

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 宗教額 博士課程
e-mail	masumi@nagasaka.mbox.media.kyoto-u.ac.jp	
発表題名 (英語)	Faith as the Possibility of Impossibility in Derrida's Thought: Beyond the Husserlian Notion of "the Idea in the Kantian sense"	
著者名	Masumi Nagasaka	
会議名 (英語)	The 2 nd DERRIDA TODAY International Conference	
開催地(国、市)	London, UK	
参加期間	2010 年 7 月 19 日 ~ 7 月 21 日	

In this paper, I presented the notion of faith as the “possibility of impossibility”, co-originated with “decision in the midst of undecidability”. Taking into account the fact that Derridean notion of faith is closely linked to his project of deconstructing Husserlian phenomenology, the argumentation is expounded in the following three steps.

The first is concerned with how Derrida, in his reading of Husserl's *Origin of Geometry*, shows that philosophical “belief” is co-originate with philosophical “decision”. The primary focus is Husserlian notion of “the Idea in the Kantian sense”, that can be anticipated as *ideality*, although its content cannot be given as *reality*, and thus could be conceived as *ideal possibility of real impossibility*. It can be anticipated by intention without intuition or pure one in the form of teleological faith and thus the “Kantian” Idea presupposes nothing else than faith, which places decision beyond knowledge.

The second is focus on the Husserlian notion of “real possibility”, considered as something connected to actuality (*Wirklichkeit*) and different from the “simple ideal possibility”, presented in his posthumous work (HUAXXXVI). The most important consequence of this distinction consists in the “exclusion” of real possibilities in the process of actualization. This exclusion belongs to the “thing” that exists as actuality by virtue of having been chosen among all others. In this sense, some kind of “punctuality (pointness)” divides ideality and reality, being the essential source of the exclusion.

Finally, I indicate that Derrida, by putting into question this “punctuality”, points out that the very distinction of ideality and reality has a character of fluctuation or a sort of aporetic structure. The utterance “*ideal possibility of real impossibility*” does not itself contain an aporia, however, having once discovered the above-mentioned fluctuation, we rediscover it as “*possibility of impossibility*”. In this case, we can trace the borderline between real possibility

学会発表渡航支援報告書

and ideal possibility with the help of “intention without intuition” revealed in teleological faith.

Thus, I have inferred that through his deconstructive reading Derrida inherited the Husserlian notion of “the Idea in the Kantian sense” as the “possibility of impossibility”, that is somewhat perpendicular to the horizontal territory of Husserlian “real possibility”. All the aporias that stunned Derrida in his last years like “forgiveness”, “decision”, “invention”, “hospitality”, etc. can only be conceived through their impossibility. Here, faith is not only not opposed to knowledge: furthermore it can only be reached through the radical auto-critique of knowledge itself as deconstruction.

During the conference, I have had many occasions to discuss with eminent Derrida scholars that provided fruitful criticism of my paper. Apart from other considerations, came a remark about the distinction between “possibility of the impossible” and “possibility of impossibility”. It was very stimulating and drove me to the conclusion that I should mark out two strata in the Derrida’s argumentation. First, we should discern “possibility of such and such impossible” when we are dealing with one particular impossible, and only afterwards, we can extend the impossibility of this impossible, for solely through this procedure that the possibility has a sense as possibility. And hence the impossibility of this impossible is a condition for this possibility. The extension from first stage to the second should be clearly implied when I say “possibility of impossibility”.

