

1
2
3
4
5 Omnia El Shakry

6 7 8 **History and the Lesser Death** 9

10
11 In Thesis III, the collective reflects upon the interconnected practice of crit-
12 ical theory and history. “*Critical historians . . . recognize that they are psychical-*
13 *ly, epistemologically, ethically, and politically implicated in their objects of study. . .*
14 *psychically*, historians should acknowledge and try to work though, rather
15 than simply act out, their unconscious investments in their material. . .
16 *ethically*, historians bear a responsibility toward—are in some way answerable
17 to—the actors and ideas, as well as their legacies and afterlives, being ana-
18 lyzed” (III.6).

19 What, then, is the role of ethics within the writing of history? And how
20 might our ethics be connected to the psychic stakes we hold in our objects
21 of study? As historians, what is our responsibility to the dead in our present
22 historical moment of danger, what Sigmund Freud termed “the times on
23 war and death” (273)? In cultivating an ethics of listening to, and learning
24 to speak with, the dead, how can we attend to the gravitas of this encounter,
25 in which we are inherently implicated, both consciously and unconsciously?

26 In our encounter with the dead across time and space, we could be said to
27 inhabit the space of the *barzakh*—a liminal zone or an isthmus. Such an isth-
28 mus was conceptualized by the medieval mystic Ibn Arabi (1165–1240) as
29 a space between the existent and the nonexistent, the known and the un-
30 known, “which is neither the one nor the other but which possesses the
31 power (*quwwa*) of both” (qtd. in Chittick, *Sufi Path* 118). Separating the living
32 and the dead, death and resurrection, the corporeal and the spiritual, the
33 *barzakh* is the domain of the imagination and the imaginal world. All humans
34 partake of this imaginal world, and it is most manifest in the realm of sleep
35 and the dream, an imaginal realm of being known as the lesser death (Chit-
36 tick, *Self-Disclosure* 338–39).

37 Writing history may be conceptualized as just such a realm of the lesser
38

1 death, in which a communication with the *beyond* of life takes place. In the
 2 minor traditions of modern historiography, the ethico-theological implica-
 3 tions of writing history have been emphasized and connected to the critique
 4 of historicism. Within Walter Benjamin's critique of historicism, the open-
 5 endedness of a messianic eschatological future in which "every second of
 6 time was the strait gate through which the Messiah might enter" (264) af-
 7 farded the critical historian the opportunity to recognize "the sign of a Mes-
 8 sianic cessation of happening, or, put differently, a revolutionary chance in
 9 the fight for the oppressed past . . . in order to blast a specific era out of the
 10 homogeneous course of history" (263).

11 We might imagine Benjamin's cessation, the caesura of the present in
 12 which the critical historian is writing history, "in which time stands still
 13 and has come to a stop" (262) as analogous to the space of the *barzakh*. Dwell-
 14 ing in the caesura between past and present would not be possible were it
 15 not for what Benjamin termed the "here-and-now" (*Jetztzeit*) of history. The
 16 past, both of the individual and the collectivity, appears not as a frozen in-
 17 heritance, nor as a disruption of the present, but as a liminal encounter with
 18 death itself, which takes place in the *Jetztzeit* in which we confront our own
 19 finitude and the "work of death." The critical historian "establishes a con-
 20 ception of the present as the 'time of the now' which is shot through with
 21 chips of Messianic time" (263).

22 Such an eschatological orientation of the historian should not surprise us.
 23 One need only be reminded of Karl Löwith for whom the modern philosophy
 24 of history and the historical consciousness of the Judeo-Christian Occident
 25 was "indeed, determined by an eschatological motivation, from Isaiah to
 26 Marx, from Augustine to Hegel, and from Joachim to Schelling" (18). Within
 27 this view of history, he noted, "the past is a promise to the future; conse-
 28 quently, the interpretation of the past becomes a prophecy in reverse, dem-
 29 onstrating the past as a meaningful 'preparation' for the future" (Löwith 6).
 30 Crucially, such a view resonates as well with the ethical orientation of psy-
 31 choanalysis. In his Seminar on *Ethics*, Jacques Lacan proposed an experimen-
 32 tal ethical orientation toward the Last Judgment, conceiving ethics as "the
 33 relationship between action and the desire that inhabits it" (313).¹ Such an
 34 ethical encounter could only be thought through in relation to the Last Judg-
 35 ment and it stood in explicit contrast to any notion of ethics structured by
 36 commonplace understandings of the Good.

37 Lacanian psychoanalysis places ethics at the core of man's relationship to
 38 the Good, as an unconscious dialectical relationship between the subject
 39 and the law mediated through enjoyment (*jouissance*). And yet within Lacan's
 40

1 framework the Good is not imagined as the moral universe of general values
 2 (neither “the moral ‘ought’ of the superego,” nor the Kantian categorical imper-
 3 ative), but rather a positive orientation toward what lies *beyond* the for-
 4 mal law, an “antimoralistic ethics” (De Kesel 50–51). For Lacan, ethics re-
 5 ferred to the “paradoxical possibility that one can consciously confront
 6 oneself with the domain in which one usually disappears, namely the domain
 7 of the ‘thing,’ of *jouissance*” (De Kesel 267). Thus conceptualized, ethics re-
 8 quires a turn away from “the service of goods” (Lacan, *Seminar* 313)—from the
 9 instrumental, the self-preservative, in short from the moral and material
 10 economy of modern man as we know him to be confined “to the most for-
 11 midable social hell” (Lacan, “Aggressiveness” 101).

12 If ethics entails an orientation to our desires and “in the end desire is de-
 13 sire for death and for nothing,” then the “Lacanian ‘thing’ names this stub-
 14 born kind of ‘nothing.’ . . . It is the ‘nothing’ that would survive us even if we
 15 satisfied our (death) desire with the entire world” (De Kesel 101). Is this not
 16 the destruction of the world which we are now witnessing? *Das Ding* precisely
 17 as a nothing “which would survive us even if we satisfied our (death) desire
 18 with the entire world.” Preserving this distance, bringing it into view, encir-
 19 cling it; highlighting the modalities in which other traditions have brought
 20 this abyss, this gap or *béance*, into view is the purview of psychoanalysis, the-
 21 ology, and by extension, one might argue, critical history.

22 If the task of the critical historian, in Benjamin’s words, is “to seize hold of
 23 a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger” then it is only by contem-
 24 plating our own disappearance, or stated differently, our own death, within
 25 a moment of danger that the historian can seize the past “as an image which
 26 flashes up at the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again. . . .
 27 For every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its
 28 own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably” (255). In encountering our
 29 own disappearance and the deathliness of our drive in the realm of the lesser
 30 death we confront the deadly enjoyment of our catastrophic times, confront-
 31 ing *das Ding* as a radical evil around which we must keep our distance and
 32 yet ethically orient ourselves. It is in this impossible space where humans
 33 confront the excess of their drives that a meaningful historical knowledge
 34 might be created. ■

35
 36 **Omnia El Shakry** is professor of history at the University of California, Davis. She is the
 37 author of *The Arabic Freud: Psychoanalysis and Islam in Modern Egypt* (2017) and
 38 *The Great Social Laboratory: Subjects of Knowledge in Colonial and Postcolonial Egypt*
 39 (2007) and editor of the multivolume *Gender and Sexuality in Islam* (2016).
 40

NOTE

- 1 I am inspired here by conversations with Stefania Pandolfo and by her “Divine Trial and *Experimentum Mentis*.”

WORKS CITED

- Benjamin, Walter. “Theses on the Philosophy of History.” In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, 253–64. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Chittick, William C. *The Self-Disclosure of God: Principles of Ibn al- Arabi’s Cosmology*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Chittick, William C. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al- Arabi’s Metaphysics of Imagination*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- De Kesel, Marc. *Eros and Ethics: Reading Jacques Lacan’s Seminar VII*, translated by Sigi Jöttkandt. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.
- Freud, Sigmund. “Thoughts for the Times on War and Death.” In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 14, translated by James Strachey, 273–300. London: Hogarth, 1957.
- Lacan, Jacques. “Aggressiveness in Psychoanalysis.” In *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*, translated by Bruce Fink, in collaboration with Héloïse Fink and Russell Grigg, 82–101. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959–1960*, translated by Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1992.
- Löwith, Karl. *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Pandolfo, Stefania. “Divine Trial and *Experimentum Mentis*: The Psychoanalyst, the Imam, and the Ordeal of Madness.” *Psychoanalysis and History* 20, no. 3 (2018): 293–311.