

CONCERNING THE FESTIVE AND THE MUNDANE

*For Professor J.H. van den Berg on the occasion of his eightieth
birthday*

Bernd Jager

Département de psychologie, Université du Québec, Montréal (UQAM).

(This article was published in: *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*
Vol. 28, No 2 1997 pp. 196-234.)

The festive and the quotidian offer two fundamentally different perspectives on the human world. The quotidian attitude opens to us a workaday world structured by mental and physical barriers which require to be leveled or removed. The festive attitude gives access to a world of the threshold in which we play the role of host and guest and in which it is possible for things and living beings to make their personal appearance. Modernity can be understood as an era in which a quotidian, work-oriented attitude was made to dominate and reconfigure all areas of human existence and in which the festive was progressively removed from public, and finally from private, life. The

renewal of psychology requires a re-understanding and a re-integration of the festive dimension in our lives.

I lived my childhood in a small rural community in the North of Holland, where on Sunday afternoons our family was in the habit of visiting friends and relatives on their farms. My father had followed a commercial career, but the great dream of his childhood had been to own a farm. The conversations on those afternoons frequently turned to subjects agricultural and our midday meals were invariably followed by a leisurely stroll past the fields for a look at the crops.

It puzzled me as a child that these walks did not lead to the center of the village, to the park, or the football field, but that they almost always led past the same fields where the farmer had already spent his entire week. What was it, I asked myself, that drew the farmers back to their place of work on Sundays, when their religious convictions would hardly permit them to touch a rake or a plow, and when, moreover, there were so many other interesting places to take a look at? What did these farmers see on Sundays that they could not have seen on Mondays or Tuesdays?

It was only much later that I began to understand that the farmer's relationship to his fields, and to his crop, and indeed to his entire world, was different on Sundays than it was on weekdays. It became

then clear to me that workdays and feast days referred not merely to different days of the week, but to fundamentally different ways of living our life. This insight became clear to me only in retrospect, when I began to reflect on my memories of my father and his friend strolling through the country side on Sundays, while quietly appraising the crops and admiring the landscape. They were in the habit of walking slightly bent over, with their hands deep in their pockets, or folded behind their backs. They would speak for a while in low tones about family and financial matters, and then move on to more lively and humorous stories about our village life. They spoke in the ancient, regional dialect that was virtually impenetrable to anyone not from our province. From time to time their conversation would lag, they would stop walking, and cast a tender and approving glance at the crops and the fields. What stands out in my memories is the tenderness and gladness in the men's faces as they stood there silently surveying the landscape. They would stir themselves, as if embarrassed, from their reveries, playfully kicking a clod of earth, or absentmindedly pulling a weed here and there.

As a child I experienced the activities of our Sundays at first as simply different from those that occupied us during the week, and I felt no need to conceptually link the two worlds together into one comprehensive whole. The festive reality of the Sunday afternoon

strolls would always be followed by the workaday realities of Monday and Tuesday. Yet it never ceased to amaze me how distant and different these two realities were from each other, how each possessed its own distinct repertoire of human relationships, its own stock of communal habits, its own styles of eating, dressing, talking, or even of standing, in short, how each presented us with its own distinctive way of relating to the self, to others and to the surrounding world. Only gradually did I discover how closely these two very divergent ways of inhabiting the world intertwined and depended upon each other.

Workdays and Feast days

Thinking back about the relationship between those two worlds, I know that even as a school child, it was clear to me why there had be workdays. These days clearly were there to provide the material basis for our existence. Even a small child could understand that the more elaborate meals, and the leisurely walks of Sundays would not have been possible without the industrious weekday cultivation of the crops. But the second part of that proposition, which asked about the need for Sundays, was much more difficult to understand, and neither my parents, nor my teachers were able to make this need intelligible. This

is not to say that I received no answers to my question. I was, in effect, overwhelmed by answers, but none of these truly responded to my quest. I heard then, as now, the same ready-made, popular answers that lie on the tip of every tongue, but none of these aided my understanding. I was told the common, materialistic and rationalistic explanation, according to which Sundays were essentially days of leisure in which people prepared themselves for the days of work ahead. Sundays provided the leisure, so went the old dirge, that was needed to increase human production and to improve morale. Sundays are there to make people more efficient in their tasks on Mondays and Tuesdays. We find an analogue type of reasoning in Von Clausewitz famous and witty saying to the effect that war is the continuation of diplomacy, be it "by different means". War would not differ essentially from peacetime diplomacy, since both war and diplomacy pursued identical aims. Similarly, Sundays would pursue the same aims as do workdays, even if these would be accomplished "by other means". The difference between these days would be a question of style, of appearance, but not of substance. This rationalistic slight of hand does solve, in a manner of speaking, the problems posed by a fundamental difference between feast days and workdays, or between the sacred and the profane, or between war and peace. But this type of solution makes us think of the surgeon who boasted about his

radically new surgical procedure that solved an important medical problem, with the only drawback being that it killed the patient.

My question concerning the difference between workdays and feast days did not ask to get rid of a difference, it only asked to be brought in a closer contact with that difference, of seeing that difference with greater acuity, and with more understanding. What I wished to understand was not that the tired bodies of my elders would be restored during leisurely walks through the country side. The mystery that confronted me was not the biological question of how rest restores a tired organism, but the existential and ontological question of how the festive, as embodied in the Sabbath, and understood as a distinct form of human life, can be thought to form a necessary compliment to the world of ordinary daily activity. What I sought to understand was how the festive creates a distinct way of being present to the world, and how that distinct way might be thought to differ from, and compliment, the manner in which we inhabit the world in our ordinary workaday life. From this distance my childish question can be seen as a first step in discovering something concerning the ontological mystery of the Sabbath. As we will see later, it is the Sabbath that introduces a beginning, a middle, and an end in what would otherwise be an endless, and ultimately meaningless series of quotidian tasks.

These Sunday afternoon walks of my childhood did not take place within a cultural vacuum; their purpose and meaning unfolded within a distinct Judeo- Christian cultural framework. Within that framework the difference between festive and quotidian reality points back to its foundation in a creation narrative. This mythic account narrates the institution of the ontological difference between work and celebration, between what is festive and quotidian, or between what sacred and profane. (1) This creation myth does not merely present us with an account of what we find present on earth; it is not merely an enumeration of created things and beings. It is first and foremost an account of the coming into being of a difference that lodges itself not only between the sacred and the profane, between creator and created, but also between workdays and feast days, Sundays and Mondays. The Priestly version of the creation myth, such as we read it in the Book of Genesis, describes the creation of the world as an orderly unfolding process in which periods of divine active ordering and fashioning are succeeded by periods of contemplation, benediction and rest. The myth represents the divine creative act as always already internally divided between, on the one hand, an active "hands on", creative part, that can be thought to foreshadow the quotidian realm, and, on the other, a contemplative, "hands-off", creative part that can

be thought to foreshadow the festive realm. Thus we read that on the third day:

And God said: "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together in one place, and let the land appear." And it was so. God called the dry land Earth and the waters that were gathered together he called Seas.

This period of activity is then immediately followed by a contemplative phase of creation:

And God saw that it was good.

The passage can be seen to span an ontological divide between two very different aspects of the process of creation. There is, first of all, question of a "gathering together into one place" of water and land, of an active interfering and coming to grips with an existing order. This activity differentiates, names, allocates and commands. This active, interfering phase is followed by a second phase of seeming withdrawal, characterized by a stepping back from an active parting, gathering, and rearranging, and by the assumption of a distinctly different attitude of appraising and welcoming that what had been created. This

second part of the creative act is summed up in the phrase: "And God saw that it was good".

This paradigmatic dual pattern of creation, in which periods of active quotidian creation are succeeded by periods of festive detachment and appraisal, is repeated on the third day of creation with the generation of plants yielding seeds and of trees bearing fruit. It is repeated again on the fourth day with the birth of the stars, the seasons and the years. And it reappears on the fifth day when the sea becomes the habitat of fish, and the air the realm of birds; and again on the sixth day, when terrestrial animals begin to populate the earth. It is reiterated, finally, and with added emphasis, on the same sixth day, when creation reaches completion with the birth of Adam and Eve.

All of these acts of divine creation follow a dialectical pattern in which a period of active interference in the existing natural order, of separating, distinguishing and naming, is followed by a contemplative and festive standing back that finds expression in the sentence: "And God saw that it was good".

The narrative about the birth of mankind concludes with an especially emphatic phrase:

And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good.

Let us note here in passing that the relevance of this biblical account of creation, along with the insight it offers into the relationship between quotidian and festive reality, should not be dismissed as irrelevant to psychological thought on the grounds that it belongs to a religious tradition. The story of creation as told in Genesis has been so much part of our Western way of life, has for so long shaped our practices and institutions, and cultivated our thoughts and feelings, that any attempt to understand our historically formed humanity while arbitrarily ruling out any reference to it, can only lead to confusion and willful distortion. Moreover, a psychology that does not recognize religious sensibilities and practices as a unique and irreducible aspect of the human condition is necessarily an incoherent psychology, as doomed by its selective blindness as would be a program of physics that would require us to disregard gravitation, or a chemistry that would have us discount carbon compounds.

All known viable societies, living under conditions as vastly different as those encountered by nomadic tribes, or modern city dwellers, and under climatic conditions as divergent as those of arctic tundra, desert and tropical forest, have from their very inception shared the common practice of interrupting their quotidian life with festive interludes. This

pattern of alternating quotidian with festive times is so fundamental to human kind, and so ubiquitous as to make us think of human inhabitation as always, and essentially, a dialogue between these two very different ways of experiencing and engaging our world. (2)

The King James version of the Priestly story of creation ends by setting the six days of creative labor apart from the festive, seventh day. It is this seventh day that the Creator "blessed and hallowed":

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested (shabat) from all his work which he had made.

Strictly speaking, there is in this passage as yet no mention of the Sabbath in the form it eventually was to take as a distinctly Judaic and Christian institution. The passage in question only presents us with the verbal form shabat or chabat, which may be translated as "he rested" or, "he ceased". The word resonates curiously with the Hebrew word for "seven", cheba, which also refers us to the completion of a cycle. (Gerard, A., 1989, p. 1212) According to E. Klein, (1971, under Sabbath) the Hebrew verb shabat is closely related to the Arabic

sabata for "he cut off, interrupted, ceased, rested", and to the Akkadian shabatu for "to cease", "to complete". It is primarily in this latter sense of "completion" that we want to read the text, so that we might translate "shabat" to mean that the divine creator withdrew from an active interfering participation in creation, in order to stand back from it in a contemplative, benevolent manner, such as would complete creation.

If we summarize what has been said thus far, we come to the conclusion that the Old Testament represents the divine act of creation as inherently of a dual nature, and as essentially composed of two mutually irreducible parts. Divine creation begins as a positive act of ordering and making, and thereafter establishes a threshold which opens a festive perspective upon all that has been created. This threshold is created the very moment the deity interrupts his active ordering of the world, to stand back from it, and to contemplate and bless that what he has made.

It is in this manner that the creation myth of the Old Testament not only recounts the exemplary ordering, production and generation of all that was made---activities which we repeat in our quotidian activity--- but it also makes mention of the creation of a first threshold which surrounds the human world with a festive horizon. It is this festive horizon opened by the first threshold that enables us to see all aspects

of our world in a meaningful relationship to each other. Moreover, where the horizon of work shows us the world as an arena where we pit our strength and resolve against the forces of nature, the festive horizon forms the background against which all things and beings acquire their independence and their specific individuality. It is only from the threshold of the festive that persons and things appear to us as it were in person, and as actively manifesting themselves. No aspect of reality comes fully into its own until it has been greeted, contemplated and blessed, until it has been given the space and time to fully manifest itself.

Working hands and greeting hands

This paradigm of creation, with its characteristic internal shift from quotidian forming and producing to festive greeting and contemplating, has left its imprint on all aspects of Judeo-Christian culture. We find this pattern reflected in the order of our days and seasons, in our speaking and writing, and we find it inscribed even on our own bodies and in the manner in which we move and breath. We notice, for example, how the dexterity of our hands in particular, and of our body and mind in general, permits us to actively engage the world, in the sense of "coming to grips" with issues and problems, of

"shaping" materials and of "*manu-facturing*" (hand-making) tools and objects. It is this type of dexterity, embodied in hand and mind, that gives us access to a quotidian, workaday world in which we transform merely natural materials and space into an inhabitable human place. This manual, mental and corporeal dexterity and strength enables us to confront the natural forces of a natural world on its own terms, and to force it to conform in some degree to our needs.

But these same hands that permit us to confront and transform the natural world are also capable of engaging our surroundings in a very different manner, when, for example, we welcome a guest, or say a prayer, or depict or describe a landscape, or sing the praise of a hero, or articulate and give a stage to a dimly felt thought. The "same" hands that fashion an object can also greet the stranger, can embrace a landscape, and welcome a thought, can comfort the aggrieved, can bestow blessings and say farewell. The "same" hands capable of countering and manipulating the forces of a merely quotidian, natural world, are also capable of maintaining a revealing distance between self and other, between host and guest, native and foreigner, man and woman, child and adult, mankind and God. Before it can hallow this festive and revealing distance, the "working" body must first cease its immersion in the natural world of labor; it must leave behind the quotidian sphere in which it confronts the natural forces, to take up a

new position at the threshold separating a festive Sabbath from the days of work. It is this threshold that makes possible the transformation of a laboring body into to a festive one, or of a body ready to conquer obstacles to one ready to recognize and greet a host or a guest. (3)

The Genesis myth of creation thus introduces the idea of a dual sphere of creative activity, the two parts of which cooperate to form a truly human world. A psychology seeking to understand human embodiment must recognize this same dual nature of the human body, which enables us, not only to confront a natural world, and to order, produce and shape natural reality, but which also endowed us with the gift of greeting and embracing natural, human, and divine subjects. All cultural formations must necessarily elaborate this fundamental duality which is incarnate in the human body, and which finds expression in the Genesis account of divine creation. A culture incapable of making the fundamental distinction between material manipulation of a natural universe, and welcoming a stranger, or between working and praying, will find itself also incapable of making a fundamental distinction between material objects, on the one hand, and human or divine subjects, on the other. Moreover, the absence of that distinction inhibits the flourishing of art, or the development of thought or of meaningful ritual, since all of these essentially depend on the

recognition of a difference between what is sacred and profane, what is festive and what quotidian.

It is in any case striking that all viable cultures are marked by the fact that they organize time in such a way that periods devoted primarily to the quotidian struggle for existence, are always followed by periods of a marked festive nature, in which some aspect of the human or divine world is greeted and celebrated. We may state it as a general rule that the quotidian world stands under the sign of the human and the divine hand that transforms, overcomes, or masters the resistances of the natural world to human habitation. By contrast, the festive world stands under the sign of an expressive hand that in greeting, in praying, in welcoming, and in saying farewell overcomes the distance and difference between subjects, both human and divine. The festive realm thus makes attainable truly inter-subjective relations.

This is not to deny that all cultures or civilizations must find their own distinct ways to elaborate this embodied dual nature of the human presence. The paradigm for developing and balancing these two distinct human possibilities is one suggested by the body itself, and by the manner in which it integrates a left and a right side, so as make possible the execution of coordinated movements. And, again, in a similar way, this integration shows itself in the manner in which a particular culture coordinates the roles of men and women, in order to

make harmonious cooperation between them more likely to occur. The principal cultural task here is to integrate human bodily differences in such a way that what might be potentially opposites--on the anatomical level we speak even of antagonists--are transformed into parts that cooperate in a unified action. The human and the divine, the quotidian and the festive, the right side and the left, man and woman, child and adult, self and other, native and foreigner all have the potential, both of forming pairs of mutually destructive antagonists, or of becoming integrated, though never indistinguishable, parts of a functional larger whole. A human community maintains and improves itself only by means of a difficult, humanizing cultural labor that consists of ever renewed and redoubled efforts to integrate these fundamental differences into larger functional and meaningful wholes. The disintegration of a culture is marked, either by the progressive collapse of difference itself, by the failure to actively maintain and elaborate essential distinctions, or by the failure to integrate these differences with their opposites into larger cultural units. The hatred of difference is fed by the false dream of effortless social interactions, of easy mixing without shocks or surprises, within a culturally neutered milieu of like-minded, mutually indistinguishable individuals. The hatred of integration is also fed by the false dream of an unbridled and unchallenged individuality, of an ego sufficient unto itself that needs

not make concession to others. Both dreams represent a wish to find access to a cultural life, and a fully human existence, without having to pay the price of admission. That price of admission is always one of coming to terms with cultural, religious, personal, sexual and developmental differences.

It should thus be understood that although different cultures may elaborate these fundamental dualities in various ways, no viable culture can ignore the differences between the sexes, or between what is festive and what is mundane, or between what is sacred and profane. It is in just the same way that the human body cannot function without it maintaining and integrating an irreducible difference between a left side and a right side. Our Judeo-Christian heritage approaches ontological differences in a complementary and integrative fashion and it carefully elaborates a vital difference between workdays and the Sabbath, workdays and feast days. In so far as we continue to cultivate that heritage, we remain capable of forming a dual cosmos out of such distinctly different realms as the mundane and the celestial, or the masculine and feminine realms. It is this ancient dual paradigm of paradigms that supports our cultural, religious and social life, while the paradigm of an unitary universe furnishes the support for our modern, natural scientific, and technological civilization. The paradigm of the dual cosmos has both Jewish and Christian as well as

Greek and Roman roots, while the paradigm of an unitary universe as we now understand it, constitutes a modern cultural development growing out of the Copernican revolution. Our very existence as embodied and cultural beings remains fundamentally intertwined with the image of a dual cosmos which situates a host in respect to his guest, a self in respect to an other, a human being in respect to a divine being, a man in respect to a woman, a native in respect to a foreigner, an adult in respect to a child, or a teacher in respect to a student. All these relations become deformed and finally incomprehensible when we attempt to recast these in the unitary image of a natural scientific universe.

The creation myth of Genesis envisions the act of creation as the coming into being of those differences and distances that mankind is called upon, not to destroy, but to inhabit. To inhabit, rather than destroy, the difference between man and woman means for each to enter into a particular relationship with the other and together to form a couple in which the essential differences between them are safeguarded and made to bear fruit. To inhabit rather than to destroy the difference between what is human and what is divine means to enter into a viable form of religious association in which neither the god will be deprived of his divinity, nor the worshipper of his humanity, and in which their difference continues to bear fruit. To

inhabit the difference between child and adult means to give form to this difference by entering into a familial relationship that accepts and delights in these differences and that makes them bear fruit. To inhabit the difference between man and animal means to assume the role of a responsible steward within a relationship that cultivates the differences between being human and being an animal in such a way that these differences become sources of mutual revelation.

The paradigm for all these forms of association is not the universe of Galileo, or that of the modern natural sciences, but the dual cosmos of host and guest. To resolve the conflict between these contrasting conceptions of the world in the manner suggested by the paradigm of natural scientific universe would mean to accept an absolute choice between one or the other. To resolve it in the manner suggested by the paradigm of the dual cosmos of host and guest would mean to make place, both for a natural scientific universe, and for an inhabited world of encounter and mutual revelation. From all evidence it is clear that the world of host and guest, of mutual, intersubjective revelation, becomes distorted beyond recognition when it is transposed upon a natural scientific universe. It is in the same way that the world of natural science cannot survive when it is made to conform to the paradigm of a host and guest relation. Yet it is possible to apply the pattern of the dual cosmos to the way the world of science is made to

relate to the world of hospitality, and to envision a dual world in which the two are not in deadly conflict, but where together they create an inhabitable space in which there is ample room for the exploration of both. We would thereby inhabit the differences between these two perspective in ways that would make their differences bear fruit. And the same fundamental dual pattern obtains when we seek to situate our Greek and Roman cultural heritage in respect to our Jewish and Christian heritage. To fully live a cultural life that benefits from these rich and divergent civilizations means to inhabit their differences in such a way that these bear further cultural fruits that we leave for future generations to harvest..

The emblem of inhabited difference is the threshold. This threshold opens the dual cosmos in which there is place for more than one perspective on our world, and in which we will adjust the perspective to benefit the appearance of the phenomena we seek to investigate or summon. The threshold grants unity to the indivisible pair of host and guest. The invitation from the host, and the acceptance of that invitation by the guest, establishes a covenant of the threshold that safeguards their unity without eroding their essential differences. The self and other can be cultivated only within an inhabited space ruled by such a threshold. Only a dual cosmos offers us the kind of space and time in which it is possible to develop human relations, and to create a

world that holds the promise of transcending relationships ruled by the quotidian desire to reduce the other to the self, and the different to the same.

We saw before how the fundamental duality of quotidian and the festive reality is inscribed, not only upon our hands, but upon the human body as a whole. Within the world of work the human body recedes beneath its tasks, grows anonymous, and submerges itself within the world of natural reality. Within this world we struggle both mentally and physically to overcome the resistance nature offers to the fulfillment of our human needs.

Within the festive realm the human body emerges from its hiding underneath these tasks in order to place itself in a new light as a subject addressing another subject. In making the shift from the world of work to the festive world, we move from a realm dominated by obstacles to a world that stands entirely under the sign of the threshold.

We have already referred to the human hand as incarnating an ontological difference that permits it to turn back and forth from the world of work to the world of greeting and meeting. This essential dual possibility enclosed within the unity of the human hand thus gives us access, first of all, to the world of work, in which we shape and order a natural and material world, and solve natural scientific problems. It

permits us, further, to enter an inhabited, festive and intersubjective world of mutual revelation, of greeting, blessing, embracing, and saying farewell.

Let us now see how this dual unity of the human body manifests itself in our manner of breathing. When we need to lift a heavy object we begin by taking a deep breath. This breath fills us, amplifies and solidifies our body, and gives us, as it were, a greater resistance to the pressures we confront in the workaday natural world. Once the strenuous job is done we exhale with vigor, wipe our forehead, and sit down to "regain our breath". But within the festive world of personal encounters, we inhale means to open oneself up to a splendid sight, to a great musical or theatrical performance, or to a "breathtaking passage" in a great book. What "takes our breath away" is our total attention to the appearance of the other, and this appearance makes us "forget ourselves", makes us a pure spectator who symbolically surrenders the very space of his own physical existence in order to provide, as it were, more room for the manifestation of the other. A variant of this theme is the marine recruit standing attention while awaiting inspection with "bated breath". The abated, held-in breath has here the meaning of "making oneself small", and of ceding one's place to another, so as to make possible a fuller appearance of the other. The held-in breath has here also the meaning of placing oneself

completely at the disposition of the other, of being "all ears and eyes" for the other. This implies being ready to pay full attention even to the smallest gesture of the other, and to perform every command the moment it is given.

Within the festive sphere of personal encounters, "breathing in" signals a welcome to the other. It clears an hospitable space within which the other is invited to fully manifest himself. "Breathing out" assumes within this context the meaning of answering the appearance of the other by manifesting oneself, by addressing the host or guest in speech or song or fluid gesture.

We notice how this dialectic is at work in a musical or theatrical performance, where the silence and the dark of the auditorium represents a "breathing in", a spell-bound listening and absorbed watching, while, from the perspective of the actors, the performance has the significance of an expressive and artful exhaling of the kind that attends all presentation of the self to a host. We might say that all performing art, whether it be of a verbal, musical, or movement-oriented character, necessarily assumes the form of such "artful exhaling". The French essayist Allain once noted that a song is, in final instance, a shout that has been brought under (artful) control. For us the difference between a shout and a song lies also in the fact that the

shout announces to us the vital presence of the other, while a song is capable of giving us, in addition, the truth of that presence.

It is interesting to observe how the relationship between audience (breathing in) and performers (breathing out) reverses itself the moment the curtain comes down on the last note of the score, or the last act of the play. At that moment the roles are reversed and the audience burst into applause, which announces their approving presence, while the performers bow and recede, so as to make place for the manifestation of the audience. Clapping at the end of a performance appears in this context as a grateful "exhaling" and as a joyful coming down from the height and the tension involved in welcoming and undergoing the performance. The performers line up silently, bow and say farewell to their guests, who pour out their praise over their hosts. The successive raising and lowering of the curtains repeats the gesture of farewell.

Within the quotidian world of work, the taking and the holding of a deep breath prepares for countering the resistance of a natural world. The held-in breath prepares the body to remove an obstacle. Within the festive world of personal encounters the bated breath announces the arrival of the other from across a threshold. The human body is thus lived in a very different way within the festive and the quotidian world and it is therefore wrong to suppose that our world is supported

at all times by the self-same biological body, and that differences in context are merely experienced on a "mental" or "emotional" level. The entire body participates in an appropriate way in our lifting a burden or in our experiencing a meaningful personal encounter. The fundamental attitudes of working and celebrating run deeper than conscious thought or will, they are embedded in our very flesh. Of special interest to psychologists is the manner in which the characteristic dual attitudes of the festive and the quotidian manifest themselves in the oral sphere. Much like the orifice of any other natural creature, the human mouth opens upon a world of biting, chewing and sucking. All these activities are designed to conform nature to the human body. These functions or activities transform the natural reality of plant and animal matter into the shape and substance of the human body itself. Eating and digesting can thus be seen as the most radical, and perhaps also most typical form of work, understood as the transformation of a natural world into a human world.

However, the "same" mouth that opens upon a world of work, understood as the transformation of nature, also asserts itself within the festive and intersubjective domain of human speech. The "same" mouth that is active in the natural world of biting, chewing and swallowing is also capable of distancing itself from that terrain and of

crossing over into a world of mutual manifestation of self and other under the aegis of the spoken word. The human mouth differs thus from the orifices of all other natural creatures by the fact that it is able to leave behind the quest for food and the struggle for survival, and involve itself in a festive encounter that seeks the mutual revelation of self and other.

We emphasize here the fact that before hand or mouth can assume its proper role in human encounter, the human body first must take its distance from the quotidian struggle with a natural and resisting world. Before the intersubjective dimension can be fully inhabited, the working hand must loosen its grip upon the natural world, and the chewing mouth must take its distance from a world conceived as material to be mastered and appropriated. Only after that distance is gained can the body enter the realm of speech, and approach the threshold to welcome the stranger. It is for this ontological, rather than for a merely utilitarian and natural scientific reason, that we admonish our young children to wash their hands before sitting at the table, and urge them not to speak with food in their mouth.(4)

We should take note of the manner in which the difference between animal feeding and human eating is reflected in all Western languages. In English we make the principled distinction between feeding and eating, while in French we distinguish between an animal brouter or

pa tre and a human diner or manger. In German we distinguish between a human essen and an animal fressen and in Dutch between a human eten and an animal vreten. In Latin we clearly feel the difference between the human prandere, cenare and epulari on the one hand, and the animal pascere or devorare, on the other.

We might recall in this connection a most amusing passage in Apuleios' *The Golden Ass* in which we find an hilarious account of an actual crossover between eating and feeding. I am referring to a description of the hero Lucius, who after being magically transformed into an ass, attempts in this new form to recline for dinner. He leans uncomfortably on one elbow, and then, while desperately trying to give his huge donkey muzzle some faint resemblance to a human mouth, he attempts to quaff wine from a fancy cup, in the manner of a Roman patrician. (Apuleius, 1915, Bk.10, p. 503)

It is noteworthy, however, that the so-called life-sciences of biology and medicine, including anatomy, physiology and bio-chemistry, all are structurally incapable of making this crucial ontological distinction between eating and feeding. And it goes, almost without saying, that a psychology modeled on the natural sciences is similarly incapable of making this same crucial, ontological distinction.

We might notice here, between parenthesis, that we speak of the suckling infant as "feeding", while we think of the weaned infant as

capable of true "eating". The infant, understood as in-fans, is by definition incapable of using his mouth as an organ of speech. The process of weaning must in this context be understood as preparing the child to inhabit a dual cosmos of chewing, biting, and sucking, on the one hand, and of speech and personal encounters, on the other. Weaning refers thus essentially to the process by which the infant acquires for the first time the ability to bridge the ontological divide between two worlds, and it is this ability that distinguishes the human child from other living beings or natural things. The contemporary, English "weaning" refers to the Old English *gewennan* and the German *gewöhnen* for "becoming accustomed to new circumstances". In contemporary German one speaks of "weaning" in terms of *entwöhnen*, which means "to dis-accustom" or "to break a habit", but which means originally "to leave a house or home", presumably, to inhabit another. The fundamental metaphor is that of moving from one house or home (*Wohnung*) to another, and becoming accustomed to new circumstances.

The importance of this semantic analysis is that it establishes the essential link between weaning and inhabitation. To be "weaned" means here to acquire the mobility to move past a threshold from an inside to an outside, or from one house to another, or from one world, or ontological stance, to another. Within this context our embodied

humanity is not fixed and limited to a relationship to either a natural or a spiritual world, but has within itself the resource to move between a natural, quotidian world of necessity and a festive and spiritual world of mutual, inter-subjective revelation.

Fully socialized, or fully humanized eating bridges the distance between these two worlds. This is done, not by conflating the two attitudes of biting, chewing, swallowing, and that of addressing the other, into a single mixed stance, as would be the case if we learned to eat and speak all at the same time. We do this, rather, by respecting the distinctiveness of each attitude, and by learning to navigate between them. Far from encouraging us to blend the two worlds together, fully socialized, "cultivated" eating celebrates our ability to shift from one perspective to an other, without infringing upon either one's integrity. Such eating honors the pattern of the dual cosmos that we already recognized as informing such cultural institution of marriage and religious cults. These civilizing institutions manage to bring harmony to a dual cosmos of left and right, of man and woman, parent and child, mortals and immortals, without violating their distinction.

Within this context, "culture", "cult" and "cultivation" point to practices that bridge the distance between, on the one hand, a world of work and the festive world of encounter in which we meet self and other.

Within the world of work we live in a world of immediacy in which we "take hold" of what is nearby, in which we grab, appropriate, bite, chew, digest and dissolve all distance and difference between our body and that of a surrounding natural world. Eating and digesting are central features of the world of work, which have their intellectual analogues in the solving of problems and in the dissolving differences, and in the desire to draw the entire variegated world of natural reality within one transparent web of technically controlled and scientifically understood relations.

But this latter world needs to be placed in a fertile relationship to a festive world in which the central issue is that of maintaining distance and difference in the interest of a truthful disclosure of self and other. We may think of a human dual cosmos as made up of a festive and a quotidian world in which each stands in a relation of mutual revelation to the other. We then come to think of culture as that which creates a relationship between these two worlds in such a way that the integrity of each remains intact.

We saw his process of cultural formation at work in the realm of sociable eating, in which a quotidian stance of chewing and digesting is successfully integrated with the festive stance of conversation. We see here again how the difference between civilization and barbarism resides in the will to bridge rather than conflate or destroy the

difference between the festive and the quotidian. Within the context of our example this means that amid all the biting and chewing that attends eating we do not forget that we have accepted the role of host and guest. Within the workaday world this same will to bridge that ontological difference expresses itself in our willingness to interrupt temporarily the pursuit of our daily tasks, so as to make ourselves available for an inherently festive, personal encounter.

There where the dual cosmos remains the emblem of civilization there it also remains possible to bridge an ontological distance. There where the modern natural scientific universe has replaced the dual cosmos, our understanding of ourselves takes the form of solving practical or scientific problems and ignoring ontological distinctions. Eating becomes fueling a biochemical organism, sexuality becomes an exchange of bodily fluids, host and guest relations become a mask for what in reality are power relations that grow out of the biological need to survive. By contrast, we have distinguished the weaned child from the infant by the child's ability to shift ontological levels, by the capacity to move back and forth between the barrier world of chewing, biting and sucking, and the festive, threshold world of mutual revelation. Development means here to make the infant's world of solving and dissolving problems, of biting, sucking and swallowing,

part of a more encompassing world that includes festive world and self disclosure.

This development takes place at the moment when the sucking mouth of the infant is transformed into the speaking mouth of the young child. This same transformation can be observed when all the quotidian preparations for a meal, from seeding to harvesting, to threshing, kneading, cooking and serving, is placed in the service of the more encompassing purpose of a mutual revealing, world-disclosing conversation. Eating without thought, and without conversation, is essentially un-weaned, un-inhabited eating. It should be clear from this that a natural scientific point of view, which remains entirely embedded in the quotidian world of work, cannot recognize distinctions in ontological levels and must perforce remain ignorant of the difference between a speaking mouth and an eating mouth, or between a working hand and a greeting hand. Such a point of view is equally incapable of distinguishing between "eating" and "feeding", or between what pertains to human, to divine or to animal being. Finally, such a point of view cannot differentiate between manipulating someone like a tool, and addressing him as a host would a guest. To rediscover these vital differences within a world overwhelmed by the modern uni-culture of the quotidian, we need to find access to other than natural scientific, narrative traditions.

The term Shabat

Let us now return to the Genesis text and attempt to find an adequate translation for the Hebrew word "shabat". To read this word as referring to a rest that is simply the opposite of activity, is to impoverish the creation myth beyond recognition and to miss what is most important about the festive Sabbath. The institution of the Sabbath was not built on a simple negation of activity but, on the contrary, was meant to complete and integrate two distinct ontological forms or levels, of divine and human creative activity.

Let us return for a moment to the question with which we started this inquiry. We wanted to know how we should understand the importance of the festive horizon as it surrounds all aspects of a fully human, workaday world. The perspectives of modern natural science refer strictly to the workaday world and to our struggle to secure our place at the heart of nature. Such perspectives all have been purged of any reference to the festive, and therefore cannot help us to understand the meaning of the Sabbath. Only a reading that is in tune with the festive can raise the important question about what it was that came into being, when the Creator praised, greeted and blessed what he had wrought.

To answer this question we must enter into the spirit of the text and understand the divine approval of creation first as a personal relation between a divine subject and his world. In his standing back from creation, in contemplating and blessing all that he had made, he created for the very first time a personal relationship between a creator and what he had made. It is this relationship, achieved in his standing back from his work, and in his blessing and greeting, that gives the world a subjective dimension and opens it up to personal relationships. It is this same hospitable distance, offered to an other, that transforms a merely natural world into a human world by making it humanly inhabitable. We may then imagine that the beneficent smile of the creator brought a radiance to the landscape, and that it was this radiance that revealed the world in all its bounty. It was in this way that a resplendent and beaming landscape came into being, whose essence would not be fulfilled in merely feeding and sheltering a cold and hungry humanity, but whose very being would draw human beings within a festive relationship to their surrounding world, to each other, and to their creator.

The essence of that festive relationship would be that of honoring a distance, in such a way that this distance could be lived as a place of self manifestation of the self and the other. The seventh day of creation can be seen to have given a personal presence to the natural

and the human world. It was no doubt this physiognomic and personal quality of the festive Shabbat that drew my father and his friends back to the same agricultural fields they already knew so well from the perspective of workaday reality. They came to see these fields revealed in the new and very different light of the Sunday. We might say that they returned to see the fields revealed in person and within the context of a welcoming, beckoning, festive relationship of host and guest.

It is ultimately by virtue of this festive light that we feel invigorated in our desire to inhabit the earth, and that it becomes possible for us to feel truly at home in the world. It is this light of the festive that gives a unique presence to whatever it illuminates. It is what makes a particular landscape unforgettable and irreplaceable. We may long for a garden, a house, a landscape of our youth, the same way that we long for a person we once knew and loved, because both once welcomed us, and both made their appearance within the light of the festive. By opening the register of the personal, the festive makes it possible for us to recognize a landscape as we would an old friend, it permits us to experience trees as offering us their shade, as paths inviting us to explore the hills, or cool streams as bidding us to take a rest at the water's edge.

When we attempt to understand what it is that binds the festive to the personal we are referred back to that mysterious moment recalled in the creation myth of Genesis, when the creator stood back from his creation in order to survey what he had made, and in order to pronounce it as being good. At that very moment a relationship of a maker to what he has made was transformed into a radically different relationship, comparable to that maintained by a host at the moment of his welcoming a guest. It is this festive and personalizing relationship of host and guest that ultimately defines the specifically Judaic and Christian relationship between a creator and his creation. It is this relationship of host and guest that serves us as a model for all creative relationships.

Neither the splendor of a landscape, nor the radiant smile of someone we love could ever exist outside the horizon of the festive that surrounds our world of daily tasks. And that festive horizon would not have come into being, had not a divine creator smiled on creation. A great garden in bloom, a tall city rising up from the plains, a wondrous golden field of grain stirring under a blue summer sky, a bird soaring in the rising wind, a festive table laden with great food, all these sights place us in a relationship of a grateful guest to a welcoming, generous host. These sights are not mere natural scientific phenomena, arising out of a world of colliding natural forces, nor are they reducible to the

labor of our eyes, or to the functions of biological organisms straining to survive another day. These sights can emerge only within a world that has hospitality as its foundation, and wherein creation itself is understood as an exchange of gifts.

From the workaday perspective of natural science, the physiognomic and personal world of the festive realm cannot come directly into view.

For this reason, any understanding of our world that places itself wholly within the perspective of a natural- scientific, quotidian world, leaves out of consideration the most essential aspects of human existence. (5) A so narrowly based perspective can tell us nothing concerning the meaning of the festive, and can lead us only to misunderstand the meaning and functions of work. It condemns us to misunderstand the Sabbath as merely a day of relaxation, and to mistake religious worship as either an immature, or a perverse, or a false practice of science and technology.

Within such a partial and restricted view of human life, the human sciences are condemned to either wither away altogether as irrelevant to life, or become mere pawns in various ideological struggles seeking to transform the nature of human institutions. In either case, the most important questions concerning human existence cannot be raised, either because they are considered to have been answered already, or

because they have been arbitrarily placed outside the purview of human science.

We have noted already that the workaday world normally is surrounded by a horizon of the festive. It is this horizon that gives meaning to even the most monotonous, or arduous of tasks. (6)

Therefore, with the closing of a festive horizon around the workaday world there inevitably follows a neglect of the personal and the ethical dimensions, which in turn leads to a deterioration of all other aspects of personal life, including those of intellect and rationality. (7) Only a constant dialectic interweaving between what is quotidian, and what is festive, between what is sacred, and what profane, can create an inhabitable, human world.

We have thus far approached the myth of Genesis as a narrative and festive horizon surrounding a particular historical and cultural way of life. It is this narrative that shaped our Western conceptions concerning work and celebration and it is to this narrative that we must return to make sense of our own history. The influence of that narrative did not remain restricted to religious thought or to broad cultural and moral issues. We find the imprint of that narrative on our aesthetic and scientific culture at every turn of the road. Neither the cultural ideals of the Renaissance, nor those of the Copernican revolution, nor the very idea of scientific rationality itself, could have

developed except within the festive horizon of a Judeo-Christian narrative of creation that has sheltered, cradled and inspired European civilization from its very beginning.

Michelangelo's depiction of the creation of Adam

Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel painting of the creation of Adam occupies the fourth of the large central ceiling panels. When we approach the painting in the knowledge that it represents the birth of Adam we are likely to feel at first surprised to see how little the scene conforms to any of our preconceived notions about divine creation. We find, for example, no explicit reference anywhere to Adam being materially shaped or formed by an artisan-god; the painting does not show us how God gathers clay, or how he mixes it with water or how he transforms it into a likeness of a man. Nor does it show us how God blows life and breath into Adam's nostrils or how he imparts movement to his inert body. The whole panel is thus devoid of any reference to the technical and supernatural problems that we are likely to bring with us to the scene.

Michelangelo foregoes not only the metaphor of the artisan god, but he also abstains from using images of natural or agricultural production. There are no references to abundant crops or to luxuriant

foliage. There are no flowers waiting to be fertilized, no trees bending under the weight of fruit, no horn of plenty pouring out its blessings over the landscape. Michelangelo's painterly meditation on the divine creation of man relies as little on the commonplaces of supernatural handiwork, as it does on the image of a divine craftsman, or the notion of a celestial farmer.

What we see instead is an emotionally charged scene of a parting between a father and his fully grown son. The only element suggesting that the represented event takes place in the heavens rather than on earth is the absence of an operant gravitational force. The figures of father and son thus do not appear as stepping, but rather as floating away from each other. The first question likely to arise in our mind is how we are to rhyme the idea of the birth of mankind, and that of the coming into being of a human world, with this strange image of a grown son saying farewell to his father?

Our first reflective task is thus to contemplate the dual theme of birth and separation, of beginning a new life, and of reluctantly taking one's distance from one's past. This reflection leads us to contemplate the tragic dimension of human life and we are reminded of the march of time that inexorably leads us, all at once, into two directions. Our forward looking hope tells us of waiting adventures and of satisfying achievements, while a backward looking nostalgia recounts what we

have lost on the way. It is in this manner that we are constantly moving, all at once, both towards and away from what we love. We are also led to think about the nature of divine creative activity and about the manner in which it is represented in this panel. This task is not made easy for us because, as we noticed, the panel lacks reference to any of the usual metaphors for creative powers. It is only after our eyes have adjusted to the light illuminating this panel that we discover a mysterious power in the figure of parental love. Moreover, this love is not made manifest in any particular parental action of protecting, consoling or feeding, but becomes evident only in an exchange of farewells. The hand of God blesses Adam while it evokes in him a reluctant, but freely given, response in the form of a farewell. Our attention is thus drawn towards the very center of the painting, there where God's hand reaches beyond the billowing folds of his lilac cloak. At the same time Adam raises his outstretched hand above the unformed earthly sphere of green and blue. Their outstretched hands almost touch, but instead of taking hold of each other, father and the son consent to let each other go. They transform their reaching for each other into a greeting of each other, and it is this transformation that completes Adam's birth. All hope of the future, and all the sadness about an imminent break, appears contained within the brief interval that gradually, but unmistakably, separates their greeting

hands. Michelangelo's dramatically charged hiatus between Adam's hand and that of his father-creator brings into view two fundamentally different attitudes towards self and other. The one constitutes a quotidian work-oriented attitude of clinging, holding, protecting, and of dissolving distance, and the other a festive attitude of greeting and mutual recognition.

One could plausibly argue that the whole of the painting, if not the totality of works assembled in the Sistine chapel, culminates in the representation of this mysterious interval in which we find the summary of Adam's human relationship to his divine creator. This interval marks a break with what is past, and signifies at the same time the opening of new human horizons. It represents a break with the past in so far as it takes its distance from a quotidian realm of material making and transforming, grasping and holding on. It marks the transformation of a working hand into the greeting hand, and it thereby announces the coming into being of a new, human order.

This first break or tear makes itself felt in the difference between the sacred and the profane, in that between host and guest, between man and woman, between child and parent. But it also announces the coming into being of the Sabbath and of a new, emancipated relationship in which the struggle with natural forces, created by working hands, is suspended to make place for the festive space of

personal and mutual recognition, created by hands that greet and bless. From across the sacred interval that separates and joins the father and the son, each figure is able to recognize the other as a person. This recognition of subjectivity is inherently a creative moment, and it is, in last instance, this form of creativity that Michelangelo celebrates in this famous panel.

The greeting gesture of Adam's hand constitutes a first creative human response to the divine creative act, and it represents his recognition of the personhood of his father. This first tentative gesture contains already the promise of a religious and a familial practice, in which the recognition and cultivation of personhood will stand central. In this way we come to think of the moment of Adam's birth as a fully human being as occurring at the very moment when the interval between his hands and the hands of his creator begins to change, begins to reject all quotidian, literal, utilitarian gestures, and when it becomes transformed instead into a festive and Sabbatical distance in which Adam's humanity, and God's divinity both become apparent.

When we continue to meditate on the outstretched hands, we realize that the fragile hiatus could still be easily breached by the working hand of either God or Adam seeking to replace their symbolic attachment with a literal and material holding on to each other. With only a little exertion the two hands could annul the distance between

them and overcome their separation. But the festive Sabbath takes hold of both and draws them into a new life together. We see here reaffirmed our understanding of the human body as one that is foreordained both to work and to recognize and celebrate the personal existence of self and other. The human body fulfills this destiny only there where it learns to reach beyond the obstacles imposed by time and space and natural circumstance. The human body becomes fully human only there where it ceases to rail against its natural and mortal fate, and enters into a covenant of a personal and festive relationship. We understand the divine creation of Adam within the light of Michelangelo's meditation as the transformation of Adam's working body into a festive body. Adam's birth could come about when both creator and creature were ready to take distance from their working bodies and were willing to live their mutual attachment to each other within the liberating constraints of the sabbatical hiatus. They became able to greet, to bless, and to say farewell to one another. Let us note here that the "sabbatical" hiatus repeats the design of the threshold that marks every house, every church and temple and every ancient city. We find it repeated in the design of an altar, or in the gate of a walled city. We find its image in the particular hesitation we experience when we approach the personal domain of an other. In all these instances the "sabbatical" hiatus announces the festive

transformation of working hands into greeting and blessing hands. The human body that is a slave to its tasks, and a beast of burden, is thereby liberated and becomes a festive body reflecting the image of a divine creator.

We do not achieve our humanity by either choosing to embody exclusively the festive or the workaday dimensions of human life. Full humanity shows itself only there where these two dimensions are integrated into one irreducible whole. Yet this integration must occur in such a way that each dimension retains its own distinctive character, so that the one cannot be mistaken for the other.

We are reminded in this context of how the human body integrates a left side with a right side in such a way that neither side can be confused with the other. Both sides remain distinct, even though they form part of a single human body. It is this maintenance of their distinctiveness within the unity of the body that makes possible their integrations. It is this that makes possible an effective and coordinated movement of the body as a whole. Such movements depend on each side retaining some degree of independence, some relative freedom and distance from the other side. This relative freedom and distance forms a precondition to effective and harmonious interaction. The whole body can move in a purposeful manner because the right side is not confused with the left side, or vice versa. Integration of parts into

a larger whole does not follow here from abstract egalitarian principles, nor is it inspired by the idea of a melting pot. Sound, graceful bodily movement requires here that one side retains a privilege over the other.

It is in a similar way that the quotidian and the festive participate in human life to give flow and direction to human time. These two dimensions are organized in such a way that the festive marks the beginning and the end of a particular configuration of time, while the quotidian necessarily occupies the space and time between a beginning and an end. The festive must maintain a privilege over the quotidian by marking its beginning and by signaling its end. The festive hand that blesses, greets and says farewell, both opens and closes a world of labor. Without this festive intervention the human world would deteriorate into an endless, exhausting, and ultimately meaningless succession of tasks. The festive thus forms the horizon of the quotidian, and it is this horizon that gives meaning and purpose to daily task. In the absence of that festive horizon, work becomes drab, compulsive and meaningless drudgery.

The worlds of compulsion, of depression and of anxiety all lack such a festive and meaning-giving horizon, and it is this absence that gives these worlds their particular grey and lifeless character. We should, of course, not be blind to the fact that the festive dimension can as little

exist in the absence of the quotidian, as the other way around. The world of work ultimately furnishes the material support for the festive. But this truth is not absent from our public discourse, where it is often cited to create the wrong impression that only the workaday world contributes substantially to our well-being. The corollary truth is of greater importance for contemporary life, namely, that the festive dimension punctuates human existence in such a way that it becomes possible for us to create spoken or written sentences, musical phrases and framed images, and in general, to constitute meaningful episodes in our life.

If we now repeat the main insights derived from Michelangelo's painting we observe first of all how he places Adam's birth within a context of saying farewell and of receiving and bestowing blessings. These interpersonal and essentially festive gestures refer us back to the Sabbath, understood here as the spatial hiatus that extends between the left hand of Adam and the right hand of God. It is this sabbatical hiatus that puts an end to the quotidian relationship between a maker and what he makes. It transforms a quotidian, task-oriented relationship into a festive relationship between a host and a guest. The painting as a whole can thus be understood as an insightful commentary on the biblical account of the creation of the human world. We read there that:

On the seventh day God ended (shabat) his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day. And God blessed and sanctified it.

Between the ending of the divine labor and the blessing of the world, there occurs a profound transformative moment in which two fundamentally different attitudes or modalities are made to intersect.

This point of intersection is embodied in a threshold. The general structure of a threshold is such that it holds together two very different attitudes and two very different worlds, and that it does this, paradoxically, by keeping each separate and distinct from the other.

The paradigm of all thresholds is the dual cosmos that holds together a divine and a human realm in such a way that they remain both forever distinct, and forever interrelated.

From the perspective of the dual cosmos, a completely terrestrial world, considered in complete isolation from a celestial or divine realm, appears a senseless construct. That same standpoint could not recognize as viable a total festive realm, unconnected to a workaday world. And neither would it make sense to study the left side of the body without any reference to the right side. The threshold functions as the separating and interconnecting principle of a dual cosmos. It embodies the ultimate figure of personal relations, which is that of

host and guest. The threshold of the home holds together, first of all, a host and a guest. It brings together an outside, represented by neighbors and distant dwellers, and an inside, made up of members of a family. In the form of an altar it brings together an outside, represented by the realm of the gods, and an inside, represented by the human realm. But in all these instances it incarnates the meeting of a host and a guest. It is starting from that premise that the threshold can bring together native and foreigner, dweller and voyager, man and god. And it is on the same principle that it can separate and bring together what is sacred and profane, what is festive and quotidian, what is workday and what is feast day. But the fundamental configuration remains that of the meeting of a host and a guest.

It is, finally, possible to understand the Sabbath itself as a paradigm for all thresholds. We began this essay with a recollection of how the Sabbath transformed the workaday fields, understood as endless sources of demands and tasks, into aspects of a welcoming landscape that is capable of rewarded human contemplation, and that has the resources to answer love with love. The Sabbath showed itself there as a threshold that imposed its hallowed distance, that brought to a halt a relationship of quotidian struggle, and that revealed the world as ultimately hospitable to human inhabitation.

Adam does not begin the human journey the way a rock falls from a mountain or the way water spills over a cliff. That journey begins only at the moment when there emerges between the creator and what he created a threshold that asserts both their difference, and their mutual belonging to each other, and that binds them together in a relationship of host to guest. This threshold takes the form of an avowal, a pledge, a covenant. As such it has none of the material strength of chains or fetters, yet it binds securely creature and creator, husband and wife, mother and father to child, friend to friend, in the manner of a host to his guest. The festive bond that makes possible the beginning of Adam's journey and that opens the horizon of a fully human world does not make its appearance as a link between cause and effect, or as a material bond of violence, of need, or even of habit. The covenant that binds Adam to his creator is not the work of laboring hands, or of calculating minds, or the result of material necessity. That covenant finds its most perfect expression in nothing more substantial than in a mutual gesture of greeting and blessing hands. Adam thus enters a truly human perspective the moment he perceives his falling away from his father as saved by a threshold that transforms a fall into a farewell. This leave-taking binds the guest forever in spirit to his host. Adam's gesture of farewell marks him already as someone capable of a spiritual union, as capable of establishing a family, of entering into

friendships, of making sacrifices and of remembering the infinite benevolence of his beginnings. Adam's departure stands thus entirely under the sign of the festive. He departs in faithfulness to his origins and while buoyed by the love of those he left behind.

Adam's gesture, while he glances back at his father, forms the basis for all future religious ritual, from sacrificing to praying, to singing and studying.

Emancipation as a form of creation

As we have seen, the birth of Adam as represented in Michelangelo's painting breaks new ground and moves beyond the worn-out clichés that speak of creation in terms of growth, production or fabrication. His portrayal of God makes no reference to Promethean or Herculean feats, nor to Hephaestean craft. The creation of Adam is not imagined as a technical miracle belonging to the sphere of the everyday workaday world, but as a moment of festive separation in which the creator acknowledges the personhood of mankind and in which mankind accepts the personhood of its maker.

Michelangelo's profound understanding of the dialectical Judaic and Christian conception of creation is perhaps not unrelated to his

profession as a painter. For every artist, writer or thinker there inevitably comes a time when he or she must finish a manuscript, or varnish and frame the painting, or stop the carving and polishing of a sculpture. There comes a moment when the creator must renounce further work on his creation, must give up the right to further shape and modify the work, and allow it to occupy a place in the public world beyond the confines of the study or studio.

It is only after a work has moved beyond the influence of the shaping hands of the artist that it begins to possess the distinct character of a work of art. It is at this point too that it begins to take on certain features that make it resemble a living person. It is only after the artist has surrendered his work to public viewing that the work can begin to be judged on its own merits, that it becomes capable of responding to our queries, of contradicting our first impressions, and that it acquires the force to modify our way of thinking or feeling within a relationship that retains the essential features of a host-guest relationship.

Once the work has found its place within the public realm, the author is no longer at liberty to change its content or to further determine its meaning by physically altering the work. Any dissatisfaction the author may still feel with his work must now take the form of critical commentary rather than that of artistic or auctorial revision.

The dual process of creation is thus marked by two very different types of relationships that obtain between the author and his work. The first of these is performed by the activity of working hands, and the second exclusively by the activity of greeting, blessing or admonishing hands. (Note 8)

The emancipating transition from object-to-be-worked-upon in the studio to an artwork-to-be-displayed-and-contemplated in the public realm, transports the artwork past a particular threshold out of the realm of the quotidian into that of the festive. The transition assumes at the same time the character of a metaphor that links together two realms, without dissolving their respective differences. Within this metaphoric space working hands transform themselves into blessing hands, workdays metamorphose into a Sabbath, and what at one time was still merely handiwork has now become transfigured into art. Ever since the Renaissance the formal emancipation of a work of art typically takes the form of affixing the artist's signature to it, and then varnishing the work. This emancipation of the work remains thus indissolubly linked to the metaphoric transubstantiation of working hands into blessing hands. The working hands want to keep changing and improving the work, want to keep holding on to it, while the festive hands are capable of letting it go "out of hand". We saw the Sabbath as the point of transition between these different modalities

of the hand. It was the Sabbath that transformed the farmer's fields from a mundane source of endless tasks into the radiant face of a summer landscape. The Sabbath is always present whenever a great work emancipates itself from the hands of the artisan, and shows its face for the first time in public.

We understand the concept of emancipation as it applies to a person or a work in its etymological sense as *emancipatio*, or as *ex-manicipium*, and thus as referring to the formal act of "letting go" ("ex") of something that we "have or hold in our hands", (*mancipium*) and that we therefore legally own. (Klein, E., 1971, under *emancipate*) The ancient world knew a formal process of *mancipium* by means of which an owner acquired or sold property rights in the presence of five witnesses. We still make use of such expressions as "laying one's hand" on a bargain or we say "this car has "changed hands" several times, and in doing so we repeat very ancient, possibly prehistoric, formulations of transfer of property. We think of the world of property transfers as a workaday world where things are manu-factured, where they are "handled" and where they "change hands". This world has as its necessary complement a festive world of e-mancipation and manu-mission. "E-mancipation" means most literally "a letting go out of one's hand" and "manu-mission" means "a sending away out of one's hands". Both terms refer again to formal legal acts whereby, in the

ancient world, minors or slaves were allowed to emerge from the world of work into the festive sphere of a personal and public life.

To be a slave in the ancient world meant to live one's entire life confined to a world of work, where all things and beings are but objects to be shaped and instruments to be used. To be a slave meant to never be able to make a personal appearance in one's own right, never to have a voice, a name, or even an appearance of one's own. The ancient rite of manu-mission or e-mancipation, by contrast, gave the freed slave for the very first time a face and a name of his own, and permitted him for the first time access to a festive realm beyond craft and purchase. Following this rite of passage into the festive and public realm, the former slave or minor no longer was to be regarded a mere instrument in the hand of an other. He became a full-fledged person, endowed with a face, gifted with a voice, capable of making an appearance in his own person and, in final instance, he became capable of playing the role of a host and a guest within the festive realm of human and divine hospitality.

It would be no exaggeration to think of the ancient practice of manu-mission as akin to a legal procedure recognizing a particular being as being endowed with a soul, and therefore as being fully human. It is within this ancient context that we must place Aristotle's expressed opinion that a slave could not truly be regarded as a human being,

since a slave did not belong to himself, but to an other. It is for the same reason that we continue to associate slavery with a kind of murder of the soul that deprives its victims of a fully human existence. The status of Michelangelo's painting of Adam, prior to it being given its freedom of expression within a public realm, thus resembles in certain respects the status of Adam prior to his leaving the home of his father, or even that of a slave prior to emancipation. And this status, in turn, reminds us of a modern humanity, fettered by endless tasks and daily routines, and finding no respite in the absence of the emancipatory power of the Sabbath.

The moment the painter signs his painting, varnishes it, and then lets it go "out of his hands", is also the moment that a work emancipates itself from its master. As we have seen, the first aspect of that moment is one of sacrifice, in which the artist permits a rift to open between himself and his handiwork. We use the term sacrifice here in the ancient sense of "making sacred", and in the sense of "allowing something to escape the circle of profane possession and use", and of entering it into a festive circle where it may come fully into its own. Where it may shine and show itself on its own account and in its own right. In this act the artist renounces any further right to treat the work as a mere thing to be used or altered at will. Between the artist and the work there grows a creative rift that refuses to be healed by

means of material manipulations, clever calculations or feats of quotidian industry. From now on the work must be approached within a festive, humanizing and personalizing exchange of glances. The work is now no longer a mere object, but becomes instead the manifestation of an independent personal presence.

We have noted before that at the moment that Adam leaves the working hands of God, at the very instant that he raises his hand in greeting in response to the blessing of his maker, he is a besouled being, a man who speaks and understands and is made in the image of his creator. At that moment of his awakening and emancipation Adam becomes capable, not only of doing work, but also of celebrating, greeting and praising. To have a soul means in last instance to be able to enter into a relationship of host and guest and to participate in the festive revelation of self and other. It is at the doorsteps of the host that we speak our name, that we say who we are, and this speaking is the beginning of a self-manifestation, which is at the same time is an asking for the appearance of the host.

This gesture of coming up to the door of the host to call upon him, and to bid him to "answer his door", repeats the ancient pattern of religious sacrifice and prayer, in which we appear in festive attire before the altar, the holy stone, or the holy site, and ask in return for the appearance of the divine host or guest. It is in this manner that we

manifest ourselves before every threshold. We say our name, we show our face, we declare our intentions, while at the same time seeking to evoke the manifestation of our host, or our guest. This call before the threshold is all the while our acknowledgment that our world and our self remains dark and incomprehensible outside the light of conversation, outside the bonds that bind a host and a guest together. This saying who we are, while calling for the other, creates the festive light in which the world of the host and that of the guest both stand revealed.

The threshold of difference between the hand of Adam and the hand of God makes its appearance, first, as a painful rift and as a loss and a sacrifice. But, true to the paradigm of the threshold, it is also a first dawn and daybreak of a human world. To celebrate that daybreak means to accept the loss of a unitary paradise and to affirm the fateful and ineradicable difference between God and man, heaven and earth, workday and feast day, man and woman, one generation and the next. We signal our acceptance of that covenant every time we step across a threshold and thereby willingly bind ourselves to a contract that differentiates and interrelates the roles of host and guest. The fundamental form of this contractual relationship is a covenant such as the one that binds a people, understood as a guest, to their deity, understood as their host. The ultimate subject matter of

Michelangelo's great painting is thus all at once, the birth of Adam, the coming into being of a besouled humanity, and the establishment of a covenant between God and mankind. The painting asks us to contemplate the creation of the first couple of host and guest, and to understand hospitality as the very heart and soul of the realm of the festive. We note also that the relationship of hospitality is initiated here by a gesture of greeting and blessing that bridges a threshold. We may also think of this moment of creation as one which gives rise to speech. Those hands of God and of Adam are already speaking hands. We may deduce from this that the first words ever spoken were those of a difficult and heartfelt "farewell".

Metaphoric speech belongs intrinsically to the threshold, while literal, factual speech belongs to the narrower, and later to be developed realm of the quotidian, in which mankind learns to confront obstacles.

(Note 9)

Summary and Conclusion

The festive announces itself wherever and whenever there takes place a genuine revelation of self and other. Its cultural manifestations take such diverse forms as the display of festive attire, the donning of masks, the playing of roles. It demands heightened speech in the form of liturgical address, poetic utterance, soul searching confession, the

recitation of ancient texts. It requires musical performances, public dancing, the display of ancient relics and sacred images, public contests of bravery, of beauty and daring. It prescribes the decoration of buildings, the burning of spices or incense, the display of wealth. All these festive revelation of an individual or collective subject are structured by a host guest relation, the most fundamental of which is that between the world of the living and the world of the dead, or between the world belonging to mortals and that belonging to immortals or gods. On a religious level the festive is a display of a personal or a collective subject that is addressed to an other world, or to a world of others, in the hope of rousing a similar display from that other side. A festive display of the self is always, at the same time, an asking to see, to hear, to imagine the other. The festive cannot be thought without reference to our desire to find access to our own and the others reality. The festive is giving psychological and cultural form to our human inability to see ourselves, except within a relationship of host and guest to an other. Or to see or imagine our own world, except in relationship of host and guest to an other world. The festive is a showing, because showing is our sole way of seeing objects and subjects in person.

A festive relationship to the Other is always structured by a threshold. This threshold can take the form of an altar, a holy stone, a cliff, a

holy mountain, a place of divine encounter (Bethel) etc. It is always a place where we are brought to a stop (shabat) for the purpose of an encounter between host and guest.

The threshold is the source of all law governing human and divine relations. This means that we must consider human relations as having evolved out of festive relations with the sacred. It is in the same way that the construction of secular houses follows rules of construction that were learned in raising megaliths and building temples.

We understand the essential function of the threshold to be that of holding a host and a guest together in a progressively emancipating, humanizing relationship of mutual revelation. The entire history of the Jewish people can be understood as a history of a eventful, progressive and mutually revealing relationship between a people, understood as guest, in relationship to their God, understood as Host, and in which the covenant and the laws are the threshold that regulates their relationship.

It is in this manner that we learn to read the book of Job as the exemplary story of a man who is willing to surrender everything, including his own life, but refuses to surrender the covenant, or the threshold, that binds him as a guest to his divine host. Despite his many trials, he refuses to abandon his human station before the divine

threshold, from where he does not cease to address his host and implore him to make his appearance. It is ultimately only this divine appearance that reconciles Job to his difficult human circumstances. He would have gladly surrender everything he owned, including his comfort and his health, but he would not cede his place before the threshold, because he knew that to surrender that place would mean to forfeit his own humanity.

The realm of the secular and the quotidian, of the endless succession of tasks, is in itself a mode of revelation of self, other and the world. Within this realm the threshold which governs festive relations is replaced by a barrier against which it is our task to struggle and labor. The struggle against barriers reveals a fascinating world of material forces, while the world of thresholds reveals a world of personhood, of human and divine subjectivity. Within the world of work, human knowledge provides us with an arsenal of clever strategies that help us overcome natural barriers and that enable us to force the natural world to make concessions to our presence. But within the festive realm this struggle with nature comes temporarily to a halt before a threshold, where we utter the plea for a personal revelation of what surrounds us. The art of the workaday world is to confront our world and force it to give up its secrets. The art of the festive world is that of creating personal appearances that will provoke subsequent personal

appearances. Human existence demands the full integration of these two very different art forms. The world of work needs to be brought to a halt before the threshold of the festive. But the festive requires the material support that can come only from the world of work.

Modernity can be understood as a cultural experiment which had as its essential feature an attempt to abolish the festive and to concentrate all human efforts on the subjugation of a natural world. That experiment is now coming to an end with the growing awareness that such single-mindedness will eventually lead us to our own destruction. It is coming to an end because we begin to realize that the exclusion of the festive and its attempted replacement by relaxation and leisure activities has not brought us a higher, or more satisfying civilization, but exposes us to the growing danger of a precipitous decline.

Within this context we may understand modern psychology, sociology and anthropology as moribund attempts to provoke a revelation of human subjectivity exclusively from within the world of work. But the humanization of the world of work can only come about only by placing that world within the larger horizons of the festive. Collective, as well as individual pathology of the soul always revolve around an impaired ability to shift with ease and grace from one perspective to an other.

N O T E S

Note 1. We speak here pointedly of the creation myth as the narration of a mystery, rather than in terms of an explanation or solution to a problem in order to emphasize the difference between myth and scientific explanation. We approach myth here as a narrative of differences that relates how a particular distinction between one thing and another came into being. This form of narrative has a different aim than that of the ex-planation of differences, which is founded on the metaphor of "planing". To "plane" a surface means to remove from it all irregularities and to make it thus completely and effortlessly traversable from all directions. "Planing" removes all bumps from the road. A good ex-planation of a problem is designed to help us to get rid of it as a problem, and to assist us in moving on to the next problem. Such narratives are hostile to difference and strangeness, and to invoke them is to return to the safety of familiar grounds. The metaphor of "ex-planation" is akin to that of the "solution " or the "re-solution" of a problem. In both cases we witness the return of clarity and smoothness following an encounter with something strange and unfamiliar. The essential difference in intellectual approach between a mythic "telling of a difference", on the one hand, and

"explaining or dissolving a difference", on the other, is that the first belongs to the realm of the festive and explicitly accepts the reality of ontological differences, while the second operates within a quotidian, work-oriented perspective that, for the time being, planes or dissolves all ontological differences. Mythic telling brings us to the threshold where we display and celebrate differences. Natural scientific explaining brings us before an obstacle to progress, with the aim to dissolve or displace it.

Note 2. We think here also about rites of passage which are intended to help us pass the thresholds that separate and hold together the different phases of our life. Traditionally, the rites of passage take such forms as that of baptism, of naming the infant, followed by birthdays and graduation ceremonies, which in turn are followed by a wedding ceremony, by anniversaries of that wedding, and, finally, by burial- and memorial services.

This pattern of festive and public crossings of the threshold typically is meant to mark important beginnings and endings, both of public and private life. We still see remnants of it in the "christening" of new ships, as well as in the official "openings" of bridges and public buildings. We find that pattern also take the form of a "varnishing day", which was traditionally the day prior to an important art exhibit,

when the artists had their last chance at retouching and varnishing their paintings.

On a different level we encounter a similar phenomenon in the art of writing, which teaches us to start a sentence with a capital letter, and to end it with a period. Between the period of the last sentence, and the capital of the sentence that follows, we find an un-inscribed space that represents a festive place of representation. This space resembles an open stage, upon which the previous sentence makes a first appearance, where it collects and shows itself and acquires a meaning within the context of what went on before and of what is expected to follow. This same space between sentences also appears between the ending of one story or a book, and the beginning of a new one. A sentence that does not end in a festive period is as meaningless as is a quotidian realm that is not punctuated by the Sabbath. There where in writing we find festive periods and capitals, there we find in speech "breath-taking" beginnings and endings. These create a similar space in which the phenomena that "show themselves" become endowed with meaning.

A period is originally a *peri hodos*, a "way, or a path around something"; it is what sets a group of words apart and what gives it the means to present itself as a whole. By contrast, a sentence that is not domesticated by the stop and the flow of breath, or by the written

capital and period, becomes formless logorrhea and meaningless muddle. Clearly, the quotidian production of signs requires the Sabbath of the period if that production is to result in fully human, intelligible speech or writing.

Note 3. The ontological divide embodied by the human hand has partly been understood by the early German Gestalt psychologists who spoke of a difference between "*zeigen*" ("pointing to" , "pointing out", "showing") and "*greifen*" ("grasping", "holding on to something").

These psychologists remained ultimately imprisoned within a natural scientific point of view that made them miss the more fundamental and ontological differences between quotidian "grasping" and festive "showing". They also missed for that reason the existential significance that must be attached to their dialectic interaction.

A human body has not achieved its full humanity until it unites within itself the two ontologically distinct possibilities of a quotidian "producing" and "mastering", on the one hand, and a festive "showing", on the other.

Note 4 Eventually the child is able to enter the festive realm of fully human eating by subordinating mere bodily needs, which belong to the realm of our quotidian struggle for life, to the requirements of festive

human interactions. Eating within the festive realm demands the artful intertwining of two separate functions, that of transforming and appropriating a natural world, and that of making place for the manifestation of self and other. It requires, on the one hand, such activities as chewing, biting and swallowing food, and demands, on the other hand, that we give thanks to the host, that we offer and accept plates of food, and that we keep up an agreeable conversation with our table companions.

We celebrate the weaning of a child in so far as it involves an existential shift away from a natural and undifferentiated animal feeding to a festive, "socialized" eating. Such a socialized form makes the fundamental demand that we eat only such food as has been offered to us, and that we gratefully accept it as a gift from a host to a guest. Curiously, this structure remains intact, even in cases where those who eat the food have themselves done all the work required to bring it to the table, where they have themselves tended the fields or gardens, raised and harvested the crop, and then stored and prepared the food. There appears to be a common understanding shared by most cultures that only food that is accepted as a gift is truly fit for human consumption. Food that falls outside the circle of a festive exchange remains suspect and represents always a danger to either our physical and psychological well being.

It is possible to understand eating and drinking disorders within this cultural light as resulting from attempts to eat or drink outside the festive circle of hospitality. Such eating and drinking is marked by the desire to regress from a level of festive "eating" to a sub-human "feeding". It is within this context that psychological therapies can be seen to repeat all those strategies employed throughout the ages by parents, educators and religious authorities to persuade the child to leave behind the barbaric bliss of a pre-verbal stage and accept the complex human condition. It is for this reason that all social eating traditionally started with a prayer, which transformed food, understood merely as the labor of our hands, into a gift received from a host. This ceremony can thus be understood as transforming what could have become a mere quotidian "feeding of one's face" into a festive eating that makes place for the mutual revelation of self and other, host and guest.

By extension, the phenomenon of weaning, of entering into a festive context in which fully human eating becomes possible, means to accept the difference between self and world, mother and child. It is the acceptance of this difference that opens to the child an horizon in which it then becomes possible to gradually recognize and accept the difference between host and guest, self and other, man and woman, mortals and immortals, man and animal, workday and feast day.

Note 5. We should not interpret this to mean that the quotidian is in any way less essential to a human world than is the Sabbatical. The workaday world itself depends on human interactions that, even though they do not reveal the other as a personal and unique existence, are nevertheless essential to human existence.

Within the workaday world we encounter each other as factory workers, farmers, engineers; we are so many "hands" capable of overcoming natural obstacles, so many "heads" to solve practical or theoretical problems. Within the workaday world we are necessarily one of many, occupying a place that in our absence could, and would, be occupied by others. Within the workaday world of medicine the patient becomes a mere generic body and it is precisely this generic aspect of the body that forms the object of biological, natural scientific, workaday-oriented studies.

Yet, it is to this quotidian world of natural science that we owe the miracles of modern medicine, the abundance of food on our tables, and the lightening of the burdens of our daily work. The natural scientific and technological perspectives have thereby greatly contributed to our general well being. It should nevertheless be realized that these perspectives cannot form an ultimate basis for understanding ourselves and our world. Only a perspective formed

within a relationship of host to guest is capable of founding such a wider and deeper understanding.

Note 6 We do not take here into consideration such particular modifications of personal life as occur during mourning or in states of clinical depression. The study of depression, in particular, shows us how human life becomes finally unlivable in the absence of the horizon of the festive.

A study of life in the concentration camps also provides an avenue of research. A central feature in the design of the extermination camps was precisely the ruthless elimination of any trace of a festive horizon from the life of the prisoners, and even from that of the guards. In the absence of that horizon, burial became reduced to a technical question concerning the disposal of bodies. Personal names became reduced to catalogue numbers, religion became regarded as a contemptible superstition, and human existence itself was reduced to a life of meaningless toil leading to a meaningless death. We may approach the concentration camps as the ultimate experiment in modernity, if we understand modernity in terms of a concerted intellectual and cultural attempt to create a totally secular, totally quotidian, workaday world, in isolation from any understanding of a festive relationship between a host and a guest. This underlying motif of modernity surfaced in the

construction of the national socialist and the soviet extermination camps. They can be read in all their grim reality as a kind of writing that spells out the logic of a modern vision of the real from which is expunged any and all reference to the festive.

Note 7. Rationality is an ordering principle, it can order a given world, but it cannot, by itself, create an hospitable, or a moral world. The extermination camps of the National Socialist or the Soviet Socialists did function on perfectly rational principles. Considered in the absence of any guiding moral principle, these camps constituted well ordered and even rational societies, albeit of a particularly abhorrent variety. A further implementation of rationality would not have made these murderous and victimizing societies any less immoral or inhuman. Rather, such greater rationalization would have increased their deadly and destructive nature, if such a thing can be imagined.

A rationality growing out of the quotidian struggle with an indifferent nature can help create a liveable world only when that struggle finds its proper place within the larger horizon of the festive. Morality, such as it exists in the workaday world, ultimately derives from the world of the festive. It is only in that latter realm that subjectivity is brought before a threshold and asked to declare itself. And it is only in that realm that we can give a false representation of ourselves and

dissimulate our motives. And it is again in that same festive realm that we can either refuse or accept to fully attend to the manifestation of an other.

Note 8. Within this context there exists a principled divide between authorship and criticism. Authorship refers to the private relation between an author and his work, prior to the emancipation of the work and prior to its official presentation within the public sphere. Criticism refers to a public relationship to a work after it has been emancipated. It concerns itself with the particular place that a work should occupy in the public sphere. Authorship ends with the introduction of a threshold between the author and his work; criticism starts only after that threshold is already in place. Authorship concerns an object, criticism a subject.

The confusion between authorship and criticism, which is so characteristic of modernity, speaks not only about a confusion between a public and a private realm, it also introduces a confusion between an object and a subject, which, in turn, derives either from a refusal, or from an inability, to distinguish between a quotidian and a festive reality.

Note 9 We think here of action or speech as metaphoric when it evokes a threshold and seeks the manifestation of the other. By contrast, literal speech and action refers here to the quotidian world in which we struggle with natural forces. It leads us inside a world of work from which most thresholds have been removed to make place for barriers to progress. The metaphoric forms part of a festive project of mutual manifestation. Literal speech and action confronts natural barriers and makes possible the performance of our daily tasks. A literal, deliberately anti-metaphoric interpretation of a religious text transmogrifies it into a technical manual for the mastery of nature. Such a reading belongs to the realm of magic. A literal (quotidian) reading of a religious text is as inappropriate as is a metaphoric or "sabbatical" reading of a natural scientific report. The one studies a text concerned with the festive manifestation of personhood, in order to find instruction concerning the technical mastery of nature, while the other studies a text concerned with the technical mastery of nature in order to find in it access to the festive relationship of host and guest. The incoherence of these attempts becomes clear the moment we realize that the festive and the quotidian not only belong together, but that they are also separated from each other by an ontological divide.

Natural science owes its brilliant development precisely to a methodic guiding principle which removes from consideration, as much as that is possible, all reference to human or divine subjectivity. To force the idea of the revelation of subjectivity upon natural science would be as destructive as to force the idea of an intellectual and technical mastery of nature upon the festive realm of hospitality and on the foundational relationship of host and guest.

Bibliography

Apuleius (1915) *The Golden Ass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gerard, André-Marie (1989) *Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Paris: Robert Lafont.

Klein, E. (1971) *Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company.