

H:B:H

NOTES  
TO  
LITERATURE

*Volume One*

THEODOR W. ADORNO

EDITED BY ROLF TIEDEMANN

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN  
BY SHERRI WEBER NICHOLSEN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

*New York*

European Perspectives  
*A Series in Social Philosophy and Cultural Criticism*

Lawrence D. Kritzman and  
Richard Wolin, Editors

*European Perspectives* seeks to make available works of interdisciplinary interest by leading European thinkers. By presenting classic texts and outstanding contemporary works, the series hopes to shape the major intellectual controversies of our day and thereby to facilitate the tasks of historical understanding.

Julia Kristeva      *Strangers to Ourselves*  
Gilles Deleuze      *Empiricism and Subjectivity*

NOTES  
TO  
LITERATURE

*Volume One*

THEODOR W. ADORNO

EDITED BY ROLF TIETZMANN  
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN  
BY SHERRILL NICHOLSEN

江苏工业学院图书馆  
藏书章

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
New York

Noten zur Literatur copyright © 1958, 1961, 1965, 1974 by Suhrkamp Verlag,  
Frankfurt am Main

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
NEW YORK OXFORD

Copyright © 1991 Columbia University Press  
All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data  
Adorno, Theodor W. 1903–1969.

[Note zur Literatur. English]

Notes to literature / Theodor W. Adorno ; edited by Rolf Tiedemann  
; translated from the German by Shierry Weber Nicholsen.

p. cm.—(European perspectives)

Translation of: Note zur Literatur.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 0-231-06332-6 : \$35.00

1. Literature—History and criticism. I. Tiedemann, Rolf.

II. Title. III. Series.

PN514.A313 1991

809—dc20 90-27732

CIP

Casebound editions of Columbia University Press books  
are Smyth-sewn and printed on  
permanent and durable acid-free paper

∞

Printed in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The Press gratefully acknowledges a grant from Inter Nationes toward costs of translating this work. The Press also wishes to express its appreciation of assistance given by the Pushkin Fund in the preparation of this translation.

Excerpts from *Reason in Our Time: Literature and the Class Struggle* by Georg Lukács, translated by John and Necke Mander. Copyright © 1962 by Merlin Press. Copyright © 1964 by George Steiner. Reprinted by permission of HarperCollins Publishers.

Excerpts from Paul Valéry. *The Collected Works*, Bollingen Series 45, Volume 3: *Plans*, translated by David Paul. Copyright 1960. © renewed 1988 by Princeton University Press; Volume 7: *The Art of Poetry*, translated by Denise Folliot. Copyright 1958, © renewed 1986 by Princeton University Press; Volume 10: *History and Politics*, translated by Denise Folliot and Jackson Mathews. Copyright 1962, © renewed 1990 by Princeton University Press; Volume 12: *Degas, Manet, Morisot*, translated by David Paul. Copyright 1960, © renewed 1988 by Princeton University Press; Volume 13: *Aesthetics*, translated by Ralph Manheim. Copyright © 1964 by Princeton University Press; Volume 14: *Analects*, translated by Stuart Gilbert. Copyright © 1970 by Princeton University Press. Reprinted by permission of Princeton University Press.

Excerpts from *Endgame* by Samuel Beckett. Copyright © 1958 by Grove Press. Copyright © 1958 by Faber and Faber. Reprinted by permission of Grove Press and Faber and Faber.

For Jutta Burger



## *Contents*

### TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

*ix*

### EDITORIAL REMARKS FROM THE GERMAN EDITION

*xiii*

#### *I*

The Essay as Form

*3*

On Epic Naiveté

*24*

The Position of the Narrator  
in the Contemporary Novel

*30*

On Lyric Poetry and Society

*37*

In Memory of Eichendorff

*55*

Heine the Wound

*80*

Looking Back on Surrealism

*86*

Punctuation Marks

*91*

The Artist as Deputy

*98*



viii  
CONTENTS

II

On the Final Scene of *Faust*

111

Reading Balzac

121

Valéry's Deviations

137

Short Commentaries on Proust

174

Words from Abroad

185

Ernst Bloch's *Spuren*

200

Extorted Reconciliation:

On Georg Lukács' *Realism in Our Time*

216

Trying to Understand *Endgame*

241

NOTES

277

INDEX

281



## Translator's Preface

Matters of language and presentational form are central to Adorno's thought, as is especially clear when he writes on aesthetic issues. Those matters are discussed explicitly in all the essays included here, and in some—"The Essay as Form," "Punctuation Marks," and "Words from Abroad"—Adorno is virtually explicating his own mode of writing. Accordingly, I have tried to produce a translation that represents the essential features of this highly self-conscious mode of presentation, and thus to produce a text that will give the reader a sense of what it is like to read Adorno in the original German.

Many of the specific features of the translation follow from this intention. Because, for instance, Adorno's paragraphs are not paragraphs in the sense to which we are accustomed but rather segments or fragments analogous to short movements in music, I have left them intact. While, on the other hand, I have broken down many of Adorno's very long and complex sentences, I have retained his extensive use of the semi-colon, colon, and dash, and have tried to capture the complex rhythms of his sentence structures with their inversions and appositions. If the text sometimes has the ring of eighteenth-century English, this is why.

Adorno repeatedly draws attention to the double-edged nature of language. On the one hand, language contains a utopian, logic-transcending moment and has certain affinities with music (I have translated the German title *Noten zur Literatur* as *Notes to Literature* rather than *Notes on Literature* in order to preserve the allusion to music that Adorno intended!). But language is also logical in form, historically shaped, and inescapably contaminated by its "communicative" use. Adorno's writing

draws on both these aspects of language. It is full of idiomatic expressions and extended metaphors, often taken from the sphere of commerce and finance. It is also full of allusions, plays on words, and a largely Hegelian-derived vocabulary that Adorno uses at least as idiosyncratically as systematically. All of these features I have tried to represent in some way—"reproduce" would be too ambitious a word here.

Adorno, who emphasizes the mediated quality of everything that pretends to immediacy, certainly does not conceive language as a medium for immediate subjective expression. It is constructed, and the foreign words and foreign borrowings that figure so prominently in the texture of Adorno's writing emphasize this constructive character of language, as he explains in the essay "Words from Abroad." At the same time, Adorno's explicit sensitivity to the different tonal qualities of the word choices available to him in specific contexts make his language an almost musical medium. Of course he also conceived music as a constructive enterprise; see his essay on Valéry. I have tried to suggest an analogous texture in English. Where Adorno used French, Latin, or Greek I have done so as well, often, however, providing glosses. And I have usually tried to preserve something of what is involved in Adorno's use of "foreignisms," often using the cognate English word, which is often as conspicuous in the English text as its analog was in the German. I have also given the original German text of the poems Adorno discusses, usually providing a fairly literal English translation for reference.

Certainly the translation lacks the "snap" of Adorno's German. This is not due solely to my lack of verbal inventiveness. English pronouns, lacking gender in most cases, are more ambiguous than German ones, and I have often spelled out referents where Adorno does not. Adorno's writing verges in some sense on an artificial, constructed language, a *Kunstsprache*, which sounds "the same" throughout his writings. But at the same time, it constantly violates expectations, that is, disrupts established patterns of thought and their verbal equivalents, and it does so without explanation. Accordingly, much of what Adorno says seems ambiguous, especially for the reader who has not been "acculturated" into his mode of thought. In addition, the mere fact that he is reading a text in translation undercuts the reader's confidence in what he is reading, rendering ambiguity even more problematic. I have spelled out referents in an attempt to counteract this increased ambiguity, and as a result much of the compactness of the original has been lost. On the other hand, I have not succumbed to the temptation to rewrite what Adorno says in

order to make its implications clear. And since the essays are not intended as scholarly works, I have also largely refrained from producing an "annotated Adorno" with explanations of his allusions and his terminology. Where I have provided translator's notes they are clearly identifiable as such.

Many of the essays in this volume were previously published in translation by others, and I have consulted those versions with profit on a number of difficult passages. But I have retranslated everything for this volume.

A project as demanding as this was helped immeasurably by the contributions of friends and colleagues. I would like to express my gratitude to Marllan Meyer, Sally, Ben, and Karl Hufbauer, Lane Kauffmann, Jeremy J. Shapiro, and Richard Wolin; and to my colleagues at Antioch University in Yellow Springs, Jackson Kytte, Jim Malarkey, Elliot Robins, and Jon and Peggy Saari, all of whom read portions of the final manuscript and offered valuable comments and suggestions; to Bob Hullot-Kentor, who was instrumental in introducing me to the project; to Tom McCarthy for terminological help; to the staff of the Antioch College library, and especially Kim Iconis and Jan Miller, who went out of their way to help with texts and references; to Jennifer Crewe of Columbia University Press, who was a delight to work with; and to Arden H. NicholSEN, who read many of the essays and helped me to hear Adorno's voice.

Shierry Weber NicholSEN



## *Editorial Remarks from the German Edition*

The English translation of *Noten zur Literatur* is based on the text in volume 11 of Adorno's *Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Rolf Tiedemann (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974).

The three volumes of *Noten zur Literatur* which Adorno published himself came out—in the Bibliothek Suhrkamp series—with Suhrkamp Verlag, Berlin and Frankfurt am Main (later, Frankfurt am Main). *Noten zur Literatur I*, which bore no number in the first edition, appeared in 1958 as volume 47 of the Bibliothek Suhrkamp, *Noten zur Literatur II* appeared in 1961 as volume 71, and *Noten zur Literatur III* appeared in 1965 as volume 146. The German edition, on which this English translation is based follows the last edition to appear during the author's lifetime: for the *Noten zur Literatur I*, the printing of 18,000–20,000 in 1968, for the *Noten zur Literatur II*, the printing of 9,000–12,000 in 1965, and for the *Noten zur Literatur III*, the printing of 6,000–9,000 in 1966. Adorno provided information on the genesis and previous publications of the individual essays in the list of previous publications at the end of each of the three volumes of the *Noten zur Literatur*, as follows:

### *Publication Information (Noten zur Literatur I)*

"Der Essay als Form," written 1954–1958. Unpublished.

"Über epische Naivetät," written in 1943 as part of the work in conjunction with the *Dialektik der Aufklärung*, composed jointly with Max Horkheimer. Unpublished.

"Standort des Erzählers im zeitgenössischen Roman," originally a talk for RIAS Berlin, published in *Akzente*, 1954, 5.

"Rede über Lyrik und Gesellschaft," originally a talk for RIAS Berlin, revised several times, published in *Akzente*, 1957, 1.

"Zum Gedächtnis Eichendorffs," originally a talk on Westdeutscher Rundfunk for the centennial of Eichendorff's death in November 1957, published in *Akzente*, 1958, 1.

"Die Wunde Heine," originally a talk on Westdeutscher Rundfunk for the centennial of Heine's death in February 1956, published in *Texte und Zeichen*, 1956, 3.

"Rückblickend auf den Surrealismus," published in *Texte und Zeichen*, 1956, 6.

"Satzzeichen," published in *Akzente*, 1956, 6.

"Der Artist als Statthalter," originally a talk for the Bayerischer Rundfunk, published in *Merkur* VII, 1953, 11.

### *Publication Information (Noten zur Literatur II)*

"Zur Schlusszene des Faust," in *Akzente*, 1959, 6, pp. 567ff. A note added by Adorno: "I once teased Walter Benjamin about his predilection for unusual and out-of-the-way material by asking him when he planned to write an interpretation of *Faust*, and he immediately parried by saying that he would do so if it could be serialized in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*. The memory of that conversation occasioned the writing of the fragments published here."

"Balzac-Lektüre," unpublished.

"Valéry's Abweichungen," in *Die Neue Rundschau*, vol. 71, 1960, 1, pp. 1ff.

"Kleine Proust-Kommentare," originally a talk for the Hessischer Rundfunk and the Süddeutscher Rundfunk celebrating the completion of the German edition of Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu*. Marianne Hoppe read the selected passages and the author read his commentaries on them. Published without revision in *Akzente*, 1958, 6, pp. 564ff.

"Wörter aus der Fremde," originally a talk for the Hessischer Rundfunk, published in *Akzente*, 1959, 2, pp. 176ff.

"Blochs Spuren," in *Neue Deutsche Hefte*, April 1960, pp. 14ff.

"Erpresste Versöhnung," in *Der Monat*, vol. 11, November 1958, pp. 37ff.

"Versuch, das Endspiel zu verstehen," unpublished. Portions were read at the seventh Suhrkamp Verlag evening on February 27, 1961, in Frankfurt am Main.

For *Noten zur Literatur I-III*, the editor of the complete German edition limited himself to correcting typographical errors and errors in citations and to making the citations somewhat more consistent.

Rolf Tiedemann



0000

*NOTES  
TO  
LITERATURE*

—  
*I*  
—

0000



## *The Essay as Form*

Destined to see what is illuminated, not the light.

Goethe, *Pandora*

That in Germany the essay is condemned as a hybrid, that the form has no compelling tradition, that its emphatic demands are met only intermittently—all this has been said, and censured, often enough. “The essay form has not yet, today, travelled the road to independence which its sister, poetry, covered long ago; the road of development from a primitive, undifferentiated unity with science, ethics, and art.”<sup>1</sup> But neither discomfort with this situation nor discomfort with the mentality that reacts to it by fencing off art as a preserve for irrationality, equating knowledge with organized science, and excluding anything that does not fit that antithesis as impure, has changed anything in the prejudice customary here in Germany. Even today, to praise someone as an *écrivain* is enough to keep him out of academia. Despite the telling insights that Simmel and the young Lukács, Kassner and Benjamin entrusted to the essay as speculation on specific, culturally pre-formed objects,<sup>2</sup> the academic guild accepts as philosophy only what is clothed in the dignity of the universal and the enduring—and today perhaps the originary. It gets involved with particular cultural artifacts only to the extent to which they can be used to exemplify universal categories, or to the extent to which the particular becomes transparent when seen in terms of them. The stubbornness with which this schema survives would be as puzzling as the emotions attached to it if it were not fed by motives stronger than the painful memory of the lack of cultivation in a culture in which the *homme de lettres* is practically unknown. In Germany the essay arouses resistance because it evokes intellectual freedom. Since the failure of an Enlightenment that has been lukewarm since Leibniz, even under present-day

conditions of formal freedom, that intellectual freedom has never quite developed but has always been ready to proclaim its subordination to external authorities as its real concern. The essay, however, does not let its domain be prescribed for it. Instead of accomplishing something scientifically or creating something artistically, its efforts reflect the leisure of a childlike person who has no qualms about taking his inspiration from what others have done before him. The essay reflects what is loved and hated instead of presenting the mind as creation *ex nihilo* on the model of an unrestrained work ethic. Luck and play are essential to it. It starts not with Adam and Eve but with what it wants to talk about; it says what occurs to it in that context and stops when it feels finished rather than when there is nothing to say. Hence it is classified a trivial endeavor. Its concepts are not derived from a first principle, nor do they fill out to become ultimate principles. Its interpretations are not philologically definitive and conscientious; in principle they are over-interpretations—according to the mechanized verdict of the vigilant intellect that hires out to stupidity as a watchdog against the mind. Out of fear of negativity, the subject's efforts to penetrate what hides behind the facade under the name of objectivity are branded as irrelevant. It's much simpler than that, we are told. The person who interprets instead of accepting what is given and classifying it is marked with the yellow star of one who squanders his intelligence in impotent speculation, reading things in where there is nothing to interpret. A man with his feet on the ground or a man with his head in the clouds—those are the alternatives. But letting oneself be terrorized by the prohibition against saying more than was meant right then and there means complying with the false conceptions that people and things harbor concerning themselves. Interpretation then becomes nothing but removing an outer shell to find what the author wanted to say, or possibly the individual psychological impulses to which the phenomenon points. But since it is scarcely possible to determine what someone may have thought or felt at any particular point, nothing essential is to be gained through such insights. The author's impulses are extinguished in the objective substance they seize hold of. In order to be disclosed, however, the objective wealth of meanings encapsulated in every intellectual phenomenon demands of the recipient the same spontaneity of subjective fantasy that is castigated in the name of objective discipline. Nothing can be interpreted out of something that is not interpreted into it at the same time. The criteria for such interpretation are its compatibility with the text and with itself, and its power to give

voice to the elements of the object in conjunction with one another. In this, the essay has something like an aesthetic autonomy that is easily accused of being simply derived from art, although it is distinguished from art by its medium, concepts, and by its claim to a truth devoid of aesthetic semblance. Lukács failed to recognize this when he called the essay an art form in the letter to Leo Popper that introduces *Soul and Form*.<sup>3</sup> But the positivist maxim according to which what is written about art may in no way lay claim to artistic presentation, that is, autonomy of form, is no better. Here as elsewhere, the general positivist tendency to set every possible object, as an object of research, in stark opposition to the subject, does not go beyond the mere separation of form and content—for one can hardly speak of aesthetic matters unaesthetically, devoid of resemblance to the subject matter, without falling into philistinism and losing touch with the object a priori. In positivist practice, the content, once fixed on the model of the protocol sentence, is supposed to be neutral with respect to its presentation, which is supposed to be conventional and not determined by the subject. To the instinct of scientific purism, every expressive impulse in the presentation jeopardizes an objectivity that supposedly leaps forth when the subject has been removed. It thereby jeopardizes the authenticity of the object, which is all the better established the less it relies on support from the form, despite the fact that the criterion of form is whether it delivers the object pure and without admixture. In its allergy to forms as mere accidental attributes, the spirit of science and scholarship [*Wissenschaft*] comes to resemble that of rigid dogmatism. Positivism's irresponsibly sloppy language fancies that it documents responsibility in its object, and reflection on intellectual matters becomes the privilege of the mindless.

None of these offspring of resentment are pure falsehood. If the essay declines to begin by deriving cultural works from something underlying them, it embroils itself all too eagerly in the cultural enterprise promoting the prominence, success, and prestige of marketable products. Fictionalized biographies and all the related commercial writing that depend on them are not mere products of degeneration; they are a permanent temptation for a form whose suspiciousness of false profundity does not protect it from turning into slick superficiality. This can be seen even in Sainte-Beuve, from whom the genre of the modern essay derives. In products like Herbert Eulenberg's biographical silhouettes, the German prototype of a flood of cultural trash, and down to films about Rembrandt, Toulouse-Lautrec and the Bible, this involvement has promoted

the neutralization of cultural works to commodities, a process that in recent intellectual history has irresistibly taken hold of what the Eastern bloc ignominiously calls "the heritage." The process is perhaps most obvious in Stefan Zweig, who produced several sophisticated essays in his youth and ended up descending to the psychology of the creative individual in his book on Balzac. This kind of writing does not criticize abstract fundamental concepts, aconceptual data, or habituated clichés; instead, it presupposes them, implicitly but by the same token with all the more complicity. The refuse of interpretive psychology is fused with current categories from the *Weltanschauung* of the cultural philistine, categories like "personality" or "the irrational." Such essays confuse themselves with the same feuilleton with which the enemies of the essay form confuse it. Forcibly separated from the discipline of academic unfreedom, intellectual freedom itself becomes unfree and serves the socially preformed needs of its clientele. Irresponsibility, itself an aspect of all truth that does not exhaust itself in responsibility to the status quo, then justifies itself to the needs of established consciousness; bad essays are just as conformist as bad dissertations. Responsibility, however, respects not only authorities and committees, but also the object itself.

The essay form, however, bears some responsibility for the fact that the bad essay tells stories about people instead of elucidating the matter at hand. The separation of science and scholarship from art is irreversible. Only the naiveté of the manufacturer of literature takes no notice of it; he considers himself at least an organizational genius and grinds good works of art down into bad ones. With the objectification of the world in the course of progressive demythologization, art and science have separated. A consciousness for which intuition and concept, image and sign would be one and the same—if such a consciousness ever existed—cannot be magically restored, and its restitution would constitute a regression to chaos. Such a consciousness is conceivable only as the completion of the process of mediation, as utopia, conceived by the idealist philosophers since Kant under the name of *intellektuelle Anschauung*, intellectual intuition, something that broke down whenever actual knowledge appealed to it. Wherever philosophy imagines that by borrowing from literature it can abolish objectified thought and its history—what is commonly termed the antithesis of subject and object—and ever hopes that Being itself will speak, in a *poésie* concocted of Parmenides and Jungnickel, it starts to turn into a washed-out cultural babble. With a peasant cunning that justifies itself as primordiality, it refuses to honor

the obligations of conceptual thought, to which, however, it had subscribed when it used concepts in its propositions and judgments. At the same time, its aesthetic element consists merely of watered-down, second-hand reminiscences of Hölderlin or Expressionism, or perhaps *Jugendstil*, because no thought can entrust itself as absolutely and blindly to language as the notion of a primordial utterance would lead us to believe. From the violence that image and concept thereby do to one another springs the jargon of authenticity, in which words vibrate with emotion while keeping quiet about what has moved them. Language's ambitious transcendence of meaning ends up in a meaninglessness which can be easily seized upon by a positivism to which one feels superior; one plays into the hands of positivism through the very meaninglessness it criticizes, a meaninglessness which one shares by adopting its tokens. Under the spell of such developments, language comes, where it still dares to stir in scholarship and science, to resemble the handicrafts, and the researcher who resists language altogether and, instead of degrading language to a mere paraphrase of his numbers uses tables that unqualifiedly acknowledge the reification of consciousness, is the one who demonstrates, negatively, faithfulness to the aesthetic. In his charts he finds something like a form for that reification without apologetic borrowing from art. To be sure, art has always been so intertwined with the dominant tendencies of enlightenment that it has made use of scientific and scholarly findings in its techniques since classical antiquity. But quantity becomes quality. If technique is made absolute in the work of art; if construction becomes total and eradicates expression, its opposite and its motivating force; if art thus claims to be direct scientific knowledge and correct by scientific standards, it is sanctioning a preartistic manipulation of materials as devoid of meaning as only the "Seyn" [Being] of the philosophy departments can be. It is fraternizing with reification—against which it has been and still is the function of what is functionless, of art, to protest, however mute and reified that protest itself may be.

But although art and science became separate in the course of history, the opposition between them should not be hypostatized. Aversion to an anachronistic conflation of the two does not render a compartmentalized culture sacrosanct. For all their necessity, those compartments represent institutional confirmation of the renunciation of the whole truth. The ideals of purity and tidiness that are common to the enterprises of a veritable philosophy versed in eternal values, an airtight and thoroughly

organized science, and an aconceptual intuitive art, bear the marks of a repressive order. A certificate of competency is required of the mind so that it will not transgress upon official culture by crossing culturally confirmed boundary lines. Presupposed in this is the notion that all knowledge can potentially be converted to science. The epistemologies that distinguish prescientific from scientific consciousness have one and all conceived the distinction solely as one of degree. The fact that it has gone no farther than the mere assurance of this convertibility, without living consciousness ever in actuality having been transformed into scientific consciousness, points up the precariousness of the transition, a qualitative difference. The simplest reflection on the life of consciousness would teach us to what a slight extent insights, which are by no means arbitrary hunches, can be fully captured within the net of science. The work of Marcel Proust, which is no more lacking in a scientific-positivist element than Bergson's, is an attempt to express necessary and compelling insights into human beings and social relations that are not readily accommodated within science and scholarship, despite the fact that their claim to objectivity is neither diminished nor abandoned to a vague plausibility. The measure of such objectivity is not the verification of assertions through repeated testing but rather individual human experience, maintained through hope and disillusionment. Such experience throws its observations into relief through confirmation or refutation in the process of recollection. But its individually synthesized unity, in which the whole nevertheless appears, cannot be distributed and recategorized under the separate persons and apparatuses of psychology and sociology. Under the pressure of the scientific spirit and its desiderata, which are ubiquitous, in latent form, even in the artist, Proust tried, through a technique itself modeled on the sciences, a kind of experimental method, to salvage, or perhaps restore, what used to be thought of—in the days of bourgeois individualism, when individual consciousness still had confidence in itself and was not intimidated by organizational censorship—as the knowledge of a man of experience like the now extinct *homme de lettres*, whom Proust conjures up as the highest form of the dilettante. It would not have occurred to anyone to dismiss what such a man of experience had to say as insignificant, arbitrary, and irrational on the grounds that it was only his own and could not simply be generalized in scientific fashion. Those of his findings that slip through the meshes of science most certainly elude science itself. As *Geisteswissenschaft*, literally the science of mind, scientific scholarship fails to deliver

what it promises the mind: to illuminate its works from the inside. The young writer who wants to learn what a work of art is, what linguistic form, aesthetic quality, and even aesthetic technique are at college will usually learn about them only haphazardly, or at best receive information taken readymade from whatever philosophy is in vogue and more or less arbitrarily applied to the content of the works in question. But if he turns to philosophical aesthetics he is besieged with abstract propositions that are not related to the works he wants to understand and do not in fact represent the content he is groping toward. The division of labor in the *kosmos noetikos*, the intellectual world, between art on the one hand and science and scholarship on the other, however, is not solely responsible for all that; its lines of demarcation cannot be set aside through good will and comprehensive planning. Rather, an intellect irrevocably modeled on the domination of nature and material production abandons the recollection of the stage it has overcome, a stage that promises a future one, the transcendence of rigidified relations of production; and this cripples its specialist's approach precisely when it comes to its specific objects.

In its relationship to scientific procedure and its philosophical grounding as method, the essay, in accordance with its idea, draws the fullest conclusions from the critique of system. Even empiricist theories, which give priority to experience that is open-ended and cannot be anticipated, as opposed to fixed conceptual ordering, remain systematic in that they deal with preconditions for knowledge that are conceived as more or less constant and develop them in as homogeneous a context as possible. Since Bacon—himself an essayist—empiricism has been as much a "method" as rationalism. In the realm of thought it is virtually the essay alone that has successfully raised doubts about the absolute privilege of method. The essay allows for the consciousness of nonidentity, without expressing it directly; it is radical in its non-radicalism, in refraining from any reduction to a principle, in its accentuation of the partial against the total, in its fragmentary character.

Perhaps the great *Sieur de Montaigne* felt something like this when he gave his writings the wonderfully elegant and apt title of "Essay." The simple modesty of this word is an arrogant courtesy. The essayist dismisses his own proud hopes which sometimes lead him to believe that he has come close to the ultimate: he has, after all, no more to offer than explanations of the poems of others, or at best of his own ideas. But he ironically adapts himself to this smallness—the eternal smallness of the

most profound work of the intellect in face of life—and even emphasizes it with ironic modesty.<sup>4</sup>

The essay does not play by the rules of organized science and theory, according to which, in Spinoza's formulation, the order of things is the same as the order of ideas. Because the unbroken order of concepts is not equivalent to what exists, the essay does not aim at a closed deductive or inductive structure. In particular, it rebels against the doctrine, deeply rooted since Plato, that what is transient and ephemeral is unworthy of philosophy—that old injustice done to the transitory, whereby it is condemned again in the concept. The essay recoils from the violence in the dogma according to which the result of the process of abstraction, the concept, which, in contrast to the individual it grasps, is temporally invariant, should be granted ontological dignity. The fallacy that the *ordo idearum*, the order of ideas, is the *ordo rerum*, the order of things, is founded on the imputation of immediacy to something mediated. Just as something that is merely factual cannot be conceived without a concept, because to think it is always already to conceive it, so too the purest concept cannot be thought except in relation to facticity. Even the constructs of fantasy, presumably free of time and space, refer, if derivatively, to individual existence. This is why the essay refuses to be intimidated by the depraved profundity according to which truth and history are incompatible and opposed to one another. If truth has in fact a temporal core, then the full historical content becomes an integral moment in it; the *a posteriori* becomes the *a priori* concretely and not merely in general, as Fichte and his followers claimed. The relationship to experience—and the essay invests experience with as much substance as traditional theory does mere categories—is the relationship to all of history. Merely individual experience, which consciousness takes as its point of departure, since it is what is closest to it, is itself mediated by the overarching experience of historical humankind. The notion that the latter is mediated and one's own experience unmediated is mere self-deception on the part of an individualistic society and ideology. Hence the essay challenges the notion that what has been produced historically is not a fit object of theory. The distinction between a *prima philosophia*, a first philosophy, and a mere philosophy of culture that would presuppose that first philosophy and build upon it—the distinction used as a theoretical rationalization for the taboo on the essay—cannot be salvaged. An intellectual *modus operandi* that honors the division between the

temporal and the atemporal as though it were canonical loses its authority. Higher levels of abstraction invest thought with neither greater sanctity nor metaphysical substance; on the contrary, the latter tends to evaporate with the advance of abstraction, and the essay tries to compensate for some of that. The customary objection that the essay is fragmentary and contingent itself postulates that totality is given, and with it the identity of subject and object, and acts as though one were in possession of the whole. The essay, however, does not try to seek the eternal in the transient and distill it out; it tries to render the transient eternal. Its weakness bears witness to the very nonidentity it had to express. It also testifies to an excess of intention over object and thereby to the utopia which is blocked by the partition of the world into the eternal and the transient. In the emphatic essay thought divests itself of the traditional idea of truth.

In doing so it also suspends the traditional concept of method. Thought's depth depends on how deeply it penetrates its object, not on the extent to which it reduces it to something else. The essay gives this a polemical turn by dealing with objects that would be considered derivative, without itself pursuing their ultimate derivation. It thinks conjointly and in freedom about things that meet in its freely chosen object. It does not insist on something beyond mediations—and those are the historical mediations in which the whole society is sedimented—but seeks the truth content in its objects, itself inherently historical. It does not seek any primordial given, thus spiting a societalized [*vergesellschaftete*] society that, because it does not tolerate anything that does not bear its stamp, tolerates least of all anything that reminds it of its own ubiquity, and inevitably cites as its ideological complement the very nature its praxis has completely eliminated. The essay quietly puts an end to the illusion that thought could break out of the sphere of *thesis*, culture, and move into that of *physis*, nature. Spellbound by what is fixed and acknowledged to be derivative, by artifacts, it honors nature by confirming that it no longer exists for human beings. Its alexandrinism is a response to the fact that by their very existence, lilacs and nightingales—where the universal net has permitted them to survive—make us believe that life is still alive. The essay abandons the royal road to the origins, which leads only to what is most derivative—Being, the ideology that duplicates what already exists, but the idea of immediacy, an idea posited in the meaning of mediation itself, does not disappear completely. For the essay all levels of mediation are immediate until it begins to reflect.



Just as the essay rejects primordial givens, so it rejects definition of its concepts. Philosophy has arrived at a thoroughgoing critique of definitions from the most divergent perspectives—in Kant, in Hegel, in Nietzsche. But science has never adopted this critique. Whereas the movement that begins with Kant, a movement against the scholastic residues in modern thought, replaces verbal definitions with an understanding of concepts in terms of the process through which they are produced, the individual sciences, in order to prevent the security of their operations from being disturbed, still insist on the pre-critical obligation to define. In this the neopositivists, who call the scientific method philosophy, are in agreement with scholasticism. The essay, on the other hand, incorporates the antisystematic impulse into its own way of proceeding and introduces concepts unceremoniously, “immediately,” just as it receives them. They are made more precise only through their relationship to one another. In this, however, the essay finds support in the concepts themselves. For it is mere superstition on the part of a science that operates by processing raw materials to think that concepts as such are unspecified and become determinate only when defined. Science needs the notion of the concept as a *tabula rasa* to consolidate its claim to authority, its claim to be the sole power to occupy the head of the table. In actuality, all concepts are already implicitly concretized through the language in which they stand. The essay starts with these meanings, and, being essentially language itself, takes them farther; it wants to help language in its relation to concepts, to take them in reflection as they have been named unreflectingly in language. The phenomenological method of interpretive analysis embodies a sense of this, but it fetishizes the relationship of concepts to language. The essay is as skeptical about this as it is about the definition of concepts. Unapologetically it lays itself open to the objection that one does not know for sure how one is to understand its concepts. For it understands that the demand for strict definition has long served to eliminate—through stipulative manipulations of the meanings of concepts—the irritating and dangerous aspects of the things that live in the concepts. But the essay does not make do without general concepts—even language that does not fetishize concepts cannot do without them—nor does it deal with them arbitrarily. Hence it takes presentation more seriously than do modes of proceeding that separate method and object and are indifferent to the presentation of their objectified contents. The manner of expression is to salvage the precision sacrificed when definition is omitted, without betraying the subject matter to the arbitrariness of conceptual meanings decreed once and for all. In

this, Benjamin was the unsurpassed master. This kind of precision, however, cannot remain atomistic. Not less but more than a definitional procedure, the essay presses for the reciprocal interaction of its concepts in the process of intellectual experience. In such experience, concepts do not form a continuum of operations. Thought does not progress in a single direction; instead, the moments are interwoven as in a carpet. The fruitfulness of the thoughts depends on the density of the texture. The thinker does not actually think but rather makes himself into an arena for intellectual experience, without unraveling it. While even traditional thought is fed by impulses from such experience, it eliminates the memory of the process by virtue of its form. The essay, however, takes this experience as its model without, as reflected form, simply imitating it. The experience is mediated through the essay's own conceptual organization; the essay proceeds, so to speak, methodically unmethodically.

The way the essay appropriates concepts can best be compared to the behavior of someone in a foreign country who is forced to speak its language instead of piecing it together out of its elements according to rules learned in school. Such a person will read without a dictionary. If he sees the same word thirty times in continually changing contexts, he will have ascertained its meaning better than if he had looked up all the meanings listed, which are usually too narrow in relation to the changes that occur with changing contexts and too vague in relation to the unmistakable nuances that the context gives rise to in every individual case. This kind of learning remains vulnerable to error, as does the essay as form; it has to pay for its affinity with open intellectual experience with a lack of security that the norm of established thought fears like death. It is not so much that the essay neglects indubitable certainty as that it abrogates it as an ideal. The essay becomes true in its progress, which drives it beyond itself, not in a treasure-hunting obsession with foundations. Its concepts receive their light from a *terminus ad quem* hidden from the essay itself, not from any obvious *terminus a quo*, and in this the method itself expresses its utopian intention. All its concepts are to be presented in such a way that they support one another, that each becomes articulated through its configuration with the others. In the essay discrete elements set off against one another come together to form a readable context; the essay erects no scaffolding and no structure. But the elements crystallize as a configuration through their motion. The constellation is a force field, just as every intellectual structure is necessarily transformed into a force field under the essay's gaze.

The essay gently challenges the ideal of *clara et distincta perceptio* and indubitable certainty. Altogether, it might be interpreted as a protest against the four rules established by Descartes' *Discourse on Method* at the beginning of modern Western science and its theory. The second of those rules, the division of the object into "as many parts as possible, and as might be necessary for its adequate solution,"<sup>5</sup> outlines the analysis of elements under whose sign traditional theory equates conceptual schemata of classification with the structure of being. Artifacts, however, which are the subject matter of the essay, do not yield to an analysis of elements and can be constructed only from their specific idea. Kant had good reasons for treating works of art and organisms as analogous in this respect, although at the same time, in unerring opposition to Romantic obscurantism, he took pains to distinguish them. The totality can no more be hypostatized as something primary than can elements, the product of analysis. In contrast to both, the essay orients itself to the idea of a reciprocal interaction that is as rigorously intolerant of the quest for elements as of that for the elementary. The specific moments are not to be simply derived from the whole, nor vice versa. The whole is a monad, and yet it is not; its moments, which as moments are conceptual in nature, point beyond the specific object in which they are assembled. But the essay does not pursue them to the point where they would legitimate themselves outside the specific object; if it did so, it would end up in an infinity of the wrong kind. Instead, it moves in so close to the *hic et nunc* of the object that the object becomes dissociated into the moments in which it has its life instead of being a mere object.

The third Cartesian rule, "to conduct my thoughts in such an order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the knowledge of the more complex," is in glaring contradiction to the essay form, in that the latter starts from the most complex, not from what is simplest and already familiar. The essay form maintains the attitude of someone who is beginning to study philosophy and somehow already has its idea in his mind. He will hardly begin by reading the most simple-minded writers, whose common sense for the most part simply babbles on past the points where one should linger; instead, he reaches for those who are allegedly the most difficult and who then cast their light backwards onto the simple things and illuminate them as an "attitude of thought toward objectivity." The naiveté of the student who finds difficult and formidable things good enough for him has more wisdom in it than a grown-up pedantry that shakes its finger at thought, warning it

that it should understand the simple things before it tackles the complex ones, which, however, are the only ones that tempt it. Postponing knowledge in this way only obstructs it. In opposition to the cliché of "comprehensibility," the notion of truth as a casual relationship, the essay requires that one's thought about the matter be from the outset as complex as the object itself; it serves as a corrective to the stubborn primitiveness that always accompanies the prevailing form of reason. If science and scholarship, falsifying as is their custom, reduce what is difficult and complex in a reality that is antagonistic and split into monads to simplified models and then differentiate the models in terms of their ostensible material, the essay, in contrast, shakes off the illusion of a simple and fundamentally logical world, an illusion well suited to the defense of the status quo. The essay's differentiatedness is not something added to it but its medium. Established thought is quick to ascribe that differentiatedness to the mere psychology of the cognitive subjects and thinks that by doing so it has eliminated what is compelling in it. In reality, science and scholarship's self-righteous denunciations of oversophistication are aimed not at a precocious and unreliable method but at the upsetting aspects of the object that method makes manifest.

The fourth Cartesian rule, that one "should in every case institute such exhaustive enumerations and such general surveys" that one "is sure of leaving nothing out," the true principle of systematic thought, recurs unchanged in Kant's polemic against Aristotle's "rhapsodic" thought. This rule corresponds to the charge that the essay is, as the schoolmaster would put it, not exhaustive, while in fact every object, and certainly an intellectual one, encompasses an infinite number of aspects, and only the intention of the cognitive subject decides among them. A "general overview" would be possible only if it were established in advance that the object to be dealt with was fully grasped by the concepts used to treat it, that nothing would be left over that could not be anticipated from the concepts. The rule about the exhaustive enumeration of the individual parts claims, as a consequence of that first assumption, that the object can be presented in a seamless deductive system, a supposition of the philosophies of identity. As in the requirement of definition, the Cartesian rule has survived the rationalist theorem it was based on, in the form of a guide to practical thought: the comprehensive overview and continuity of presentation are demanded even of empirically open science. What in Descartes was to be an intellectual conscience monitoring the necessity of knowledge is thereby transformed into arbitrariness, the arbitrariness of a "frame of reference," an axiomatics to be established at the outset to

satisfy a methodological need and for the sake of the plausibility of the whole, but no longer able to demonstrate its own validity or self-evidence. In the German version, this is the arbitrariness of an *Entwurf*, a project, that merely hides its subjective determinants under a pathos-laden quest for Being. The demand for continuity in one's train of thought tends to prejudice the inner coherence of the object, its own harmony. A presentation characterized by continuity would contradict an antagonistic subject matter unless it defined continuity as discontinuity at the same time. In the essay as a form, the need makes itself felt, unconsciously and atheoretically, to annul theoretically outdated claims to completeness and continuity in the concrete *modus operandi* of the mind as well. If the essay opposes, aesthetically, the mean-spirited method whose sole concern is not to leave anything out, it is following an epistemological impulse. The romantic conception of the fragment as a construction that is not complete but rather progresses onward into the infinite through self-reflection champions this anti-idealist motive in the midst of Idealism. Even in the manner of its presentation, the essay may not act as though it had deduced its object and there was nothing left to say about it. Its self-relativization is inherent in its form: it has to be constructed as though it could always break off at any point. It thinks in fragments, just as reality is fragmentary, and finds its unity in and through the breaks and not by glossing them over. An unequivocal logical order deceives us about the antagonistic nature of what that order is imposed upon. Discontinuity is essential to the essay; its subject matter is always a conflict brought to a standstill. While the essay coordinates concepts with one another by means of their function in the parallelogram of forces in its objects, it shrinks from any overarching concept to which they could all be subordinated. What such concepts give the illusion of achieving, their method knows to be impossible and yet tries to accomplish. The word *Versuch*, attempt or essay, in which thought's utopian vision of hitting the bullseye is united with the consciousness of its own fallibility and provisional character, indicates, as do most historically surviving terminologies, something about the form, something to be taken all the more seriously in that it takes place not systematically but rather as a characteristic of an intention groping its way. The essay has to cause the totality to be illuminated in a partial feature, whether the feature be chosen or merely happened upon, without asserting the presence of the totality. It corrects what is contingent and isolated in its insights in that they multiply, confirm, and qualify themselves, whether

insights in that they multiply, confirm, and qualify themselves, whether in the further course of the essay itself or in a mosaiclike relationship to other essays, but not by a process of abstraction that ends in characteristic features derived from them. "This, then, is how the essay is distinguished from a treatise. The person who writes essayistically is the one who composes as he experiments, who turns his object around, questions it, feels it, tests it, reflects on it, who attacks it from different sides and assembles what he sees in his mind's eye and puts into words what the object allows one to see under the conditions created in the course of writing."<sup>6</sup> There is both truth and untruth in the discomfort this procedure arouses, the feeling that it could continue on arbitrarily. Truth, because the essay does not in fact come to a conclusion and displays its own inability to do so as a parody of its own a priori. The essay is then saddled with the blame for something for which forms that erase all trace of arbitrariness are actually responsible. That discomfort also has its untruth, however, because the essay's constellation is not arbitrary in the way a philosophical subjectivism that displaces the constraint emanating from the object onto the conceptual order imagines it to be. What determines the essay is the unity of its object along with that of the theory and experience that have migrated into the object. The essay's openness is not the vague openness of feeling and mood; it is given contour by its substance. It resists the idea of a masterpiece, an idea which itself reflects the idea of creation and totality. Its form complies with the critical idea that the human being is not a creator and that nothing human is a creation. The essay, which is always directed toward something already created, does not present itself as creation, nor does it covet something all-encompassing whose totality would resemble that of creation. Its totality, the unity of a form developed immanently, is that of something not total, a totality that does not maintain as form the thesis of the identity of thought and its object that it rejects as content. At times, emancipation from the compulsion of identity gives the essay something that eludes official thought—a moment of something inextinguishable, of indelible color. Certain foreign words in Georg Simmel's work—*cachet*, attitude—reveal this intention, although it is not discussed in theoretical terms.

The essay is both more open and more closed than traditional thought would like. It is more open in that its structure negates system, and it satisfies its inherent requirements better the more rigorously it holds to that negation; residues of system in essays, through which they hope to make themselves respectable, as for instance the infiltration of literary