

学会発表渡航支援報告書

(ふりがな) 氏 名	ながさか ますみ 長 坂 真 澄	所属・職名 思想文化学 宗教学 博士後期課程
e-mail	masumi@nagasaka.mbox.media.kyoto-u.ac.jp	
発 表 題 名 (英 語)	La complicité de la foi et du savoir chez Levinas – en la confrontant avec celle de Kant - (Complicity of faith and knowledge in Levinas' thought – in comparison with Kant)	
著 者 名	Masumi Nagasaka	
会 議 名 (英 語)	Congrès International : Lectures de la Difficile Liberté International Conference : Readings of Difficult Freedom	
開催地 (国、市)	Toulouse, France	
参 加 期 間	2010 年 7 月 4 日 ~ 7 月 9 日	

In this paper I focused on “Messianic Texts” from *Difficult Freedom* in order to accentuate complex relations between faith and knowledge in Levinasian thought. He describes faith, on the one hand, as to be propelled by knowledge, proposing the notion of religion as a maturity of reason. On the other hand, trying to deliver religion from mystification of any kind, he regards it as “relation without relation” exceeding the capacity of belief of a subject, that reveals itself beyond any possible knowledge.

This complicity manifests itself in incompatibility of rational effort, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, faith in unconditional grace, described in his lecture of *Synhedrin*. I draw a parallel between this paradox and the Kantian antinomy from *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, where he seeks a perfect conciliation of faith and knowledge through the paradox of radical evil or simultaneity of its transcendence and immanence.

The Kantian solution consists in dividing the theoretical sphere and the practical one, with two delimitating lines of human reason. A part from any “certainty”, the Idea of grace transcends theoretical domain and reveals itself as immanent effort for the practical one in the form of “hope”. I have presented this model of reconciliation as the territorialization of the two concentric spheres and their horizontal superposition.

However, this delimitation of the borderlines does not go as far as disputing the rights of the reason to have its proper territory. Following Levinasian distinction of two sorts of auto-critique of knowledge from *Totality and Infinity*, concerning the extent and the very existence of such a territory, I put into the question the legitimacy of the claims of reason. This kind of deterritorialization is essential for Levinasian reconciliation of the paradox of grace and effort. Introducing the conception of “Messiah” as “me”, which contains simultaneously grace and effort in the self-commandment, he proposes a conception of universalization as

学会発表渡航支援報告書

commandment to this particular “me” in order to support the “universe”. It is remarkably different from universalization as coordination of multiplicities or superposed territories, insofar as in the former type no such territorialization is provided. On the contrary, the second type of universalization can be effectuated only through the first one.

My general conclusion consists in the statement that Levinasian reconciliation between faith and knowledge begins with a vertical movement of reason which criticizes itself and thus deprives itself from any territoriality. Thus knowledge supplies the dynamic process of deterritorialization to reach its ultimate reconciliation with faith.

Many questions have arisen during the conference. The most substantial one deals with clarification of the distinction between “horizontal” and “vertical”. My response to this important criticism consists in the introduction of “synchrony” and “diachrony” in order to discern the opposite types of universalization. In the first case, a subject is able to measure and compare the proper territories, while in the latter it should undergo the self-transformation beyond these territories. I hope to develop this thesis in my following research.

