

Damien Casey
Australian Catholic University

In search of the preferential option for “the other” in Origen and Augustine

Concern for the poor in the Hebrew Scriptures is often closely associated with concern for the stranger, the other in one’s midst.¹ That one’s concern for justice should extend beyond one’s own is a demand taken up by Matthew in Jesus’ exhortation to go beyond pagan reciprocity.² As Jonathan Sacks argues:

We encounter God in the face of the stranger. That, I believe, is the Hebrew Bible’s single greatest and most counterintuitive contribution to ethics. God creates difference; therefore it is in the one-who-is different that we meet God.³

It is Emmanuel Levinas who has been the most influential and persuasive advocate for situating the other at the centre of biblically-based ethics. According to Levinas, it is the face of the other that represents the supremely personal dimension that is irreducible and unique, and hence is unable to be appropriated to either an impersonal abstraction or my own self-understanding. It is through the face of the other that God commands us and is the beginning of ethics.

The first word of the face is the “Thou shalt not kill.” It is an order. There is a commandment in the appearance of the face, as if a master spoke to me. However, at the same time, the face of the Other is destitute; it is the poor for whom I can do all and to whom I owe all.⁴

¹ See especially Lev 23:22; Deut 24:17-21.

² Matt 5:44-48.

³ J. Sacks, *The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations* (London and New York 2002) 59.

⁴ E. Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity: Conversation with Philippe Nemo*, trans. R.A. Cohen, Eng. edn (Pittsburgh, PA 1985) 89.

The strangeness of the Other, his irreducibility to the I, to my thoughts and my possessions, is precisely accomplished as a calling into question of my spontaneity, as ethics.⁵

For both Jewish and Christian traditions God is encountered in the face of the other. One cannot love God if one does not love one's neighbour. For Christians, this challenge is given further substance in the incarnation whereby the divine identification with the poor and the marginalised other is given definitive expression.

Although this concern for the other has a strong biblical foundation, it nonetheless strikes one as a very contemporary concern. In order to examine how the early church understood the matter I have chosen in this paper to examine how Origen and Augustine, as two representative figures, understood some key gospel passages that for us today are unambiguous statements of the preferential option for the poor who is also "other", namely Matthew 25:40: "in so far as you did this to one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did it to me" and the parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke.

Origen and Augustine

It is commonplace to contrast Origen and Augustine as representing two distinct approaches that have shaped the Christian tradition. And yet both have been, as Brian Daley observes, "figures of controversy in their own day, and even more after their death; Origen, until the end of late antiquity, and Augustine, in our own day, have become the 'theologians you love to hate' *par excellence*".⁶

Their times and temper have wrought different approaches to the way theology is done and the way that scripture is read. For Origen, operating within the typically Alexandrian hermeneutic moving from the letter to the spirit, truth is not so much something to be claimed dogmatically or possessed, but in Jesus Christ it is a person to be encountered. Truth has a personal and dialogical character that accommodates itself to the capacity and needs of the receiver out of love. This approach has much to commend it as it

⁵ E. Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. A. Lingis, Eng. edn (Pittsburgh, PA 1969) 43.

⁶ B.E. Daley, "Word, soul, and flesh: Origen and Augustine on the person of Christ", *AugStud* 36 (2005) 302.

promises a way in which to overcome many of the modern problems concerning subjectivity verses objectivity, universality verses particularity.⁷

But it was, Joseph Trigg argues, Augustine’s approach that has become normative for the West in its ethical tradition.⁸ Trigg laments the legacy of “Augustine’s frankly inerrantist approach”, which he contrasts with that taken by Origen. For Origen, Trigg argues, the Bible was a vehicle of personal transformation, whereas for Augustine, at least in his years as a bishop, the Bible was an instrument for maintaining institutional integrity.⁹ Trigg’s contrast between Origen and Augustine reflects the contemporary popular prejudice of many against institutional religion in favour of personal spirituality.

One example among others that confirms the picture that Trigg presents of the contrast between Origen and Augustine is their respective interpretations of Matthew 14:22-33, where the disciples battling the heavy sea in their boat encounter Jesus walking across the lake.¹⁰ Brian Daley, comparing how Origen and Augustine approach this scene, explains that “for Origen the familiar scene is a parable of human struggle with temptation, which providentially teaches us our need for the presence and instruction of the Logos in our lives.”¹¹ Augustine, on the other hand, reads the scene as a reminder that all of us are “foreign travelers”.¹² Every voyage exposes one to storms: “So it’s essential we should stay in the boat”,¹³ which is the church.

But when we come to consider the question of the other and matters of practical charity we might expect these evaluations to be reversed. For example, Augustine’s fashionably maligned institutional concerns, since he was a pastor, might serve actually to bring the plight of the marginalised other to the centre, while Origen’s ethics do seem to be primarily concerned with ascetical considerations.

⁷ See A.G. Ricker Parks, “Conversationality in the Gospel of John”, *Theandros* 2 (2004); available from <http://www.theandros.com/convers.html>; accessed 31st July 2007.

⁸ J.W. Trigg, “Divine deception and the truthfulness of Scripture”, in C. Kannengiesser and W. Petersen (eds), *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (Notre Dame, IN 1988) 150.

⁹ Trigg, “Divine deception”, 164.

¹⁰ Daley, “Word, soul, and flesh”, 300-327.

¹¹ Daley, “Word, soul, and flesh”, 325.

¹² Aug., *Sermo* 75.2; NBA 30/1,502. For this same idea see idem, *De doc. chr.* 1.4; NBA 8,14-16, from about the same time.

¹³ Aug., *Sermo* 75.2.2 – 75.3.4; NBA 30/1,502-504. Eng. trans. in E. Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons (51-94) on the New Testament*, The Works of St. Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, part 3, vol. 3 (Hyde Park, NY 1991).

Matthew 25:40

The ethical commandment represented by the face of the other finds clear expression in Matthew 25:34-45, where Christ is identified with the least: not only the hungry and thirsty, the sick and the prisoner, but the stranger as well. Although we might read this as a clear gospel statement of the preferential option for the poor, early Christian writers appear to have interpreted this corporately, making the identification between the individual Christian and his identity with Christ as part of the body of Christ.

When Origen cites this passage, his concern is less with the poor than it is to argue for the reality of our moral freedom and responsibility for our actions.¹⁴ He is more concerned with the separation of the sheep from the goats, the question of the last judgement being the immediate context of the passage. Accordingly, the solidarity invoked by the parable is restricted to the circle of believers.¹⁵

Augustine's reading, on the other hand, appears to pay much more attention to the universal ethical obligation entailed by Christ's injunction. It is Augustine who is clearest in reading the practical obligations that Matthew 25:40 imposes on the Christian. In discussing the story of Zacchaeus he says:

As the gospel was being read, didn't we all think how lucky Zacchaeus was... You are all looking forward to greeting Christ seated in heaven. Attend to him lying under the arches, attend to him hungry, attend to him shivering with cold, attend to him needy, attend to him a foreigner. Do it, if it's already your practice. Do it, if it isn't your practice. Knowledge of Christian doctrine is growing, let good works grow too. You praise the sower; present him with a harvest.¹⁶

On not exacting payment from those who owe to us Augustine argues that Christ is

¹⁴ See Orig., *De princ.* 3.1.6; SC 268,32-40; idem, *Comm. in Ioh.* 1.11.68; SC 120,94.

¹⁵ R. Brändle, "Zur Interpretation von Mt 25,31-46 im Matthäuskommentar des Origenes", *Theologische Zeitschrift* 36 (1980) 17-25.

¹⁶ Aug., *Sermo* 25.8; NBA 29,484: "Quando legebatur Euangelium, numquid non omnes beatificauimus Zacheum. Exspectat unusquisque uestrum suscipere Christum sedentem in caelo. Attendite illum iacentem sub portico, attendite esurientem, attendite frigus patientem, attendite egenum, attendite peregrinum. Facite qui soletis, facite qui non soletis. Crescit doctrina, crescent opera bona. Laudatis sementem, exhibere messem." Eng. trans. in E. Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons (20-50) on the Old Testament*, The Works of St. Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, part 3, vol. 2 (Hyde Park, NY 1990).

the nourisher, and he goes hungry for your sake; he is the benefactor, and he’s destitute. When he’s the benefactor, you are willing to receive; when he’s destitute, you are not willing to give. Christ is destitute when any poor person is destitute. He was ready to give eternal life to all who are his own, and he is pleased to receive temporal help in every single poor person.¹⁷

One should note that the potential for elision between “every poor person” and “those who are his own”. Elsewhere Augustine clearly identifies the poor in Christ with the Christian poor. Spelling out the implications of Matthew 25:40 Augustine exhorts:

The head is in heaven, but he’s got members on earth; let the member of Christ give to the member of Christ, let the one who has give to the one who lacks. You are a member of Christ, and you have something to give; he’s a member of Christ, and he is in need in order that you may give it. You are both walking along the same road, you are companions together. The poor man’s shoulders are free, you the rich man are weighed down with packages. Give away some of what you are staggering under, give some of your heavy load to the needy; in this way lighten your own burden, and your companion’s lot.¹⁸

Augustine’s reading of Matthew 25:40 in terms of the ecclesial body of Christ is further strengthened by his frequent pairing of this verse with Acts 9:4 – “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?” – in which the risen Christ identifies the persecution of individual Christians with the persecution of Christ himself.¹⁹ Most surprising of all for us moderns is the association that Augustine makes between the poor and the Christian ascetic elite. Com-

¹⁷ Aug., *Sermo* 38.8; NBA 29,708: “Pascit et esurit propter te; donat et eget. Quando donat, uis accipere; quando eget, non uis date. Eget Christus, quando eget pauper. Qui omnibus suis uitam aeternam paratus est dare, in unoquoque paupere temporaliter est dignatus accipere.” Eng. trans. in Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons* 2.

¹⁸ Aug., *Sermo* 53A.6; NBA 30/1,112-114: “Caput in caelo est, sed membra habet in terra: det membrum Christi membro Christi, det qui habet egenti. Membrum Christi es, et habes quod des; membrum Christi est, et eget ut des. Ambo unam uiam ambulantes, ambo comites estis: pauper leuis est humeris, tu diues grauatus es sarcinis: da ex eo quo premeris, ex eo quod te onerat da indigenti; et te releuas, et comitem subleuas.” Eng. trans. in Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons* 3.

¹⁹ Aug., *Sermo* 133.8; NBA 31/1,228. See also Aug., *Enarr. Ps.* 67.25; NBA 26,602; idem, *De trin.*, 15.19.34; NBA 4,684; and idem, *De ciu. Dei* 17.18; NBA 5/2,622-624: “Sed solet in se membrorum suorum transferre personam et sibi tribuere quod esset illorum, quia caput et corpus unus est Christus; unde illud est in Euangelio: *Esuriui, et dedistis mihi manducare...*”

menting on a difficult verse in the Lukan parable of the unjust steward, Augustine asks:

So who are the least ones of Christ? They are those who have said goodbye to all their possessions and followed him, and have distributed whatever they had among the poor, so that they may serve God unfettered by temporal fetters, and freed of the burdens of the world may raise their shoulders on high as though they had sprouted wings. These are the least. Why least? Because humble, because not high and mighty, not proud. Weigh these least ones, and you will find them a heavy weight.²⁰

Matthew 25:40 turns out not to be such a good choice for determining early Christian attitudes towards the other at all. Although we might read it today as a clear statement of the preferential option for the poor, understood as a universal obligation, one cannot deny that there are clear warrants for the patristic tendency to read the identification of the least with Christ in terms of Christ's ecclesial body.

The Good Samaritan

Perhaps the parable of the Good Samaritan is less ambiguous in that the point of the parable, in contrast with the above readings, is precisely that one should make no distinction in defining the neighbour in terms of blood, polity, or religion. Furthermore, the parable is presented as an answer to the question: who is my neighbour? After telling the parable Jesus commands us to go and do likewise. What could be less ambiguous?

But while the obvious – literal or historical, indeed ethical sense of the parable – is usually acknowledged, it is the allegorical reading that seems to be more prominent. It turns out that one of the most common readings of the parable was to allegorise it in terms of the church. We would expect to find

²⁰ Aug., *Sermo* 113.1.1; NBA 30/2,414: “Minimi ergo qui sunt Christ? Illi sunt qui omnia sua dimiserunt, et secuti sunt eum, et quidquid habuerunt, pauperibus distribuerunt; ut Deo sine saeculari compede expediti seruirent, et ab oneribus mundi liberatos, uelut pennatos sursum humeros tollerent. Hi sunt minimi. Quare minimi? Quia humiles, quia non elati, non superbi. Appende minimos istos, et graue pondus inuenies.” Eng. trans. in E. Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons (94A-147A) on the New Testament*, The Works of St. Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, part 3, vol. 4 (Hyde Park, NY 1992). However, Augustine then proceeds to criticise those who give away what does not belong to them: “Give alms from the proceeds of your just labors; give from what you rightly possess.”

this in Origen, but the near ubiquity of this sort of reading is extraordinary.²¹ What is problematic about these allegorical readings is the manner in which even with this most unambiguous of parables the love of neighbour becomes primarily love of fellow Christians. Rather than love of the other, it becomes love of the same.

On the one hand, one might imagine a compartmentalisation in the mind of the early Christian whereby if one were able to confront him or her with the literal sense that seems to have been overlooked, it might be objected that one was indeed fully aware of the literal sense, but was rather more concerned with the higher logic of allegory where the parable of the Good Samaritan is all about the church. On the other hand, the hermeneutical shortcomings may be our own. Schooled as we are in the historical-critical method, we are not comfortable with the idea of a plurality of readings, of the four senses of scripture, operating simultaneously without conflict.²²

Clement is a perfect example here, and is worth citing for his influence on Origen on this matter. Clement uses the parable of the Good Samaritan to link to two great commandments to love both God and neighbour. Discussing the question “who is my neighbour?” as explained in the parable Clement observes that:

He did not point, in the same way as the Jews did, to their blood-relation, or fellow-citizen, or proselyte, or to the man who like them was circumcised, or to a keeper of one and the same law.²³

But for Clement it is Christ who is the neighbour *par excellence*. So in loving Christ we are in fact loving both God and neighbour. Christians then are to love each other, and to this effect Clement quotes Matthew 25:34-40: “He then is first who loves Christ, and the second is he who honours and respects

²¹ See R. Roukema, “The good Samaritan in ancient Christianity”, *VC* 58 (2004) 56-74.

²² C. Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA, and London 2007) 330, argues that our modern readings of the Scriptures are themselves shaped by the scientific context in which the Platonic cosmos with its many signs and correspondences have been swept away. Similarly, religion itself has been increasingly subject to the demands of instrumental and utilitarian reason.

²³ Clem. Alex., *Quis* 28.2; GCS 17², 178: “οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον Ἰουδαίοις προωρίσατο τὸν πρὸς αἵματος οὐδὲ τὸν πολιτὴν οὐδὲ τὸν προσήλυτον οὐδὲ τὸν ὁμοίως περιτετμημένον οὐδὲ τὸν ἐνὶ καὶ ταύτῳ νόμῳ χρώμενον.” Eng. trans. in G.W. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria*, LCL 92 (Cambridge, MA 1919).

those who believe on Christ. For whatever service a man does for a disciple the Lord accepts for Himself, and reckons it all His own.”²⁴

Like Clement, Origen reads the parable as illustrating the importance of the love of Christ.

For, if you very carefully ask who is our neighbor, you will learn in the Gospel that our neighbor is the one who came along while we were lying on the ground, wounded by thieves and stripped naked by demons. He put us on the beast of his own body, and led us to the stable of the Church, and for our care and attention he gave the innkeeper – either Paul himself or all who preside over the Church – two denarii of the Old and New Testaments. He promised to supply the expenses for our care. Therefore, if we love this neighbor, we are fulfilling the entire law and all the commandments by his love.²⁵

Elsewhere, when Origen does offer practical applications of the parable, this practical assistance is invariably allegorised.²⁶

Augustine also allegorises the parable drawing on Origen’s reading as mediated, in all likelihood, through Ambrose.²⁷ In *Quaestiones euangeliorum*,²⁸ Augustine explains that the traveller in the parable is Adam, Jerusalem is the heavenly city, and Jericho signifies our mortality. The thieves are the forces of the devil who stripped him of his immortality and left him half dead in sin.

²⁴ Clem. Alex., *Quis* 30.1; GCS 17²,179: “Πρῶτος μὲν οὖν οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸν ἀγαπῶν, δεύτερος δὲ ὁ τοὺς ἐκείνω πεπιστευκότας τιμῶν καὶ περιέπων. ὁ γὰρ ἂν τις εἰς μαθητὴν ἐργάσῃται, τοῦτο εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὁ κύριος ἐκδέχεται καὶ πᾶν ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖται.”

²⁵ Orig., *In epist. ad Rom.* 9.31.2; PG14,1231-1232: “Nam si diligentius requiras quis sit proximus noster, disces in euangelio illum esse proximum nostrum qui uenit, et iacentes nos uulneratuos a latronibus, et nudatos a daemonibus iumento corporis sui superposuit, et ad stabulum ecclesiae detulit, et stabulario pro cura nostra et diligentia (uel ipsi Paulo, uel omni qui ecclesiae praeest) duos denarios noui et ueteris testamenti ad nostrae curae concessit expensas. Hunc ergo proximum si diligamus, omnem legem et uniuersa mandata in ipsius amore complemus.” Eng. trans. in T.P. Scheck, *Origen: Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Books 6-10*, Fathers of the Church 104 (Washington, D.C. 2002).

²⁶ For example, in response to Celsus’ criticism that the kingdom of God is promised to sinners, Celsus calling Jesus himself a robber: “What others would a robber invite and call?” Orig., *Con. Cels.* 3.61; SC 136,142, responds that indeed Christians are called to invite the robber, but only in order that they might “bind up their wounds by the gospel, and pour medicines of the gospels upon the soul festering with evils, like the wine, olive-oil and emollient, and the other medicinal aids which relieve the soul.” Eng. trans. in H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, 2nd edn (Cambridge 1965).

²⁷ Roukema, “The good Samaritan in ancient Christianity”, 56-74, 69.

²⁸ Aug., *Quaest. euang.* 2.19; NBA 10/2,356-358.

The priest and the Levite are the ministry of the Old Testament. The Samaritan is Christ. The binding of the wounds is restraint, the oil is hope, and the wine the exhortation to work with a fervent spirit. The beast is the flesh the Christ assumed in the incarnation. The inn is the church. The promised return of the Samaritan is the second coming, the two coins the two commandments of love, or the promise of this life and the one to come. The innkeeper is the apostle.

Against the Pelagians, Augustine makes good use of the allegorical reading of the Good Samaritan, arguing that the victim is still in the process of being cured. He remains in the inn. "Meanwhile", Augustine argues, "let us gladly accept being cured at the inn; don't let's boast of our health while we are still feeble; because all we will achieve by getting proud is to ensure that we will never be healed by taking the cure."²⁹ But Augustine does not neglect the literal and ethical sense. In *De doctrina christiana* book 1 Augustine discusses the parable arguing:

But anybody can see that no exception is made of any to whom the duty of compassion can be denied, when the command is extended even to enemies, with the Lord also telling us, *Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you* (Matt 5:44).³⁰

It is also in book 1 of *De doctrina Christiana* that we find a clear statement of Augustine's hermeneutical priorities, which puts this entire discussion in perspective. Augustine writes that "*the fulfillment and the end of the law and of all the divine scriptures is love* (Rom 13:8; 1 Tim 1:5)".³¹ Augustine explains:

So if it seems to you that you have understood the divine scriptures, or any part of them, in such a way that by this understanding you do not build up this twin love of God and neighbor, then you have not yet understood

²⁹ Aug., *Sermo* 131.6; NBA 31/1,198: "Interim in stabulo libenter curemur, non adhuc languidi de sanitate gloriemur; ne nihil aliud superbiendo faciamus, nisi ut numquam curando sanemur." Eng. trans. in Hill, *St. Augustine: Sermons* 4.

³⁰ Aug., *De doc. Chr.*, 1.30.31; NBA 8,44: "Nullum autem exceptum esse cui misericordiae denegetur officium, quis non uideat, quando usque ad inimicos etiam porrectum est, eodem Domino dicente: *Diligite inimicos uestros, benefacite eis qui uos oderunt?*" Eng. trans. in E. Hill, *Saint Augustine: Teaching Christianity (De Doctrina Christiana)*, The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century, part 1, vol. 11 (Hyde Park, NY 1996).

³¹ Aug., *De doc. Chr.* 1 35.39; NBA 8,52: "...Legis et omnium diuinarum Scripturarum plenitudo et finis esse dilectio..."

them. If on the other hand you have made judgments about them that are helpful for building up this love, but for all that have not said what the author you have been reading actually meant in that place, then your mistake is not pernicious, and you certainly cannot be accused of lying.³²

But all the same, as I had started to say, if they are mistaken in a judgment which is intended to build up charity, which is *the end of the law* (1 Tim 1:5), they are mistaken in the same sort of way as people who go astray off the road, but still proceed by rough paths to the same place as the road was taking them to.³³

This extraordinary passage, certainly to my mind, answers the charge of literalism on the part of Augustine. It is true that Augustine as a good pastor would prefer that we keep to the path, or stay in the boat, but these things would seem not to be ends in themselves, as Augustine's detractors might claim. One might even say that, in effect, Augustine's literalism is primarily pastoral and pedagogical. It also raises the question as to whether the literal/historical sense and the allegorical are really in competition. For the early Christians it would seem that the parable was all about church, but is this really so surprising when the principal context in which the Scriptures were heard was the liturgy?

Conclusion

In considering the initially attractive approach taken by Origen, I am reminded of Levinas' critique of Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue with its "self-sufficient 'I-Thou' forgetful of the universe".³⁴ As Jacques Derrida describes Levinas' remedy, it is only with the "summoning of the third party, the universal witness, the face of the world which keeps us from the 'disdain-

³² Aug., *De doc. Chr.* 1.36.40; NBA 8,52: "Quisquis igitur Scripturas diuinas uel quamlibet earum partem intellexisse sibi uidetur, ita ut eo intellectu non aedificet istam geminam caritatem Dei et proximi, nondum intellexit. Quisquis uero talem inde sententiam duxerit, ut huic aedificandae caritati sit utilis, nec tamen hoc dixerit quod ille quem legit eo loco sensisse probabitur, non perniciose fallitur nec omnino mentitur."

³³ Aug., *De doc. Chr.* 1.36.41; NBA 8,54: "Sed tamen, ut dicere coeperam, si ea sententia fallitur; qua aedificet caritatem, quae finis praecepti est, ita fallitur, ac si quisquam errore deserens uiam, eo tamen per agrum pergat quo etiam uia illa perducit."

³⁴ Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 213. On whether or not Levinas' critique is a fair one see D. Casey, "Levinas and Buber: transcendence and society", *Sophia* 38.2 (1999) 69-92.

ful spiritualism' of the I-Thou".³⁵ The face of the world must always be kept in view and my sense is that Augustine was more successful in this than Origen, although it is debatable whether Origen's was a "disdainful spiritualism". Furthermore, as this brief survey has shown, Origen and Augustine were not as far from each other as is commonly assumed.

In looking for a concern for the other in the early church what ultimately emerges is the otherness of the early Christians themselves. We catch glimpses of the sort of universal love that the concern for the other represents, but more often we are confronted with the construction of a Christian identity that is quite distinct from our own. Accordingly, the ethical challenge posed by the other will also take different forms. It is taken for granted in the early church that personal identity is primarily corporate. To be a Christian is to be a member of the body of Christ and to be assimilated to the likeness of Christ. And this understanding of the person shaped their reading of the scriptures. Ironically, perhaps, we might conclude that the ease with which early Christian writers seem to hold to a number of readings simultaneously suggests that early Christians were more comfortable with a plurality of readings than we are today.

³⁵ J. Derrida, "Violence and metaphysics: an essay on the thought of Emmanuel Levinas", in idem, *Writing and Difference*, trans. A. Bass, Eng. edn (London 1978) 314 n. 37.