those very beings that are to be grasped.”<sup>60</sup> More concretely, “the following discussion is to eliminate that initial naïve approach to the question [of transposition] which assumes that we are dealing with three beings all present at hand in exactly the same way.”<sup>61</sup> Crucially, this aim of Heidegger’s

---

<sup>56</sup> Winkler, Rafael. ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, in *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 15:4, 2007 p. 528. We return to Winkler’s analysis in the final section of this Chapter.

<sup>57</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 201

<sup>58</sup> *ibid*

<sup>59</sup> *ibid*

<sup>60</sup> *ibid*, p. 202

<sup>61</sup> *ibid*

focus on transposition, through the continued use of our analogous theses [1s – 3s], draws sleep further away from the traditional conception of it as one state or period in human being amongst many others, instead the possibility of emphasising the different modes of being between corpse, sleeper and waking Dasein begins to open up. This effect on our conception of sleep is shown by Heidegger's comment that "In general the question at issue concerns the possibility of man's transposing himself into another being that he himself is not."<sup>62</sup> The sleeper, we usually assume, is part of us. Heidegger's emphasis on transposition, and the problems there of, allows us to further chip away at this presupposition as we have already begun to do above.

All well and good, but how, we must ask, does this enigmatic concept of transposition operate for Heidegger? Before attempting answers to each of his three 'possibility of transposing' questions we are treated to a general discussion of what this term does *not* mean. First and foremost, it does not "mean the factual substitution of oneself for another being so as to take its place."<sup>63</sup> This would be to doubly miss the target of true transposition as it would both replace, and thus alter, that which we are attempting to access and it would "consist in our simply forgetting ourselves", and thus losing our point of comparison.<sup>64</sup> Essentially, this prohibition includes entirely internal, or mental, attempts at such conceptualisations of transposition. Heidegger has no more time for "a mere thought-experiment" as he does for actual transference into the position of that entity under investigation.<sup>65</sup> As commentators have noted this relates to his dismissal of the term 'empathy' as a reading of transposition.<sup>66</sup> Empathy, a previously popular reading of transposition, "implies that we are 'outside' in the first place."<sup>67</sup> Indeed, Heidegger acknowledges that self-transposition itself offers plenty of opportunities for misunderstandings along similar lines. These negative comments about transposition both strengthen the problem of 'transposition into the sleeper' whilst cutting short imagined empathetic approaches to understanding the 'internal' life of sleep.

---

<sup>62</sup> *ibid*

<sup>63</sup> *ibid*

<sup>64</sup> *ibid*

<sup>65</sup> This Heideggerian move, would bear comparison with Thomas Nagel's famous article 'What is it Like to be a Bat?' *The Philosophical Review* 83.4 (1974): 435. In a sense Heidegger already begins from Nagel's conclusion in dismissing the potential for traction of Nagel's titular question.

<sup>66</sup> See, Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, p. 119 and Winkler, Rafael. 'Heidegger and the Question of Man's Poverty in World', p. 528, for example.

<sup>67</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 203



What then, positively, is Heidegger's understanding of transposition. His initial, rather opaque, offering is that it amounts to a "going-along-with [which] means directly learning how it is with this being [the target of the transposition], discovering what it is like to be this being *with* which we are going along *in this way*."<sup>68</sup> However, through Heidegger's specific investigations into the possibility of transposing ourselves into different entities we gain some further clarity on this going-along-with. We must remember that Heidegger's aim is to disrupt our standard assumption that these various targets for transposition all operate at the same uniform at-hand level of being. Thus it is not surprising that his approach to these questions, 'Can we transpose ourselves into, (a) an animal, (b) a stone, or (c) another human being?', is designed to show that despite their grammatical similarity they, in fact, function in strikingly distinct ways. Heidegger's answers to these three questions are, in their most basic form: (a), at least potentially; (b) no; and, (c) the question itself is nonsensical.

Though by far the most time is spent analysing the nature of question (c), on the possibility of transposing into another human being, Heidegger begins with (a), the animal. This very question, we are told, already presupposes "something like a going-along-with" the animal.<sup>69</sup>

We do not question that the animal as such carries around with it, as it were, a sphere [*Sphäre*] offering the possibility of transposition. The only question concerns our factual success in transposing ourselves into this particular sphere [*Sphäre*].<sup>70</sup>

We will return to notion of the animal's sphere which secures the possibility of transposition and which will be a reoccurring point of interest for us in what follows. But for now we must move on to question (b) and the possibility of transposition into the stone. Heidegger is clear that "we cannot transpose ourselves into a stone."<sup>71</sup> In fact, the very question is "quite meaningless"<sup>72</sup> for the stone does not offer any "sphere" into which "we could transpose ourselves".<sup>73</sup> We cannot *access* the *world*, as sphere of accessibility to other beings, of the stone for it lacks, absolutely, just that. Here, once

---

<sup>68</sup> *ibid*, p. 202

<sup>69</sup> *ibid*, p. 204

<sup>70</sup> *ibid*

<sup>71</sup> *ibid*

<sup>72</sup> *ibid*, p. 206

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*, p. 204

again, we might find ourselves tempted to move the sleeper, with their stark *inactivity*, their *a-kinesia*, closer to the *inanimate* stone than to the animal. Yet comparison with the corpse – alongside the fact that the phrase ‘dead to the world’ is only applicable to certain sleepers on certain occasions, and even then is not equivalent to, simply, ‘dead’ – is enough to return the sleeper to its analogous ‘intermediate position’.

Crucially the assessment of question (c) returns us to the famous analysis of Being-with found in *Being and Time*. Whereas we might at first take ourselves to be “confronting the same question as in the case of the animal”, Heidegger is insistent that this is not the case.<sup>74</sup> We saw that question (a), for Heidegger, reveals the presupposition of the possibility of transposability into the animal, in the case of the transposing of oneself into another human “we cannot even make such an assumption”.<sup>75</sup> Just as in Division I, Chapter 4, of *Being and Time* we are shown that the solipsist has misunderstood Dasein’s essential being, here too Heidegger argues for the priority of being-with, as a structure of our being, as opposed to the priority of isolated selves reaching out to each other across imagined, and unbridgeable, divides.

For the being-there of Da-sein means *being with others*, precisely in the manner of Dasein, i.e., existing with others. The question concerning whether we human beings can transpose ourselves into other human beings does not ask anything, because it is not a possible question in the first place. It is a meaningless, indeed a nonsensical question because it is fundamentally redundant.<sup>76</sup>

Heidegger is not, of course, painting human sociality in a golden light as if we were returned to the harmony of Adam and Eve. He recognises that, in fact, we often fail to go along with, and thus to get along with, other human Daseins. However, this is only possible on the basis that man “always already finds that he is with others.”<sup>77</sup> The particular, factual, ways in which we are being-with and thus going along with has the result that, “for several reasons, and to some extent essential ones, this going along with one another is a going apart from one another and a going against one another, or rather, at first and for the most part a going alongside one another.”<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> *ibid*, p. 205

<sup>75</sup> *ibid*

<sup>76</sup> *ibid*

<sup>77</sup> *ibid*, p. 206

<sup>78</sup> *ibid*

Heidegger's account of question (c) shows that, for all his general doubts about the risks involved in using the phrase 'self-transposition', it would seem possible to meaningfully ask whether we 'can transpose ourselves into an animal?', (a), and that this must be greatly contrasted with questions (b) and (c) which are, though for different reasons, both nonsensical. However, Heidegger is clear that access to the animal's essence alongside any hope we might have of providing a more concrete answer to question (a) relies, fundamentally, on our coming to terms with his reasons for dismissing question (c) – Dasein's being-with – rather than with the impossibility of transposing oneself into a stone, question (b).<sup>79</sup> Thus, after describing how this thesis – Dasein's structural involvement with other humans – fits into the history of recent philosophy of the subject and relates to the guiding motifs of finitude or infinity,<sup>80</sup> Heidegger begins Section 50 by once again asking after the possibility of transposing oneself into the animal, question (a).

Indeed, Heidegger acknowledges that "Initially we do not seem to have gained anything from our discussion [of transposition] at all."<sup>81</sup> Yet the possibility of our being transposed surely gains some legitimacy, at the very least, from the fact that "Being transposed into others belongs to the essence of human Dasein."<sup>82</sup> Fundamentally, this question cannot be settled by theorising about our abilities or about the essence of the animal but rather considering how "we already comport ourselves ... toward animals".<sup>83</sup> For Heidegger, it is this analysis of *our* everyday comportment that demonstrates the presupposition revealed in the previous section: namely, that we can go along with animals, and "in a certain manner ... plants too".<sup>84</sup> This leads Heidegger to a brief, though intriguing, engagement with our being-with the *domesticated* animal, and the pet in particular. In keeping animals for our purposes or merely as pets "we enable them to move within our world."<sup>85</sup> We are being-with them and "they 'live' *with us*. But we do not live with them if living means: *being* in an animal kind of way."<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, this being-with is "not an *existing-with*, because a dog does not exist but merely lives."<sup>87</sup> The pet:

---

<sup>79</sup> This should remind us of Heidegger's own warning that we must keep looking in both directions.

<sup>80</sup> *ibid*, pp. 208 – 209

<sup>81</sup> *ibid*, p. 209

<sup>82</sup> *ibid*

<sup>83</sup> *ibid*, p. 210

<sup>84</sup> *ibid*

<sup>85</sup> *ibid*

<sup>86</sup> *ibid*

<sup>87</sup> *ibid*

....feeds with us – and yet, we do not really ‘feed’. It eats with us – and yet, it does not really ‘eat’. Nevertheless, it is with us! A going along with ..., a transposedness, and yet not.<sup>88</sup>

Whilst it may not appear so at first, the sleeper fits into our waking lives in a similar way. Of course, the sleeper does not go for a walk with us as the loyal hound may, and yet we do “enable them [sleepers] to *move* within our world.”<sup>89</sup> This intuitively odd claim gains some clarity if we remember that this example, though only explicitly mentioning animals, is supposed to apply to plants too – perhaps an equivalent type of relationship would be between the gardener and *their* plants.<sup>90</sup> The ‘movement’ of plants, within our world, which means a lot more than just their growth, is already presupposed and allowed for in our everyday comportment, and it is as such that sleep too is presented.<sup>91</sup>

Heidegger ends this fascinating phenomenology of the relation between Dasein and domestic animals with the key caveat to our transposedness into the animal: “and yet not.” This “not” relates to the way in which our being-with the animal is never a relating of two worlds but rather an opening of *our* world to the animal.

Transposedness into the animal can belong to the essence of man without this necessarily meaning that we transpose ourselves into an animal’s world or that the animal in general has a world. And now our question becomes more incisive: In this transposedness into the animal, where is it that we are transposed to?<sup>92</sup>

But this refusal to grant the animal world is, for Heidegger, in fact, a recognition that the animal “invites human transposedness into it, even while refusing man the possibility of any going along with the animal”.<sup>93</sup> This fundamental *refusal* is supposed to be essential to the animal and to gain traction as a description of that essence precisely because refusal only exists when “granting is possible. Earlier we expressed this situation in a purely

---

<sup>88</sup> *ibid*

<sup>89</sup> *ibid, emphasis added*

<sup>90</sup> Here the question of ownership comes into focus. It is a question which, in one form or another, must be raised in relation to sleep. It must be asked what the difference is, if any, between the shepherd minding *his* flock and the minding of those that sleep by the waking, the standing vigil that was, and still is culturally, so significant in terms of how *we*, the waking, relate to *them*, the sleepers. That this connection does nothing to minimise the counter-intuitive nature of the claim that ‘the waking own the sleeping’ demonstrates the need for a more detailed unearthing of the liminal relations between man and animal, and between waking and sleeping.

<sup>91</sup> This question of the *movements* of animals, plants, and the sleeper is considered below.

<sup>92</sup> *ibid*

<sup>93</sup> *ibid*

formalistic way when we claimed that in a certain sense the animal has and yet does not have a world.”<sup>94</sup> What is this animalistic refusal and does the sleeper refuse transposition in a similar way? However, with this hermeneutic return to the structure of deprivation as found at the end of Heidegger’s previous chapter – having in not-having – we see the completion of his demonstration that the, apparently, methodological question of transposition in fact only finds an answer in “the essence of the animal.”<sup>95</sup> Thus, the question about the refusal of the animal, and our equivalent question about the refusal of the sleeper, become questions of essence – what then *refuses* in the sleeper’s very essence?

Yet such questions themselves, as we see with Heidegger’s unpacking of the concept of refusal, quickly mutate into the following key, Heideggerian, questions: ‘where are we transposed to, if the animal has no world to fulfil this purpose?’ Or put another way, ‘what is it that the animal *has* which allows it to both be poor in world *and* refuse transposition from us?’ Both of these questions, when applied to sleep, offer us great opportunities for considering fundamentally troubling features of sleep. ‘Where is the sleeper?’ Or, ‘what is the place of sleep?’ And, more controversially, ‘what does the sleeper *have* such that it may have lost, or be poor in, world?’ Heidegger’s, preliminary, answer to his own unanswered questions will suggest both his own later discussion of the animal’s ‘disinhibiting ring’ and perhaps the most pressing difficulty with the animal’s, and with sleep’s, ‘intermediate position’. The animal “intrinsically displays a *sphere* of transposability”.<sup>96</sup> And yet, the ambiguity of such a sphere is only exacerbated by Heidegger’s insistence that “more precisely, the animal itself *is* this sphere, one which nonetheless refuses any going along with.”<sup>97</sup>

Heidegger claims to have moved beyond the “purely formalistic” analysis of the animal’s essence in these two introductory sections of his analysis. And yet, we might ask what conceptual room there is for this, as yet, anomalous sphere of transposability which is not a world? How is this squeezed, intermediate, essence of the animal to be understood? Furthermore, Heidegger has achieved this restating of the poverty of the

---

<sup>94</sup> *ibid*

<sup>95</sup> *ibid*, p. 211

<sup>96</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*

<sup>97</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*

animal through a consideration of *our* everyday comportment to the animal. Now he sets himself the goal of reversing the direction of this analysis by considering the essence of animality in terms of the animal's own 'comportment'. It is this which leads Heidegger to make his famous, and exceptional, engagement with contemporary biological and zoological research. For our purposes, however, it is the results of this appeal to observational and experimental content, as opposed to the appeal itself, which bear most fruit in relation to sleep; namely, Heidegger's striking description of the animal's *behaviour* as captivity [*Benommenheit*].

### III: Captivation [*Benommenheit*]

By the time we get to the account of animal behaviour, as found in sections 58 and 59, Heidegger has already spent significant time and effort considering and deconstructing the notion of the animal as an organism. That is to say as an entity composed of, or unified out of, various organs.<sup>98</sup> This traditional understanding of the organism is replaced by his own alternative unity of the animal, a unity of capacities rather than of organs. Though much rests on this account of the organism it is striking that Heidegger makes clear in Section 58 that "we could also have taken the characterization of behaviour as our point of departure and shown its dependence upon capability".<sup>99</sup> As we continue tracing Heidegger's analysis of the animal we follow this, alternative, suggested route and periodically return to the notion of capability or capacity which underpins the *ability* of the animal to live at all.<sup>100</sup> Yet, for our purposes it is important to see that by Section 58 Heidegger has already disrupted both mechanistic understandings of the unity of the animal, and those which rely on an inner entelechy. The specific interplay of capacities builds up to the overarching behaviour of each animal, in this way the differences in behaviour between the mole and the earthworm are easily explicable. What is yet to be discerned is what characterises all of these as *behaviour* at all? What makes these ways of animal being more than merely "processes in nature," or "events of nature"?<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> *ibid*, Sections 51 – 57, pp. 212 – 236

<sup>99</sup> *ibid*, p. 238

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, pp. 235 – 236

<sup>101</sup> *ibid*, p. 236

Of course, many might see animal behaviour – whether they would grant the human an exemption or not – as limited in precisely this way: to natural processes. Yet, as we have seen, the intermediate position of the animal demands that it is neither reduced to a material thing nor anthropomorphised via human-centric concepts. Thus too, in the case of animal behaviour, it must be distinguished from “the warming of a stone”, in the sun, and from our, human, “comportment”.<sup>102</sup> Fundamentally, and this will be of particular relevance to our comparative examination of the sleeper, the animal’s behaviour is distinguished from the causal processes considered by science in that behaviour is *relational*. The “mole... *behaves with respect to* the worm by pursuing it.”<sup>103</sup> It is in an effort to do justice to this relationality at the heart of animal being that Heidegger also acknowledges the proximity between animal behaviour and human comportment. Indeed, we often speak of people as *behaving* well or badly. However, for Heidegger this possibility of attributing behaviour, of one sort or another, to persons itself relies on “the specific manner of being which belongs to man” as being a “*comporting oneself toward....*”.<sup>104</sup>

Heidegger’s strict holding apart of behaviour and comportment has, of course, been the target of significant criticism over the years,<sup>105</sup> however, it is worth noting that he himself acknowledges that his “terminology is arbitrary”.<sup>106</sup> What matters is not the terminological distinctions but the essential underpinnings thereof. Thus Heidegger must look more closely at the behaviour of the animal, and an initial clue for how such a closer examination will retain the sharp distinction between behaviour and comportment is illustrated in the following quotation:

The behaviour of the animal is not a *doing and acting*, as in human comportment, but a *driven performing* [Treiben]. In saying this we mean to suggest that an instinctual drivenness, as it were, characterizes all such animal performance.<sup>107</sup>

This distinction between *action* and *driven performance* already shows that here, as with the question of transposition, Heidegger’s analysis of the animal both offers resources for

---

<sup>102</sup> *ibid*, pp. 236 – 237

<sup>103</sup> *ibid*, p. 237

<sup>104</sup> *ibid*

<sup>105</sup> We take Krell’s *Daimon Life* as our principle example of this, below.

<sup>106</sup> *ibid*, p. 238

<sup>107</sup> *ibid*, p. 237

describing the sleeper – we think that sleep is something performed, it has a verbal quality – whilst at the same time challenging the naïveté of our thesis’s one-for-one replacement of the animal with the sleeper – it is far from obvious how the notion of “instinctual drivenness” could be said to characterise all of sleep, nor whether the sleeper, *in themselves*, actually *performs* sleep, or for that matter anything at all. Such challenges to the naïveté of our experiment in Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep can only, in fact, amount to resources for our larger scale project of a more open phenomenological outlining of sleep.

Yet, the move to characterise animal behaviour as *Benommenheit*, captivation or benumbment, is where the real resources of Heidegger’s account of the animal emerge for describing sleep. He is struck by the way that the driven performing of animal behaviour is characterised by an “*intrinsic retention and intrinsic absorption*, although no reflection is involved.”<sup>108</sup> The individual instances of behaviour, Heidegger’s favourite examples are seizing and hunting and the like, are marked by the fact that “the animal does not drive itself away from itself.”<sup>109</sup> This glance at the stone is enough to remind us that the relationality of animal natural processes itself demands a centre from which to relate, a self-like focal point *from which* behaviour can issue, and, just as much, *to which* it must return.

Behaviour as a manner of being in general is only possible on the basis of the animal’s *absorption* in itself [*Eingenommenheit in sich*]. We shall describe *the specific way in which the animal remains with itself* – which has nothing to do with the selfhood of the human being comporting him- or herself as a person – this way in which the animal is absorbed in itself, and which makes possible behaviour of any and every kind, as *captivation* [*Benommenheit*].<sup>110</sup>

It is this absorption [*Eingenommenheit*] and captivation or benumbment [*Benommenheit*], of animal behaviour which, in a wary glance the other direction at the domain of human being, grants that the animal “*behaves within an environment but never within a world*.”<sup>111</sup> This warning glance quickly builds into full blooded cautions on the anthropomorphic risks of his own terminology, reminding us that “we must... draw the

---

<sup>108</sup> *ibid.*, p. 238

<sup>109</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>110</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 238 – 239

<sup>111</sup> *ibid.*, p. 239



specific content... [of animal behaviour] from out of animality itself.”<sup>112</sup> These warnings will be of particular importance in our consideration of the “behaviour” of the sleeper as benumbed or captivated.

We usually employ the word ‘captivation’ to describe a particular state of mind in human beings, one which can persist for a greater or lesser period of time. We use it then to refer to that intermediate state somewhere between consciousness and unconsciousness.<sup>113</sup>

Unsurprisingly this “psychiatric concept” will not do for Heidegger.<sup>114</sup> More importantly, for our purposes, neither will a permanatising of the “state known to us”, or “simply transferring” it into the animal.<sup>115</sup>

Whatever intuitive appeal the phrase ‘the “behaviour” of the sleeper *as* benumbed or captivated’ holds – consider, for example, descriptions of the sleeper as ‘numb to the world’ – it surely loses just as quickly in ascribing to the sleeper “behaviour” at all. We may appeal to two very different responses to this worry. Firstly, Heidegger’s very warnings about the danger of simply transferring concepts from human to animal being should alert us to similar problems with any simple transfer from animal to sleeper. The sleeper, for all their intriguing proximity to the animal, is not supposed to simply *take over* the being of animality. Secondly, Heidegger’s conception of behaviour, and thus of benumbed behaviour, is not so different from the processes of sleep: “It is not as if the beating of the animal’s heart were a process different from the animal’s seizing and seeing... the being as a whole in its unity, must be comprehended as behaviour.”<sup>116</sup>

However, this final defence surely raises anew a worry we have already encountered: the question of the sleeper “as a whole in its unity”. This issue reminds us that our present endeavour to employ the comparative analytic must, necessarily, jar against the intuition that sleep is best understood as part of that entity which sleeps.<sup>117</sup> And yet, it is precisely here that the essential characterisation of the animal’s behaviour

---

<sup>112</sup> *ibid*

<sup>113</sup> *ibid*

<sup>114</sup> *ibid*

<sup>115</sup> *ibid*

<sup>116</sup> *ibid*. This points ahead to our discussion of Nancy’s consideration of the bodily processes of sleep and the peculiar significance he grants the regularity of heartbeat in sleep.

<sup>117</sup> The connection between, and difficulties surrounding, sleep and issues of unity, which Anton’s article suggests are here further highlighted.

as captivation offers us new resources and reasons for reading with Heidegger the sleeper's essence as similarly so benumbed. Just as earlier we saw Heidegger dismiss attempts to describe *whatever* is sleeping via appeals to consciousness or unconsciousness,<sup>118</sup> here too our common vision of captivation as "that intermediate state somewhere between consciousness and unconsciousness" will not serve in considering the animal.<sup>119</sup> If our introduction to this Part detailed Heidegger's case against reducing sleep to unconsciousness, here we may now build on this argument to show that sleep, for a Heideggerian phenomenology, cannot be conceived as some intermediate *state* between consciousness and unconsciousness. Or, in fact, as any 'state' at all. "We do not regard captivation as a state that merely accompanies behaviour, but as the inner possibility of behaviour as such."<sup>120</sup> And thus, we must, following Heidegger, consider the manner in which this inner possibility of behaviour, captivation, shows itself. Our consideration of Section 59 will aim to show to what degree Heidegger's elaboration of the essence of behaviour as benumbed could plausibly include the sleeper. What room is there for sleep in Heidegger's intermediate category of "behaviour"?<sup>121</sup>

First a couple of cautions about this notion of captivation are necessary. Heidegger's clear warnings about transferring our everyday, state-based, conception of captivation from humanity to animality must be held alongside his explicit acknowledgement that "in elucidating the essence of this captivation we orient ourselves in a certain way with reference to the human state in question".<sup>122</sup> We might see this as Heidegger recognising that the term used and its origin is not insignificant. Secondly, Section 58 ends with the reminder that Heidegger does not take himself to be "offering a complete and thoroughly developed determination of the essence of animality", as "we are pursuing it here only from one quite specific perspective and thus in a one-sided fashion."<sup>123</sup> This question of perspectives and of incomplete versus complete determinations of essence has fuelled the debate surrounding this text's treatment of the

---

<sup>118</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 60 – 63. See pp. 53 – 54, above.

<sup>119</sup> *ibid.*, p. 239

<sup>120</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>121</sup> It might be thought that we have, in this paragraph, unacceptably conflated the behaviour of the sleeper as benumbed with the sleeper themselves as so characterised. However, this would be to miss the unifying and essential nature of behaviour. Behaviour is, as we discussed just a moment ago, not merely the way the animal 'acts' but rather the very manner of being of animality itself as distinct, that is, from the natural processes of inanimate things and from the *doings* of humankind.

<sup>122</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>123</sup> *ibid.*, p. 240

animal. It is, furthermore, precisely these features, which Heidegger is at such pains to remind us of, which make this analysis such fertile ground for our considerations of sleep.

Section 59 aims to clarify the structure of animal behaviour “in a concrete way” and, essentially, this will involve the distinguishing of animal “relationality” from that of human “relationality”.<sup>124</sup> Heidegger has already noted that the animal, in distinction to the stone, relates to other entities in our world. It is now necessary to acknowledge this within the concrete account of animal captivation that he is attempting to offer. And this “*being related to....*” of the animal is, for him, always a “*being driven forward* – and that also means a *being driven away*.”<sup>125</sup> This amounts to Heidegger granting the animal its own form of intentionality: “Seeing is the seeing of *what is seen*, hearing is the hearing of *what is heard*.”<sup>126</sup> It is this granting of intentionality to animal behaviour which forces him to examine how such intentionality differs from that involved in human comportment. For our purposes, we might ask whether the sleeper is similarly endowed with relationality, or intentionality, and if so “*what kind of relationality*” that would be?<sup>127</sup>

Famously, Heidegger will seek the tools to make this distinction in contemporary biology and zoology. Before considering the results of this examination, and how they tell on our three theses [1s – 3s], however, we must look at Heidegger’s guiding “methodological point of departure”.<sup>128</sup> We are best served, so Heidegger thinks, by beginning from “those forms of behaviour which are more remote, with respect to their consistent and intrinsic character, than those forms of comportment displayed by the higher animals that seem to correspond so closely to our own comportment.”<sup>129</sup> Krell would later note with interest and derision this shift of focus away from our hirsute cousins and the other “higher animals”.<sup>130</sup> Yet, for our purposes it is worth comparing this guiding thesis with that with which he opens the engagement with attunements earlier in the lecture course. We were told that “precisely *those* attunements to which we pay no heed at all, the attunements we least observe, those attunements which attune us in such a way that we feel as though there is no attunement there at all, as though we were not

---

<sup>124</sup> *ibid*

<sup>125</sup> *ibid*

<sup>126</sup> *ibid*

<sup>127</sup> *ibid*

<sup>128</sup> *ibid*

<sup>129</sup> *ibid*, pp. 240 – 241

<sup>130</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, p. 106 and p. 113.

attuned in any way at all – these attunements are the most powerful.”<sup>131</sup> In one sense this chimes well with Heidegger turning his attention away from the household pets and chattel, considered in Section 50’s discussion of transposition, and towards those animals or organisms which are most often forgotten about.<sup>132</sup> On the other hand, it is the proximity of the attunements that Heidegger is going to consider which allows them to mask their truly disclosive power in their everyday normality and, as such, the proximity of domestic animals, rather than the alien life of the single cell organism, might be analogous with such attunements. Perhaps the only acceptable approach is to consider those animal behaviours most proximal *and* most alien to us? The sleeper as interspersed within and around us and yet as so alien, here stirs gently.

Heidegger’s “*concrete examples*” of animal behaviour, as found in sub-section a) of Section 59, all surround the industrious honey bee and its quests for food and home, and thus also its traversal from one to the other. The details of the experiments considered are not of much importance to us here.<sup>133</sup> Instead it is the results he draws from these which we must consider. In particular, *how* the bee relates to other entities in contrast to our relations with such, and the question of its orientation and drives. Beginning with the former of these, Heidegger considers a series of experiments which he takes to shed light on the manner in which a bee relates to a specific type of entity it encounters – its food. Bees will stop eating when either the food source has been exhausted or when too full to consume any more. This might suggest that they *comport* themselves much like us. Of course, Heidegger will not take this route. Instead he asks whether “the bee recognized the honey *as present*” or rather relates to it in some other way? By means of a rather cruel and odd experiment involving the removal of a bee’s abdomen during its feeding process Heidegger suggests this alternative manner in which the bee relates to its food:

Rather, the bee is simply taken [*hingenommen*] by its food. This *being taken* is only possible where there is an *instinctual* ‘toward...’ Yet such a driven being taken also excludes the possibility of any recognition of presence. It is precisely

---

<sup>131</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 68. See pp. 64 – 65, above.

<sup>132</sup> Though, as the stung child and their distressed parent knows the bee, Heidegger’s preferred animal example is not always so unobtrusive in our worlds, let alone that of the beekeeper.

<sup>133</sup> Though one might question, and indeed many have questioned, whether Heidegger can really draw support for this thesis on animality from these specific experiments. For example, Giorgio Agamben’s *The Open: Man and Animal*, Translated by K. Attell, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. See in particular, Sections 10 – 14.

being taken by its food that prevents the animal from taking up a position over and against this food.<sup>134</sup>

The bee, and animals more generally, do not *have* entities *as* beings which are present to them but rather are “simply taken” by them. Let us pause to consider both of these words, ‘simply’ and ‘taken’, and how they might relate to the sleeper’s benumbed behaviour. The simplicity of the animal’s relationship with other entities can be seen in light of what it precludes: “any recognition of presence.” The animal does not have access to beings *as* beings and as such is exiled from the ontological sphere. This exile from the realm in which we are always already engaged<sup>135</sup> would seem to be, for Heidegger, a move from complexity toward simplicity. Whereas this has raised eyebrows in the case of animal behaviour – why should we assume that animal behaviour is any simpler than our own – it is fairly uncontroversial when applied to sleep – insomniac or not the time of sleep seems far more uniform and simpler than the multifaceted and complex waking lives we each undertake. Of course, we might contend that there is no reason to conflate the unknown with the simple or uniform. Conversely, we often talk of sleep ‘taking’ one or of someone as being absorbed or swallowed by sleep, or of *giving* oneself over to sleep.<sup>136</sup> However, here we must be on our guard against too quickly moving from the animal being taken *by other entities* and the sleeper as *taken* in general. We must hold fast to the more difficult question as we examine the remainder of this section: ‘is the sleeper taken (whether simply or otherwise) by the entities it relates to, and, if so, how is it so taken?’

This question may struggle to even get off the ground given that, as we discussed above, the sleeper is far from obviously related to other entities at all, let alone taken by them. However, returning to the bee as taken by its food, we can already see the direction of Heidegger’s analysis. The animal is prevented “from taking up a *position* over and against” other entities.<sup>137</sup> This position, or stance, is, as we discussed above, related to Heidegger’s notion of the ‘as-structure’.<sup>138</sup> It is this structure which animals lack – “...in sucking at the blossom the bee does *not comport itself* toward the blossom *as something*

---

<sup>134</sup> *ibid*, p. 242

<sup>135</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 32 [H12]: “...Dasein, in its Being, has a relationship towards that Being – a relationship which itself is one of Being.”

<sup>136</sup> This final phrase offers us the discussion of the gift *of* sleep and of one’s gift *to* sleep.

<sup>137</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 242, *emphasis added*

<sup>138</sup> See p. 77, above.

*present or not present.*”<sup>139</sup> Given this Heidegger is required to find another way to explain why the bee stops feeding in the cases mentioned above. His answer is that “activity here is terminated through an inhibition (drive and disinhibition).”<sup>140</sup> As Heidegger argued in his treatment of the organic unity of living organisms these drives are interconnected and the animal is never free of them.<sup>141</sup> For the animal “activity does not simply cease, rather the drivenness of the capability is redirected into another drive.”<sup>142</sup> Structurally this bears a striking resemblance to Heidegger’s commitment to Dasein as never being without some attunement – “Dasein always has some mood.”<sup>143</sup>

Before turning to Heidegger’s own more detailed elaboration of animal benumbment as taken, in sub-section b) of Section 59, and how that relates to the question of the sleeper’s relationship with other entities, let us consider his brief foray into the question of the animal’s space. Struck by the impressive ability of the honey bee to return home Heidegger believes that this ability to traverse substantial distances requires explaining within his new framework lest it be seen as providing evidence for a beastly affinity between us and those creatures that creep and crawl, or, in this instance, buzz. Once again the as-structure’s centrality to this question is brought out: “In the strict sense, there is orientation only where space is disclosed as such, and thus where the possibility of distinguishing different regions and identifiable locations within these regions is also given.”<sup>144</sup> However, before considering some experiments regarding the bee’s ability to return to its hive Heidegger issues the following warning: “The problem of *animal space*, of whether the animal has a space as such space at all, cannot be taken up in isolation.”<sup>145</sup> Just as “the task of clarifying such phenomena as sleeping and waking cannot be addressed extrinsically as one particular question” so here too Heidegger warns about isolating the problem of the space of the animal.<sup>146</sup> In fact, sub-section b), which “asks after the basis of a universal determination of the essence of animality”, is framed by this very problem.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> *ibid.*, p. 243

<sup>140</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>141</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 228 – 229

<sup>142</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>143</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 173 [H134]

<sup>144</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 243

<sup>145</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>146</sup> *ibid.*, p. 62

<sup>147</sup> *ibid.*, p. 243

With his experimental resources mustered, and commended,<sup>148</sup> Heidegger acknowledges that one might still talk of bees navigating their environments, through having ‘noticed’ the position of the sun. And yet, it is precisely this ‘noticing’ which, with the loss of the as-structure, the animal is refused.

It [the bee] does not strike out in a given direction prescribed for it by the place in which it has found itself. Rather it is absorbed by a direction, is driven to produce this direction out of itself – without regard to the destination.<sup>149</sup>

The animal does not ‘find itself in a place’, it is too absorbed in a direction, whichever that might be, and is driven too constantly to pause, look around, and thus find itself located. This connection between placement and Dasein and the excluding of the animal leaves Heidegger with the problematic questions: ‘if the animal does not find itself placed then how does the animal navigate?’, and ‘through what does the animal navigate?’ These questions clearly strengthen the disanalogy between animality and the sleeper in that many would not describe the sleeper as “navigating” at all.

Here we are reminded of the fact that what Heidegger is searching for will not, and should not, explain the individual details of different animal captivated behaviour – “a captivation which is quite different in the case of each animal species” – but rather the essence of animal behaviour overall.<sup>150</sup> Remaining with the example of the bee Heidegger returns us to the manner in which it is *simply taken* by that with which it relates. “The bee is *simply given over* to the sun and to the period of its flight *without being able to grasp either of these as such*, without being able to reflect upon them as something thus grasped.”<sup>151</sup> This sentence conjoins the animal’s being taken in its reflecting with its inability to “grasp” and then “reflect upon” that which it is involved. This inability is also understood as a prohibition of animal *apprehending*. The following extract reveals the complex network of terms Heidegger is playing with in these sections:

There is no apprehending [*Vernehmen*], but only a *behaving* [*Benehmen*] here, a driven activity which we must grasp in this way because the possibility of apprehending something as something is *withheld* [*genommen*] from the animal. And it is withheld from it not merely here and now, but withheld in the sense

---

<sup>148</sup> *ibid.*, p. 246. “We cannot value experiments of this kind too highly...”

<sup>149</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>150</sup> *ibid.*, p. 247

<sup>151</sup> *ibid.*

that such a possibility is ‘not given at all’. This possibility is taken away [*benommen*] from the animal, and that is why the animal is not simply unrelated to anything else but rather is taken [*hingenommen*], taken and captivated [*benommen*] by things.<sup>152</sup>

This series of terms – *Vernehmen*, *Benehmen*, *Genommen*, *Benommen*, and *hingenommen* – together provide Heidegger with his account of *Benommenheit*. They all share their root in the “*nehmen*, to take, and its past participle *genommen*”, as noted by the translators of the lecture course.<sup>153</sup> However, as is made clear by the term *Genommen*, “withheld”, these concepts are not merely added together to form the essence of the unity of the animal. Instead, here we see that the withholding of apprehending and thus of the as-structure – or in other words their subtraction – from the animal leaves the animal “not simply unrelated to anything else but rather... taken and captivated [*benommen*] by things.” Fundamentally, this reproduces, or fits within, the structure of poverty which Heidegger had been at pains to describe earlier and which we described above: having, being taken by things, in not-having – having apprehending withheld.

As our way into considering how this description of animal captivation relates to the sleeper’s potentially equivalent status, let us examine a warning that Heidegger offers us about a possible misinterpretation of his account.

But this captivation should not be interpreted simply as a kind of rigid fixation on the part of the animal as if it were somehow spellbound. Rather this captivation makes possible and prescribes an appropriate leeway for its behaviour, i.e., a purely instinctual redirecting of the animal’s driven activity in accordance with certain instincts in each case.<sup>154</sup>

This quotation provides us with the resources for both setting out a worry with sleep’s captivation, and for alleviating this worry along with some other equivalent concerns. It might be thought that the sleeper also lacks apprehension of things and is thus benumbed like the animal. Yet whatever intuitive weight this holds we cannot deny that Heidegger firstly describes sleep, via Aristotle, as the *binding* of one’s perception and essence,<sup>155</sup> and then, here, warns us not to see captivation as a “rigid fixation” or a being

---

<sup>152</sup> *ibid*

<sup>153</sup> *ibid*, p. xxi

<sup>154</sup> *ibid*, p. 248

<sup>155</sup> *ibid*, p. 62. See pp. 56 – 57, above.



“spellbound”. The worry is that what Heidegger is precisely trying to resist is the kind of sleep-like *state* based accounts of animal behaviour as they at once remain too temporary and at the same time fail to allow the “appropriate leeway for [animal] behaviour”. Yet, we have already argued that one of the main benefits of this comparative analytic of the sleeper is that it may begin to pry sleep free from just these conceptions of it. Additionally, the “*being bound*” of sleep which Heidegger takes from Aristotle is indeed a *binding* of essence as the German makes clear, *Gebundenheit*, whereas the condition of being spellbound [*Verhextheit*], as its root, *Verhexen* [bewitched], demonstrates has no such connotation of binding.<sup>156</sup> Thus when we talk of the sleeper as benumbed we do not mean that they are bewitched but rather that they are bound and sealed off from all those “beings which it itself is not.”<sup>157</sup>

The significance and functioning of this binding of the sleeper can be brought out by comparing what Heidegger says, just following his warning words on witchcraft, about the animal’s relationship with beings, in light of its lack of the as-structure. “Beings are *not manifest* to the behaviour of the animal in its captivity, they are not disclosed to it and for that very reason are *not closed off* from it either. Captivity stands outside this possibility.”<sup>158</sup> The animal, and we are arguing the sleeper too, in its intermediate position is neither correctly seen as accessing nor as being closed off from other beings. This becomes clearer when we see that “Beings could only be closed off if there were some possibility of disclosure at all”.<sup>159</sup> Here we must be reminded of our previous discussion of the disclosive power of attunements and, in particular, what Heidegger says about what he calls ‘bare mood’: “The ‘bare mood’ discloses the “there” more primordially, but correspondingly it *closes it off* more stubbornly than any *not-perceiving*.”<sup>160</sup> Previously, we analysed the possibility of the attunement, or attunements, of sleep amounting to something similar to this ‘more stubborn’ closing off. Yet we came to the preliminary conclusion that Dasein does not sleep and that attunements, along with *existence*, drop away as we lie down and lay down our burdens. The animal, which lives but does not exist, also knows nothing of these burdens and as such “*does not stand within a*

---

<sup>156</sup> Of course, magic and witchcraft have often been associated with binding and weaving, but for our purposes it is enough to see that Heidegger’s choice of wording does not suggest a prohibition against the kind of binding involved in sleep, as described by Aristotle.

<sup>157</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 62 – 63

<sup>158</sup> *ibid.*, p. 248

<sup>159</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>160</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 175 [H136]. See pp. 73 – 74, above.

*manifestness of beings.*”<sup>161</sup> The sleeper and the animal, plausibly share this exiling from the realm of disclosure, from the realm of ontology.

Clearly, this cannot be the last word on the animal’s, or indeed the sleeper’s, relationality. Instead the “driven directedness of the animal finds itself suspended [*hängt*], as it were, between itself and its environment, even though neither the one nor the other is experienced *as being*.”<sup>162</sup> This suspension, this hanging in limbo, between itself and its environment begins to demonstrate the truly problematic character of the intermediate position of the animal, and the sleeper, which Heidegger has insisted on for so long. Intuitively the sleeper is not related to beings, it does not apprehend them, and yet it, almost always, finds its way back to the world and to waking. The sleeper is not, like the corpse, without relationality. The true difficulty is to describe what, if we can still use this word ‘what’, the animal and the sleeper are related to. How is it “that captivation and behaviour display an *openness* for ... For what precisely?”<sup>163</sup>

#### **IV: Openness, Elimination and the Animal’s Disinhibiting Ring** **[*Enthemmungsring*]**

Section 60 “turns away from the animal, as it were” in considering the “what” with which the animal relates.<sup>164</sup> However, seen in another light, this is only one further turn of the hermeneutic screw tightening onto the essence of animality: an account, that is, of the *openness* of behaviour. The section itself is split into two sub-sections which attempt to clarify, respectively, that which is eliminated from animal relationality or openness and that which constitutes it, that which disinhibits animal behaviour. The former of these, sub-section a), can be seen as a deepening of the enigma [*Rätsel*] of the animal’s wealth, of relationality, *and* poverty, of *beings*, whilst the latter, sub-section b), describes the animal’s openness to *that which disinhibits it*. For our purposes, this section has the pivotal role of intensifying the enigmatic character of the sleeper whilst also sweeping away some more of our pre-philosophical notions about this intermediate and ambiguous mode of being.

---

<sup>161</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 248

<sup>162</sup> *ibid*

<sup>163</sup> *ibid*

<sup>164</sup> *ibid*

Sub-section a) and its consideration of the “eliminative character of behaviour” begins by reminding us that Heidegger is searching for that which unifies behaviour, for that which is essential to the animal mode of being. As such we must be particularly wary of focusing on individual instances of isolated behaviour – to do so would be to miss the whole: “each instinctual drive is intrinsically determined by its *being driven with respect to the other drives*.”<sup>165</sup> It is this network of drives which forms “the totality of instinctual behaviour within which the animal is driven”.<sup>166</sup> And this network in turn both allows for openness whilst, as behaviour, always prohibiting the apprehension, or having, of beings *as such*. “The animal is *encircled* [umringt] by this ring [*Ring*] constituted by the reciprocal drivenness of its drives.”<sup>167</sup> The animal thus encircled by a *Ring* from which it “cannot escape” might appear as a purely negative characterisation and so Heidegger wonders: “What does this inability [to apprehend beings] positively imply for the phenomenon of captivation and its characteristic openness?”<sup>168</sup>

The positive interpretation of this *eliminative* character of animal behaviour opens with the following striking claim: “This *fundamental trait of behaviour*... can show itself as destruction – as devouring – or as avoidance of...”<sup>169</sup> Heidegger calls on “concrete phenomena” to support the supposed universality of this eliminative quality of behaviour. The example he turns to is the much cited cases of “female insects [who after mating] devour the male of the species.”<sup>170</sup> This most alien instance of animal behaviour – the taboo of cannibalism here distances and alienates the animal from us *and our world* – is supposed to demonstrate that “The animal is never there for the other simply as a living creature, but is only there for it either as sexual partner or as prey – in either case only in some form of ‘away’ [weg]. Behaviour as such is always intrinsically a form of elimination [*Beseitigen*].”<sup>171</sup> This formulation stands, given what we know about the animal’s deprivation of the as-structure, however, it is easy to see how it might lead to a fatal misconception. It is but a short step from recognition of this fundamental trait of

---

<sup>165</sup> *ibid*, p. 249

<sup>166</sup> *ibid*

<sup>167</sup> *ibid*

<sup>168</sup> *ibid*

<sup>169</sup> *ibid*, p. 250

<sup>170</sup> *ibid*

<sup>171</sup> *ibid*. One need only consider popular science-fiction films such as the ‘Alien’ franchise or ‘Species’ to see how easily we associate this mixing of the predatory and the sexual with the monstrous and the alien. The complex and problematic role of gender in such films cannot here be examined.

*behaviour* to taking the eliminative nature of the animal as necessitating “purely negative” comportment.<sup>172</sup> “But in fact there is no question of any comportment whatsoever, not even a negative one.”<sup>173</sup> Of course, this just as clearly mitigates against the possibility of an overly positive interpretation of animal behaviour *as comportment*. Whether animals viciously devour their mates-cum-prey or tenderly nurture their young we go wrong for Heidegger if we move from these behaviours to negative or positive comportments.

The question persists: ‘*what are* animals related to in behaving one way, which appears positively eliminative, or another, which appears positively constructive?’ Heidegger turns to animals “and insects in particular [that] relate to light”, with the aim of discerning the “instinctual context” of light-seeking and light-avoiding behaviour.<sup>174</sup> Through a series of encounters with butterflies, crabs and moths, or rather with their relationships to light, we are reminded that the animal is always *taken* by that to which it relates and thus is not left “free for the light as such.”<sup>175</sup> Heidegger insists that the extremely strong relations these animals have with light – as he puts it, the “animal locks its behaviour and what is proper and peculiar to it [*Eigen-tum*] into the light...” – are never equivalent to our own varying relations with light.<sup>176</sup> The moth “plunges into the light precisely because it does not attend to the light or grasp it as such in its light-seeking behaviour.”<sup>177</sup>

As such Heidegger acknowledges that the description of animal behaviour as eliminative is “inevitably misleading”.<sup>178</sup> It draws us towards an unwarranted positive interpretation of this *fundamental trait of behaviour*. And yet, what other interpretation, what negative interpretation, could there be? Heidegger’s answer comes in the form of the animal’s *rejection* of beings.

It [this alternative interpretation] arises because the animal’s behaviour expresses a kind of rejection on the part of the animal with respect to what it relates to in its behaviour. In this *rejecting things from itself* we see the animal’s

---

<sup>172</sup> *ibid*

<sup>173</sup> *ibid*

<sup>174</sup> *ibid*

<sup>175</sup> *ibid*, p. 251

<sup>176</sup> *ibid*

<sup>177</sup> *ibid*

<sup>178</sup> *ibid*, p. 253

self-absorption. The latter does not imply that the organism is encapsulated within itself, cut off from any and every relation to the environment.<sup>179</sup>

Fundamentally, however, such an answer can only lead to a deepening of the enigma [*Rätsel*] of animal behaviour:

This eliminative character of all behaviour, the way in which it leaves things to one side, is an enigma [*Rätselhaftigkeit*] which repeatedly forces us to address the question: What then is behaviour related to and what is the nature of this relation? Or we can now also ask: Where is the *ring* with which the animal is *encircled* as such, and how does it encircle the animal? What is this encircling [*Umringen*] like, if a relation to other things is not merely sustained, but constantly brought about [*errungen*] by this encircling?<sup>180</sup>

This eliminative character of behaviour, this rejecting of things, this leaving of things to one side, *is* the animal's self-absorption, or to put it another way its imprisonment within its encircling *ring*. The enigma comes with the caveat to the first of our just cited extracts – that this self-absorption is never an encapsulation or cutting off of relations – and this mystery results in the questions listed in our second extract.

Before considering these questions, and moving, with them, onto sub-section b) of Section 60, it is necessary to return to the sleeper and to ask whether the behaviour of the sleeper is fundamentally eliminative, and if so, how so? Whatever intuitive appeal Heidegger's *positive* characterisation of animal behaviour as eliminative may hold – and it is important to note that he himself provides us with specific constructive counter-examples – the sleeper, surely, appears far more positively eliminative. Whereas animals avoid some things, the worm – if it is lucky – avoids the mole, whilst devouring and destroying others, the sleeper, in contrast, avoids almost, or in fact, *everything*. It takes avoidance to its limit. Furthermore, Heidegger's account of light-avoiding animals might suggest to us the sleeper's, or half-sleeper's, turning away from the beam of sunlight which has somehow found its way into the bedroom. The appeal of such an account is clear to see – the sleeper, if it behaves at all, behaves only, or so this interpretation would have it, in avoiding all that with which it might relate. And is this not the very structure of poverty which Heidegger has been insisting on from the beginning of his comparative examination? Namely, having in not-having.

---

<sup>179</sup> *ibid.*, p. 252

<sup>180</sup> *ibid*

However, as we have seen this *positive* interpretation of elimination is precluded in the case of the animal and so too, if our analogy is to hold, in that of the sleeper. There are two reasons why the sleeper's behaviour cannot be positively characterised as in the previous paragraph. Firstly, it must be asked why we are so quick to describe the sleeper's behaviour as 'avoidance', or indeed with any negative name lifted from waking life? In the example we have just given of the sleeper, or half-sleeper, turning away from, 'avoiding', the light we could just as easily have described them as *seeking* the darkness. Or to take another familiar phenomenon: a half-sleeper may often *seek* the cool side of a pillow. Perhaps the thought is that 'darkness', or 'coolness', or 'comfort', or 'sleep' itself, are too loose conceptually to be conceived of as intentional objects for the sleeper.<sup>181</sup> And yet this very thought brings us neatly to our second reason for turning away from such an intuitively positive account of the behaviour of the sleeper – if the sleeper lacks such objects that it may seek then surely it just as much lacks those it is supposed to avoid. It is tempting to "understand eliminative behaviour as a seeking of emptiness, [but] then we should already have to understand the animal's behaviour fundamentally as a self-comportment toward beings as such."<sup>182</sup> The positive interpretation holds the double standard of granting beings to the sleeper to be avoided whilst denying them the same as to be sought.

Heidegger's determined opposition to anthropomorphism is cached out in his hardline stance on the animal's exile from the as-structure. For our purposes, this exile provides a lens through which we can describe the sleeper's apparently negative behaviour as structurally *eliminative* without falling victim to a hollow anthropomorphic projection. The question, of course, remains what exactly the sleeper, like the animal, is open *to*, given this elimination of beings which underpins its very relationality. Alongside this arises the suspicion, one which Krell and others put clear voice to, that Heidegger,

---

<sup>181</sup> An alternative view might be that it is not the sleeper that seeks such but rather the half-waking-self in the half-sleeper, or simply the waking-self that does so. And thus these things, sought near or within sleep, may be counted as intentional objects, just not the sleeper's objects. This thought raises the question of how this waking-self, nestled as it is within the folds of the sleeper, is to be distinguished, or demarcated, from the sleeper? A suspicion quickly arises that such an account lets the phenomena play second fiddle to our theoretical, hard and fast, distinctions. One remembers Rilke's warning cited above, and originally cited by Krell: "*Aber Lebendige machen alle den Fehler, / daß sie zu stark unterscheiden.* [Yet living beings all make the same / mistake – they distinguish too sharply.]" - cited on p. 1 of *Daimon Life*.

<sup>182</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, pp. 252 – 253

despite all his efforts, has not truly thrown off the preconceived negative account of the animal, and thus, we might add, nor that of the sleeper.

With the enigma of the animal's relationality re-affirmed, sub-section b) begins with the secondary questions which Heidegger described and which we just cited: "Where is the *ring* with which the animal is *encircled* as such, and how does it encircle the animal? What is this encircling [*Umringen*] like?"<sup>183</sup> As such this sub-section attempts to clarify "something resembling a *surrounding environment*" for the animal.<sup>184</sup> With this move *from* the essence of animality, ostensibly *out*, to the *place* of animality we see the focus on world, and the animal's poverty therein, returning to centre stage. Initiating this investigation comes the assertion of the animal's openness to *otherness* "the animal opens itself to what is other in approaching it."<sup>185</sup> As the eliminative character of this openness has made clear what the animal opens itself to cannot be manifest as beings. Instead, "a being such as the animal... can only come upon the sort of entity that '*affects*' or initiates the capability in some way. Nothing else can ever penetrate the ring around the animal."<sup>186</sup> With these essentialist remarks, and he insists that he is here still operating on the fundamental rather than the concrete level, Heidegger has described the manner of animal openness "as *disinhibition* [*Enthemmung*]."<sup>187</sup>

Such "*affects*" *stimulate* the animal in disinhibiting its behaviour, in activating its drives. However, one might think, Heidegger acknowledges, that instinctual drives are "precisely characterized by their uninhibitedness" and as such we should talk of the animal's others as inhibiting rather than *dis-inhibiting*.<sup>188</sup> Yet once again this view, for Heidegger, rests on an overly quick comparison with human comportment and its supposed "control [as opposed to the uninhibited animal] and so on."<sup>189</sup> Instead the animal's drives, in their unity as behaviour, indicate, in themselves, "an inner tension and charge, a containment and inhibitedness that essentially must be disinhibited before it can pass over into driven activity".<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> *ibid*, p. 252

<sup>184</sup> *ibid*, p. 253

<sup>185</sup> *ibid*, p. 254

<sup>186</sup> *ibid*

<sup>187</sup> *ibid*

<sup>188</sup> *ibid*

<sup>189</sup> *ibid*

<sup>190</sup> *ibid*

So far these descriptions of the animal's behaviour seem to allow for plausible extension over the sleeper. The sleeper, whatever their relationship to other beings, seems open to being *affected*, *stimulated*, and *dis-inhibited*. Furthermore, the same temptation which prompted us to call the sleeper's behaviour negative or eliminative, in the positive sense, also suggests that the sleeper is inhibited, fundamentally reticent. Perhaps most obviously all of these ways that the sleeper relates may cause the sleeper to transform into the waking-self. And here, fundamentally, lies the problem with this analogy. We have already seen that animal behaviour must – as with capability and drives in general – be self-absorbed and self-*sustaining*, or as Heidegger puts it “subservient”.<sup>191</sup> And yet, surely this archetypal *disinhibition* of the sleeper results precisely in the *dissolving* of the sleeper. The sleeper's ‘behaviour’, which could no longer be called such, of waking-up amounts to the very opposite of the requirement that the animal continually *be capable*: “Something which is no longer capable, irrespective of whether a capacity is used or not, is no longer alive.”<sup>192</sup> One might almost say that the sleeper in such cases is too disinhibited to behave itself. This problem with the analogy intuitively responds to the image of the sleeper as dying every morning and being born anew every night, if, that is we are lucky!

Leaving, for just a moment, this problem of behaviour and awakening let us consider the possibility that the sleeper behaves through the disinhibition of its drives *whilst* asleep. How else are we to explain the fact that sometimes we awake with our heads where our feet were the previous night or in some other odd position.<sup>193</sup> Or one might think of dreams which, upon awaking, we believe ourselves, or others, to have discovered their external source.<sup>194</sup> What disinhibits such, *internal to sleep*, behaviour? It seems that this is equivalent to the question which has already been reiterated so often by Heidegger in his search for the openness of the animal – open to *what*? “Since that which disinhibits behaviour essentially withdraws and eludes it, so too the relation of behaviour to that which occasions it is a *not attending to it*.”<sup>195</sup> Thus the *what* of animal relating

---

<sup>191</sup> *ibid*, p. 253. See Sections 53 – 55 which prefigure this via the subservience of organs to the organism.

<sup>192</sup> *ibid*, p. 236

<sup>193</sup> Or, indeed, any of the host of parasomnias; sleep-walking, sleep-talking, night-terrors, etcetera.

<sup>194</sup> Though here, as ever the question of the dreamer and the sleeper's relationship or identity cannot be assumed but must rather be investigated. An investigation we have, of course, suspended and yet which keeps returning.

<sup>195</sup> *ibid*, p. 254



*withdraws* [entzieht sich] *as it disinhibits*. This withdrawal of *things* from the animal, even whilst they retain some hold on them, reminds us of the way in which sounds withdraw, or become more distant, as one slips into sleep.<sup>196</sup>

The animal *is dis-inhibited*, remains open, but never *has that which* disinhibits it.

Thus the *intrinsic self-encirclement* [Sich-Einringen] of the animal is not a kind of encapsulation. On the contrary, the encirclement is precisely *drawn about* the animal in such a way that it *opens* up a sphere within which whatever disinhibits can do so in this or that manner.<sup>197</sup>

This at first appears to be but another articulation of the paradox described above – that the animal is open even though it can never have that which it must be open to, beings. However, in fact something more astonishing is being proposed in this account of the animal's *disinhibiting ring*. Here we see the extension of the animal's essence, of animality, beyond the commonly held boundaries of skin, fur, and carapace.

...[T]he life of the animal is precisely the struggle [*Ring*en] to maintain this encircling ring or sphere within which a quite specifically articulated manifold of disinhibitions can arise. Every animal surrounds itself with this disinhibiting ring, and not merely subsequently once the animal has already been living for a certain period of time, because this encircling belongs to the innermost organization of the animal and its fundamental morphological structures.<sup>198</sup>

And thus the true significance of the *self* of the animal's *self*-absorption comes into view. Absorption does indeed indicate a form of limitation but not within "the so-called 'interior' of the animal, but in the ring of the interrelated drivenness of instinctual drives as they open themselves up."<sup>199</sup> Perhaps unsurprisingly Heidegger has no time for describing a hermetically sealed animal identity, after all the question of world is what motivated his comparative examination.

Thus it is that we are brought back to the thesis of the animal's poverty in world, but now we can see that it is "a poverty which roughly put, is nonetheless a kind of

---

<sup>196</sup> "Now comes the peal of the distant clock, with fainter and fainter strokes as you plunge further into the wilderness of sleep." - p. 77 of Nathaniel Hawthorne's 'The Haunted Mind', in *Twice Told Tales*, Vol. 2. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Publishers, New York, 1900. Epigram to Nancy's *The Fall of Sleep*.

<sup>197</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, p. 255

<sup>198</sup> *ibid*

<sup>199</sup> *ibid*

wealth.”<sup>200</sup> With this wealth merely hinted at and with animal essence opened up we must return to the problem of the sleeper’s dis-inhibition, and more broadly the analogy we have been considering between Heidegger’s account of animality and a potential phenomenology of sleep. The mistake with both the worry about the *dissolving* of the sleeper in awakening *and* with our initial response to it through a consideration of dis-inhibiting behaviour *within* sleep is that they both presuppose that the essence of the sleeper must be *internal* to it. Yet, as we have just seen, the animal for Heidegger is structurally, essentially, open. This, when held alongside Heidegger’s dissatisfaction with limiting sleep to a temporary *state*, suggests that we have succumbed to precisely the reading of sleep that our exegesis has moved us away from: sleep as a part of consciousness, a state within it, a sub-section. Another means of seeing this point is to consider that the sleeper is not, phenomenologically, confined to those periods of time we ordinarily describe as sleep. A consideration of going-to-sleep – which in its projective aspect is so often forgotten or inadequately discusses as we have seen – is enough to suggest that the behaviour of the sleeper needs to be understood not only as *dissipating* but also as *instantiating*, or *constituting*. However, it is crucial to see that this is not merely to acknowledge the coming to be of the interiority we call sleep, a recognition of the ‘being born anew’ described above. Instead we are better served by considering the sleeper through the lens of *life* rather, that is, than the boundaries or edges thereof. This shows the *living sleeper* as fundamentally open, or in other words “our scarcely conceivable, abysmal bodily kinship with the” sleeper.<sup>201</sup>

However, this kinship, as with the animal, is dangerously easy to misunderstand. And this danger is doubled. We risk either forgetting the wealth of the animal and the sleeper in favour of their poverty, or forgetting their poverty in favour of their wealth.<sup>202</sup> The animal must not be confused with the stone, nor with Dasein. However, *as* Dasein we, for Heidegger, constantly “end up talking as if that which the animal relates to and the manner in which it does so were some being”.<sup>203</sup> We constantly forget the poverty and, in so doing, are necessarily blinded to the peculiarity of the wealth. Yet, as we saw in our exploration of transposition, claims about the essence of animality are necessarily

---

<sup>200</sup> *ibid*

<sup>201</sup> Heidegger, Martin. ‘Letter on Humanism’, in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill, p. 248

<sup>202</sup> Though it might be hard to imagine the latter having worked through so much of Heidegger analysis of the animal which is, we must not forget, driven by the thesis ‘the animal is poor in world.’

<sup>203</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 255

entangled with methodological considerations. Here such considerations return to the fore:

...the *essence of life can become accessible only if we consider it in a deconstructive [abbauenden] fashion*. But this does not mean that life represents something inferior or some kind of lower level in comparison with human Dasein. On the contrary, life is a domain which possesses a wealth of openness with which the human world may have nothing to compare.<sup>204</sup>

The question of the limits of our access to the animal and to the wealth of animal openness is here raised. This necessitates a deconstructing, or dismantling, approach to the animal whilst also holding at bay the hierarchical claims associated with a detached observer model, implicit in the natural scientist's approach to the animal. This key denial of any hierarchy of man over animal will be central to the arguments of Heidegger's defenders considered below.

Section 60, Sub-section b) continues with a reminder of what we have learned of 'that which the animal is open to'. Namely, that it "must always... withdraw itself."<sup>205</sup> This withdrawing signals that that which disinhibits the animal is "*nothing enduring* that could *stand over against the animal as a possible object*".<sup>206</sup> It is worth noting how this characterisation of the stimuli which the animal encounters recalls not only the exile of the animal from the realm of beings but also the sleeper's inability to take-up a stance, inability to stand over against. Of course, with this characterisation of the animal's openness as open to stimuli which disinhibit animal behaviour comes the risk of a slide back into naturalistic accounts of cause and effect. Heidegger is quick to block such a relapse as the animal is already related prior to the stimulus and to think of the stimulus as a cause of a particular effect in the animal is to ignore this prior engagement. The prior engagement is the animal's intrinsic encirclement: "it is only where there is disinhibition and intrinsic encirclement that stimulation is possible."<sup>207</sup> The animal has always already found itself in its own encircling ring.<sup>208</sup> Fundamentally, this means that different animals will have different intrinsic rings which in turn dictate which stimuli can disinhibit which

---

<sup>204</sup> *ibid*

<sup>205</sup> *ibid*, p. 256

<sup>206</sup> *ibid*

<sup>207</sup> *ibid*

<sup>208</sup> *ibid*, p. 257

animals. “However strong or intense a stimulus is, objectively speaking, a particular animal may be utterly unresponsive to particular stimuli.”<sup>209</sup>

Heidegger ends this Section, before bringing his Chapter and the analysis of the animal to a series of conclusions, with what appears to be a definition of life itself. “More precisely, we must say that life *is* nothing but the animal’s encircling itself and struggling [*Ringen*] with its encircling ring, a ring by way of which the animal is absorbed without its ever being with itself [*bei sich selbst*] in the proper sense.”<sup>210</sup> We have considered the sleeper within this framework and seen that, whilst initial difficulties appear, in fact the sleeper struggles within a particular type of encircling ring and as such is not best seen as a turning inwards at the expense of the outer. Instead this very framework of inner and outer is problematized in the case of the animal and, also, for the sleeper. Our very undertaking of this analysis of the animal amounted to a critique of the presupposition that the sleeper is within and subordinate to the subject as a whole. Here we see that such demarcating of the sleeper, as with the animal, is fundamentally problematized by a more fine-grained consideration of the modes of being of sleeper, waking Dasein, and the corpse.

## V: Conclusions, Self-Objections and Incomplete Analyses

Only now can we hope “to conclude by delimiting a correct concept of the organism”.<sup>211</sup> Thus it is that Heidegger announces the beginning of the end, not of the comparative analysis but of the animal section thereof.<sup>212</sup> This concluding section of Chapter 4 of Part II of *FCM*, Section 61, is itself split into three sub-sections. These can be broadly outlined as follows: sub-section a) summarises the account of the organism so far established, notably highlighting the animal’s essential self-encirclement in its environment; sub-section b) briefly describes the origins of this account of the essence of the organism in theoretical biology; whereas, sub-section c) reveals a fundamental limit or incompleteness to the account presented so far. Heidegger’s consideration of the

---

<sup>209</sup> *ibid*

<sup>210</sup> *ibid*

<sup>211</sup> *ibid*

<sup>212</sup> This distinction, between the end of the animal analysis and that of the comparative examination in which it sits, will be of importance our assessment of the critiques and defences of Heidegger’s lecture course below.

animal, however, will require another chapter, though admittedly a short one, before reaching its conclusion, which anyway, as we will see, cannot truly be called such. Chapter Five, in Section 62, returns us to the thesis with which the interrogation of the animal began – ‘The animal is poor in world’ – and offers a solution to the paradox of the animal’s relation to world that followed from this. Only then, in Section 63, does Heidegger acknowledge the charge of anthropocentrism, which many commentators have found so damning of his account of the animal, before, that is, dismissing this worry and leaving the animal, and its relation to world “a problem,” though “one which [he] cannot broach now”.<sup>213</sup>

Beginning then with Heidegger’s most explicit summary of the organism, behaviour and captivation, in Section 61, sub-section a), we must, as ever, be on our guard against the old misconceptions of metaphysics. Namely, that the organism can be seen neither as a bundle of instruments, nor a collection of instinctual drives.<sup>214</sup> Instead “we can say that the organism is the capability for behaviour in the unity of captivation.”<sup>215</sup> Fundamentally this unity, as we have just discussed, does not map onto the physical unity of the organism’s body with its, incorrectly described, *sharp* boundaries of hide, shell, or coat of fur. Seen from the perspective of traditional metaphysics, the boundary of this captivated unity of the organism is already what we might, just as misleadingly, call ‘external’ to our body, already ‘out there’.

For the animal is not first an organism and as such an organism then something more that comes to bind itself to its environment. Rather its *being bound* [Verbundenheit] *to the environment, the self-encircling which is open to disinhibition*, belongs to the inner essence of behaviour, i.e., belongs to that for which the capability is there as capability. This *self-encircling* is the *fundamental capability of the animal* into which all the other capacities are as it were integrated and from out of which they grow.<sup>216</sup>

Truly the animal’s ring of disinhibition forces us to speak not so much of the boundary of the organism, of the essential limits of animality and as such of the essence of animality itself, but rather of a “*being bound* [Verbundenheit] *to the environment*”, which we must

---

<sup>213</sup> *ibid*, p. 273

<sup>214</sup> Instinctual drives are essential to Heidegger’s account of the organism but, as we have just discussed, this must not be thought of as first constituting the organism internally before contacting the environment in which it lives.

<sup>215</sup> *ibid*, p. 258

<sup>216</sup> *ibid*

remember is structurally a being *open* to disinhibition. This binding in being open is, as the unity of captivation, not merely “as intimate” as that old intimacy of “the unity of the body” but rather the very ground and condition of the possibility of this as such.<sup>217</sup>

Heidegger follows this with a succinct and important summary of “the characteristic structural moments of *captivation* in six points”.<sup>218</sup> However, before we consider these “structural moments” we must pause and reflect on this binding [*verbindlich*] of the animal to its environment. In particular we must ask how this being bound [*Verbundenheit*] relates to Heidegger’s earlier appeal to the Aristotlean description of sleep, discussed above, as a “δεσμός [desmos, bond, fetter, collar], a *being bound* [*Gebundenheit*], a peculiar way in which αἴσθησις [aisthēsis, perception] is bound.”<sup>219</sup> We best approach the insights of this new comparison, between the bondage of the sleeper and that of the animal, by exploring the difference between *Gebundenheit* and *Verbundenheit*. This difference, which is concealed by their uniform translation into the English ‘being bound’, is of the utmost importance to the exercise, the somnological-zoological analogy, which we have been undertaking in following Heidegger’s way [*Weg*] of animal analysis.

Though these two words, *Verbundenheit* and *Gebundenheit*, share a common root in the verb *binden* [to bind] they also have important differences in meaning and in everyday use. Beginning with *Gebundenheit*, the simpler of the two words, we can break it down into *Gebunden* [bound or tied], the past-participle of *binden*, and *heit*. Thus ‘boundness’ or ‘being bound’ amounts to a close enough translation of *Gebundenheit*. However, as a word, it is often used to describe or suggest fixity and thus solidity or surety. One is put in mind not only of the locking away of the demons, or Krell’s daimons, of the night – children tucked up *tight* in bed, more fastened there than nestled – but also of the solid, and secure, *foundation* upon which a good *day’s work* must be based: a *good*

---

<sup>217</sup> *ibid.* It is worth noting that here we find a justification, of sorts, for our caution in assigning sleep to the realm of bodily phenomena. If captivation marks the sleeper’s mode of being then, as with the animal, this unity conditions the very possibility of the bodily unity of the sleeper. Furthermore, as this analogy is not meant to be ‘one for one’, we can ask to what degree such a unity exists for the sleeper at all? Certainly the relationship between the sleeper and their body here offers more questions than it answers. In contrast, an initial turn to the body would have risked closing down just these questions in favour of placing sleep within the preconceived domain of the body.

<sup>218</sup> *ibid*

<sup>219</sup> *ibid*, p. 62. See pp. 56 – 57 above.

*night's sleep*.<sup>220</sup> Furthermore, the priority evident here is one where sleep is looked *back upon as bound*. The *Ge-* of *Gebundenheit* designates the past. The sleeper *was* bound but never *is* bound and this word holds none of the strangeness of our blissfully throwing ourselves into bondage each and every night, with regularity – if we are lucky. Lastly, Heidegger's translation of δεσμός, as *Gebundenheit*, carries with it the privileging of *having-been-asleep* which we have already identified in the Husserlian phenomenology of sleep, above.

What then of the animal's bondage, of *Verbundenheit*? *Verbunden* may mean to bandage, to dress (a wound, for example), to connect, to associate, or to form a bond more generally. And it is from this that the primary use-meanings of *Verbundenheit* come: solidarity, closeness, attachment. This is, of course, not an exhaustive list, but it does succeed in demonstrating the associative quality of *Verbundenheit*, the being bound *to-*ness, which seems lacking in *Gebundenheit*. The question arises of how differently these claims about the animal's bondage to its environment would appear to the English reader if we take Heidegger to be describing the animal's 'solidarity, or closeness, with its environment'? Clearly such a reading would at least dampen our, understandable, worries about Heidegger's, seemingly, overly negative description of the animal. However, we would go wrong to see in this *Verbundenheit* merely the idyllic unity of the noble, however savage, beast with its environment. Whatever resources Heidegger may offer the environmentalist, here and elsewhere, he holds little sympathy for such romanticism.

Instead the ambiguity and tension in this term, *Verbundenheit*, are essential to understanding Heidegger's description of the animal. The *Ver-* of *Verbundenheit* must be considered. As a prefix this *Ver-* has frustrated many attempting to learn German given its plethora of seemingly contradictory and diverse uses. However, we can, broadly, see it as adding three types of potential meaning to a word. It can suggest change or transformation in the sense of moving from one state-of-affairs to another. It is this sense of the prefix which we appealed to in our brief engagement with Understanding [*Verstehen*], in Chapter 3, above. However, *Ver-* may also suggest error or, more accurately, misguidedness, as in the following example: '*Ich habe mich verlesen*', which

---

<sup>220</sup> The sense in which the normative value of sleep is reliant on this binding of the sleeper to the will of the waking self appears here and can be contrasted with Nancy's account of the value of sleep, of the demand of sleep, as seen in Chapter 5, below.

may be translated as ‘I misread.’ Here we can think of *Ver-* as matching *mis-* in English expressions such as *misread*, *mishandled*, *misconceived*, and so on. And lastly, *Ver-* can give the impression that that which the constituted term is applied to is *away* from the perspective of the person making the statement in which the *Ver-* term is included. Think of *Vertrieben* [dispel] or *Verdrängen* [displace, dispel, or oust]. Of course, these three meanings or roles of *Ver-* are not easily separable, as our examples demonstrate, and furthermore, they all share a common theme which we might call ‘going beyond boundaries’. Such ‘going beyond boundaries’ can suggest the change or transformation of something, or it could indicate a failure to stay within accepted *bounds*, transgression, or, lastly, it can, from the perspective of those within such boundaries, indicate the being-away of that which the *Ver-* term is assigned to.

In returning to the animal analysis we can see that Heidegger was, as ever, careful in his use of terminology. The animal’s being bound to, or its solidarity with, its environment carries with it an internal ambiguity. *Verbundenheit* involves a tension between the binding of the root word *binden* and the going beyond bounds of the *Ver-*. The essence of the organism is found in its captivation as a being bound to its environment, and thus to the open. *For us*, as *Dasein*, the animal is bound and restrained, it is world poor, and yet this being bound of the animal involves a transformation or mutability, a transgression – the animal is beyond our man-made morality (we are to avoid *animosity*, after all), and a being-away. It is the last of these that reminds us of the problems of transposition which we have already discussed: the animal is, no matter how ontically present to us, ontologically distant and as such problematic. We will return to all three of these features of the animal’s bound essence very shortly, none of them are uncontroversial. First, however, we must ask why the sleeper is denied this internal ambiguity? The question can be posed anew thus: ‘Why is the sleeper merely a *having been* bound [*Gebundenheit*] and not a being bound [*Verbundenheit*]?’

It could be argued that when Heidegger favourably cites Aristotle’s account of sleep he is not signing-up to it but merely pointing out the unexplored directions for an analysis of sleep which such an account offers. From this we might further conclude that whereas the sleeper is bound [*Gebundenheit*] – and we must remember that sleep “is not only a way in which *perception* is bound but also our *essence*, in that it cannot take in other beings which it itself is not” – *before* a somnolent comparative examination has



been undertaken, through such we come to see that it is, rather, a closeness, or solidarity, [*Verbundenheit*] with the place of sleep.<sup>221</sup> Clearly sleep's being bound in closeness to a place cannot be simply overlaid onto the being bound of the animal to its disinhibiting ring – animal's sleep too, or so we assume. Once again questions proliferate whilst answers dwindle. Furthermore, it is just as likely that this very difference between the animal's mode of being and that of the sleeper is best understood through these different words for the bondage involved in these two very different cases. Or, otherwise put: perhaps Heidegger *was* ascribing to the Aristotelean view and did see sleep as less problematic or ambiguous than the animal. These alternative interpretations, which need not be conceived merely as a scholarly quibble about Heidegger's own view but rather a question about the possibility of delimiting the sleeper as such, guide the remainder of this section.

These introductory reminders with which Heidegger opens Section 61 are, however significant they seem to us, merely the lead-in for his skilful six-point summary of the structure of captivation. Here we will merely sketch Heidegger's summary, in our own words except for point five, though using his own "abbreviated form, [of] the six points" to guide our headings.<sup>222</sup>

1. *Withholding*. The animal has the manifestness of beings structurally withheld from it. As such it may only behave, and never comport, itself. Perception is, fundamentally, beyond it.
2. *Being taken*. And yet the animal is in relation to other beings. This relation, as it is not one of perceiving, is one of being taken by.
3. *Absorption*. The totality of the animal's drives pushes it from one relationship of being taken to another. Its captivation is also an absorption in its unified totality of drives. This is the closest the animal comes to "self-hood".
4. *Openness for something else*. As such the animal is open to that which disinhibits its drives, it is open to that which is other than it.
5. *The structure of encirclement thus given*. "This disinhibiting ring is not like a rigid armour plate fitted around the animal, but is something with which the animal

---

<sup>221</sup> *ibid*, 62. *Emphasis added*

<sup>222</sup> *ibid*, p. 260

encircles itself as long as it lives.”<sup>223</sup> This involves an inherent struggling with this ring which in fact constitutes the very struggle of life itself.

6. *The indication that captivation is the condition of the possibility of any kind of behaviour.* Captivation as prior to all biological and zoological analysis and revealed as the, transcendental, condition for the possibility of such analyses.

This list of structural moments offers us a helpful means of considering our own comparative analysis of the sleeper. However, we must hold off from such a blow by blow examination, for, as Heidegger makes explicit, this structure is not “the definitive clarification of the *essence of animality*”.<sup>224</sup>

Step six may appear to suggest that Heidegger is here dismissing the very theoretical biology which he had previously drawn on. However, the end of sub-section a) and the whole of sub-section b) easily dispel such an impression. Conversely, Heidegger is keen to free the scientist from both “the apron strings of philosophy” and a dependence on “newly discovered facts.”<sup>225</sup> At this point in his philosophical development, and perhaps only at this point – as we will see when considering Padui and Winkler shortly, Heidegger still held out hope for a radical *scientific* overcoming of mechanism and the dominance of technology, *techné*, what he would later formulate and diagnose as *Gestell*. In the field of the life sciences this would involve an overcoming of “Darwinism and the increasingly powerful, purely analytical method in morphology and physiology.”<sup>226</sup> Given this, Sub-section b) should be understood as an unearthing of the biological steps which paved the way for any possible understanding of the essential structure of captivation as Heidegger has described it. These two steps, though they would later be further developed by others, were undertaken by Hans Driesch and Jakob Johann von Uexküll. “The *first step* concerns the recognition of the holistic character of the organism.”<sup>227</sup> Whereas the “*second step* is the insight into the essential significance of research concerned with how the animal is bound [*Verbundenheit*] to its environment.”<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> *ibid*, p. 259

<sup>224</sup> *ibid*, p. 260

<sup>225</sup> *ibid*, pp. 260 – 261

<sup>226</sup> *ibid*, p. 260

<sup>227</sup> *ibid*, p. 261

<sup>228</sup> *ibid*

These two steps can be seen as corresponding with two withdrawals in Heidegger's own account of the animal; namely, the move away from instrumentalist or mechanistic accounts of the organism, and, secondly, the rejection of the bodily unity of the animal in favour of its openness within its disinhibiting ring. Whilst he is clear that neither account of the organism is free from the influence and context of the "dominant mechanistic theory and investigation of life", these steps nonetheless retain their radical promise for Heidegger.<sup>229</sup> Though he only explicitly names the "great danger [*Gefahr*]" which accompanies the insights of Driesch we can, with little effort, unearth the parallel threat that lurks within Uexküll's contributions.<sup>230</sup> Driesch's neovitalism, with its appeal to entelechy – and despite its insights into the unity of the animal, is in fact, for Heidegger, still bound to the old metaphysical account of animality.

As far as biological problems are concerned, vitalism is just as dangerous as mechanism. While the latter does not allow the question of purposive behaviour to arise, vitalism tries to solve the problem too hastily.<sup>231</sup>

In fact, both mechanism and vitalism, whether neo- or otherwise, share the same mistaken metaphysical presupposition about the animal. They both, as McNeill explains, "presuppose in advance and from the outset that entities *in themselves* have the character of *eidos* ("form") and of *logos*, that the *Being* of entities (here, of living beings) has in the first instance and in general the character of a "*self*" (of self-subsistence and identity) that is reducible to and accessible as *logos*."<sup>232</sup> Yet, as we have seen, Heidegger's very question demands that we call into question such presuppositions and consider the very mode of being of the animal from out of the animal itself.<sup>233</sup>

Given this it is not surprising that Uexküll's problematizing of the metaphysical understanding of the unity of the animal appears as all the more groundbreaking in this sub-section of the course. However, here too, with Uexküll's talk "of an 'environing world' [*Umwelt*], and indeed of the 'inner world' of the animal" there is clearly the potential for misreading Uexküll and thus misunderstanding the animal.<sup>234</sup> Whereas, with

---

<sup>229</sup> *ibid*

<sup>230</sup> *ibid*, p. 262

<sup>231</sup> *ibid*

<sup>232</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 29

<sup>233</sup> We will return to this question of the animal's *eidos*, or lack thereof, in our next, and concluding, section.

<sup>234</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 263

Driesch one risks assigning the same fundamental structure of being to the animal as that of the stone, or indeed any other entity of scientific interest, here Uexküll *appears* to grant the animal that which Heidegger has been attempting to approach: world. Whatever Heidegger claims Uexküll truly means by his talk of *Umwelt* – “the *disinhibiting ring*”, of course – it is clear that here, as at the start of the animal analysis, the beast balances, with remarkable capability but without a hint of *understanding*, on a knife’s edge. The “animal is separated from man by an abyss [*Abgrund*]”, *and*, also, from the stone by another.<sup>235</sup>

Yet this precarious balancing act which both Heidegger and his animals are undertaking is, in sub-section c), made all the more difficult – the knife’s edge becomes a slack rope and strong and unpredictable winds abound – with the addition of *motion*. Heidegger’s account of the animal “is still incomplete.”<sup>236</sup> “All life is *not simply organism* but is *just as essentially* process, thus formally speaking *motion*.”<sup>237</sup> The organism, if by that we mean the structural unity of the animal’s being, is fundamentally distinct from anything which might be described, or better *delimited*, in a static snapshot.

Captivation is not a static condition, not a structure in the sense of a rigid framework inserted within the animal, but rather an intrinsically determinate motility which continually unfolds or atrophies as the case may be. Captivation is at the same time motility, and this belongs to the essence of the organism.<sup>238</sup>

This bite in the tail, or at least near the tail, of Heidegger’s analysis of the animal as captivated behaviour should not surprise us. The account of the animal has, of necessity been interwoven and fundamentally linked with a more general account of life, and life, as we all know, has a tempo or flow of its own. “Even in our everyday experience we are familiar with the birth, growth, maturing, aging, and death of animals.”<sup>239</sup> This process and animation which, only now, comes to the fore brings with it the tension we found above in sub-section a)’s *binding* of the animal to the open. The *Ver-* of the animal’s *Verbundenheit* to its environment contained within it the *struggle*, the straining, against, within, and beyond the bounds of traditional metaphysical conceptions of essence.

---

<sup>235</sup> *ibid*, p. 264

<sup>236</sup> *ibid*, p. 265

<sup>237</sup> *ibid*

<sup>238</sup> *ibid*

<sup>239</sup> *ibid*

How then might this turn to motility and to the process or flow of the animal relate to the sleeper and to our comparative analysis thereof? Whilst there are many possible interpretations we will here indicate two substantive ones, which happen to contradict. Firstly, it might be thought that the resulting incompleteness of Heidegger's account of the animal illustrates the point of severance of the somnological-zoological analogy. Whereas the animal fundamentally contains, is animated by, motility, the sleeper, as we see in Aristotle's account, precisely lacks this – "sleep is an ἀκίνησία [akinesia, not-move, quiescence, or rest]."<sup>240</sup> The sleeper, with their exile from Dasein, world and projection, on this account also loses that which complicates and makes incomplete the account of the animal so far offered – movement, transformation and process. This interpretation certainly rests on common intuitions about sleep – when wishing to traverse, or to move at all, we do not usually go for a nap – and yet, as we will see, there are good reasons to favour an alternative unpacking of the relevance of this internal incompleteness of the animal analysis for any Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep.

Instead, let us take the account we have so far been developing of the sleeper as, still in analogy with the animal, fundamentally incomplete. This takes the ἀ- of ἀκίνησία as not, in the case of sleep, indicating a total lack of motility but rather as describing a problematic and alien type thereof. We might formulate this as the requirement that we truly investigate the relationship between the sleeper and movement, process and flow.<sup>241</sup> There are many ways we might begin to describe this somnolent motility: the gentle rise and fall of the chest in sleep; the twitching, tossing and turning, to whatever degree, of all sleepers; or the sleepwalker's parallel life of journeys, activities and accidents. However, all of these remain within the familiar – to waking everyday Dasein that is – realm of spatial motility. Heidegger, conversely, as his description of the everyday experience of the motility of animals demonstrates, has in mind movement through time. Heidegger's point, in application to the organism, can be taken as mirroring Husserl's movement from static to genetic phenomenology: it is not enough to describe the static unity of the organism when the organism is not incidentally, or secondarily, just as much a unity across time – "the organism as we now understand it does not simply happen to get caught

---

<sup>240</sup> *ibid*, p. 62

<sup>241</sup> In our final Chapter the last of these will be brought out in particular focus given the discerning of an intriguing connection between sleep and water or liquidity, in Nancy's work.

up as it were in this motility. Rather, this motility determines the being of the animal as such.”<sup>242</sup> The sleeper too then must not be conceived as a static unity. And yet here too arises one of the most striking features of the sleeper’s temporal motility: it is intermittent or interrupted.<sup>243</sup> Can we even speak of a unity of the sleeper across the daily, noisy and alert, plains of waking life? Holding aside this intriguing question it remains nonetheless plausible that we, regardless of how we answer the question of the sleeper’s trans-wakeful unity, go wrong when we treat sleep as a state, condition, or entity which might be extracted from its “*motility of a peculiar kind*”.<sup>244</sup>

“Birth, maturing, aging, and death all too obviously remind us of the being of man, which we recognize as being historical.”<sup>245</sup> However, as this phrase, this “all too obviously”, reminds us we must be wary of distinguishing the animal so sharply from the stone – from that which does not have motility inherent to its mode of being – that we fall, unsuspectingly, into the error of anthropomorphising the animal. Heidegger, snapping of his gaze back in the other direction of comparative analysis, draws out the questions of history and death. Very quickly we are moved from the question of a “particular individual” animal’s history to that of “the animal kind, the species”.<sup>246</sup> Heidegger’s hope is that this type of questioning offers renewed resources for bringing into question such “celebrated and notorious” concepts as “development”.<sup>247</sup> Yet, unsurprisingly we are also reminded that it is questionable whether we should “speak of history at all where the being of the animal is concerned?”<sup>248</sup>

With Heidegger’s brief but fascinating engagement with the *end* of life, here at the end of his chapter on the mode of being of life, we discover another reason to favour our second, and chosen, interpretation of the importance of Heidegger’s parting revelations on animal motility for our account of the sleeper. Namely, that the question of life’s motility “is not an arbitrary one and cannot possibly be dealt with by subsequently

---

<sup>242</sup> *ibid*, p. 265

<sup>243</sup> This, of course, harks back to our initial questioning, with de Warren, of the relationship between sleep and interruption and how this precipitated Husserl’s appreciation of the problem of sleep for phenomenology.

<sup>244</sup> *ibid*

<sup>245</sup> *ibid*

<sup>246</sup> *ibid*

<sup>247</sup> *ibid*, p. 266

<sup>248</sup> *ibid*

trying to insert it into the analysis as it were”.<sup>249</sup> Surely this prohibition against subsequently tacking on motility to the essence of life as captivity is just as prohibitive of our subtracting of motility from the captivity of the sleeper. Furthermore, our own Chapter’s premise has been that sleep is fundamentally, and intriguingly, as closely linked to life as it is to death. Thus it is that Heidegger’s intertwining of death and life in these final pages of Chapter 4 is particularly interesting for us.

“The touchstone for the appropriateness and originary character of every question concerning the essence of life lies in whether or not this question has adequately grasped the problem of death and whether or not it is able to take it up into its own question concerning the essence of life in the correct way, and vice versa.”<sup>250</sup> Heidegger is cautious to note that this is not the same thing as treating one or the other as the *sufficient* explanatory condition for understanding the other. However, the necessity of understanding death in relation to the animal’s motility, and thus its life, is clear – “the problem of the motility of life has to be unfolded in relation to death, although not death alone.”<sup>251</sup> The sleeper, thus, as analogous with the animal, cannot be understood, in its motility, without considering its death. Once again we are brought back to the question of the sleeper’s longevity. Does the sleeper die with each dawn? Or does the sleeper live on whilst we dream that they have long since departed?

However, it is here that Heidegger’s appeal to comparative examination is brought back to centre stage. For “it is questionable whether death and death are the same in the case of man and animal, even if we can identify a physico-chemical and physiological equivalence between the two.”<sup>252</sup> Even, or perhaps most so, in death “the animal is [still] separated from man by an abyss.”<sup>253</sup> Captivity, as the structure of living organisms already sets “*quite determinate possibilities of death*”, or limits for the animal.<sup>254</sup> In fact, Heidegger is explicit: “the animal cannot die in the sense in which dying is ascribed to human beings but can only come to an end.”<sup>255</sup> This ‘coming to an end’ suggests a possible course for comparing these comments on the animal’s death with that of the

---

<sup>249</sup> *ibid*

<sup>250</sup> *ibid*

<sup>251</sup> *ibid*

<sup>252</sup> *ibid*, p. 267

<sup>253</sup> *ibid*, p. 264. Also see Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, pp. 126 – 131

<sup>254</sup> *ibid*, p. 267

<sup>255</sup> *ibid*

sleeper's end. Perhaps the return to waking is a similar *end*? Never a death but always something final. Enough for motility but not enough for contact with the *nothing* and existential angst. However, given our insights about sleep, and the sleeper, being, through the analogy with the animal analysis, strikingly removed from the periodic and state-based conception we are required to question these over hasty moves from animal demise to sleep's cessation. In a similar vein, one might claim that this excluding of the captivated from death reveals that 'the good death' as we often conceive it, dying in one's sleep that is, is in fact, for Heidegger, no *death* at all.<sup>256</sup>

Section 61 closes with a reminder that this account of the animal's essence was itself initiated by Heidegger's controversial thesis: 'The animal is poor in world.' The question arises of how the relationship or priority between this thesis and this characterisation, as captivated, should be conceived. It is in exploring this question of priority that Section 62 returns us to the paradox of the animal's, apparent, poverty *and* wealth in world.

With the *animal* we find a *having of world* and a *not-having of world*. Either this result is intrinsically contradictory and impossible, or we are employing the word 'world' – as the accessibility of beings – in a different sense each time when we formulate the problem in terms of the animal having world and not having world. In that case the concept of world has not yet adequately been elucidated.<sup>257</sup>

This puzzle or paradox of the animal was originally encountered in Section 48 of *FCM* and closes the introductory remarks on the comparative examination in Chapter 3 whilst presenting the problematic which drives Chapter 4, and thus the animal analysis as a whole. Now, at the end of that analysis, we can see that there was, indeed, an equivocation in the use of 'world' the initial paradox. The point upon which this confusion rests is found in the phrase "as the accessibility of beings" of 'world' in our previous quotation. Now with the animal's captivation explored we can see that the animal does have "access to... and indeed to something that actually is. But this is something that *only we* are capable of experiencing and having manifest *as beings*."<sup>258</sup> The 'as-structure' is lacking

---

<sup>256</sup> Nancy's alternative view of the connection between sleep and death and good and evil, the normativity of sleep, is considered in the next Chapter. See pp. 187 – 212, below.

<sup>257</sup> *ibid.*, p. 268

<sup>258</sup> *ibid.*, p. 269



for the animal and as such we begin to see with clarity what the animal lacks, the true significance of thesis [2.]. However, the initial puzzle presented in Section 48, which we discussed on pp. 103 – 104 above, speaks of a having and a not having *of world*. Here, at least, Heidegger is emphatic: “...the animal essentially cannot have world at all, although that which it relates to can always be experienced as a being in *our* experience.”<sup>259</sup> Fundamentally one cannot ascribe a world to an entity that does not have beings manifest to it.

This *not*-having of world, this decisive exiling of the beast from *our* world and “*our* experience”, must also allow for the maintenance of the poverty structure we analysed in our tracing of Heidegger’s opening comparative moves in Chapter 3, Part II, *FCM*. Thus we must recall that “this not-having of world does not force the animal alongside the stone”.<sup>260</sup> Heidegger’s notion of poverty requires that the not-having of the animal is only possible on the basis of a certain having. What possession could amount to the condition of the possibility of the animal’s poverty in world?

Being open in captivation is the *essential possession* of the animal. On the basis of this possession it can be deprived, it can be poor, it can be determined in its being by poverty. This having is certainly *not a having of world*, but rather being held captive to the disinhibiting ring – it is *a having of that which disinhibits*.<sup>261</sup>

Thus it is that, whilst the puzzle of the animal’s relationship to world *appears* settled, the intermediate and constitutently poor character of animal being is retained. The animal’s “not-having of world is not merely a case of having less of world in comparison with man, but rather a case of not having at all – but this now in the sense of a *not-having*, i.e., on the basis of a having.”<sup>262</sup>

For our purposes we must remind ourselves that this very puzzle, which now *appears* solved, amounted, in its structure, to our final piece of textual evidence for the potential for approaching Heidegger’s phenomenology of sleep *through* his comparative examination in our opening engagements with the comparative examination. There we pointed to the similarly paradoxical structure of whatever is sleeping’s relationship with

---

<sup>259</sup> *ibid*

<sup>260</sup> *ibid*

<sup>261</sup> *ibid*, pp. 269 – 270

<sup>262</sup> *ibid*, p. 270

being-there, both being-there and not-being-there, and the animal's relationship to world, having and not-having.<sup>263</sup> Now we must ask two questions: firstly, whether Heidegger's solution to the puzzle of the animal's world offers an equivalent solution to our mirrored comparative examination of the sleeper's relationship with world; and secondly, whether this decisive moment sheds any light on the sleeper's relationship with being-there, with Dasein. Both questions should, it will be shown, be answered in the affirmative, all that remains is to show the manner of this affirmation.

Beginning with our own comparative analysis of the corpse, the sleeper, and Dasein – 'what is the sleeper's relationship with world?' If, through the twists and turns of Heidegger's comparative path [*vergleichenden Weg*], our analogy has held between the sleeper and our abyssal cousins then, as we have seen, the captivation of the sleeper denies it, like the animal, world. However, the difficulty comes, as we have also already discussed, in considering how this denial leaves the sleeper distinct from the corpse. In other words, what is the not-having of world of the sleeper, its poverty, based on. What is the primordial *possession* of the sleeper which allows its deprivation of world and of beings? Surely it is precisely life itself that the sleeper possesses. The regular beat of blood around the body, the rise and fall of the chest, and, fundamentally, it's being bound [*Verbundenheit*] to its environment, to its locale. Life is always in place and this, the place of sleep, amounts to the very possession upon which the sleeper's poverty in world stands.

And, of course, this appears to tellingly chime with the conclusion of our existential analysis of the sleeper – that Dasein does not sleep. The sleeper is *not*-being-there, is not Dasein. Yet this apparently definitive statement, when taken by itself, fails to realise the proximity between Dasein and the sleeper. Fails to recognise the abyssal kinship. We must remember that sleeping could be "rightly conceive of" as "being-away" and yet being-away *for Dasein* "is not something which happens arbitrarily from time to time, but is an essential characteristic of man's very being".<sup>264</sup> Here the ambiguity of the relationship between waking and sleeping and being-there and being-away, the ontological priority, appears settled. However, even without the destabilising of this priority which we are about to encounter, it is essential to see that two intriguing questions are already pressed upon us. Firstly, how is the sleeper's being-away related to that of

---

<sup>263</sup> See pp. 52 – 53, and p. 103, above.

<sup>264</sup> *ibid*, p. 63. See pp. 61 – 62, above.

Dasein? To quote Krell “How do matters stand (as Heidegger likes to ask) with an abyss of essential separation, a chasm, which at the same time marks an abysmal affinity, a chiasm?”<sup>265</sup> And, secondly, upon what, upon which possession, is the sleeper’s being-away founded? This latter question cannot be answered, as in the case of Dasein, through a *being-there*. Unless it is Dasein itself that guarantors the very possibility of sleep. Yet surely another option presents itself. Once again the place, the ‘there’ of the sleeper’s mode of being, striped of its relationship with being and ontology is that which distinguishes the sleeper from waking Dasein. This ‘where’ of sleep *is* the sleeper.

Yet this settling of puzzles raises, as we have just seen, the question of Dasein’s connection with the animal and with the sleeper – the animal lacks beings but “that which it relates to can always be experienced as a being in *our* experience.”<sup>266</sup> It is this relationship, this perspectival move, which, at the beginning of Section 63, returns us to the methodological and more, discussions of the very possibility of describing the animal’s essence, to, in other words, transposition. However, this debate now takes the form of an “objection to our [Heidegger’s] thesis”.<sup>267</sup> The objection is neatly summarised thus: “It is only from the human perspective that the animal is poor with respect to world, yet animal being in itself is not a deprivation of world.”<sup>268</sup> This takes the form of a limiting of our ability to ascribe content to animality. We can be “certain”, for Heidegger, of the intermediate position of the animal *and* that this involves a “not-having” of world.<sup>269</sup> But is this not-having rightly conceived as “an essential *poverty* with regard to world?”<sup>270</sup> Heidegger provides us with two reasons we might think that “the thesis concerning the animal’s poverty in world goes too far.”<sup>271</sup> The first is that surely deprivation, over not-having, requires that one knows something of that of which one is deprived – “But this is precisely what we have denied in the case of the animal”.<sup>272</sup> What is more this epistemic problem appears all the more pressing given that humans also, “first and for the most part”, do not “properly know of world as such.”<sup>273</sup> Secondly, the negativity of poverty –

---

<sup>265</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 6

<sup>266</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 269

<sup>267</sup> *ibid*, p. 270

<sup>268</sup> *ibid*, pp. 270 – 271

<sup>269</sup> *ibid*, p. 270

<sup>270</sup> *ibid*

<sup>271</sup> *ibid*

<sup>272</sup> *ibid*

<sup>273</sup> *ibid*

“a kind of pain and suffering” – would presumably be discernible in the essence of all living beings.<sup>274</sup> And yet:

Biology knows absolutely nothing of such a phenomenon. Perhaps it is the privilege of poets to imagine this sort of thing. “This has nothing to do with science.”<sup>275</sup>

This shift from science to poetry marks the limits of his initial thesis, thesis [2.]. It is “not an interpretation which remains true to the proper essence of animality, but merely a comparative illustration.”<sup>276</sup> The thesis is “misleading precisely with respect to the essence of animality itself”.<sup>277</sup>

And yet, the apparent downgrading of the guiding thesis of the animal analysis is not to be. Instead, we are reminded that all this, all the analyses of animal being and the comparative examination of which they are part, are orientated from *out of* the fundamental attunement of boredom and towards the “‘as a whole’ which profound boredom itself manifests”.<sup>278</sup> As such we are told that in spite of our movement “closer to an elucidation of the concept of world”, we have, so far, “merely acquainted ourselves with the negative side of the matter.”<sup>279</sup> This “negative side” is the animal in its captivation, as the not-having of world. But why *negative* given the great efforts undertaken to retain the *intermediate* position of animality? The thought is once again perspectival: from Dasein’s world-forming perspective the animal is allied with the stone in its *not*-having world. The natural result is that we must clarify this very perspective in relation to world. In fact, “the supposedly purely negative characterization – our examination of the not-having of world – will only begin to exercise its full effect once we prepare to bring out the essence of world with respect to the world-formation of man.”<sup>280</sup> This functions as a response to the first aspect of the objection as just described – not ourselves having clarified world how are we to know with certainty that poverty does not accurately describe the animal’s relation to world? Indeed, for Heidegger, “we

---

<sup>274</sup> *ibid*, p. 271

<sup>275</sup> *ibid*

<sup>276</sup> *ibid*

<sup>277</sup> *ibid*

<sup>278</sup> *ibid*, p. 272

<sup>279</sup> *ibid*

<sup>280</sup> *ibid*

have no right *now*, or at least *as yet no right to alter our thesis that the animal is poor in world or to level it down to ... a mere not-having*".<sup>281</sup>

What though of the charge of the negativity inherent in this ascription of poverty to the animal, the second aspect of the objection? In this penultimate paragraph of the animal analysis Heidegger returns us to two essential, and essentially disrupting [*erschütternd*], features of animal being. The animal "finds itself essentially exposed to something other than itself," something that "brings an *essential disruption* [*wesenhalt Erschütterung*] into the essence of the animal."<sup>282</sup> How this shocking, trembling in the face of the open is supposed to combat the "pessimism" or negativity of poverty will be considered momentarily.<sup>283</sup> Yet, for us this shattering [*erschütternd*] at the heart of the animal should put us in mind of the way in which sleep caused, in Heidegger's brief treatment of it, the very principle of non-contradiction "to shatter [*erschüttern*] in its very foundations."<sup>284</sup> Metaphysics, its principles and our accounts of essences, our definitions, are shaken or disrupted here. The last word on the animal, quite properly, goes to death, for "we cannot clarify it [the essence of the animal] until and unless we also take into account the fundamental phenomenon of the life process [motility] and thus death as well."<sup>285</sup> This shaking, open, mode of being hurtling, as it is, through *its* environment and *its* time and always towards *its* death, if we may call it such, must, much like Heidegger's thesis "remain as a problem".<sup>286</sup> As must that hint of a somnolent mode of being which we have been following and awakening through this Chapter.

## VI: Conclusions and Controversies

So much for the somnolent *Holzweg* within Heidegger's animal analysis, his animal trail, *Tier Weg*. Yet, as we have seen, these paths are no easy countryside strolls. They pass, instead, through the dark embraces of ancient places teeming with life, not so much the Black Forest as the primordial forest, and a forest of night. This gloomy forest, like that in the fairy tales of the Brothers Grimm, holds dangers both for Heidegger, and,

---

<sup>281</sup> *ibid*

<sup>282</sup> *ibid*, p. 273

<sup>283</sup> *ibid*

<sup>284</sup> *ibid*, p. 61

<sup>285</sup> *ibid*, p. 273

<sup>286</sup> *ibid*

indeed, for those who would retrace his steps. The question must be asked whether Heidegger has followed in the animal's tracks successfully. David Farrell Krell offers us a useful way of approaching an answer when he, borrowing a phrase from Faulkner, describes *FCM* as Heidegger's "most splendid failure".<sup>287</sup> We must, with Krell, ask why 'splendid' and why a 'failure'? "Splendid because Heidegger here tries with remarkable persistence and energy to compare the world-relations of stone, animal, and human being, without collapsing into either crass physicalism or naive vitalism and anthropomorphism."<sup>288</sup> Like Odysseus on that most awe inspiring of journeys Heidegger must avoid the almost human grasping of the Scylla of anthropomorphism whilst remaining free from the persistent pull of the Charybdis of anthropocentrism.<sup>289</sup> These twin perils frame his analysis and both guarantee its brilliance whilst determining its limits. Furthermore they echo the risks that accompany our own project: we must neither level sleep down, *à la* physicalism and anthropocentrism's reductive perspective, nor project waking characteristics into or over the sleeper, as its phenomenologically problematic status invites us to do.

In the ancient myth the two perils of beast and natural event, sometimes rationalised as shoals of rocks or a reef, and a whirlpool, are positioned such that a sailor, Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, has no choice but to choose one or the other trial to face. There is no middle, or intermediate, course to chart. As such Odysseus, following the advice of Circe, elects to face the many heads of Scylla and lose only a few men rather than risk the loss of his entire boat and crew to the maw of the whirlpool Charybdis. The genius of Heidegger's text lies in its attempt to do what even cunning Odysseus could not – hold fast to an intermediate course. However, as we will now examine, through our chosen example of Krell's *Daimon Life*, there has been a proliferation of commentators who

---

<sup>287</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 8

<sup>288</sup> *ibid*

<sup>289</sup> To be sure anthropocentrism is not limited to physicalism. Many anthropocentric positions – those evident in the Abrahamic religions, for example – are decidedly resistant to physicalism and naturalism more generally. However, it is correct to see physicalism as a type of anthropocentrism, as we will see in a moment when tracing William McNeill's defence of Heidegger's animal analysis. Physicalism, in levelling all beings down to the same mode of being, that of the present-at-hand, assumes the legitimacy of the position of the observing subject which describes such uniformity. This anthropocentrism is felt in the "all things being equal" that is implicit in the physicalist's reduction back from our embodied and emplaced engagement with the world. It makes no matter whether we apply the same levelling down to ourselves as humans constructed of cells programmed by genes and so on and so forth. This secondary step is always already built on the hubris of assuming our privileged access to objectivity.

argue that instead Heidegger merely chooses one horn of the dilemma, and that his choice shows both less wisdom and less self-awareness than that of Odysseus'.<sup>290</sup>

For Krell there can be no doubt that Heidegger, despite his best efforts, sails thoroughly within the remit of anthropocentrism and is sucked ineluctably back to a position akin to metaphysics – “it is blatantly anthropocentric”.<sup>291</sup> This “failure”, which Krell will call “a colossal” and “*daimonic* failure”, is tied to the “self-objection” with which Heidegger closes the animal analysis.<sup>292</sup> It is a failure to relinquish the dominant and imperious position of the human observer and thus approach the animal justly and without prior, metaphysical, assumptions. From such a perspective, whether acknowledged or not, Heidegger cannot but take the animal’s essence as bound [*gebundene*].

Before offering responses to this charge, via the detailed and sympathetic reading of *FCM* found in the work of William McNeill, let us isolate the three main strands of Krell’s critique of Heidegger’s animal analysis as found in the following extract:

For he [Heidegger] openly confesses that he is unable to say anything about the way in which *death* intervenes in both animal and human life. Not only does he find himself resorting to a blatantly metaphysical and even ontotheological appeal to the “as-structure,” which here means the apophantic rather than the hermeneutic “as” and the discourse of *Vorhandenheit* more than anything else, but he also catches himself (or *almost* catches himself) reverting to the distinction between human dying and animal perishing, *Sterben* as opposed to *Verenden*, even though it has become clear to all that something very much like the nothing (*das Nichts*) shatters the ring of animal as well as human life.<sup>293</sup>

The three lines of critique here can be summarised thus: 1) Heidegger sets up an unjustifiably sharp distinction between animal and human life; 2) this distinction is based on an appeal to the “as-structure” which seems to undo, as opposed to build on, the

---

<sup>290</sup> The list of philosophers who have taken issue with Heidegger’s account of the animal is exceedingly long and such commentaries vary greatly in type and in quality. For example, Derrida’s *Of Spirit* marks perhaps the beginning of serious critical attention to *FCM*’s animal analysis and provides a tantalisingly brief though thoroughly ingenious list of worries. These worries would later be analysed and developed by thinkers such as Simon Glendinning, in his book *On Being with Others – Heidegger, Derrida, Wittgenstein*, and Krell. At the other end of the spectrum there now exist numerous anaemic versions of the charge of anthropocentrism such as John Gray’s *Straw Dogs*, pp. 48 – 52.

<sup>291</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 130

<sup>292</sup> *ibid.*, p. 128

<sup>293</sup> *ibid.*, p. 13

groundbreaking work of *Being and Time*; and 3), fundamentally Heidegger seems unable to account for the animal's relationship to death, and thus to "something very much like the nothing (*das Nichts*)".

The first of these points of criticism, 1), can be seen as containing the other two, 2) and 3), in setting-up a hierarchy which amounts to a fervent anthropocentrism. The implausibility of this holding us aloof from the animal and denying of the animal such Dasein-specific qualities as comportment, for example, is demonstrated, Krell argues, by, amongst other things, a couple of slips in Heidegger's own application of this terminological demarcating. "For a brief moment Heidegger allows himself to slip back into the living language of (human) comportment: the bee "comports itself" toward the sun (*verhält sich zur Sonne*). Later he will be guilty of the same *lapsus calami*, when the female praying mantis devours her mate."<sup>294</sup> However, as we have already cited twice, it is Krell's belief that Heidegger is guilty of, what Rilke calls, 'drawing distinctions too sharply.'<sup>295</sup> What is the problem with sharp distinctions we might, quite reasonably, ask? One is tempted to reply that Krell's problem with such things is just as tied to his philosophical pedigree as he argues is Heidegger's sharp distinguishing of the man from the animal – deconstruction often seeks to problematize dualisms. This tempting but unfair charge would be to miss Krell's specific focus on the topic of *life*. Krell's point is rather that when specifically dealing with the squirming and slippery question of life sharp distinctions slice through all too blindly.

In this specific case we must ask what it is that could justify this sharp separation, this cleaving of us from our abyssal kin? It is, as we have seen, in 2) above, the "as-structure" but essentially Krell argues that not "the foundational hermeneutical-as but the derivative aphophantic-as comes to dominate – and undo – fundamental ontology; furthermore, as Heidegger himself here suspects, his earlier labors to establish a "fundamental attunement" for metaphysics will have been in vain."<sup>296</sup> This aphophantic-as is derivative for it relies on the hermeneutical-as of Dasein as developed in *Being and Time*, an "as-" that is prior to and importantly distinct from the aphophantic-as of everyday and technical language. For Krell this amounts to a slip back into the old

---

<sup>294</sup> *ibid.*, p. 126

<sup>295</sup> *ibid.*, p. 1

<sup>296</sup> *ibid.*, p. 129



metaphysical prejudices of many a humanist philosopher: “human beings are once again those logical, logistical living beings who have the word and who take the floor to declare that animals inhabit an impoverished world”.<sup>297</sup> It is the focus on ‘declaration’, on our naming this *as* that, which seems to Krell a step backwards to the familiar picture of ontotheology – as familiar as *Genesis* 2:20 and man’s naming of the beasts and plants of the earth. In contrast “animal life is an essence that is enigmatically and hermetically sealed within its own undifferentiated self-revealing and self-concealing.”<sup>298</sup>

Finally, 3), Krell is particularly incensed by the incompleteness which, by Heidegger’s own admission, plagues his analysis. As we saw in Section 61, sub-section c) the account of the animal as captivated is missing an essential aspect – an account of the animal’s motility, what Krell calls the “animatedness (*Bewegtheit*) of life.”<sup>299</sup> This in its turn requires us to face “the difficult problem of death” and inquire as to the death of the animal, into the finitude of animality.<sup>300</sup> In the case of *Dasein*, famously, death, our being-toward-death, can individuate us and wrench us back to ourselves, back to our ownmost being. Just before this lecture course Heidegger had presented this feature of the being of *Dasein* as a relation to the nothing (*das Nichts*).<sup>301</sup> Yet, as our long extract from Krell above makes clear, Heidegger will deny the animal exactly this relationship to the nothing: “*Nein!* he cries, but why the need to shout?”<sup>302</sup> Just as we repeatedly encountered the limits of our intermediate analysis of the sleeper through the necessity of considering its relationship with death, so Heidegger encounters a similar limit, as far as Krell is concerned, in the “touchstone” of death.<sup>303</sup> However, Krell is not disappointed that Heidegger struggles with such a difficult question but rather with his recourse to the old “distinction between human dying and animal perishing, *Sterben* as opposed to *Verenden*”,<sup>304</sup> as if, or so Krell sees it, the entire animal analysis was for naught and Heidegger efforts can but “reduplicate beliefs and prejudices that have prevailed throughout the history of metaphysics?”<sup>305</sup> The concern is that, in spite of his protestations

---

<sup>297</sup> *ibid*

<sup>298</sup> *ibid*, p. 17

<sup>299</sup> *ibid*, p. 128

<sup>300</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 273. Also cited in Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 111

<sup>301</sup> Heidegger, Martin. ‘What is Metaphysics?’, in *Pathmarks*, pp. 82 – 96

<sup>302</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 127

<sup>303</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 266. Cited and discussed in Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, pp. 128 – 129

<sup>304</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life – Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*, p. 13

<sup>305</sup> *ibid*, p. 19

to the contrary, Heidegger has returned to the old hierarchy of beings: with the bee lower than the baboon and the entire plant and animal kingdom ruled *over* by man. Or to put it another way: that “deprivation”, “captivation”, “elimination”, and, perhaps most of all, “bound” are not as stripped of their normative connotations as Heidegger would like.

One cannot help but notice that these complaints that Krell raises against Heidegger map almost perfectly onto the very findings of our own somnolent excavations. Sleep is sharply separated from Dasein – it is exiled from existence and reduced to life. When we push at why this line of demarcation arises we found that the sleeper lacks projection and stance, it lacks the *as*-structure or beings *as* beings. And lastly, the sleeper’s relationship with death, our ownmost and their daily dissolution, remains shrouded in uncertainty and seems to push the comparative examination to its breaking point. What if such findings, as seems clear in the final case, were in fact the very signs of the failure of our method? The failure of Heidegger, and us with him, to successfully navigate the reefs of anthropomorphism and the maelstrom of anthropocentrism?

William McNeill, in the first chapter of *The Time of Life*, sees such criticisms as failing to grasp the radicality of Heidegger’s treatment of the animal. If Krell takes seriously and develops the “self-objection” with which Heidegger ends his animal analysis,<sup>306</sup> then McNeill elaborates on, and defends, Heidegger’s response to that objection. The core of this response, as we saw above, is that we must not be overly hasty in dismissing the thesis of the animal’s poverty in world *as deprivation* until we have gained a handle on at least one more of the theses of the comparative examination: “man is *world-forming*.” With this in mind McNeill not only interprets the animal analysis differently to Krell, and others, but also reminds us not to take these chapters out of their context of the comparative examination, and of Heidegger’s thinking more generally. “Only if one isolates the analyses of animal Being from their proper context, as tends to happen in contemporary debate, does the thesis that the animal is “poor in world” appear to merely reinscribe a fundamentally traditional, metaphysical “theory” distinguishing the animal from the human.”<sup>307</sup>

<sup>306</sup> “...section 63, which raises an objection to the thesis concerning the animal’s impoverished world. The objection, as far as I can see, is not met.” Krell, F. David. *Daimon Life*, p. 128

<sup>307</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 50

In contradistinction with Krell, who finds Heidegger's protestations against vitalism and entelechy to be a mere cover for his reintroduction of metaphysical distinctions, McNeill sees in Heidegger's text a fundamental opposition to anthropomorphism, and *thus* to the tradition's anthropocentrism as well. His defences of the animal analysis can be broadly divided into three kinds: i) countering the broad charge that Heidegger slips back into metaphysics in this lecture course; ii) demonstrating how it is possible to take seriously Heidegger's claim to be doing justice to the animal's being from *out of its being*, or in other words, how the terms with which Heidegger describes the animal need *only appear* negative or derogatory; and lastly, iii) unpacking, as instructed, the third and final thesis of the comparative examination – man's world-formation. As with Krell the latter two of these arguments can be seen as elements internal to the main thrust of former.

As we saw in our examination of Section 61, sub-section b) above Heidegger's description of the animal is not supposed to provide a new account of the *essence* of animality but rather to question the very applicability of assignment of essences in this case.<sup>308</sup> The following extract illustrates McNeill's core argument and its relationship with its component parts – ii) and iii):

Given that the "organism" is a fundamentally *open* way of Being, it is evidently problematic even to claim that one could conclusively define, that is, delimit in a definitional *logos* that would circumscribe its Being, *what* "the animal" in its essence "*is*." Even Heidegger's characterization of the *way of Being* of the animal as *Benommenheit* [1] neither claims to be a conclusive theory of animality that would be valid for all time, [2] nor does it present a blanket theory of animal Being that could simply be "applied" indifferently to all animals. [3] Nor, finally, does it present a definition that would simply allow us to oppose animals on the one side to human beings on the other.<sup>309</sup>

The final three claims, [1] – [3], amount to straight-forward rejections of commonly put criticisms of Heidegger's account of the animal. For example, [1] and [3] can both be found throughout Krell's work, whereas [2] is one of Derrida's most direct critiques of Heidegger found in *Of Spirit*.<sup>310</sup> It is of primary significance, however, to identify what

---

<sup>308</sup> See pp. 140 – 141, above.

<sup>309</sup> *ibid*, pp. 34 – 35

<sup>310</sup> Derrida, Jacques. *Of Spirit*, p. 57. See also Glendinning, Simon. *On Being with Others*, p. 68

motivates this rejection of “*what*” questions, questions of “essence”, in the case of the animal?

Here a return to the mythical duality of Scylla and Charybdis is instructive. Whereas we have been treating anthropomorphism and anthropocentrism, and indeed vitalism and physicalism, as two horns of a dilemma facing whosoever would undertake a philosophical account of the animal, we have perhaps lost sight of what underpins this predicament itself. What McNeill takes Heidegger’s account to be doing, rather than plotting a course between these two perils or falling prey to one or the other, is overturning the presuppositions of the dilemma. As such our very distinction between anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism begins to lose its traction. It matters not whether we determine the animal’s essence as less than ours on some universal scale or whether we establish the animal’s essence as equivalent to ours via reference to our own. In both cases we have resorted to a metaphysical schema which Heidegger is explicitly withdrawing from: “...Heidegger’s analyses problematize from the outset any attempt to understand the Being of the organism or of the animal on the basis of a presupposed *eidōs*.”<sup>311</sup> This presupposition is already to take for granted “the medieval interpretation of the Being of beings as substance, an interpretation prepared in part by Greek philosophy”.<sup>312</sup>

It is the schema of hidden *eidōs*, accessible via *logos*, which Heidegger disrupts in his comparative examination, according to McNeill. To see the details of this anti-metaphysical turn we must consider ii) and iii), respectively, Heidegger’s non-derogatory ascription of world poverty, and his calling into question of the essence of man. In both cases world or world-relation must remain at the centre – “The entire analysis of animal Being, we must recall (and Heidegger is emphatic about this), is subservient to this leading task [inquiring after the meaning of world].”<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 31.

<sup>312</sup> *ibid*, p. 33. This connection to the notion of “substance” should put us in mind of Heidegger’s last Marburg lecture course, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, and Heidegger’s work there with Leibniz’s treatment of being. In so doing we come closer to acknowledging the context of *FCM*, as well as the animal analysis, within what some have called Heidegger’s ‘metontological period’. For example, McNeill himself in ‘Metaphysics, Fundamental Ontology, Metontology 1925 – 1935’, in *Heidegger Studies*, Volume 8, 1992, pp. 63 – 81, and Michael Lewis in his ‘The relation between transcendental philosophy and empirical science in Heidegger’s *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*’, footnote 15, p. 5, forthcoming.

<sup>313</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 50

Beginning with iii): man's relation to world is one of world-formation.

Is it the human being that in each case forms the world, as Heidegger's third thesis, "man is world-forming," might seem to claim? If so, are we not after all trapped in a kind of anthropocentric perspectivism in which human beings, whether as individuals or collective subjects, somehow form and thus "have" their human world, from which they could know nothing of the "world" or "worlds" of animals?<sup>314</sup>

However, a reading of the final chapters of *FCM* illustrates, for McNeill, that Heidegger is not setting-up man as the author of world, in some traditionally metaphysical and idealist sense, but rather describing man as the site of "an *event* that occurs and continues to occur", that "occurs in and through human beings, who partake in the happening of this event, although they do not originate it as "subjects.""<sup>315</sup> This is already enough to destabilise man's imperious position as the entity that crafts, at will, worlds. It is not man's decision to form worlds and as such we are being-in-the-world whether we like it or not. And this being-in involves, constitutively, attunement or disposition. It is this attunement which, as we have seen, is always *already* with us which conditions the very possibility of all our endeavours, including, essentially, any attempt to understand animal being, or indeed, that of the sleeper.

The primacy of attunement in the disclosure of our Being entails that living nature, in holding us captive, is never entirely reducible to an object of theoretical contemplation. Rather, it is that to which we are always already bound in advance, that which binds us prior to all our activities and actions."<sup>316</sup>

We do not stand, imperious, over and above the animals naming left, right, and centre but rather are always already, through our "bodily attunement (prior to any self-disclosure or presence as such)", involved in life *and* in "the happening of language."<sup>317</sup> The aphophantic as-structure is itself rooted in this event of world-formation. However, this also has the effect of precluding an absolute detachment from life, from the animal.

---

<sup>314</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 39 – 40

<sup>315</sup> *ibid.*, p. 40

<sup>316</sup> *ibid.*, p. 41

<sup>317</sup> *ibid.*, p. 42

And yet, it is the ‘binding’ of this extract which brings us to McNeill’s insistence that the animal’s being is not being denigrated in Heidegger’s account but rather is receiving the justice it deserves – is being allowed the freedom it requires. We are put in mind of the *Ver-* of the animal’s *Verbundenheit* to its environment, just as we were put in mind of the *Gebundene* when reading Krell. McNeill, reminding us to look even a little beyond the narrow scope of the animal analysis, points to the “intrinsic elevation [*Erhabenheit*] of nature over itself, a sublimity that is lived in life itself.”<sup>318</sup> This must not be mistaken for a granting of extra status to the animal on some grand scale of being, the Hegelian spectrum Krell sees Heidegger as dangerously close to, but rather an acknowledging that for *Dasein*, an entity that is just as much living as it is questioning the meaning of being, nature will never be reducible to presence-at-hand. This is to acknowledge both that we are always already attuned as living and as transposed “*into the encircling contextual ring of living beings*”, and that the animal is thus, from our perspective as so attuned and transposed – but what other perspective could there be?, essentially *open* in its being.<sup>319</sup> “As a consequence of this very openness of the activity of living, the animal is always more than it already is: it exceeds every “already” in an incalculable manner that can never be theoretically discerned.”<sup>320</sup>

This appears a final blow to the biologist whom Heidegger had praised so highly, it appears to leave behind all possibility for ascertaining an essence of animality. But there can be no doubt that for all its dispelling of anthropomorphism, indeed, hidden metaphysical anthropomorphisms, it retains the special status of human being – though truly it is of the *Da-sein* of human being. We will return to this, the reasons for and the questions about it, momentarily through our consideration of Rafael Winkler and Raoui Padui’s two alternative takes on the exceptional status of this lecture course and of the limits of Heidegger’s animal analysis. First, however, we must consider where our sleeper is left after all of this to-ing and fro-ing between Scylla and Charybdis, between metaphysics and science, and between Heidegger, his detractors and his defenders.

Let us pick out a couple of promising consequences from McNeill’s reconstruction of Heidegger’s text which both reinforce and develop aspects of the animal

---

<sup>318</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 278

<sup>319</sup> *ibid.*, p. 276. But see pp. 276 – 279

<sup>320</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 43

analysis which we have already seen as fertile ground for any potential Heideggerian phenomenology of sleep. First we must remember that Heidegger asks after the ‘what’ of sleep and that it is this move which led us to consider the relationship between sleep and Dasein in the first place.<sup>321</sup> However, now, if our somnological-zoological analogy holds, we must see that ‘what’ questions are as inappropriate in regards to the sleeper as they are to any entity that shares in life with us. The ‘who’ of sleep is clearly just as out of the question given Heidegger resistance to anthropomorphism and his respect for the alterity of this other life encountered within the world but always refusing the world. Yet this only adds to our puzzlement about what and how we may speak of the sleeper? One is tempted to follow Heidegger’s suggested, but never actualised, ‘crossing out’ of the terms with which we discuss the sleeper – a language put to sleep.<sup>322</sup> Secondly, this openness of the sleeper and the inaccessibility of it is not some accidental feature of our theoretical method in approaching them. Instead our basic attunement, which is with us always, always involves a pointing back to that living within us. Sleep *lives* within even at our most wakeful moment and it is neither present to us, nor could be, yet we go wrong if we think that makes it nothing to us at all.

When it comes to animals and sleepers Heidegger’s analysis appears more and more a discourse of limits and of the limiting of our access. This is felt particularly strongly in Rafael Winkler’s ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, which will be the first of two brief examples of readings of *FCM* that seek to move beyond, as opposed to criticise or reconstruct and defend, Heidegger’s thought. Both Winkler and Padui, our second example, offer us insight into the unique status of *this* specific moment on Heidegger’s philosophical *Weg* and the consequences for any future phenomenology of sleep.

As Winkler’s title suggests his article focuses on the limitations, or poverty, allotted to human being, or Dasein, in the comparative examination’s investigations of world. This already intuitively fits with his stated aim “to undo once [sic] for all the oft-repeated charge of Heidegger’s anthropocentric interpretation of the animal”.<sup>323</sup> Yet, this

---

<sup>321</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 60. See p. 48, above.

<sup>322</sup> *ibid*, p. 198: “...we ought to cross out the word ‘rock’ in order to indicate that whatever the lizard is lying on is certainly given in some way for the lizard, and yet is not known to the lizard as a rock.” And see p. 102, above.

<sup>323</sup> Winkler, Rafael. ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, p. 521

initial goal is tempered by Winkler's later assertion "Derrida's remark in *Of Spirit*, that it is always a matter for Heidegger of 'marking an absolute limit between the living creature and the human Dasein', is indisputable, *except* for this very precise, very peculiar spot in Heidegger's text."<sup>324</sup> In this sense Winkler withdraws from the blanket defences, offered by McNeill, in focusing on a specific singularity within this very unique text in Heidegger's oeuvre. This "peculiar spot in Heidegger's text" is, as we suggested early in Chapter 2 above, Sections 49 and 50 and the discussion of transposition therein. Winkler finds in these sections a moment when "what Heidegger is saying... doesn't entirely agree with what he's doing or showing us."<sup>325</sup> This all turns on the question of the animal's *refusal* of transposition "which appears in man's relation to the animal".<sup>326</sup> Whereas many have read this, with good reason, as pointing towards the poverty of the animal – McNeill for example<sup>327</sup> – Winkler insists that instead Heidegger has here glimpsed "the question of man's access to life."<sup>328</sup>

"Surely man's poverty in world, life's refusal to give itself to man, is more mysterious, more enigmatic, more elusive than the animal's so-called *privatio* of the *logos*."<sup>329</sup> Winkler is here building on the thought that life, or rather our relation to it and its subsequent and necessary refusal of us, marks and illustrates our own poverty in world rather than that of the animal. He wonders "whether, instead of being quasi-indiscernible, man's relation-to-life doesn't bespeak an opaqueness of greater intensity than man's relation-to-death."<sup>330</sup> Here life, its radical refusal to us – which we have affirmed repeatedly through this analysis but most explicitly in McNeill's consideration of the openness of animality just considered – announces our finitude more sharply even than the impending impossibility of possibilities, than, that is, death. This shows the *Keinesweg* promised above – the refusal of a *no way*.<sup>331</sup>

Yet, "[t]he fact is that Heidegger will say nothing of the sort."<sup>332</sup> Heidegger, as McNeill correctly noted, will see this as internal to the animal itself – "will displace

---

<sup>324</sup> *ibid*, p. 529. Citing Derrida, Jacques. *Of Spirit*, p. 54

<sup>325</sup> Winkler, Rafael. 'Heidegger and the Question of Man's Poverty in World', p. 529

<sup>326</sup> *ibid*

<sup>327</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 48 and p. 24

<sup>328</sup> Winkler, Rafael. 'Heidegger and the Question of Man's Poverty in World', p. 529

<sup>329</sup> *ibid*

<sup>330</sup> *ibid*

<sup>331</sup> See p. 58, above.

<sup>332</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 530



(*versetzen*) this poverty entirely onto the animal and disfigure it into a *privatio*.”<sup>333</sup> For Winkler, and for us, this “hypothesis”, and he acknowledges that it is “no more than a hypothesis”, offers us a momentary opening to questions and problems which lay dormant within Heidegger’s animal analysis.<sup>334</sup> Without needing to undo any of our hard won accounts of the animal and thus, perhaps, of the sleeper we have here learned something further about wakeful Dasein itself. We have begun to approach the intersection between life and existence. This connection is, of necessity, tied to the relationship between the sciences and fundamental ontology and both Winkler and Padui will see in this text a rare moment in Heidegger’s thinking of this relationship.

In ‘From the Facticity of Dasein to the Facticity of Nature: Naturalism, Animality, and Metontology’, as its title suggests, Padui situates *FCM*, philosophically, in Heidegger’s metontological period and thus sees it as one of the lecture courses in which the positions and, crucially, the distinctions formulated in *Being and Time* undergo modification or are, even, overturned.<sup>335</sup> The “question of animality”, or the question of Dasein’s relationship to non-Dasein life – and thus to nature, problematizes the central Heideggerian distinctions of facticity versus factuality and, fundamentally, the ontological distinction of the ontological and the ontic.<sup>336</sup> For Padui, the disrupting of these distinctions offers the glimpse of a *Weg* not taken in Heidegger’s fraught relationship with the natural sciences and with naturalism more generally. Whilst Heidegger will “shrink back from the abyss of... naturalism” Padui maintains that the animal analysis, and the metontological turn signalled in *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, present problems for this later retreat.<sup>337</sup> Problems which Heidegger does not adequately deal with. In this sense Padui finds in these texts resources for a twisting free from Heidegger’s dominant position on naturalism, and animality.

This internal critique offers resources for considering the position of the sleeper in relation to animal and Dasein which, like McNeill and Winkler’s accounts, problematize the simple story of a nightly exile from Dasein status. However, Padui

---

<sup>333</sup> *ibid.* See pp. 210 – 211 of *FCM* as well for Heidegger’s seeking of this refusal in the essence of animality.

<sup>334</sup> *ibid.*, p. 531

<sup>335</sup> The other courses being *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (1928), and, to a lesser extent, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1927).

<sup>336</sup> Padui, Raoni. ‘From the Facticity of Dasein to the Facticity of Nature: Naturalism, Animality, and Metontology’, in *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual*, 3 (2013), p. 62

<sup>337</sup> *ibid.*, p. 67

remains far closer to Derrida and Krell's line of critical commentary in bringing out the inherent instability of the intermediate position of the animal in Heidegger's analysis. Fundamentally, for Padui, "the distinction between the facticity of Dasein and the factuality of nature is blurred by the addition of a previously excluded middle."<sup>338</sup> Just as we found Krell raising the problem of the animal's finitude above here too, in Padui's article, the question is whether the animal – and the sleeper – can truly be cleaved from Dasein, denied death, and constitutively poor in world. However, Padui does not halt at such questions or stand back and wait for Heidegger's sharp distinctions to fall apart. Instead we are taken a step further into the question of what remains after the collapse of the ontological difference. Most significantly "the question of animality brings with it the threat of something like gradualism – the idea that one can be more or less Dasein-ish, that one can be "in" a world to different degrees."<sup>339</sup> And from here it is but one further step to the claim that "Not only are "animals" poor in world, but many human animals can be poor in world, such as children or the mentally disabled, or perhaps even the severely drunk or sleeping."<sup>340</sup>

Padui's analysis presents us with an alternative way of reading our somnological-zoological analogy. As an internal critique of Heidegger's Dasein-analytic. The thought – a thought much like that presented in the Haar quotation cited in our 'Introduction' to this Part – is that we, and Heidegger, should not sit easy with what is inadvertently excluded from existence. For Padui, this amounts to an invitation to reconsider the question of naturalism in Heideggerian thought. The opening of a way through Heidegger's overly "broad" understanding of naturalism and thus offering a potential rapprochement between Heideggerian philosophy and modern scientific research.<sup>341</sup> We need not follow Padui to acknowledge what all our chosen commentators would surely also agree with: "problems and *aporiai* proliferate in this text [*FCM*]"<sup>342</sup>

We have tarried with this *aporetic* lecture course, not in the hope of answering – to return to Winkler's analysis – the question of whether the refusal of the sleeper demonstrates a fundamental poverty in world at the heart of the sleeper or waking Dasein.

---

<sup>338</sup> *ibid.*, p. 65

<sup>339</sup> *ibid.*, p. 66

<sup>340</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>341</sup> *ibid.*, p. 56

<sup>342</sup> *ibid.*, p. 65

Rather we must precisely *refuse* this alternative. The most significant result of our somnological-zoological analogy so far has been to detach the sleeper from the everyday conception of it as a fleeting state *within* consciousness and to see instead a fundamentally open mode of being which “exceeds every “already” in an incalculable manner that can never be theoretically discerned.”<sup>343</sup> As such the sleeper, which is never Dasein, is nonetheless never entirely separable from Dasein. Of course, “[t]he fact is that Heidegger will say nothing of the sort”, but perhaps here we see the somnolent undertow at its most powerful.<sup>344</sup> What appeared to be a separating of Dasein from the sleeper, “by an abyss [*Abgrund*]”, now appears to have only instantiated the sleeper in its radical connection with its somnolent place, in its essential openness.<sup>345</sup> Perhaps, here, we find a new reading of man’s essential “*being away*” a being away which is *not* “being torn away in that wakeful manner that is the breath of all philosophizing”.<sup>346</sup> Could it be that Heidegger himself could not hear “midnight’s voice”? Might it be that the everyday blinded even him to that which sleeps, but never dies, whilst Dasein hammers, writes and even *questions*? Let us, with Heidegger, end with Zarathustra’s “intoxication song” and the wonder of the depth of *world* which includes, refuses, and awakens that which sleeps:

O Man! Attend!  
 What does midnight’s voice contend?  
 “I slept my sleep,  
 “And now awake at dreaming’s end:  
 “The world is deep,  
 “Deeper than day can comprehend.  
 “Deep is its woe,  
 “Joy – deeper than heart’s agony:  
 “Woe says: Fade! Go!  
 “But all joy wants eternity,  
 “Wants deep, profound eternity!”<sup>347</sup>

<sup>343</sup> McNeill, William. *The Time of Life, Heidegger and Êthos*, p. 43

<sup>344</sup> Winkler, Rafael. ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, p. 530

<sup>345</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 264

<sup>346</sup> *ibid.*, p. 366

<sup>347</sup> *ibid.* A slightly modified translation from R.J. Hollingdale’s version of Nietzsche’s *Thus Spake Zarathustra* (London: Penguin, 1988), p. 333

## Part III – Falling from Phenomenology to Sleep and Back Again

## Chapter 5

# Levinas, Nancy, and the Dream of a Somnolent Phenomenology

### I: Introduction

Let us recap on our somnolent journey so far. We have been tracing the possible paths open to phenomenology, to phenomenological philosophers and philosophies, in responding to Nancy's challenge. The challenge, as we saw in Part I, raises worries not only about philosophy's ability to account for, to *de-limit*, sleep but in particular for the phenomenologist "approaching the bed".<sup>1</sup> De Warren scoured the margins of Husserlian phenomenology and produced a direct response to Nancy. However, in our sketching of this preliminary phenomenology of sleep we saw that such a response would certainly not satisfy Nancy and that it required that we grant the priority of an ever-wakeful absolute consciousness which in turn regulates and distributes sleep and waking. Out of the limits of such an account came our search for a surprisingly missing existential analytic of the sleeper in Heidegger's *Being and Time*, in Part II. This in turn led us to consider, through the comparative analytic of *FCM*, a hypothetical account of the sleeper – to undertake a clearing and setting off from a *Holzwege* that Heidegger indicated but never, himself, followed. It is at the end of that path, an end which is necessarily arbitrary and itself limited, that we now find ourselves.

In this Part, and this concluding Chapter, we move, via a more direct phenomenological encounter with sleep, to our closing consideration of Nancy's text *The Fall of Sleep* and its relationship with those phenomenologies of sleep we have examined. In contrast with the ambivalent absence of sleep in Heidegger's middle period work, the presence of sleep in the progressions of Levinas's early texts *Existence and Existents*<sup>2</sup> and *Time and the Other*<sup>3</sup>, is striking. Indeed it is no coincidence that Levinas chose these texts,

---

<sup>1</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 13

<sup>2</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, translated by Alphonso Lingis, The Hague: Nijhoff, 1978

<sup>3</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other*, translated by Richard A. Cohen. 2nd ed. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.

texts which decisively mark his own “profound need to leave the climate of” Heideggerian philosophy, in which to discuss the philosophical significance of sleep.<sup>4</sup> Instead it will be argued that Levinas’s account of sleep must be read as structured by his efforts to provide a truly post-Heideggerian phenomenological philosophy. By exploring the narrative placement of the account of sleep within *Existence and Existents* it is possible to highlight both the positive *position* of sleep in Levinas’s philosophy, and, essentially, its limits. Limits which will come to the fore in our reading of Nancy’s approach to sleep.

What, broadly, might we hope for from a Levinasian account of the sleeper in contrast with the Heideggerian one we have been outlining in the previous Part? Firstly, we must be clear as to what we should not hope for. We must not expect to find, in Levinas’s philosophy, a thinking which does justice to the animal, or to the alterity of non-human *life* and *as such* a means of describing, and opening the possibilities of the sleeper. This is for two clear reasons. Firstly, Levinas’s radical rethinking of ethics – as an ethics of the Other – stops short at the animal other. As Derrida puts it:

It therefore appears all the more urgent to raise the question of the fact that the Jewish thinker who, no doubt with justification, passes in this century for the most concerned with ethics and sanctity, Emmanuel Levinas, did not make the animal anything like a focus of interrogation within his work. This silence seems to me here, at least from the point of view that counts for us, more significant than all the differences that might separate Levinas from Descartes and from Kant on the question of the subject, of ethics, and of the person.<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, where we found a point of contact between Heidegger’s account of *life* and a possible Heideggerian approach to the sleeper, with Levinas it is precisely the distance from *life*, from the everyday, and from the world of these lives which grants sleep its place, or position, in his work. The Levinasian account, which Levinas himself only indicated and never completely articulated, of sleep suggests that sleep resists, in so far as it is sleep, light and the reduction to the Same. Levinas, put very simply, offers us an

---

<sup>4</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, p. 4

<sup>5</sup> Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal that Therefore I am*, edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008, pp. 105 – 106. Also see Matthew Calarco’s *Zoographies – The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008): “The two dominant theses in Levinas’s writings concerning animals are: no nonhuman animal is capable of a genuine ethical response to the Other; and nonhuman animals are not the kinds of beings that elicit an ethical response in human beings—which is to say, the Other is always and only the *human* Other.” – p. 55.

account of sleep where the alterity of sleep is not reducible to the totality of life – where life really means the dominance of the presence of consciousness as self-consciousness in waking life

It is here that we see what we might hope to gain from a specifically Levinasian encounter with sleep: in demanding that we do justice to the separation of the Other, or to its exteriority we are offered a similar position in relation to sleep – namely, that justice be done sleep *as separate*. This structure of allowing the separation of the Other is made manifest in Levinas's descriptions of the face of the Other: "[t]he face has turned to me—and this is its very nudity. It is by itself and not by reference to a system."<sup>6</sup> Separate sleep, and herein lies the essential phenomenological value to a Levinasian account of sleep, will be described not in terms of its place within consciousness but precisely in regard to its exceeding of it, to, in other words, its radical exteriority. However, here too are found the limits of such an account – actual and potential limits, limits in what Levinas, in fact, did write on sleep and limits on any possible *Levinasian* phenomenology of sleep.

Yet, and here we find our means of approaching the presence of sleep in Levinas's early post-war writings, it is necessary to further nuance our understanding of Levinas's response to Heidegger's philosophy. As we have seen, in Part II, Heidegger's account of sleep describes the manner in which sleep enacts a loss of possibilities. Of course, the point for Heidegger is not that this loss is merely the loss of some possibilities, such as the possibilities involved in undertaking philosophical inquiry, alongside the gaining of others, such as the possibility of dreaming, but rather the more radical loss of the very possibility of questioning towards the meaning of being. Thus sleep enacts not a loss of *a* possibility of Dasein but rather of Dasein-status itself. The paradoxical nature of Levinas's alternative is precisely that Levinas does not so much disagree with this description of sleep and its place in relation to our connection to being but rather changes the normative status of this suspending of our relationship with being, this, temporary, *exit*.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*, translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, 1969. p. 75

<sup>7</sup> In taking this as my guiding thread I am following Jacques Rolland in his 'Introduction' to *On Escape* (Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*, translated by Bettina Bergo, edited by Jacques Rolland. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003), and Robert Bernasconi's article 'No Exit: Levinas' Aporetic Account of Transcendence'. *Research in Phenomenology* 35.1 (2005): 101-117.

## II: From Sleep to the Existent – Levinas, Sleep, and the Promise of Escape

Before moving onto Levinas's detailed and fascinating treatment of sleep it is necessary to consider the context of this treatment within Levinas's withdrawal from Heidegger's philosophy which begins, unsurprisingly, in 1933 and, arguably, continues for the rest of his philosophical career. In his 1935 article 'On Escape'<sup>8</sup> we see what seems, at first, a classic phenomenological analysis, where a phenomenon is selected, clarified and analysed. In this case Levinas's chosen phenomenon is the need, or desire, to escape.<sup>9</sup> A desire which Levinas claims to be borrowing from "the language of contemporary literary criticism".<sup>10</sup> However, very quickly, in fact before we are even introduced to the term 'escape' as the topic of Levinas's phenomenological exploration, we see that there is much more at stake for this text than merely analysing one phenomenon amongst the plethora of phenomena.

This is in part due to the way in which Levinas undertakes phenomenology. As Richard A. Cohen puts it: "[t]o understand the meaning of a term, any term, Levinas seeks out its most extreme sense."<sup>11</sup> This practice leads Levinas to see the desire for escape as always derivative of the fundamental structure of our relationship with being. In 'On Escape' Levinas sets himself two targets. Firstly, he aims to trace back all specific, we might say ontic, instances of the desire to escape to our universal, ontological, desire to escape being. Secondly, the demonstration that such a desire is founded and points towards a real prospect open to us and not merely a chimerical fantasy. It would be fair to say that 'On Escape' focuses on the former to the detriment of the latter.

However, already, in showing the desire to escape as, fundamentally, a response to an enchainment to being and a discomfort *in our being*, Levinas has begun his move

---

<sup>8</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*

<sup>9</sup> Levinas's early work does not distinguish between need and desire in the famous, and important, manner that he will do so in *Totality and Infinity*. As such, this distinction need not concern us here except to say that this specific phenomenon will be developed into the later notion of desire as opposed to need.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*, p. 52

<sup>11</sup> Cohen, Richard A. 'Levinas: Thinking Least About Death—Contra Heidegger'. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 60.1-3 (2006): 21 – 39. p. 33



away from Heidegger and towards his own unique critique of the philosophical tradition. ‘On Escape’ presents us with, amongst other things, an attempt to think need, against the tradition, as not merely a privation, within being, of that needed, and, more significantly, a structure for assessing routes, or paths, out of being.<sup>12</sup> In particular, Levinas considers the phenomenon of pleasure as a form of the promise of escape which in fact breaks that very promise and leaves us back where we started – enchained in being. In this way he establishes what we might see as three stages of our relationship with being; enchainment to being – accompanied by “nausea” and a “desperate” need to escape,<sup>13</sup> promises of escape, and escape itself. Of course, already we should be on our guard against seeing these three modes of relating to being as stages of a progression, or dialectic. To do so would be to describe escape as a *state* which is to *be* achieved and such a state would already, in such a description, be susceptible to domestication, or the bringing of escape into being, and would, as such, announce the very failure of escape. Nonetheless, this structure, along with our anti-Hegelian caveat, does allow us to position sleep in relation to the crucial distinction between the promise of escape and escape itself. This will be of particular importance in explaining Levinas’s move away from sleep in favour of the relationship with the Other in the latter parts of *Existence and Existents*, in *Time and the Other*, and in his later texts.

It is as a continuation of this search for an escape from being that we must see Levinas’s 1947 work *De l’existence a l’existant*.<sup>14</sup> In this sense, as the French title makes clear, this key text – the text which first introduced Derrida to Levinas’s work – must be seen as employing a narrative structure which reverses Heidegger’s in *Being and Time*. We should be alive not only to this broader context in which Levinas’s early work resides but also the specific movement of this text *from* existence (being) *to the* existent (entity). Levinas is searching for the meaning of singularities as distinguished from the meaning of parts within the whole.<sup>15</sup> This allows us to, rather playfully, reformulate Heidegger’s guiding question into a Levinasian equivalent. Rather than asking ‘why is there something rather than nothing?’ Levinas instead asks, in *Existence and Existents*, ‘how is there a

---

<sup>12</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*, p. 73

<sup>13</sup> *ibid*, p. 66

<sup>14</sup> As we are about to see the narrative structure of the French title is lost in the standard English translation *Existence and Existents*.

<sup>15</sup> Already, here, we can see the beginnings of a connection between Levinas’s work and Nancy’s. We consider this proximity below.

*thing* rather than just *something*?' Which we might rewrite, in Heideggerian terms, as 'why is there the Ontological Difference between being and beings?'

In both *Existence and Existents* and *Time and the Other*, sleep makes its appearance near the middle and at a pivotal point of the arguments, following Levinas's descriptions of the *il y a*, or *there is*.<sup>16</sup> More accurately, it directly follows Levinas's accounts of existential insomnia. In the earlier of these texts Levinas entitles the chapter in which the *there is* is described, 'Existence Without a World'. The *there is*, the space of the night – "space itself disengaged from its function as receptable [sic] for objects", announces the presence of existence, or being, without existents, beings, entities and, essentially, without their world.<sup>17</sup> Already we should be alive to the contrast this brings out with *Being and Time*. For Heidegger, famously, Dasein is always already being-in-the-world. Levinas's use of sleep, the place of sleep in this text, directly follows his disruption of this structure of Heidegger's.

These concepts of space, world, and place will be returned to very shortly, and are the key to our understanding Levinas's engagement with sleep more generally. But, first, it is important to see that the *there is*, in all its forms and manifestations, amounts to the disappearance of the subject. This disappearance, famously, does *not* amount to an *ecstatic* exit from being and presence but rather the removal of what scant protection the existent had from the overwhelming rumbling of the *there is*. "In horror a subject is stripped of his subjectivity, of his power to have private existence. The subject is depersonalized."<sup>18</sup> This horror is not mine or yours but rather explodes the bounds of subjectivity and, as such, constitutes what Levinas calls, tellingly, a tragic "fatality". This fatality enacts the inevitability of being's return, which he had, in 'On Escape' highlighted through nausea: "The binding, or irremissible, quality of nausea constitutes its very ground. Despair over this ineluctable presence constitutes the presence itself."<sup>19</sup> That the

---

<sup>16</sup> The complex relationship between sleep and the *there is* can already be glimpsed in the Levinas's description of 'the night' as amounting to a trace of the *there is* which can indeed "occur right in the daytime." p. 54 of Levinas's *Existence to the Existents*.

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, p. 55

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*, p. 56

<sup>19</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*, p. 68. One might, productively, attempt to compare and contrast this "binding" to being and the tragic tone of Levinas's description of it with Heidegger's normative sounding description of the animal as *being bound* [Gebundenheit].

fatality of the *there is* is tragic and calls for tragic depiction will be significant to the constitutive power of sleep.

This return of presence in negation, this impossibility of escaping from an anonymous and uncorruptible existence constitutes the final depths of Shakespearean tragedy. The fatality of the tragedy of antiquity becomes the fatality of irremissible being.<sup>20</sup>

Through tragedy Levinas refuses the *possibility* of death, anxiety in the face of death, and the ecstatic more generally, as offering an escape from the *there is*. Instead he ends his chapter with a nod in the direction of Husserl: “we must ask whether consciousness, with its aptitude for sleep, for suspension, for *epoché*, is not the locus of this nothingness-interval.”<sup>21</sup>

The next chapter of *Existence and Existents*, ‘The Hypostasis’, begins with Levinas’s, now famous, account of insomnia. Yet it is worth emphasising that insomnia is framed, structurally and conceptually, by sleep. And in addition, as *Time and the Other* succinctly puts it, consciousness is precisely defined in opposition to vigilance: “Consciousness is the power to sleep.”<sup>22</sup> This initially counter-intuitive claim becomes clearer when we see that consciousness “is [for Levinas] a hesitation in being.”<sup>23</sup> This hesitation, which we will return to below, distinguishes consciousness from vigilance. Vigilance, as insomnia – rather than ‘in insomnia’ as insomnia announces the *there is* and thus the destruction of all inside-outside carving-up, can involve no hesitation or break. Sleep thus, for Levinas, interrupts the vigilance of the *there is*.<sup>24</sup> This definition of consciousness as “a hesitation in being” recalls the opening sections of *Existence and Existents* which deal with the existential reticence of the ‘The Relationship with Existence’.<sup>25</sup> These early movements of the text are diametrically opposed to the relationship that Dasein holds with being for Heidegger. Yet the duality of the Levinasian relationship to being, as hesitation, only finds its origin and very possibility through sleep. Of course, this should not surprise us given that the very relationship with existence has already been described with words such as weariness, fatigue and indolence.

---

<sup>20</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existent*, p. 57

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*, p. 60

<sup>22</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other*, p. 51

<sup>23</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, p. 64

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*, pp. 7 – 25

This structure, of a relationship of keeping at bay, is founded upon Levinas's description of the relationship between consciousness and sleep.

It is paradoxical to define consciousness by unconsciousness. They do not merge into one. Yet the event of consciousness does not refer to the unconscious just as its contrary. Consciousness, in its opposition to the unconscious, is not constituted by the opposition, but by this proximity, this communication with its contrary...<sup>26</sup>

Without this "communication", without this "proximity" – a word which is tellingly prescient of both Levinas's later philosophy of the Other and Nancy's work, consciousness would not *be*.<sup>27</sup> There would only *be* eternal vigilance. For Levinas *this* proximity underpins the very possibility of intentionality, light, *without* being absorbed *into* intentionality.

...the way consciousness refers to the unconscious is not an intention in turn. It consists in a fainting away at the very focal point of its luminousness. This characterizes the way light is produced, as scintillation.<sup>28</sup>

The focal point, or 'source', of the light is not itself illuminated, or contained by the light. However, it is the word scintillation that should draw our attention. Scintillation prefigures what Levinas will call the "evanescence" of the "I" as the instant, or the present.<sup>29</sup> Evanescence is intimately tied to what Levinas calls the "very paradox of consciousness."<sup>30</sup> This on-off, blinking, evanescence underpinning consciousness, as we will see below, might be compared to the twofold *rhythm* of sleeping-waking which Nancy emphasises.

We can see now that sleep is not just a power *of* consciousness but *itself has the power* of constituting consciousness. This productive and positive account of sleep, when distinguished from the vigilance of insomnia, shows sleep as the very granting of consciousness. The very gift of escape from the horror of the night. Yet it is essential to

---

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*

<sup>27</sup> One might, indeed we will, take these words as clues towards a Levinasian phenomenology of sleep that never was and that we can only indicate below.

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*, p. 65

<sup>29</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other*, p. 53ff

<sup>30</sup> *ibid*, p. 51

note that this very gift is founded upon sleep's phenomenological status as the disappearance, however temporary, of intentional consciousness and thus too of the weight of being. Such an account of sleep stands in clear contrast to Heidegger's implicit conception of sleep – an account where sleep amounts to an impoverishing of world and Dasein-status and, thus, the end, however temporarily, of the quest for the meaning of being.

Yet, Levinas's early productive account of sleep also interestingly reverses a Husserlian problem with sleep which we encountered in our analysis of de Warren in Part I. There we saw that Husserl's reason for postulating the sleeplessness of the transcendental ego rested on the need for an initiator of the transformation between sleeping and waking. This was in turn motivated by the desire for symmetry between the phenomenological accounts of going to sleep – which seems to be something subjectivity is, at least partly, involved in – and waking-up – which seems, by definition, initiated from beyond the remit of waking subjectivity. With this in mind, the significance of Levinas's productive account comes into view. Instead of asking how consciousness can allow the interlude of sleep – the lapse from presence – Levinas describes sleep as permitting the very gap or distance *from presence*, as being, and thus allowing consciousness. This can be succinctly summarized by contrasting Husserl's problem, 'how we wake-up', with Levinas's: 'how we escape insomnia and, finally, drop off.' "The impossibility of rending the invading, inevitable, and anonymous rustling of existence manifests itself particularly in certain times when sleep evades our appeal."<sup>31</sup> This reversal furthers Levinas's normative radicalising of being and, with it, sleep as well. However, we must remember that Levinas would, in time, return to the question of what keeps watch in the night of consciousness.

Before moving on to this Levinasian return to vigilance and move away from sleep it is essential that we explore the relationship between sleep, place and the 'here' or 'localisation' as found in these early texts.

There is not only a consciousness of localization, but a localization of consciousness, which is not in turn reabsorbed into consciousness, into knowing.

---

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*, p. 61

There is here something that stands out against knowing, that is a condition for knowing.<sup>32</sup>

This localisation, as the precondition for consciousness, knowing and intentionality must itself be beyond intentionality – it “stands out against knowing”. This ‘here’ is established precisely by sleep as a carving out of the *there is*. How does this carving out take place? Precisely by doing just that: by taking a place. Levinas is explicit in naming the body’s primordial role in this existential drama of beginning. “In lying down, in curling up in a corner to sleep, we abandon ourselves to a place; qua base it becomes our refuge. Then *all* our work of being consists in resting.”<sup>33</sup> The contrast between Heidegger’s denial of *understanding* to the sleeper and Levinas’s finding, in the sleeper’s “lying down” precisely the power, and productivity, of the hesitation of sleep should now be apparent.<sup>34</sup>

This refuge, this place of sleep, is to be radically contrasted with the ‘Da’, ‘there’, of Da-sein. Specifically because, as Levinas puts it, “the latter already implies the world.”<sup>35</sup> Whereas for Heidegger Dasein, ‘there-being’, is always already in the world, for Levinas the interrupting of vigilance is required for the existent as separated, *as existent*, to exist at all. Thus this concept of place does not so much replace the Heideggerian notion of being-in-the-world but rather *situates it*, as unfolding out of the emergence of subjectivity as position. The very possibility of positing objects for Levinas, which will, of course, take place within the world, is secondary to the *here* of subjectivity’s emergence, the body, and sleep.<sup>36</sup>

Place, then, before being a geometric space, and before being the concrete setting of the Heideggerian world, is a base. ... It [the body] is not situated in a space given beforehand; it is the irruption in anonymous being of localization itself.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, pp. 65 – 6

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*, p. 67, my emphasis. This emphasis on the importance of the body, on the materiality of sleep, consciousness and the relationship to being, allows for interesting comparisons with some of Merleau-Ponty’s later work. Bettina Bergo’s ‘Radical Passivity in Levinas and Merleau-Ponty (Lectures of 1954)’ offers one means of initiating such a comparison. Such thoughts also, of course, bring us closer to our discussion of Nancy and the collapse of our suspension of the question of the body and sleep.

<sup>34</sup> See pp. 75 – 76, above.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid*, p. 68

<sup>36</sup> “It [the body] is not posited; it is a position.” – *ibid*, p. 69

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*

Levinas is at pains to distinguish between his description of the body's constitutive power, in our ability to sleep, and previous accounts of space. It is our contention that this effort is required precisely to allow "space" for an account of radical exteriority outside of the totalising tendency of traditional notions of space. It is with this goal in mind – a broadening of our conception of space or place – that Levinas attacks the foundational status of Kant's conception of space as transcendently ideal and Heidegger's conception of being-in-the-world and equipmentality.

This initial positioning of sleep founds all other accounts of space and all possibilities in space and this is done by constituting the existent *as hesitation* in the face of being. This hesitation is, and as mentioned above this could be taken as an oblique reference to Husserl, a 'suspending of being'. Sleep can thus be taken as an escape, however temporary, from the irremissibility of being. This pivotal moment of the emergence of the subject shows again the positivity of sleep in the early Levinas's philosophy – without it being, as the *there is*, would truly be unified as the Same.

Let us briefly summarise what this Levinasian account would provide us with in terms of a phenomenology of sleep. As we mentioned above Levinas would have accepted Heidegger's description of sleep as a cessation of the adventure of being, or more accurately as a loss of the world which facilitates and conditions the ownmost possibility of Dasein – questioning towards the meaning of being. However, this feature of sleep, this loss of sleep, in Levinas's account amounts to precisely sleep's gift – the suspension of the weight of being. The dark hollows of sleep shield us from the light of the world and from being's irremissibility. For our purposes this allows us to describe, phenomenologically, the manner in which sleep, *as an interruption of intentional consciousness – if not all consciousness*, establishes, or re-establishes, consciousness in waking. The very promise of sleep underlies, in Levinas's account, the separation of subjectivity, *as subjective*, from the totalising force of being. Sleep, in Levinas's account, finally takes on not only a positive or productive status in terms of the whole of lived experience and in his narrative departure from Heideggerian thinking, but also, and this is of essential importance, enacts this normative promotion through insisting on the separation of sleep from waking life and its powers. This second point, the separation of sleep, is surely what we identified above, *Separate Sleep*, as the promise offered in this engagement with Levinasian phenomenology.

### III: "...but there will be a reawakening."<sup>38</sup>

Thus sleep offers an escape from the *there is* and fits into the ongoing drama of Levinas's search for an escape from being begun in 1935 in 'On Escape'.<sup>39</sup> We have shown how, in the case of sleep – as elsewhere, this search cannot be separated from Levinas's attempt to leave the climate of Heideggerian ontology. Yet, the question which we must now move to is this: 'Does the escape of sleep – this positivity within the negativity of sleep as suspension of insomnia – offer a true escape from being or is it rather merely the false promise of escape, an escape *within being* – from one regional (*ontology*) to another?'

We do not need to look far to begin an answer to this question. In fact, a simple consideration of how sleep's production of the existent as separated from the *there is* fits into the subsequent argument of *Existence and Existents* will suffice. As we saw above this interruption furnishes the existent as a substantive as opposed to the verbal flux of being. This moment of solidity Levinas calls the 'present'. It is worth noting that sleep operates, as the positioning of the existent, as "the *here* of position," and thus "precedes every act of understanding, every horizon and all time."<sup>40</sup> As such, this 'present', which Levinas is describing, is not the present as one point within the flux of time but rather 'the instant' which precedes and pre-conditions time. Very quickly we are brought from "the mastery and the very virility of the substantive", which both marks and allows the subject's separation from the flux of being, to a new problem – 'how do we move from one instant to another?'<sup>41</sup> In other words: 'how is it that this instant, as the moment of beginning, can avoid becoming trapped within itself?'

In fact, this is precisely the position that Levinas wishes to describe. One way to understand the structure of Levinas's argument at this point is to see that what he has described as hypostasis, the instant or present, is precisely trapped in a boot-strapping situation. Levinas has, purposefully, described subjectivity in its moment of triumph and

---

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*, p. 78

<sup>39</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*, *passim*

<sup>40</sup> Levinas, Emmaneul. *Existence and Existents*, p. 68

<sup>41</sup> *ibid*, p. 103



constitution as being faced with a new weight and a new enchainment. “Time, far from constituting the tragic, shall perhaps be able to deliver us from it.”<sup>42</sup> As the title of *Time and the Other* suggests it will only be with the encounter with the Other that time will release us from the hypo-*stasis* of the present. By this point we are not lost within the neutral anomalousness of the *there is* but rather “having being as an attribute” become weighed down with this – the very archetype of identity. We are riveted to ourselves. This returns Levinas to his earlier descriptions of the instant’s relationship with existence. As discussed, we should not be surprised to find that this relationship is described through, what we may call, neighbouring phenomena to sleep; namely, weariness, indolence and fatigue. Yet, a puzzle remains: how is this relationship between the instant, *as constituted by the very possibility of sleep*, and its existence defined through weariness?

Here, indeed, we strike at the limits of the power of the isolated subject as instant and with it the limits of the positivity of Levinasian sleep.

The present is subjected to being, bonded to it. *The ego returns ineluctably to itself; it can forget itself in sleep, but there will be a reawakening.* In the tension and fatigue of beginning one feels the cold sweat of the irremissibility of existence. The being that is taken up is a burden.<sup>43</sup>

In sleep we are forgotten, our being and its weight is forgotten, “but there will be a reawakening.” The instant, in its scintillation, sleeps but does not escape “the irremissibility of existence.”<sup>44</sup> It seems clear that sleep can offer only a promise of escape, a dream, if one likes, of an escape that is then lost in the return to waking and to the burden of the instant in its solitude. In following this schema from ‘On Escape’ sleep would leave us still ‘within being’.

Sleep is a modality of being, in which a being withdraws from itself, and is delivered of its own self-control. This freedom does not involve nothingness; it is not a “nihilation,” in the contemporary expression. But, on the other hand, this freedom is only a “thought.” We must not fail to recognize the event in sleep, but we must notice that into this event its failure is already written. Fragile sleep, soft-winged sleep, is a second state.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*, p. 78

<sup>43</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*. It could be argued that this is the true kernel around which Nancy and Levinas’s differences proliferate: Nancy’s conception of *existence* knows nothing of this “fatigue of beginning”.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid*

<sup>45</sup> *ibid*, p. 84

Sleep, in its fragility, offers, we are told, a “freedom [which] is only a “thought.””<sup>46</sup> Yet, as Levinas’s “on the other hand” illustrates, this limitation of sleep as liberation, this mere “thought” of freedom is not limited in its failure to amount to a “nihilation”, to the Heideggerian nihilation in death. Sleep, and here in lies both its promise and disappointment for Levinas, touches an exit from being before this very same exit slips away. Only the Other, and their gift of time, will grant such an exit.

Indeed, this pattern of interpretation of sleep is repeated in Levinas’s more mature work. In particular, in *Totality and Infinity* sleep is famously a form of exteriority – and thus differentiated from the Husserlian account – but nonetheless one *from* which we live: “We live from “good soup,” air, light, spectacles, work, ideas, sleep, etc . . . These are not objects of representations. We live from them.”<sup>47</sup> Sleep remains part of interiority, one of the distractions which pull us away from the true exteriority of the Other and the ethics which springs from our relationship to them. By *Otherwise than Being* sleep is described as part of the subject’s “enchainment to itself, where the ego suffocates in itself due to the tautological way of identity, and ceaselessly seeks after the distraction of games and sleep in a movement that never wears out.”<sup>48</sup>

However, and this “however” must act as but a note of an interpretation which can only be pointed towards here, there are hints of an-other interpretation of sleep in Levinas’s work. An interpretation which would read back from the *radical* passivity of Levinas’s later texts – such as *Otherwise than Being*, and ‘Substitution’ in particular<sup>49</sup> – through slightly earlier texts ‘From Consciousness to Wakefulness’<sup>50</sup>, ‘Philosophy and Awakening’<sup>51</sup>, and ‘In Praise of Insomnia’<sup>52</sup>, to an alternative reading of the somnolent writings of the late 1940s. Such an interpretation would take its cue, and find its spur, in

---

<sup>46</sup> *ibid*

<sup>47</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*, p. 110

<sup>48</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise Than Being, or, Beyond Essence*, translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University Press, 1998. p. 124

<sup>49</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise than Being*, pp. 99 – 130

<sup>50</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. ‘From Consciousness to Wakefulness’ in *Of God Who Comes to Mind*, translated by Bettina Bergo, Stanford University Press, Stanford CA, 1998, pp. 15 – 32

<sup>51</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. ‘Philosophy and Awakening’, in *Entre Nous*, translated by Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav, Continuum, London, 2006, pp. 66 – 77

<sup>52</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. ‘In Praise of Insomnia’, in *God, Death, and Time*, translated by Bettina Bergo, Stanford University Press, Stanford CA, 2000, pp. 207 – 212

Bettina Bergo's paper 'Radical Passivity in Levinas and Merleau-Ponty (Lectures 1954)'. In that paper Bergo proposes to read "Levinas *through* Merleau-Ponty", in particular, to broaden the former's notion of radical passivity through the latter's pluralist conceptions of it.<sup>53</sup> This, alternative and hypothetical, interpretation would find its engine and direction in an attempt to read Merleau-Ponty's account of sleep in his lectures of 54<sup>54</sup> *through* Levinas's early account of sleep, position and the promise of escape. Instead, we turn here, to *The Fall of Sleep*, or rather the anticipation of that fall, before the fall.

#### IV: Before the Fall

*The Fall of Sleep* is brief. Deliberately, all too brief. For all the pause before the fall the fall itself disappears in *an* instant – as opposed to *the* instant: blink and you might miss it. A fleeting mediation *on* – or better, a somnolent sojourn *in* or nocturnal tarrying *with* – sleeping, falling, tombs, water, death and much more besides. Its chapters are short as well, like the snatched threads of a dream already slipping away – "a scrap left over from sleep."<sup>55</sup> The connections between them are often unclear, hazy but not absent. Nancy's penchant for fragments, as opposed to the traditional essay structure, means it would be artificial and violent to now attempt to tie some singular narrative around and through this beautiful little book.<sup>56</sup> And, for all its brevity, we have seen, in Chapter 1, the challenge this text poses to phenomenology. Furthermore, in the body (or *corpus*) of this thesis we have seen how this text stands (though this is an inappropriate word) as a monumental treatise when compared to the briefness of those sidelong glances at sleep which we have uncovered, sheltered, hidden and faltering, in the body (or *corpus*) that we call the phenomenological tradition.

Therefore, we will now lay side by side this text and our prior analyses of sleep as found in, and awakened from, the work of Husserl, Heidegger and Levinas. What can

---

<sup>53</sup> Bergo, Bettina. 'Radical Passivity in Levinas and Merleau-Ponty (Lectures 1954)', in *Radical Passivity – Rethinking Ethical Agency in Levinas*, Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy 20, edited by Benda Hofmeyr, Springer, 2009, pp. 31 – 52

<sup>54</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Institution and Passivity*, translated by Leonard Lawlor. Evanston: Northwestern Univ Press, 2010

<sup>55</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 25

<sup>56</sup> "Whilst the fragment is one of the preferred forms of Nancy's writing, this does not simply dissect an original identity. The shattering precedes the unity: each fragment collaborates with the other, but not in order to reconstitute a lost coherence." – Daniele Rugo, *Jean-Luc Nancy and the Thinking of Otherness*, London, Bloomsbury 2013. p. 6.

these naps have in common with Nancy's deeper and more reinvigorating touching of sleep? The following process of comparison and contrasting offers insight into how Nancy's thinking of sleep develops out of phenomenology whilst also constituting a radical critique of it. We begin by, briefly, reconsidering the challenge which motivates this thesis as it is found early in *The Fall of Sleep* (Ch. 3). However, here, in contrast with in Part I, our focus is not on how this relates to the possibility of a Husserlian phenomenology of sleep. Instead, remaining in greater proximity to Nancy and to his text, we trace the multiple layers of the *fall* of sleep – a fall away from significance, self / subject, and grounds (earth) (Ch. 1 – 3). Following still the legacy of phenomenological approaches to sleep we find, perhaps surprisingly, Nancy's descent continuing into the *world* of sleep – an 'Equal World' [*Monde égal*] (Ch. 4). Here and in the following chapter (Ch. 5) the contrast between Nancy's account of the sleeper and Heidegger's exiling of the sleeper from world, being and Dasein status – as described in Part II, takes shape. However, only via a comparison with Levinas and his account of sleep which we have just sketched (Ch. 7) do we strike upon the true radicality of Nancy's account of sleep. In unpacking the new Nancean conception of the sleeper we draw on Gerald L. Bruns' *On Ceasing to be Human* where he claims that *The Fall of Sleep* describes an 'experience of freedom'.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, through a developing of Bruns' insight we are in a position to explore the most positive approaches to the sleeper which Nancy makes, as found in his chapters on lullaby (Ch. 6) and death (Ch. 8). These approaches, constituting as they do productive proximities between sleep and waking and sleep and death, respectively, awaken us to directions for future somnolent, and creative, investigations. These findings, along with our comparisons with the phenomenological literature offer an alternative reading of Nancy's challenge to phenomenology. The demand not to cease phenomenology at the edge, or limit, of the bed but rather to allow that phenomenology itself is always granted by, and *from*, sleep. Future phenomenological or philosophical questioning will not be *toward* sleep but rather *from* it – it takes its cue and its origin *from* "the blind task of sleep [*la tâche aveugle du sommeil*] (Ch. 9)."<sup>58</sup> Our Chapter, and this thesis, will thus close with preliminary notes towards such a somnolent phenomenology – notes, that is, *from* the sleeper *to* the phenomenologist.

<sup>57</sup> Bruns, Gerald L. *On Ceasing to be Human*

<sup>58</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 48 and *Tombe de sommeil*, p. 86

## V: Falling

Sleep is proclaimed and symbolized by the sign of the fall, the more or less swift descent or sagging, faintness.<sup>59</sup>

Sometimes when lying in bed, approaching the edge of sleep, a sudden jolt – a “hypnagogic jerk” – wrenches us back to waking. This phenomenon is preceded by a sensation of falling and followed by shock, fear, and an elevated heart rate. This *surprised* reaction, this violent return or break in our descent is not an *everynight* experience for most. Nonetheless it points us, for Nancy, towards the “amorphous, hard-to-identify substance” of sleep: “none other than that of the fall, of sagging and unfastening”.<sup>60</sup> Nancy hints at the value of this strange phenomenon in his first chapter:

...until that underlying closeness to simple inertia that we know in the bodies of sleeping infants, which we sometimes recognize when on the edge of sleep we feel that we are beginning to stop feeling the basic energy of our bodies. We feel the suspense of feeling. We feel ourselves falling, we feel the fall.<sup>61</sup>

There is much that we might pick out from these three short quotations. However, for now let us consider how this “amorphous, hard-to-identify substance” of sleep, this “more or less swift descent”, may relate to the challenge which, two chapters further into *The Fall of Sleep*, led us to seek the slumbering phenomenology of sleep within phenomenology itself.

Sleep, for Nancy, limits itself and the phenomenologist (or perhaps the philosopher) approaching it. It allows “the waking phenomenologist approaching the bed to perceive nothing but the appearance of its disappearance, the attestation of its retreat.”<sup>62</sup> This allowance, or gift, to the waking phenomenologist, generalises the contact with falling which manifests so violently in the occasional hypnagogic twitch. Sleep “*shows* of itself only its disappearance, its burrowing and its concealment.”<sup>63</sup> There is nothing given of sleep, *except the fall*. Maintaining, for only a little bit longer, our suspension of

<sup>59</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 1

<sup>60</sup> *ibid*, p. 4

<sup>61</sup> *ibid*, p. 3

<sup>62</sup> *ibid*, p. 13

<sup>63</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*

the question of dreams – which surely here arises stronger than ever before – let us compare this insistent following of the falling thread of sleep with the first response to this challenge to phenomenology which we considered. De Warren takes umbrage at Nancy claim that this feature of sleep means that “There is no phenomenology of sleep”.<sup>64</sup> For De Warren, this is to make two mistakes: it misdescribes sleep and underestimates phenomenology. Through a description of sleep reconstructed from Husserl’s later phenomenology of time-consciousness and his fragmentary unpublished comments on sleep we saw that phenomenology certainly *could* offer an account of sleep. An account which surely could allow for the phenomenon with which we began this section – that occasional surprise, that recoiling from sleep.

Yet we also saw the philosophical price this thoroughgoing Husserlian phenomenology of sleep demands. It requires a demarcating of sleep’s force, scope and dominion. We sleep under the ever watchful eye of absolute consciousness.<sup>65</sup> The question remained at the end of our first Chapter whether that price was worth paying in exchange for an extending of phenomenology’s remit into the “night of the lowered eyelids”.<sup>66</sup> We proceeded into our consideration of Heidegger by asking whether we might find an alternative phenomenological approach to sleep, a better deal or lower price perhaps. However, now the suspicion arises that the very question is posed on an unstable premise. De Warren takes Nancy’s remarks on the limits of phenomenology and sleep’s appearance as if they *stood* alone, or as if they are posed, only within the Nancy’s third chapter ‘Self From Absence To Self’. However, these comments do not *stand*, alone or otherwise, they fall or drop through the process of Nancy’s faithful following of sleep as “proclaimed and symbolized by the sign of the fall”.<sup>67</sup> By tracing this fall, as found in the first three chapters of *The Fall of Sleep*, Nancy touches on a thread which quickly unravels attempts to situate, position, or domesticate sleep and the sleeper.

---

<sup>64</sup> *ibid*

<sup>65</sup> This cleaving of the sleeper from that which, waking, underwrites the somnolent journey has been shown in this thesis as a point of continuity across phenomenological accounts of sleep. “Wakefulness alone can give way to sleep, and wakefulness preserved stems from sleep refused, sleepiness refused.” - *ibid*, p. 2.

<sup>66</sup> *ibid*, p. 6

<sup>67</sup> *ibid*, p. 1

An *everyday* fall, such as from a tree or down some stairs, is *from* one place and *to* another.<sup>68</sup> However, from the very beginning of the book we see that the fall *of* sleep is a different type of fall. A more radical falling: “I’m falling asleep. I’m falling into sleep and I’m falling there by the power of sleep.”<sup>69</sup> As sleep “sums up” and “gathers” other falls to it we see that sleep’s fall itself falls away from the specificity of directional falling – falling *from* the tree *to* the ground. In fact, it is the sleep’s fall away from *ground* itself which Nancy is describing. What might have appeared an arbitrary, perhaps merely linguistic, connection between sleep and falling is, in these short chapters, revealed as the essence of sleep.<sup>70</sup> Yet, this cannot be seen as the essence of a set state for: “faintness and falling consist in not allowing a state to persist with the tension natural to it (a state of tension, then, that is not a “state”).”<sup>71</sup>

What then can Nancy say of *this* fall if it is both from sleep, “by the power of sleep”, and to sleep? For Nancy the fall of sleep is never merely *this* fall. As it “sums up” and “gathers” falls to it sleep displays the first side of a duality of falls that Nancy describes. We might call this the inwards breath of the fall to sleep. Sleep does not fall *to* sleep it falls *into* itself. “I fall inside my own satiety as well as my own vacuity: I myself become the abyss and the plunge, the density of deep water and the descent of the drowned body sinking backwards.”<sup>72</sup> Nancy calls this “not metamorphosis. At the very most... an endomorphosis... the formation of an interiority”.<sup>73</sup> However, as the ambiguity of this fall “inside my own satiety as well as my own vacuity” shows, this fall is always also a fall *away*, what we might call the out breath of the fall of sleep. “This other fall—the fall of distinctions—is added to the first one and gives it its real coherence: I fall asleep, that is to say, “I” fall, “I” no longer exist, or else “I” “exist” only in that effacement of my own distinctions.”<sup>74</sup> This difficult passage warns us away from a plausible misinterpretation of the inwards breath – that the fall of sleep falls *to* some radical interiority, the true “I”. This second movement, this outwards breath – more a huff

---

<sup>68</sup> The *everyday* must be held alongside the *any-night*, and this relationship of day, night, universality and indistinguishability will be examined in the next section.

<sup>69</sup> *ibid*, p. 2

<sup>70</sup> Nancy will, as the text falls further into its reverie, add to, sharpen and loosen, this fundamental heart of sleep without ever leaving it behind or sublimating it.

<sup>71</sup> *ibid*

<sup>72</sup> *ibid*, p. 5

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*, p. 4

<sup>74</sup> *ibid*, p. 7

and puff which blows all houses down than a little escape of used-up air, shows that the fall of sleep is just as much the falling away of distinctions, of tensions, of divisions.<sup>75</sup>

Yet this “effacement of my own distinctions” has a number of further destabilising effects. First of all, this, our own, two-step motif of the breath in and *then* out, *if* it is understood as two *separate* steps, falls away. “There is simultaneity only in the realm of sleep.”<sup>76</sup> The “immersion overflows and carries away any sort of analysis.”<sup>77</sup> This offers us an ambiguity in Nancy’s description of sleep that is worth keeping in mind throughout this Chapter – the ambiguity of falling through air or water.

Secondly, the loosening of the ties that bind together the “I”. The falling away of the distinctions underpinning the “I”, the ego. “I fall asleep and at the same time I vanish as “I”.”<sup>78</sup> It is this aspect of the fall of sleep which has the dual results of drawing us away from the questioning of philosophy, and of phenomenology in particular, *and* reveals the *self*, the “*in self*”, of sleep.<sup>79</sup> The “I” distinguishes itself from other, from world, and thus it is that the questions of the questioner find that which is to be questioned. However, with the fall, or better the plurality of falls, of sleep, this all collapses:

“Who am I?” disintegrates in the fall of sleep, for this fall carries me toward the absence of questions, toward the unconditional and indubitable affirmation—alien to any system of doubt, to any condition of identification—of a being-in-self [*être-à-soi*] that tolerates no unpacking, no analysis of its structure. It is not responsible for some problematic of “relation to self” [*rapport à soi*] or of “presence to self” [*présence à soi*]: neither relation nor presence have to be asserted here. Nor can the form or general logic of “to,” of “be to,” be asserted: the “to” in sleep has yielded to “in.”<sup>80</sup>

It is out of this yielding, this laying down of responsibilities, that Nancy’s limiting of phenomenology comes. The separation of appearance and reality falters in sleep and with it the possibility of a constituting consciousness. The performance of the phenomenological reduction might lead to a similar *putting aside* of this distinction but for the sleeper, Nancy contends, this very performance is always already unnecessary,

<sup>75</sup> We return to this move to equality in our next section.

<sup>76</sup> *ibid*

<sup>77</sup> *ibid*, p. 8

<sup>78</sup> *ibid*, p. 11

<sup>79</sup> *ibid*, p. 13

<sup>80</sup> *ibid*, pp. 12 – 13



impossible and without motivation. It is as such that the denial of any phenomenology of sleep falls, temporarily – like all falls – into view. However, it is the other side of Nancy’s third chapter – the sense of sleep that “obscures signification, [that] ... makes sense only of sensing oneself no longer appearing” – that must concern us as we proceed.<sup>81</sup> What can Nancy say of this “Kantian *thing*” about which phenomenology must remain silent?<sup>82</sup>

Before moving on to this question and indeed to the many others which this tumble after the sleeper has raised – whilst simultaneously denying the traction of questioning itself – let us highlight, or predict, one more falling away, or loosening, of tensions. In particular, we can already see that our specified suspensions, the dual suspending of the questions of sleep’s relationship to the body and to dreams, must, if we are to follow Nancy on the trail of the fall, themselves fall away. We will see the specific dissipation and falling away of this holding apart of sleep-body and sleep-dream in the following sections. Only a body can fall and who can say where/when the dreamer begins and the sleeper ends.

## VI: Lost *in* the World of Night: Dreaming *from* a Somnolent World

“Everything is equal to itself and to the rest of the world.”<sup>83</sup> So begins Nancy’s fourth chapter – ‘Equal World’ [*Monde égal*]<sup>84</sup> – with this reminder that the question of place, of the location of the sleeper, has been central to all of our previous engagements with phenomenology and sleep. In this chapter Nancy can be seen as extending his preceding examination of the *into* of sleep’s fall whilst also further exploring the consequences of sleep’s stripping away of distinctions – the fall continues. In this section we will consider how this equality of sleep, sleep’s equal world, reveals a sleeper who

---

<sup>81</sup> *ibid*, p. 13

<sup>82</sup> *ibid*

<sup>83</sup> *ibid*, p. 1b

<sup>84</sup> In this title already we should hear echoes of the opening pages of Derrida’s *Glas* (translated by John P. Leavey 1986, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press). The question of the relationship between this knell and the *tombe*, of *Tombe de sommeil*, is worthy of far more attention than our space allows. However, let it just be said that *Glas*’s holding of a commentary on Hegel [so prone to equalising and to the equal] alongside one on Genet at least superficially resembles the motif of the *singular-plural* which animates so much of Nancy’s work. That it appears here along with the question of the sleeper’s world should remind us that world will never be for Nancy, however much it is characterised by equality, a “unity”, as Marie-Eve Morin reminds us on p. 43 of *Jean-Luc Nancy*, Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2012.

has left behind the existential *and* the comparative analyses which we considered above. If Husserl asked a high price for his phenomenology of sleep, Heidegger will spurn any and all offers. It is this, Heidegger's, refusal of sleep which most strikingly contrasts with Nancy's tactful touching of the fall of sleep-night-dream.

As such this section, whilst following Nancy into the night, develops three points of comparison between the Nancean sleeper and that described in our hypothetical Heideggerian account. Firstly, and most thoroughly, the sleeper's relationship with world must be considered. Nancy, as the use of the definite article – "*the* world" – in the opening line of Nancy's fourth chapter suggests, lacks Heidegger's qualms about describing the sleeper, our four-legged cousins, and indeed much else besides, as within the world. Secondly, we will briefly consider how this relates to Nancy's ascription of "silence" to the sleeper. This odd "silence", along with our third point in which Nancy's account touches on Heidegger's latent somnological thinking, allows us to move onto the question of sleep's *making-sense* – "Sense, here [in sleep, in sleep's nightly worlding], neither fulfills [sic] nor enlightens. It overflows and obscures signification".<sup>85</sup> This third point of contact concerns the question of posture or stance.

In order to approach night, as it is here that the question of sleep and world emerges, Nancy continues with the egalitarian thinking that followed from the falling away of the "I" in his previous chapter. "All sleepers fall into the same, identical and uniform sleep."<sup>86</sup> And as such "sleeping "well" or "badly" comes down merely to sleeping more or less, in a more or less continuous, or more or less perturbed fashion."<sup>87</sup> These claims may seem outlandish but it is both hard to see what sleeping well could mean except this uniformity or continuity of sleep, and clear how this follows from the retreat of distinctions considered above.<sup>88</sup> In fact, "Everyone sleeps in the equality of the same sleep—all the living—",<sup>89</sup> and this is "why night suits it".<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 13

<sup>86</sup> *ibid*, p. 17

<sup>87</sup> *ibid*

<sup>88</sup> We return to this question of differentiation in and of sleep when exploring sleep's ethical status and the demand to "let sleep" in our next section.

<sup>89</sup> *ibid*, p. 18

<sup>90</sup> *ibid*, p. 17

“For there to be night, though, there must be day.”<sup>91</sup> Indeed, it is in the contrasting of night and day that Nancy further develops his situating, his placing, though we will see the limit of these terms shortly, of the fall of sleep. Day stands, shining in the “primal *lux*”, and it stands out, it differentiates and is differentiation itself.<sup>92</sup> “Day is always another day, it is, in general, the other of the same.”<sup>93</sup> Nancy is, of course, not denying the possibility of “the most repetitive monotony” of “one-day-always-like-another”.<sup>94</sup> Nor that nights can “differ among themselves”.<sup>95</sup> Instead he is describing what we might call the underlying movements which constitute this “Twofold rhythm, solar and lunar, waking and sleeping.”<sup>96</sup> Nancy is describing a further difference or distinction, “the rhythmic distinction between the inequality of day and the equality of night”, which itself situates sleep, *as fall*.<sup>97</sup> Remember that falling is neither a state nor a solid condition but in its movement is always a movement *into* night and thus away from the sharp distinctions of day.<sup>98</sup>

This egalitarian night, sleep’s fall away from light, does not, as such, fall to Rilke’s words, taken up by Krell as a warning against “the error of drawing distinctions too sharply, too violently.”<sup>99</sup> It is no mere accident that it is here, in this chapter about the equal world of sleep, that Nancy describes the “sleeping together” that for many “evokes nothing less than what we call in the crudest way (but why crude? except because we have thus twisted the sense of words, at least in the French language) “going to bed together.””<sup>100</sup> Yet for Nancy this together – without losing its intimacy – takes on a global sense (as opposed to significance): “In their [those who sleep together] “together” is refracted the entirety of all sleepers: animals, plants, rivers, seas, sands, stars set in their

---

<sup>91</sup> *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>92</sup> *ibid*

<sup>93</sup> *ibid*, p. 21

<sup>94</sup> *ibid*

<sup>95</sup> *ibid*

<sup>96</sup> *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>97</sup> *ibid*

<sup>98</sup> All this talk of movements should return us to the missing analysis of the motility of life in Heidegger’s comparative examination *and* the parallel movements of sleep and phenomenology suggested in our Chapter 1.

<sup>99</sup> Krell, David F. *Daimon Life*, p. 13. Referring to his epigrams from Rainer Maria Rilke’s *Duino Elegy*, no. 1: “*Aber Lebendige machen alle den Fehler, / daß sie zu stark unterscheiden*. [Yet living beings all make the same / mistake – they distinguish too sharply.]”, on p. 1 of *Daimon Life*.

<sup>100</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 18. This aspect of the “together” of sleep – the sexual, the intimate, the loving – is striking and Nancy’s insights into it will be briefly explored in our next section. Though a more thoroughgoing treatment of sleep and sex is both justified and opened by our concluding statements.

crystalline spheres of ether, and ether itself, which has fallen asleep.”<sup>101</sup> One might blink, or quickly rest ones eyes, and miss that here for Nancy the ‘uncertainty’ that Heidegger describes when considering *what* sleeps never even arises: “We do not say that the stone is asleep or awake. Yet what about the plant? Here already we are uncertain.”<sup>102</sup> *Here*, embracing the other(s) and embraced by night, this uncertainty and this assignment of sleeping and waking, these distinctions, have *no place*.

Sleep, for Nancy, does not draw us into the poverty of animals, nor deaden us to world as in the case of the stone. Instead it offers the world shared by all things. It grants equality across all beings. In this sense, and in many others, Nancy enacts an egalitarian conversion of Heideggerian philosophy. In *The Sense of the World*, published in French, as *Le sens du monde*, some twenty four years before *Tombe de sommeil*, at the beginning of a chapter entitled ‘Touching’, Nancy cites Heidegger’s famous passage contrasting the “touching” of lizards, stones and humans.<sup>103</sup> For our purposes the following four questions will help us to situate Nancy’s difference from Heidegger on world:

Why, then, is “access” determined here *a priori* as the identification and appropriation of the “other thing”?... why does one have to determine “access to” *a priori* as the only way of making-up-a-world and of being-toward-the-world? Why could the world not also *a priori* consist in being-among, being-between, and being-against? In remoteness and contact without “access”?<sup>104</sup>

As we have examined above the question of access – or transposition – is central to Heidegger’s treatment of animality and offered resources for the parallel Heideggerian account of the sleeper which we developed. Yet for Nancy the question of access – an access which is surely lost in the fall of the sleeper away from distinctions and distinctness – misses the prior relationship with world which all beings have. As Marie-Eve Morin puts it: “world-forming is not a human activity but an ontological one: *it* worlds, or *there is* sense, sense itself circulates.”<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>102</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *FCM*, p. 62

<sup>103</sup> *ibid*, pp. 196 – 197. As we discussed above, Derrida also comments on this passage in *Of Spirit* and a longer discussion of this earlier engagement with Heidegger’s *FCM*, by Nancy, would need to consider in some depth this connection. Here we may, unfortunately, only offer the connection as food for future enquiry.

<sup>104</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Sense of the World*, translated by Jeffrey S. Librett. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997, p. 59

<sup>105</sup> Morin, Marie-Eve. *Jean-Luc Nancy*, p. 45

Thus we can, in fact, say that the Nancean sleeper does sleep with the fishes, *à la* Heidegger, or indeed with the stones, Sphinxes,<sup>106</sup> stars and everything else besides. But what we cannot say is that this equalising sleep amounts to a loss of world. Rather, and we will come back to this in a moment, world, as sense making, is touched upon in sleep without the usual obscuring of sense by the glittering significances with which we are so surrounded in waking life. “The problem with phenomenology [and Heidegger], according to Nancy, is that it thinks access (significance, light) only in terms of appropriation.”<sup>107</sup> We discussed earlier the risks of such appropriations, such anthropomorphisms, and in a moment we will return to this question of sense, significance and world. For now it is enough to see that, in sharp contrast with Heidegger’s exile of the sleeper from world, in *The Fall of Sleep* “Sleep itself becomes the return to the immemorial world, to the world from beyond the world, to the world of obscure gods who utter no creative word.”<sup>108</sup>

Here, as words fail us – slip away from us and lose their significance, their pull – the second of our points of contact comes into view. Night, for Nancy, “suits” sleep not only because of its movement towards the indistinct, its “darkness”, but also due to its “silence.”<sup>109</sup> This “silence” of sleep, what Nancy will call “the suspense of creative speech” should return us to the centrality of language for Heidegger’s conception of Dasein.<sup>110</sup> However, not merely in terms of the dumb animal who, lacking discourse, also lacks existence and world, but also in relation to the somnolent undertow of sleep’s silent uncanniness as found in *Being and Time*. In our second Chapter we examined whether the sleeper possesses discourse [*Rede*].<sup>111</sup> First we considered Heidegger’s claim that “the person who keeps silent can ‘make one understand’ (that is, he can develop an understanding), and he can do so more authentically than the person who is never short of words.”<sup>112</sup> This, when held alongside Heidegger’s claim that “Only in keeping silent does the conscience call; that is to say, the call comes from the soundlessness of

---

<sup>106</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 3

<sup>107</sup> Morin, Marie-Eve. *Jean-Luc Nancy*, p. 45

<sup>108</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 22

<sup>109</sup> *ibid.*, p. 17

<sup>110</sup> *ibid.*, p. 24

<sup>111</sup> See pp. 72 – 73, and 77 – 79, above.

<sup>112</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 208 [H164]

uncanniness”, hints at another, more radical, sense to the silence of sleep.<sup>113</sup> Of course, to cite Winkler once again, “The fact is that Heidegger will say nothing of the sort.”<sup>114</sup> As with the animal and the “man [who] is dumb” the sleeper does not *keep silent* at all for Heidegger.<sup>115</sup> However, Nancy here finds in sleep’s curtailing of language its very ‘divinity’:

...the most uniquely divine thing revealed in it [sleep] is the suspense of creative speech. No “*Let there be this!*” is uttered, no commandment to make something come to be. There is a silent obedience to the difference of the being: to this “nothing,” to this “no thing,” to this *ex nihilo* that light first drove back to the heart of darkness in the movement by which it sprang from it.<sup>116</sup>

Defying dogma and affirming the originary difference of day and night mentioned above Nancy insists that God slept after the first day of creative work. It is the uncanny silence to which sleep owes its loyalty that Nancy seeks when he follows the fall of sleep, when he seeks the sense of putting aside creating and naming.

Our third and final point of contact, like our last two, brings us one step closer to the sense of sleep and away from the meaning, significance, of sleeping, waking, and Dasein. The sleeper does not stand-up, they cannot take-up a stance. In our earlier treatment of Heidegger we wondered whether the giving-up of standing, of our upright posture, in sleep signalled, as opposed to causing, the forfeiting of *understanding* as well.<sup>117</sup> Thus, when we also remember the benumbed animal and its lack of comportment, its inability to stand in relation to another being *as* being, we begin to see that here again Nancy’s account of sleep lies at some distance – a distance taken and granted by sleep – from Heidegger’s. Laying our head down, giving-up on the erect stance with which we undertake our *day to day* life is also to lay aside significance and to open the sense of sleep. Taking Morin’s summary of this key distinction in Nancy’s thought we should note “the relation of significance is vertical while that of sense is horizontal.”<sup>118</sup> For Morin significance concerns “the relation of reference”, as commonly understood, whereas

---

<sup>113</sup> *ibid*, p. 343 [H296]

<sup>114</sup> Winkler, Rafael. ‘Heidegger and the Question of Man’s Poverty in World’, p. 530

<sup>115</sup> Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, p. 208 [H164]

<sup>116</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 24

<sup>117</sup> See pp. 71 – 77 above and the explicit connection between *Verstehen* and *vorstehen* discussed in Heidegger’s *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 276

<sup>118</sup> Morin, Marie-Eve. *Jean-Luc Nancy*, p. 5

sense “concerns what happens *between* things, ideas, bodies and people in their encounters, their movements of attraction/ repulsion.”<sup>119</sup>

How then do we, the awake, approach the sense of sleep, “this eclipsed thing... the eclipse itself: not the fiery ring around it, but the perfectly dark heart of the eclipse of being”?<sup>120</sup> One means is hinted at in the “*between*” that sense names. Dreams seem a good contender as situated between waking and sleeping – in contact with both but restricted to neither. “*Perchance* to dream, that is to say, perchance something of night passing into day, by chance, by misfortune or by capricious luck.”<sup>121</sup> Nancy’s focus on the *chance* nature of dreams, that *perchance* we may dream when we sleep, is more than just a reference to the eponymous Danish play. In Hamlet’s *perchance* Nancy finds the fragility of the dream, a vulnerability to “the acidity of day”, and this delicacy signals the care of touch as opposed to the blinding light underpinning sight, understanding and grasping.<sup>122</sup>

Yet, despite – or perhaps through – this fragility, the dream is “like waking, similar to it, and [we] dream as waking. Dream in place of waking.”<sup>123</sup> This bridging, this *between*, offers, perhaps a mode of ‘contact without access’ to sleep. Furthermore, and once again surprisingly, the “daydream already shapes sleep in broad daylight, sleep in the midst of waking.”<sup>124</sup> This “reverie” opens “a somnolent world into which the dreamer sinks and is lost.”<sup>125</sup> Nancy proceeds to describe this sinking in a beautiful and technical – with attention being paid to the similarity to our technical reproduction of dreamlike images in cinema – fall into dream and dreams. This account closes, appropriately with the falling away of the dream, that sensation everyone knows of having lost the dream, and losing with it “the sleep that now escapes” us.<sup>126</sup> Fundamentally this in-between, this uncertain, indistinguishable, “weight” and “heavy presence” of dreams returns us to the question of world and sense.<sup>127</sup> “Something was brought back from nothing, and in effect it is a configuration of nothing” – this offering, in its resistance to significance (contra, and yet with, psychoanalysis), is the movement of sense making. This movement, in its

---

<sup>119</sup> *ibid*

<sup>120</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 24

<sup>121</sup> *ibid*, p. 25

<sup>122</sup> *ibid*

<sup>123</sup> *ibid*

<sup>124</sup> *ibid*

<sup>125</sup> *ibid*, p. 26

<sup>126</sup> *ibid*, p. 27

<sup>127</sup> *ibid*, pp. 26 – 27

richness, is what Nancy affirms in direct contrast with Heidegger's sleeper who sleeps always in a poverty made all the worse by its former, being-questioning, wealth.

Shouldn't we, rather, esteem this considerable increase of our world as equal to the night of an outside-the-world within which we come to float like astronauts who work in space wearing those enormous spacesuits that make their gestures look clumsy and their thoughts hazy? But beneath their blurry appearance, astronauts carry out precise maneuvers and delicate operations. Like the maneuvers, operations, conducts, techniques, and arts deployed in the broad spaces of sleep.<sup>128</sup>

## VII: From Insomnia to a World without Sleep

Sleep presupposes the fear of night has been conquered—but night is the wilderness of fears.<sup>129</sup>

Let us now stray from the path of Nancy's reverie. Where he follows his chance encounter with dreams with the soothing [*berceur*] refrain of the lullaby [*berceuse*] – that rocking between waking and sleep, from and to, back and forth – we turn now to what motivates this search for the sense, the between, of sleep.<sup>130</sup> This question of motivations will also furnish us with a consideration of what underpins Nancy's interest in sleep more generally. The question of the presence of sleep, in Nancy's work, brings us to the connection between his work and that of Levinas. As such this section will assess what these thinkers share in their encounters with sleep, in both instances a reaction to Heidegger, and what distances them, the specific nature of these reactions. Fundamentally, their differences will be ontological and not ethical, or normative. Here we will see the emergence of a 'normativity of sleep' – or, better, '*for* sleep'. A shared demand to do justice to sleeping *and* waking.

We saw in our opening sections of this Chapter how Levinas's post-war work enacts a departure from Heidegger and Heideggerian thought. These texts, following the path already set out on in 'On Escape', seek an exit from being. In effect, as is particularly clear in *Existence and Existents*, they reverse Heidegger's search for that most general of all things – being – *from* the singularity of our own being-there. Instead Levinas asks after

---

<sup>128</sup> *ibid.*, p. 28

<sup>129</sup> *ibid.*, p. 37

<sup>130</sup> We will return to Ch. 6 'Lullaby' and Ch. 8 'The Knell [Glas] of a Temporary Death' in our next section.



the possibility of difference, alterity and *singularity* given the overwhelming presence of being.<sup>131</sup> It is in this context that the question of sleep appears for Levinas – as, that is, a search for “a hesitation in being.”<sup>132</sup> It might seem strange, given what Nancy explored above of the equality of night, to search for difference in sleep. However, as we saw above Levinas is not so much searching for the annulment of waking life in sleep but rather an escape from radical insomnia, an escape from the horror of the *il y a*.

The *il y a*, for Levinas, is accompanied by the existential (and truly indistinguishable) affect of ‘horror’. In these early texts horror is described in a number of ways but its fundamental structure is the return of presence in, and within, absence: “Horror is the event of being which returns in the heart of this negation, as though nothing had happened.”<sup>133</sup> The two main ways that this horror is encountered are through a thought experiment inspired by a famous section of Husserl’s *Ideas I*<sup>134</sup> – “imagine all things, beings and persons, returning to nothingness”<sup>135</sup> – and the appeal to radical insomnia. It is this second encountering of the horror of the *il y a*, which “manifests itself particularly in certain times when sleep evades our appeal”, that must concern us here.<sup>136</sup> The *il y a* of insomnia is characterised by a horror from which we cannot turn away – it does not fix our attention<sup>137</sup> but commands a terrible vigilance:

It’s very occurrence consists in an impossibility, an opposition to possibilities of sleep, relaxation, drowsiness, absence. This reverting of presence into absence does not occur in distinct instants, like an ebb and flow. The *there is* lacks rhythm, as the points swarming in darkness lack perspective. For an instant to be able to break into being, for this insomnia, which is like the very eternity of being, to come to a stop, a subject would have to be posited.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> Bruns, Gerald L. *On Ceasing to Be Human*, p. 100, note 13. “The singular (singularity) is crucial to Nancy’s thinking, but it is also a major preoccupation in French thinking from Bataille and Blanchot to the present. ... Levinas’s *Autrui* is singular in this sense, as is the ethical subject who is responsible for the good of the other, come what may.”

<sup>132</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, p. 64

<sup>133</sup> *ibid.*, p. 56

<sup>134</sup> Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas I*, Section 49, pp. 109 – 112

<sup>135</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other*, p. 46

<sup>136</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, p. 61

<sup>137</sup> Here again the proximities and differences with Husserl – who we should remember understood sleep as a slackening of attention and affectivity – are worthy of note.

<sup>138</sup> *ibid.*, p. 62

Nancy and Levinas share a horror in the face of this lack of “rhythm” this “opposition to possibilities of sleep”.<sup>139</sup> They share a horror of “this anonymous nightwatch”, but where they differ is that for Nancy this nightwatch will not amount to a “where [in which] I am completely exposed to being”.<sup>140</sup> We return to this loss of rhythm, and exposure to being, shortly.

The complex web of similarities and differences between Nancy and Levinas here deserve more space than we can offer but it is, for now, enough to see that they share a fundamental abhorrence of, and appreciation for the power of, the denial of sleep. In both cases, as we noted above this worry and its parallel turn to sleep itself can be seen as a reaction to Heidegger. Furthermore, in both cases these thinkers move *from* specific “phenomena” *to* the diagnosis of a more general, and harder to approach, dilemma.<sup>141</sup> However, the devil – and here we are dealing with the devilish (and as we will see *evil*) – is in the details; in, that is, the specific phenomena Nancy and Levinas move from, what it is they move towards identifying, and how they differ in their responses to Heidegger.

For Nancy “[i]t is not a matter of insomnia”, as with Levinas, but rather “of the world in which it is forbidden to sleep because of a process of torture whose effectiveness is not in doubt.”<sup>142</sup> Sleep deprivation reveals the normative weight of sleep – the obligation to *let sleep* – as radical insomnia did for Levinas. It is worth picking out that this *torture* is *effective*, for Nancy this “is not in doubt”. It is telling that Nancy names it, with a certainty which we all must share, *torture*. One need not have *experienced*, have lived through, sleep deprivation torture to be certain not only of its effectiveness but also that it is torture. What is more Nancy has chosen a phenomenon which is striking in its justification – in that it is justified. The world of sleep deprivation is also the world in which torture is justified, its justification is proclaimed by governments, television, cinema and causal thinking more generally. Perhaps here “we must ask ourselves whether it isn’t the unjustifiable that, in spite of everything, we want to justify?”<sup>143</sup> The “positive

---

<sup>139</sup> *ibid*

<sup>140</sup> *ibid*, p. 63

<sup>141</sup> As we discussed above Levinas sees his account of insomnia as already beyond phenomenology, hence our encasing of “phenomena” in scare quotes: “Our affirmation of an anonymous vigilance goes beyond the *phenomena*, which already presupposes an ego, and thus eludes descriptive phenomenology.” - *ibid*

<sup>142</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 38

<sup>143</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Experience of Freedom*, translated by Bridget McDonald, Foreword by Peter D. Fenves. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994, p. 132

wickedness”, “the measure of a new “knowledge of good and evil”” must involve “the affirmation that evil is strictly unjustifiable”.<sup>144</sup> Though Nancy does not name sleep deprivation as this new *evil* he sought to describe in *The Experience of Freedom* twenty years earlier, we can, nonetheless, see something striking in his horror at the denial of sleep. Something akin to Levinas’s horror and yet different.

Their difference lies, as in our previous section, with the question of world. For Levinas, insomnia is prior to world or rather enacts its dissipation. In this way the journey *to sleep* – which, as we saw, Levinas concentrates on in contrast with Husserl’s worry about the return *to waking* – is itself the forming of the hypostasis that founds world – our *position*, our *here*, from which a world is unfolded. As such night, the night which “in insomnia... itself... watches”, is not a world, for Levinas, but rather the “impersonal vigilance” of the *il y a* itself.<sup>145</sup> This vision of night might seem to contrast with Nancy’s earlier discussion of the night of equality, the night which “engendered” sleep – Nyx giving birth to Hypnos.<sup>146</sup> However, even at the end of Ch. 4, Nancy hints at the nuancing of his account of night: “Without night it [sleep] would have no place to exist, and living beings would be organized in such a way that they could bustle about in perpetual day without wearing out.”<sup>147</sup> This perpetual day, seemingly innocuous and merely a harmless philosophical thought experiment, takes on a very different tone by the last three pages of Ch. 7. “World in shambles, out of balance, uneven enough to make sleep itself devastated by unevenness.”<sup>148</sup>

Such a world, “the world in which it is impossible to sleep”, is, of course, also Heidegger’s *world* – the world which the sleeper appears within, for waking Dasein, but only ever as poor, and as denied access, scratching with piteous mewls at the edges of imperious Dasein’s domain.<sup>149</sup> This denial of access to world, which already appeared illegitimate given the falling away of distinctions in sleep, here takes on a more sinister character – here it appears to be a universalised, perhaps a *totalised*, form of sleep deprivation torture. The urgent tone of Nancy’s text increases, however, with his

---

<sup>144</sup> *ibid*, p. 123

<sup>145</sup> Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*, p. 63

<sup>146</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 22

<sup>147</sup> *ibid*

<sup>148</sup> *ibid*, p. 38

<sup>149</sup> *ibid*

suggestion that this “World in shambles” is not only a phantasm of Heideggerian philosophy but rather “It is possible that the world today is that way: without sleeping or waking.”<sup>150</sup> This world, which we all inhabit, is for Nancy threatening not only to sleep but, and through that threat, to waking as well – we will return to this shortly. This too resembles Levinas’s productive account of sleep – for without sleep, without an *escape* from insomnia, there can be no subject, no distinctions, no waking life as we know it, only the return of the indistinct rustling of the *il y a*.

Yet, for Nancy the question of “the world in which it is impossible to sleep” takes us one step further back. Insomnia “which is a wandering *from sleep itself*” is a distraction, for him, from the true threat, the threat of an attack on that which modulates, allows, and *senses* waking and sleeping – which Nancy will call world *and* soul.<sup>151</sup> The character of the world, as that which offers both sleeping and waking existence, or rather simply *existence* as we will see, is what worries Nancy. This world, which we live in and suffer from, transforms night and thus sleep too:

Nights shot through with flashes of fire, of frenzy, of famine. Nights stripped of their very night, uprooted from darkness and shadow, thrown into the harsh light of a nuclear blinding. Sleeps that are nothing but parodies, caricatures of sleeps, heads kept buried beneath muddy water but kept from giving themselves over to the abandon of deep waters.<sup>152</sup>

Nancy’s placing of the sleeper, alongside the wakeful, within *the* world – in contrast to both Heidegger and Levinas – allows him to situate the horror of radical sleep denial, of a world without sleep, in relation to waking life, and its politics and ethics. “It is not a question of an Other (the inevitably “capitalized Other”) *than* the world; it is a question of the alterity or alteration *of* the world.”<sup>153</sup> In contrast to Levinas who searches for – and is disappointed by the supposed lack of – an escape in sleep, Nancy pushes the proximity of sleeping and waking and so reveals the essential sense of their communication – which in our shambolic world threatens to collapse into a communion.

---

<sup>150</sup> *ibid*

<sup>151</sup> *ibid*, *emphasis added*

<sup>152</sup> *ibid*, p. 39

<sup>153</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*, translated by Robert Richardson and Anne E. O’Byrne, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000, p. 11

In order to understand the danger of this “World deprived of rhythm, world that has deprived itself of rhythm” we must turn to Nancy’s conception of the soul – the soul, which as the title of Ch. 7 tells us “never sleeps”. “Absence belongs to the body and to the mind; it is foreign to the soul.”<sup>154</sup> This, at first, appears to be nothing but a return to a conception of the soul as old as Western philosophy itself – or, at least, as the Socratic dialogues and the father of philosophy we know from them. The soul, seems to be Nancy’s ‘absolute consciousness’, his Dasein, his return to vigilance: the moment, that is, at which sleep is denied in Nancy’s philosophy. If we have been tracing in this thesis not only the accounts of sleep found in phenomenology but also phenomenology’s delimiting of sleep, ‘sleep this much but never more’, then here we surely come to the equivalent moment in Nancy’s thinking.

And yet Nancy is careful, wisely, to avoid this *fall* amounting to a retreat back to a pre-critical, pre-phenomenological, and pre-deconstructive privileging of the permanent, present, and pristine conception of the soul which it at first appears.<sup>155</sup> Nancy is as ever interested in the way in which beings are *with* each other and the case of the sleeper and the wakeful is no exception. This connection, this proximity, this ‘modulation’, he names the soul. Once again we are returned to the *between* as Nancy’s point of focus in his examination of sleep. However, this time the between is not of sleep and its world – though the shadow of the world looms large here as ever – but rather of the communication *between* waking and sleeping – perhaps just a chance echo of the intermediate position of the sleeper in our previous work on Heidegger, but perhaps something much more. Fundamentally, this is achieved by refusing that the soul’s lack of sleep makes it an “insomniac... quite the contrary, it is indeed the soul that sleeps with the sleep of the sleeper and that wakes with the wakefulness of the one awake. It is the soul that watches in the midst of sleep and that sleeps only in waking.”<sup>156</sup>

Already the ambiguity in this description of the soul – as “never sleeping” and yet that “sleeps with the sleep of the sleeper” – signals something distinct from the traditional

---

<sup>154</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 35

<sup>155</sup> Nancy’s ‘soul’ must be distinguished from the spirit or subject of self-consciousness. The presence of sleep in Nancy’s work was from the start situated alongside his critique of spirit: “Immortal, unengendered, insomniac: this is the triple negation over which the life of the spirit rises, imperturbably adult and awake.” ‘Identity and Trembling’, *The Birth of Presence*, p. 12, also cited in Gerald Bruns’ *On Ceasing to Be Human*, p. 5.

<sup>156</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc, *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 37

spike of presence securing waking with waking through sleep – making *one* wakefulness across or, better, *over* and *above* the sleeper.

But the soul animates sleep as well as waking. The soul is both sleeping and vigilant, and for that very reason it does not sleep. Nor is it awakened: in waking it is that which ceaselessly dozes, in sleeping it is that which wakes and watches—from all quarters, every time, it is that which, giving form and tonality to a presence, adheres to the edges, to the outlines.<sup>157</sup>

This soul adhering “to the edges” offers the “sleeper huddled inside the waker” and “the waker circling inside the sleeper.”<sup>158</sup> It speaks not of the limit of sleep as the surrounding of it<sup>159</sup> but rather of limits as edges that *touch*, of the skin of the body which touches the world of the night – which is still the world of the waking – even when the “night of the lowered eyelids” has taken us.<sup>160</sup> The soul “itself is the rhythm... the gently dancing shadow that keeps watch all the time over the possibility of alternation and rocking, over this turn-by-turn without which we would be either dead or else would be living beings standing stiff in their heroic posture, like that Socrates able to spend the whole night standing up: vigilance itself, the idea bright without shadow, and also without music.”<sup>161</sup> And yet, and with all of this, “In the end it [the soul] has to stop watching over sleep.”<sup>162</sup> And here, with this account of the soul *between* waking and sleeping, and animating *both*, in hand, we see the true depth of Nancy’s worry about our world: sleep does not suffer the torture of its own deprivation, rather the soul must live in this world “without sleeping or waking”.<sup>163</sup> “How to sleep, distraught soul, soul without soul, soul that floats lifeless over the field of battle or muck whose inanity an operating-room lamp garishly exposes?”<sup>164</sup>

## VIII: Experiencing, Ex-isting, Entering and Leaving Sleep

---

<sup>157</sup> *ibid*, p. 36

<sup>158</sup> *ibid*

<sup>159</sup> See p. 25, above.

<sup>160</sup> *ibid*, p. 6

<sup>161</sup> *ibid*, p. 37. And remember that “Sleep, perhaps, has never been philosophical.” *The Birth of Presence*, p. 13. Though this earlier claim about sleep and philosophy’s incompatibility is made alongside a reference to Descartes we can, by *The Fall of Sleep*, see that the legacy of sleep’s refusal and delimiting extends much further into the history of philosophy.

<sup>162</sup> *ibid*

<sup>163</sup> *ibid*, p. 38

<sup>164</sup> *ibid*, p. 39

The person who sleeps is a mental body or a bodily mind, one lost in the other, and in both cases, in both aspects, a subject extravasated, aspirated, *ex-posed* or *ex-isting* in the strongest and most problematic sense of these words.<sup>165</sup>

Nancy and, the early, Levinas share an abhorrence of unceasing vigilance, of the end of rhythm and the silencing of all music. What, however, does this make sleep in its interruption of that which would be incessant and all dominating? Gerald L. Bruns, in opening his *On Ceasing to be Human*, finds a peculiar liberation, or freedom, in Nancy's *The Fall of Sleep*. This freedom of sleep mirrors, Bruns suggests, that found in the act of writing according to Maurice Blanchot: "...it is a kind of limit-experience in which the one who writes is turned inside out, evacuated, becoming something entirely other, without identity."<sup>166</sup> Sleep, as described by Nancy, offers an *experience*, a limit-experience or experience of the touching of limits as we just saw, of freedom and Bruns allows us to approach this freedom of "becoming something entirely other, without identity." This reminds us that sleep is not merely a break from incessant wakefulness but also from subjectivity – it is "where consciousness and subjectivity become empty concepts."<sup>167</sup>

A number of puzzles ensue. How can there be experience of anything in sleep? What *kind* of freedom could be experienced in sleep? And, *who*, or *what*, has this experience of freedom? In progressing through these questions we, with the help of Bruns, find Nancy's most concrete account of the sleeper – though this account is, fundamentally, marked precisely by its lack of concreteness, by the falling away of all foundations.

Beginning, then, with experience. What could it mean to speak of experience in sleep, of somnolent experience? The clue lies in Nancy's early discussion of the falling away of the "I" in sleep – the loss of subjectivity in sleep precludes any attempt to understand this experience as relating to something gained, or grasped, by the subject or consciousness. Knowledge will have nothing to do with this experience:

---

<sup>165</sup> *ibid*, p. 35

<sup>166</sup> Bruns, Gerald L. *On Ceasing to Be Human*, p. 1

<sup>167</sup> *ibid*, p. 3

Experience is neither knowledge nor nonknowledge. Experience is a passage, a transport from border to border, an endless transport from shore to shore, all along a tracing that develops and limits areality.<sup>168</sup>

Experience, in all its movement plays, *between* and as, two equal and equiprimordial roles according to Nancy's earlier work *The Experience of Freedom*. It "is the testing of something real" and a keeping to the limits.<sup>169</sup> In both cases Nancy draws on the etymological origin of the word experience: "the origin of the word "experience" in *peirā* and in *ex-periri*, an experience is an attempt executed without reserve, given over to the *peril* of its own lack of foundation and security in this "object" of which it is not the subject but instead the passion, exposed like the pirate (*peirātēs*) who freely tries his luck on the high seas."<sup>170</sup> And yet, "The act of founding is indeed the act par excellence of *experiri*, of the attempt to reach the limit, to keep to the limit."<sup>171</sup>

This perilous founding act of experience in sleep cannot be *of* a subject as we might mistakenly believe given the word "act" which Nancy speaks of: "the founding gesture, the experience of the limit, does not belong to a founding subject, nor does it support a founded object."<sup>172</sup> As such we begin to see that the freedom Bruns finds in Nancy's account of sleep "is not the property of a subject but rather belongs to existence at the level of its singularity, irreducibility, and irrepressibility."<sup>173</sup> Before returning to this word which is welling up out of our discussion of Nancy's account of the sleeper more and more – *existence* – and with it the quotation with which we began this section, let us first consider this freedom which is experienced as the subject falls away.

Bruns, citing 'Identity and Trembling' again, contrasts Nancy's thinking of freedom, "a *finite* thinking that no longer depends on concepts of consciousness or the self-possessed spirit, or indeed that no longer depends on concepts at all", with that of Hegel.<sup>174</sup> Freedom, for Nancy, is thought as that which makes self-possession impossible, like experience it finds no subject, or object, which it is founded upon. "Freedom is, in

---

<sup>168</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Corpus*, translated by Richard A. Rand. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008. p. 113

<sup>169</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Experience of Freedom*, p. 20

<sup>170</sup> *ibid*

<sup>171</sup> *ibid*, p. 84

<sup>172</sup> *ibid*, p. 86

<sup>173</sup> Bruns, Gerald L. *On Ceasing to Be Human*, p. 6

<sup>174</sup> *ibid*



effect, the excess of things with respect to any determination, their anarchy with respect to any principle or rule.”<sup>175</sup> For Bruns this thinking and its writing, that is Nancy’s texts, are a “bursting [of] the seams of the propositional style of philosophical thinking”.<sup>176</sup> Sleep, who does not practice philosophy and who hides away from the phenomenologist, offers in its *generous* embrace the freedom from concepts, from significance, which, for Bruns, frees “you and me—from any denomination, including the epithet “human”.<sup>177</sup> Remember that, for Nancy, in the “together” of those who sleep intertwined “is refracted the entirety of all sleepers: animals, plants, rivers, seas, sands, stars...”<sup>178</sup>

Yet, and here we must distance ourselves from Bruns and his narrative, our third question remains: ‘*Who*, or *what* experiences this freedom from concepts, at the limit of all things?’ We know, by now, that only one word can name – though this too will say too much – that which experiences, freely, sleep: ‘existence’. The sleeper *ex-isting* is “a mental body or a bodily mind, one lost in the other, and in both cases, in both aspects, a subject extravasated, aspirated, *ex-posed* or *ex-isting* in the strongest and most problematic sense of these words.”<sup>179</sup> This quotation bears repeating<sup>180</sup> as it marks the point at which Nancy’s claims about the sleeper reach their greatest distance from *both* Heideggerian and Levinasian approaches to sleep – and it is a matter of *approaches*. The sleeper, unlike Heidegger’s animal and sleeping human, *ex-ists* for Nancy and, as such, sleep offers not even the promise of an escape from existence, of a move out of being. Nancy’s notion of existence, as Morin argues, amounts to a dissolving of the ontological difference: “there is no difference between existence and the existent, the existent’s “reality” is nothing other than the putting into play of its own existence.”<sup>181</sup> The ontological difference, which permitted Heidegger’s lifting of Dasein out from amongst other living beings *and* which described the neutrality of being *from* which Levinas demands an exit, in sleep merely falls away. Of course, for Nancy sleep will not be alone in this type of existence. It is not as if waking existence holds the ontological apart from the ontic whereas in sleep we slip away from such actions. Perhaps this slipping away is announced more wholeheartedly but the thought that existence could isolate it off – the

---

<sup>175</sup> *ibid*, p. 7

<sup>176</sup> *ibid*

<sup>177</sup> *ibid*, p. 11

<sup>178</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 20

<sup>179</sup> *ibid*, p. 35

<sup>180</sup> Repetition, as we will see momentarily, structures the existence of the sleeper.

<sup>181</sup> Morin, Marie-Eve. *Jean-Luc Nancy*, p. 34

sleeper from the wakeful – is precisely what Nancy is denying in his talk of the soul as *between* and in his account of existence more generally.

Rather than focusing on the technicalities and distinctive features of Nancy's use of the term 'existence' we are better served by seeking a more robust and concrete description of the sleeper, as ex-isting. Such a description is to be found in Nancy's holding of sleep in proximity, not to itself, but instead with those forms of existence which border, neighbour, and touch sleep. In particular, Nancy's consideration of the movement from waking to sleep, through the phenomenon of the lullaby, and his treatment of sleep and death according to and through their proximity, offer useful insights.

We saw above that it is the soul which communicates between waking and sleeping, which negotiates their differences and their contacts. This soul is the name Nancy gives to this originary difference and contact between waking and sleeping but in the previous chapter, Ch. 6, he had already discussed the conditions for the possibility of entering sleep. We noted in our first Part that Nancy finds the question of our entrance to sleep more problematic than Husserl. Whereas, absolute consciousness can put waking consciousness to sleep, for Husserl, Nancy insists that "No one puts himself to sleep".<sup>182</sup> From the assigning of the power over sleep to sleep itself, and its stripping from the subject, Nancy realises the value of a consideration of the "access road to its realm."<sup>183</sup> Of, that is, the lullaby.

What leads to sleep has the shape of rhythm, of regularity and repetition. It is a matter of nothing but mimicry, since sleep itself is rhythm, regularity and repetition. Sleeping does not consist of a process like that of walking, eating, or thinking. The only processes that belong to sleep are those of respiration and circulation. They themselves are put to rest, they find a slower cadence there, a deeper amplitude scarcely differentiated moment by moment. When it goes to sleep, the body is rocked to the rhythm of its heart and lungs.<sup>184</sup>

There is much in this paragraph which we could pick out but let us first note that the mimicking of sleep in that which "leads to sleep" is, despite the word "mimicry [*mimétisme*]", essential and fundamental, it is a condition for the possibility of sleep at

---

<sup>182</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 29. See Ch. 2, Sc V, above.

<sup>183</sup> *ibid*

<sup>184</sup> *ibid*, pp. 29 – 30

all, “no one enters sleep without some sort of lullaby.”<sup>185</sup> Furthermore, this passage to sleep, this soothing [*berceur*] into sleep, as with the fall, is itself part of sleep – sleep’s processes “respiration and circulation” are processes of “rhythm, regularity, and repetition.” In this pairing of the respiratory, spirit, and the circulatory, processes Nancy again brings the mind-body, body-mind into communication in the *rhythm* of sleeping existence. For sleep is, at its *heart*, a matter of the rhythmic “so also does sleep compose in itself the rhythm in which its profound nature is reflected.”<sup>186</sup> What is this rhythm, *what* is this “profound nature”? Nancy’s answer to this question is to destabilise existentially this *approach* to sleep: “Rocking movements put us to sleep because sleep in its essence is itself a rocking, not a stable motionless state.”<sup>187</sup>

Here, at the gates of sleep, heralded by yawns (the uncontrollable in and out of breath) and by the falling away of inhibitions, by the “to-and-fro of hands, of lips, tongues, and moist genitals”.<sup>188</sup> Here, already, sleep *is* as *ex*-isting. As the limit by which waking tests itself, by which we experience. The rocking of sleep, back and forth, neither within nor without but *with*, was already presaged in the “Twofold rhythm, solar and lunar, waking and sleeping” of Nancy’s ‘Equal World’.<sup>189</sup> The essential lullaby, without which the fears of night – that “wilderness of fears” – would never be conquered, shows that sleep, like experience, freedom, and existing, is not to be thought of as one, or any, *thing* at all.<sup>190</sup> It is the passage, the fall, the rhythm, the *with*. This is why Bruns praises Nancy for steering clear of definition “Wisely Nancy does not try to give sleep a definition”.<sup>191</sup> Motion, “defines” sleep, just as rocking and rhythm does but only if one realises that this motion is never internal to sleep. Sleep, as the essentiality of the lullaby proclaims, is spread throughout waking – remember as well that the soul sleeps *within* waking – and

---

<sup>185</sup> *ibid*, p. 30. This extract should remind us of what Merleau-Ponty said of going to sleep in *Phenomenology of Perception*, see Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 166: “Moreover, the situation of aphonia can be compared to sleep: I lie down in my bed, on my left side, with my knees drawn up; I close my eyes, breathe slowly, and distance myself from my projects. But this is where the power of my will or consciousness ends. Just as the faithful in Dionysian mysteries invoke the god by imitating the scenes of his life, I too call forth the visitation of sleep by imitating the breathing and posture of the sleeper.”

<sup>186</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, pp. 30 – 31

<sup>187</sup> *ibid*, p. 30

<sup>188</sup> *ibid*, p. 31

<sup>189</sup> *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>190</sup> *ibid*, p. 37

<sup>191</sup> Bruns, Gerald L. *On Ceasing to Be Human*, p. 4

this should remind us of the similar findings of our earlier work on Heidegger. The *delimiting* of sleep to *one* state does not hold water in post-Heideggerian thinking.

What we might call Nancy's 'phenomenology of proximities' continues when we consider that the sleeper is, as with any passage, rhythm, and rocking, *temporary*. The fall, like the rhythm, points, pointedly in the case of a physical fall, towards its conclusion – towards its ending. The leaving behind of sleep must surely also be part of sleep, be part of the rhythm of sleep's existence. Nancy beautifully articulates the proximity between sleep and its posthumous neighbour – death – in his penultimate chapter, 'The Knell [*Glas*] of a Temporary Death'.<sup>192</sup> "Like death, sleep, and like sleep, death—but without awakening. Without a rhythm of return, without repetition, without a new day, without tomorrow."<sup>193</sup> Here, near the end of his mediation on sleep, Nancy mediates between sleep and death which are like one another, which are so close that the Greek's named them twin brothers – Hypnos and Thanatos.<sup>194</sup> Furthermore, even in these opening lines, we are already warned away from seeing this relation from only one side – Nancy does not write "Like death, sleep" alone but also "and like sleep death". In the course of this chapter – so near the ending of the text and yet *not* that ending, we see the inquiry broaden out from a consideration of sleep *through* death to a consideration of death *through* the passage and rhythm that *is* sleep as *ex-isting*. The title of the chapter itself enacts just such a modification, or modulation, of death through sleep.

This double movement of this chapter is all the more productive and important as it prevents us from a key misunderstanding. Namely; sleep's ending in death – the *good* death of modernity – is not the ending of rhythm, it is not *the* ending of existence. Holding firmly to the connection between sleep's *ex-isting* and the passage to sleep, the lullaby,

---

<sup>192</sup> Our reading of this striking chapter must be, of necessity, selective – as indeed have been all the readings offered above – and so at this stage it is worth noting that we will not discuss the manner in which Nancy's account of death relates to his work on the 'deconstruction of Christianity'. Though, as we will point to in a moment, one of the ways in which a future somnolent phenomenology could develop would be to do exactly this – to connect the *tombe* of sleep and the tomb from which Jesus was raised up. Texts such as *Noli me tangere* (*Noli me tangere. On the Raising of the Body*, translated by Sarah Clift, Pascale-Anne Brault, and Michael Naas. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008) and *Adoration* (*Adoration. The Deconstruction of Christianity II*, translated by John McKeane. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012) would be of particular use in such an undertaking.

<sup>193</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 41

<sup>194</sup> "The one holds much-seeing light for those on the earth, but the other holds Sleep in her hands, the brother of Death—deadly Night, shrouded in murky cloud." Hesiod's 'Theogony' in *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

we see that this possible leaving of sleep, death, only spells the end of “a rhythm *of return*”,<sup>195</sup> of the “possibility of alternation and rocking, over this turn-by-turn”.<sup>196</sup> If the dead lie apart from the sleeper in their lack of a rhythm *of return* then what do they share, what, if anything, lies between the rhythm of life’s beating and rocking and that of death?

Nancy is playing on a productive, and ambiguous, proximity between the dead and the sleeper. Reminding us of Rimbaud’s sleeper in the valley “who has two red holes in his right side” and yet appears to all the world to be sleeping is to remind us to look both ways or through both neighbours windows.<sup>197</sup> As such Nancy suggests that we consider not only the sleeper’s *temporary* death but also that “one could also say that death is necessarily temporary, for it lasts only as long as time lasts.”<sup>198</sup> This is because the dead, “like any sleeper... has joined eternity: the reverse of time.”<sup>199</sup> The reverse of time is, according to Nancy, not time’s “stretching out flat in torpor and in coma”, not “its turning back to duration deprived of rhythm” but rather its “annulment”.<sup>200</sup> And *here*, for it must be a matter of a here or a there “*there where*, of course, and not *when*, for no time is given for that, only a place apart from all places”, again the word *rhythm returns* – what rhythm remains in death and in sleep, what rhythm survives this “annulment of time”?<sup>201</sup>

Nancy’s answer lies in the “form of *not* [which] outlines a hollow, it presses a footprint [*pas*] in the sand of shores that we keep approaching and leaving. A hollow, a hollowing out, an elevation, the immobile and immutable rhythm of the grave and the tomb, the respiration of the death sleep.”<sup>202</sup> The not [*pas*] and the without [*sans*] mark this chapter and it is in them that this shared rhythm is announced “*Not*—says the sleeper as well as the dead man, I am not there.”<sup>203</sup> Here Nancy finds a presence, or sense, or existing, in the *not*, in the *place* of “death sleep”. “*Tomb of Sleep*, says this cemetery”.<sup>204</sup> The place of death and the place of sleep share, but are never united, in this rhythm of the

---

<sup>195</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 41, *emphasis added*

<sup>196</sup> *ibid.*, p. 37

<sup>197</sup> *ibid.*, p. 42

<sup>198</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>199</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>200</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>201</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>202</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>203</sup> *ibid.*, p. 43

<sup>204</sup> *ibid.*

without [*sans*] “a sleep of earth or ash, a sleep without sleep and without insomnia, without awakening and without intention, a limitless sleep: the infinite brought down to the rhythm of each finite existence. [*d’un sommeil de terre ou de cendre, d’un sommeil sans sommeil et sans insomnie, sans réveil et sans intention, un sommeil sans bords : l’infini déposé selon le rythme de chaque existence finie.*]”<sup>205</sup> This “rhythm of each finite existence [*existence finie*]” is what connects the dead and the living *through* the between of sleep. Nancy expresses this through the sharing of this place of the *not* and the *without* which we, the living, watch over – whether it is the place of sleep or the place of the dead – the cemetery. This is why to “deprive someone of a grave” is connected with the horror of a world without sleep, it is to deprive “the dead [of] the sleep that comes back to them”.<sup>206</sup> Only at such a place, which stands in for the nowhere of sleep and death, can we, the living and waking, undertake our vigil: “our vigil opens a rhythm between the living and the leaving”.<sup>207</sup>

What remains of this “leaving”? Only existence, existence in all its singular plurality. Existents which “cannot help but sketch out a strange, unsettling, indecipherable sign, the sign without signification of an inconsistent but insistent complicity with no other analogy than that of a common sleep, shared since unsharable.”<sup>208</sup> The rhythm of existence remains. Sleep in all its “fluid being” holds together the rhythm of life and that of death.<sup>209</sup> The sleeper, ex-ists, and floats between the *time* of life and the *place* of death – the “deathbed”.<sup>210</sup>

## IX: The Blind Spot [*Tache*] of Sleep, or Notes Towards a Somnolent Phenomenology

Not seeing connects with some possibility of help or hope for sight.<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 43 – 44, and *Tombe de sommeil*, p. 79

<sup>206</sup> *ibid.*, p. 44. This connecting of the denial of a grave, “of a recognition of the body”, strengthens my earlier claim that for Nancy the discussion of a world without sleep is a discussion of evil, of the new understanding of evil required by the twentieth century, with its mass graves and those who deny these, and as such deny even the memorial, even the status of grave.

<sup>207</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>208</sup> *ibid.*, p. 45

<sup>209</sup> *ibid.*, p. 42

<sup>210</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>211</sup> *ibid.*, p. 48

Nancy begins his final chapter – ‘The Blind Task [*Tâche*] of Sleep’ – by returning to the figure of the insomniac – that point at which he touches, at a distance, Levinas’s thinking. “Whoever does not know how not to wake up, whoever remains on the lookout in the hollow of sleep, he, she, is stuck with his or her fear.”<sup>212</sup> As such Nancy remains with the demand to ‘let sleep’, but also with that which draws us away from sleep, with the fear of sleep itself – of leaving our nightly terrors and “entering the night.”<sup>213</sup> And yet, we might think that this return to the problematic of *entering* sleep is premature, or that it misses out, is blind to, another problematic. Nancy considered the fall of sleep, the lulling into sleep, the soul’s modulation of waking and sleeping, and the leaving of sleep by the route of death – the slipping from the bed to the deathbed. What about the rising again at dawn, what about our *everyday* awakening? We might think that, at the end of Nancy’s “sojourn” with sleep, that the rhythm of sleep’s *return* to waking has not been described or articulated in full.<sup>214</sup> Are we here returned, as if we had never left Husserlian phenomenology, to the problematic of ‘how we wake *again*?’

Let us rephrase this worry: we have, with Nancy, travelled to Hypnos’s realm, shrouded by his mother Nyx, and with his dreadful brother, Thanatos, ever near, at the limits of our vision and at the limits of our experience. But what, upon our return, upon our awakening, do we retain from this journey – from the passage that sleep is in its existing? What have we learned, not only about sleep, but about existence more generally? Surely we have learned much about what we *cannot* hope for: we cannot hope for a *completed* definition of sleep; nor for a *sharp* distinction between sleep and waking; nor, indeed, for a *separation* between sleeping and death, for, in other words, a safety in sleep. These lessons, Nancy’s lessons about or of sleep, can be illustrated by reference to two Ancient Greek gods and their proximity to Hypnos. Firstly, Charon, Hypnos and Thanatos’ brother and like them the son of Nyx and Erebus (Darkness or Shadow), the ferryman or boatman who carried, *for a fee*, those crossing the river Styx one way or the other. There is much which we might investigate between these deities but perhaps most striking is their connection to water and journeys across water – sleep’s lack of

---

<sup>212</sup> *ibid.*, p. 47

<sup>213</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>214</sup> *ibid.*, p. 48

foundations, its “fluid being”,<sup>215</sup> echoes the perilous journey of those travelling with Charon.<sup>216</sup>

The second Ancient Greek deity which can, in its connections to sleep, illustrate the lessons of Nancy’s text is the messenger with the winged sandals – Hermes. Hermes, a god of transitions and messages, commands Hypnos, perhaps through his winged staff, his Caduceus. His directing of Hypnos and with Thanatos, is beautifully depicted on the Euphronios Krater.<sup>217</sup> On one side of the vase is represented a scene from *The Illiad* where, after Sarpedon falls in battle, Zeus sends Hermes, who in his turn enlists Hypnos and Thanatos, to save Sarpedon’s body from the Achaens.<sup>218</sup> Sleep and death, like Hermes who here commands them, stand for not only the transitions from *one* state to an-*other*, they also take on the messenger quality of their master – they carry a body and a bodily message. Sleep as communication but never communion or unification, that is Nancy’s message. Sleep’s singularity, its existence, is never an isolation – we never, for Nancy, sleep alone.<sup>219</sup> But what about the content of Sleep’s message, which cannot be reduced to a set of words or anything subjective or objective? All we can say is that it is the sense that wells up in the freedom of sleep’s fall, of the falling away of signification.

And yet can we not *hope* for something more? Can we not hope for something more concrete, some account of sleep’s essence? As the quotation with which we began this section illustrates Nancy sees “some possibility of help or hope for sight” in the “absence of all vision and all visibility.”<sup>220</sup> For Nancy, following a close – and surely phenomenological – examination of “the instant just before [sleep], when eyelids have slipped over our eyes and they for one moment have remained seers behind their curtain”, identifies this hope for sight with a “seeing... that is like seeing the invisible”.<sup>221</sup> In seeing the absolute blindness that is sleep, in that instant on the edge of sleep, we realise “that there is nothing to see”.<sup>222</sup> But what, concretely, can we build upon this *seeing*, if we can

---

<sup>215</sup> *ibid*, p. 42

<sup>216</sup> I would like to thanks Christos Hadjioannou for bringing this connection between Charon and Hypnos to my attention along with many other interesting conversations somewhere *between* myth and philosophy.

<sup>217</sup> Now on display at the National Etruscan Museum in Rome.

<sup>218</sup> A scene which should put us in mind of Nancy’s connecting of allowing a place for sleep and allowing a place for the dead in the world.

<sup>219</sup> As Nancy put it some twenty years earlier “One never sleeps alone. And one never dies alone.” ‘Identity and Trembling’, *The Birth of Presence*, p. 35

<sup>220</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 48

<sup>221</sup> *ibid*

<sup>222</sup> *ibid*



call it such? Nancy's answer, with which he ends this text and his own somnolent sojourn, is that such efforts are, whatever else they are, foreign to "the blind task of sleep" they are still efforts "to try to discern the invisible" and they are limited just as phenomenology, as we knew it before, was.

However, there remain avenues for inquiry. There are still roads, or rather watery ways, not travelled by Nancy and left open by sleep, philosophy and phenomenology. Here, at the ending of our reverie let us offer just two broad directions of future investigation. Firstly, we may follow Nancy's instructions and tarry with, "sojourn in", the sleeper.<sup>223</sup> We may seek means, within Nancy's writing, for attending to the sleeper and to their message further. Two such means would surely be a listening<sup>224</sup> to sleep and its message, an effort to hear, sleepily, the "mumbles" that amount to "a confused attestation of existence", "a kind of grunt or sigh that escapes from barely parted lips."<sup>225</sup> And, of course, the touching of sleep which crosses between waking, the parent cradling the child and cradling their sleep too, and the sleepers embracing and entwined.<sup>226</sup>

Though this course would lead to a more thoroughgoing and multifaceted understanding of Nancy work and its relation to sleep a second direction is available to us. It is to follow in Nancy's sleepy footprints, to trace, from his sojourn, a method *from* sleep. We have already, in passing mentioned the idea of a phenomenology of proximities. This model, where the description is never that of a detached observer and is never merely *from* and *to* but always *back again* as well. This model follows Nancy's treatment of sleep, lullabies, dreams, and death and asks 'what of waking'? As such it seeks that which remains proximal and touching sleep as our eyes open and we ex-it sleep, without ever leaving it. This course of research, this future project, summons the resources of close description and priority of *ex*-perience to trace a somnolent phenomenology *within* the day and *between* us, as waking, and sleep. It will not be found in the lucid writings of phenomenologists but rather in the limits, at the edges, of those writings. The moments when these writings give out and give-up, when they fall from

---

<sup>223</sup> *ibid*

<sup>224</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Listening*, translated by Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007

<sup>225</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 14

<sup>226</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Corpus*, and *Corpus II, Writings on Sexuality*, translated by Anne O'Byrne, New York: Fordham University Press, 2013, for example.

exhaustion, there “we feel the fall.”<sup>227</sup> To touch on an example, Merleau-Ponty’s unfinished work *The Visible and the Invisible* offers, in its falling away, an opening for discussions of just this proximity between the invisible of the day and that which Nancy finds but does not pin down in sleep.<sup>228</sup> And, of course, the truth remains that these two course, these two routes – perhaps that of night and day, sleeping and waking – are not truly separable and must, in fact exist in communication *with* each other.

---

<sup>227</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, p. 3

<sup>228</sup> Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and the Invisible*, translated by Alphonso Lingis and edited by Claude Lefort, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968

## Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Translated by K. Attell, Stanford Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Alter groupe de recherché en phénoménologie. *Veille, sommeil, rêve, Alter revue de Phénoménologie*, No. 5/1997 – Éditions Alter, ENS de Fontenay-Saint-Cloud, 31, avenue Lombart
- Anton, Corey. 'Dreamless Sleep and the Whole of Human Life: An Ontological Exposition'. *Human Studies* 29.2 (2006): 181-202.
- Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. Volume 1*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Bergo, Bettina. 'Radical Passivity in Levinas and Merleau-Ponty (Lectures of 1954)'. In: Benda Hofmeyr (ed) *Radical Passivity. Rethinking Ethical Agency in Levinas*. 1st ed. Springer, 2009. 31-52.
- Bernasconi, Robert. 'No Exit: Levinas' Aporetic Account of Transcendence'. *Research in Phenomenology* 35.1 (2005): 101-117.
- Bruns, Gerald. *On Ceasing to be Human*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Calarco, Matthew. *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Cohen, Richard A. 'Levinas: Thinking Least About Death – Contra Heidegger'. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 60.1-3 (2006): 21-39.
- Crary, Jonathan. *24/7. Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*. New York: Verso, 2013.
- Dahlstrom, Daniel O. *The Heidegger Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- De Warren, Nicolas. 'The Inner Night: Towards a Phenomenology of (Dreamless) Sleep'. In: Dieter Lohmar and Ichiro Yamaguchi (eds). *On Time - New Contributions to the Husserlian Phenomenology of Time*. 1st ed. Springer Netherlands, 2010. 273-294.

- Derrida, Jacques. *Edmund Husserl's Origin of Geometry, an Introduction*. Translated by John P. Leavey. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Glas*. Translated by John P. Leavey. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*, Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Rogues*. Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal that therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Descartes, René. *Key Philosophical Writings*. Translated by E.S. Haldane and G.R.T. Ross. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd., 1997.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. *Being-In-The-World*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.
- Fuller, Matthew. 'Deep Sleep'. Lecture Given as part of 'Objects and Relations: Visual Cultures Public Programme', Goldsmiths University, London. Thursday 21st November, 2013.
- Glendinning, Simon. *On Being with Others: Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Derrida*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Haar, Michel. *The Song of the Earth*, Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik. Welt—Endlichkeit—Einsamkeit*,

Gesamtausgabe 29/30, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, 1983

Heidegger, Martin. *Off the Beaten Track*, Edited and translated by Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Heidegger, Martin. *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

Heidegger, Martin. *Pathmarks*, Edited by William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, Translated by Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, Translated by Michael Heim. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, Translated by Matthias Fritsch and Jennifer Anna Gosetti-Ferencei, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Hesiod. *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, Vol. 1. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006

Husserl, Edmund. *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis*, Translated by Anthony J Steinbock. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. First Book. Translated by F. Kersten*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.

Johnstone, H. W. 'Sleep and Death'. *The Monist: An International Quarterly Journal of General Philosophical Inquiry* 59 (1976): 218-233.

Krell, David Farrell. *Daimon Life: Heidegger and Life-Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Kroker, Kenton. *The Sleep of Others and the Transformations of Sleep Research*.

Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Leder, Drew. *The Absent Body*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Discovering Existence with Husserl*. Translated by Richard A. Cohen and Michael B Smith. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1998.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Entre Nous*. Translated by Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav. 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 2006.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents*. Translated by Alphonse Lingis, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *God, Death, and Time*. Translated by Bettina Bergo. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Of God Who Comes to Mind*. Translated by Bettina Bergo. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *On Escape*, Translated by Bettina Bergo, edited by Jacques Rolland. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise Than Being, or, Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University Press, 1998.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other* Translated by Richard A Cohen. 2nd ed. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, 1969.

Lewis, Michael 'The relation between transcendental philosophy and empirical science in Heidegger's *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*', forthcoming

Malcolm, Norman. *Dreaming*. London: Routledge & Paul, 1959.

Marder, Michael. *Plant-Thinking: A Philosophy of Vegetal Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

McNeill, William. 'Metaphysics, Fundamental Ontology, Metontology 1925 – 1935'. *Heidegger Studies* 8 (1992): 63-81.

- McNeill, William. *The Time of Life: Heidegger and Ethos*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Institution and Passivity*, Translated by Leonard Lawlor. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2010.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by D.A. Landes. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2012.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and the Invisible*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis and edited by Claude Lefort, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968
- Morgan Wortham, Simon. *The Poetics of Sleep. From Aristotle to Nancy*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.
- Morin, Marie-Eve. *Jean-Luc Nancy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2012.
- Mulhall, Stephen. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Heidegger and Being and Time*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Murdoch, Iris. *The Black Prince*. New York: Vintage Books, 2006.
- Nathaniel Hawthorne's 'The Haunted Mind', in *Twice Told Tales*, Vol. 2. Thomas Y. Crowl & Co. Publishers, New York, 1900
- Nagel, Thomas. 'What is it Like to be a Bat?'. *The Philosophical Review* 83.4 (1974): 435.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc, and Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe. *The Title of the Letter. A Reading of Lacan*. Translated by Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Adoration. The Deconstruction of Christianity II*. Translated by John McKeane. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Translated by Robert Richardson and Anne E. O'Byrne, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Corpus*. Translated by Richard A. Rand. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Corpus II. Writings On Sexuality*. Translated by Anne E. O'Byrne. New

York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Listening*. Translated by Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Noli me tangere. On the Raising of the Body*. Translated by Sarah Clift, Pascale-Anne Brault, and Michael Naas. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Birth of Presence*. Translated by Brian Holmes. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Experience of Freedom*. Translated by Bridget McDonald, Foreword by Peter D. Fennes. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Fall of Sleep*, Translated by Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Sense of the World*, Translated by Jeffrey S. Librett. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Tombe de sommeil*. Éditions Galilée, 9, rue Linné, 75005 Paris, 2006.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. London: Penguin, 1988.

Padui, Raoni. 'From the Facticity of Dasein to the Facticity of Nature: Naturalism, Animality, and Metontology'. *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 3 (2013): 50-75. Web. 9 Oct. 2015.

Polt, Richard F. H. *Heidegger: An Introduction*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Richardson, William J. *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963.

Rugo, Daniele. *Jean-Luc Nancy and the Thinking of Otherness*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University



Press, 1962.

Staehler, Tanja. 'How is a Phenomenology of Fundamental Moods Possible?'. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15.3 (2007): 415-433.

Williams, Simon J. *The Politics of Sleep*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Winkler, Rafael. 'Heidegger and the Question of Man's Poverty in World'. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15.4 (2007): 521-539.