

## *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity*

Author(s): Jacques Derrida. Edited by Geoffrey Bennington, Katie Chenoweth and Rodrigo Therezo. Translated by Katie Chenoweth and Rodrigo Therezo.

Publisher: University of Chicago Press

Reviewer: Harrison Lechley, University of Brighton

### Introduction<sup>i</sup>

For someone so enthralled by ghosts, it seems fitting that a 'long-lost' manuscript should appear within Jacques Derrida's oeuvre posthumously. *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* (University of Chicago Press), a text produced from the ghosts of Derrida's archive, constitutes the third instalment of Derrida's four essays on *Geschlecht* – a word which has no equal translation in English nor French but refers to sex, nation, race, generation, humanity, lineage in ambivalent measure. This posthumous reconstruction is based on: Derrida's 1984-1985 seminar on philosophical nationalism (*Ghost of the Other*) at the *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales* (EHESS); and an 'incomplete' version of its seminars 7-8 distributed to participants at Loyola University, Chicago in March 1985 where Derrida had intended to present this manuscript (titled *Geschlecht III*) but instead presented *Heidegger's Hand (Geschlecht II)*. As such this volume comprises two parts: the first being the 'unfinished and incomplete' *Geschlecht III* manuscript; the second, *Sessions 9-13 of Ghost of the Other*.

Despite the impossible task at hand, the volume is perhaps as 'faithful' a reconstruction as Derrida scholars could hope for. The editors have gone to extraordinary lengths to ensure as much of Derrida's original material has been kept intact: where necessary Derrida's own French translation is kept alongside Heidegger's German, the original French translation and now their English translation; and ambiguous or illegible words (much has been transcribed from Derrida's hand-written notes) remain and are marked out. As far as possible attempts

have been made to ensure this reconstruction preserves the polysemy of the text and ensure no interpretation is foreclosed through editorial procedure.

That the lost should re-appear is a fitting place to start. It would be tempting to classify the publication of this text as a missing puzzle piece that completes the *Geschlecht*-series jigsaw and answers long-standing questions. David Krell (2007; 2012) has become a leading authority on this lost piece and poses the following: (a) 'what sense are we to make...[of this] tranquil childhood' (p. 178, 2007) or peaceful division of *Geschlecht* that Heidegger demands?; (b) the importance of animality (and its refusal) in the fundamental ontology of *Dasein* and *Geschlecht*; and (c) that 'gathering is always a privileged signifier for Heidegger' which 'protects the unborne' (p. 180; p. 189, 2007). It would be a mistake to argue that *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* reveals hidden answers that remained entirely elusive until now. The idea of a singular location which resolves disparate issues is precisely the problem Derrida targets here. This volume does provide crucial answers – but these answers are not entirely absent from Derrida's other works. Nevertheless this is crucial reading for those interested in Derrida's thought on the dangers of *gathering* as a privileged signifier; the ways in which polysemy remains distinct from dissemination for Derrida; and, finally, the problems of demarcating *any* characteristics as proper to the human. In sum, *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* threads these together in order to demonstrate a nascent political thought propelling Derrida's earlier works which remain more radical than his later 'political' writings such as *Rogues* (2005).

### *Geschlecht III*

Derrida opens *Geschlecht III* by drawing the audience's attention to Heidegger's interpretation of the German poet George Trakl in order to determine to whether a 'Heideggerian reading' succeeds in destroying or 'extend[ing] beyond' the 'metaphysico-aesthetic representation' (p. 4), or whether it walls up to and becomes entangled and caught within its snare. In short, the entire volume centres around this singular question - how can Heidegger's position be understood through his Trakl interpretation? - and Derrida's dismay at this position. This should come as no surprise to those who have read Krell (2007; 2012): he suggested as much of *Geschlecht III*.

To begin Derrida analyses two pairs of literary criticism terms that Heidegger employs when interpreting Trakl's poetry: *Gedicht* (poetic style or essence, oeuvre) and *dichtendes Sagen* (poetic speech, poetic expressions, poems); *Erläuterung* (elucidation, clarification) and *Erörterung* (situation but also contextualisation, discussion, debate) – rooted in the German *Ort* (place; location). Heidegger names *Zwiesprache* (dialogue) as the relation between *Gedicht* and *dichtendes Sagen*: 'a two-way speech, exchanged here between *Denken* [thought] and *Dichten* [writing]' (p. 23). It is thus a case of translation. Writing is exchanged for thought. For Derrida, this institutes a propriety to speech. To delimit *Zwiesprache* as the 'most appropriate' form of speech – that which defines the 'Greatness' of the Great Poet – is to situate (situation; *Erörterung*) thought as the *Ort* (place) where *Greatness* resides: *Gedicht*.

For Heidegger, the wandering path of *Fremd* (the root of stranger (*Fremder*) and the strange (*das Fremde*)) is a symbol in Trakl's poems for accessing *Gedicht*. Following the *Stranger* leads to difference but not conflict. This is the *Greatness* of humanity that Heidegger envisions: peaceful difference. This path distinguishes the 'thinking animal' from bestiality for him. It marks the 'tranquil childhood' Krell (2007) implored us to make sense of. For Heidegger, humanity (*Geschlecht*) must follow this path, but designation or inauguration of a new *Geschlecht* (humanity, generation) is a two-step process: 'there are...two blows, two strikes [*Schlag*], two stamps' (p. 46) of *Geschlecht*. The first mark (*Schlag*) is discord or difference and the second is the inscription of that discord in grapheme as conflict or decomposition. The former attempts to mark the neutrality of *Dasein* without effacing the differences that comes with *being-in-the-world*. The *Stranger* is a return to this first step and enables peaceful difference as humanity's salvation.

This *wandering* path and its facilitation of difference evokes an erratic drifting which refuses the propriety of any direct path. Derrida argues this is an illusion: 'the wandering of [this] Stranger we won't call "nomadic": he is not "countryless" or "destinationless"' (p. 29). This gathering of heterogeneous elements can always be traced back to a singular *Ort* (place): the first step of *Geschlecht*. The desire to return to the origin, to find 'the true' (*wahre*) and safeguard (*verwahren*) it, is troubling for Derrida: it is an attempt to gather 'our primitive language and we are not far from Fichte here' (p. 17). Obliquely, Derrida infers the political

implications of such a philosophical position: the expansionist logic of the nation and the exceptionalism that propels it. These themes of *Ort*, nationhood (*Geschlecht*) and gathering are, as the rest of the volume illustrates, caught within a politics of propriety.

### Session 9

*Geschlecht III* thus seems to provide an overview of *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* with Sessions 9 to 13 each further elucidating an aspect of this overture. Session 9 focuses on: the role of Platonic-Christian metaphysics in Heidegger; the role of the untranslatable idiom and the importance of place (*Ort*); and finally, the difference between polysemy and dissemination. It is this last part which most demonstrates the difference Derrida wishes to institute between his own work and Heidegger's. I would argue that it is this distinction which marks the difference between a politics of propriety and a politics which attempts to displace propriety and the violence it authorises.

First, Derrida proposes that Heidegger's emphasis on the unicity of place (*Ort*) fails to be reducible to Platonic-Christian metaphysics, and *yet also* remains unable to think beyond it. Krell (2007) argues that Heidegger thinks of himself as offering a 'reversal and overcoming of, or coming to terms with, Platonism' (p. 184). Here we see Derrida dismiss the idea of any 'reversal' and argue instead that Heidegger's emphasis on the unicity of *Ort* reveals a foregrounding to Platonic-Christianity: a 'more-originary' place which is non-temporally 'before' or 'prior to' the Platonic-Christian ontological oppositions. *Gedicht* is not a spiritual place but a place of the material world, a place *in-the-world*. It is only the poems written (*dichtendes Sagen*) which enables the possibility of accessing the unspeakable *Gedicht*. Despite this, *Gedicht* gathers these 'material' polysemic poems into a singular and univocal - that is a proper - understanding. In sum, Derrida argues that Heidegger *destrukts* (not deconstructs) the metaphysical opposition of spiritual-material and reanimates it to think it differently. Yet, he merely tethers them to another singular site of origin (*Geschlecht, Being or Dasein*).

Second, Derrida focuses on the role of the untranslatable idiom in the 'second step' or second blow/mark (*Schlag*) which institutes division and, as Krell (2012) argues, 'magnetises' Derrida.

Here, *Elis* - a young boy in Trakl's *An den Knaben Elis* ('To The Boy Elis') - is introduced alongside the *Stranger* which, for Heidegger, also promises salvation and the new *Geschlecht*. Both enable the possibility of resisting the conflict of the 'second blow' by returning to this 'pre-originary' first step: peaceful difference. Derrida argues this 'pre-originary' foundation is not neutral. The figures of *Elis* and *Stranger* can only be understood through the 'Old and High, secret, idiomatico-poetic' German (p. xxix) - not everyday German. *Elis* and *Stranger* are not universal nor ahistorical conceptions but deeply historical ones: they are impossible to translate, and only a deep, rich understanding of this history and its linguistic connotations allows for the possibility of their comprehension. Consequently, Derrida is concerned that *Geschlecht*, this new humanity, is delimited by the propriety of Old and High German as the proper thought of any 'thinking animal'. Contingent characteristics are here made proper, neutral and universal. The *Geschlecht* that can salvage humanity must *properly* apprehend and understand this idiomatic and untranslatable history and *be* part of it.

This brings us to the third part of *Session 9* and to the heart of *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* as a project (perhaps even the entire *Geschlecht* series itself): the gathering and untranslatability of *Ort* as 'a difference between polysemy and dissemination' (p. 52). Polysemy is not a word Heidegger himself uses. It is Derrida's own translation of *mehrdeutig* (ambiguous) which aims to: a) capture the multiplication of difference that *Being* inaugurates; and b) to differentiate from his own conception of *dissemination* which, unlike Heidegger's *mehrdeutig* (ambiguous) or polysemy, does not gather these differences into a singular unicity. For Heidegger, difference is coterminous with singularity but the former must converge or gather in a singular place. For instance, poems and *Gedicht* do not efface or annul one another, but the former are possible because of the singular *Gedicht*. For Derrida, this is highly problematic. It privileges this singular, *idiomatic* place above all others as the necessary starting point for humanity's salvation from decomposition. Dissemination then is difference *tout court*; perpetual deferral and displacement. Any attempt to gather or locate is always a violent imposition. As Noah Martin (2015) wryly comments: 'the kind of dissemination [polysemy] that is not in opposition to gathering is a watered-down dissemination' (p. 3). A polysemic conception of difference continues to institute a proper place amongst perpetual difference. It is a violent and always unjust imposition which installs boundaries of propriety: moving from the metaphysical origin to the 'pre-originary' *Being*. What is proper to

humanity's salvation then is a thinking animal contingent on the boundaries of Old and High German: others can exist but the future begins here.

### Session 10

If *Session 9* is critical of Heidegger's polysemic gathering, which privileges a contingent historical *Ort* (place) as proper to humanity, then *Session 10* explores the violent implications of this boundary demarcation. Derrida argues that this privileging of historical place (*Ort*) enables a quasi-nationalism, one tied to myths of a discreet language, land and history, to overwhelm Heidegger's account of the new *Geschlecht*.

*Session 10* opens with a clarification: *Gedicht* is not something other than the *Dichtung* (poetry). *Gedicht* is rather the fundamental tone (*Grundton*) of the *Dichtung*; it is a silence that marks what is *really* being said when we speak. *Grundton* is not *elsewhere* with regard to the poems of *Dichtung*; it is the unspokenness of these poems. *Gedicht* is the unspoken, 'true' meaning of these poems. Heidegger finds this unspoken meaning by metonymically linking words and phrases from everyday German to Old and High German. *Gedicht*, like *Being*, is *always* an essence of becoming: made *through* poems but not existing outside them. This negotiation means that the supposed neutrality of *Gedicht* and *Being* is then always marked by a discreet linguistic history: Old and High German. Derrida here summarises the fear that has stalked his reading of Heidegger thus far: it is not merely a form of nationalism, but a propriety of *Being* dependent upon these contingent, historical conditions and something far more delimiting in its scope. *Session 10* argues then that just when Heidegger is at his most radical, he stutters, redoubles back on himself and imposes a quasi 'philosophical nationalism'. This 'proper thought' of *Erörterung*, the thinking animal and *Geschlecht* act as necessary pre-conditions for humanity - reaffirming the propriety of those who can have access to it and can enter subjectivity. Anything less is bestiality or non-human. In this singular move, some humans then become sub-human and this marks the ultimate danger of any politics or philosophy of propriety.

## Session 11

If *Session 10* outlines the violent implications of delineating *Geschlecht* as a proprietary foundation for humanity's salvation, then *Session 11* hammers these home. First, Derrida situates the *Stranger* and *Elis* between and against two concepts of modernity and German Idealism: cosmopolitanism and humanism. Second, Derrida argues that Heidegger's conception of the Occident (Europe, the West) is integral to this positioning. Moreover, Derrida argues that a *Geschlecht* which retains the Occident as its home is a dangerous form of proprietary violence which radically excludes.

The *Stranger* and *Elis*, unlike humanism or cosmopolitanism, refuse the human being as the foundation for the human experience: 'what throws [the throwing, *das Werfende*] in such projection is not the human being but *being itself*, which sends [*schickt*, which destines] the human being into the ek-sistence of *Da-sein* that is his essence' (p. 97; my italics). Heidegger turns to Holderlin's *Heimkunft* ('Homecoming') to designate *Heimat* (homeland) as this thrownness [*das Werfende*] of *Da-sein*. Yet this homeland, Derrida argues, must be thought, not nationalistically nor patriotically, but rather 'in term of the history of being' (p. 98). Moreover, for Heidegger this history, this *Heimat*, must be understood as *Abendland* – a phrase Trakl uses in his oeuvre to denote the Occident and which literally translates as *Land of the Evening*. Heidegger eulogises that the evening prepares and clears the way for the morning and the new *to come*, just as *Being* is a site (*Ort*) which prepares and clears the way for the unborne *Geschlecht* to come. For Derrida then, Heidegger's assimilation of Holderlin's *Heimat* and Trakl's *Abendland* announce the limits of the new configurations that can emerge from *Being* (that pre-originary place) and which can resist the decomposition of the second step, the bad *Geschlecht*. The *Heimat's* "countrymen" are not the citizens of the German nation; *countrymen* refers to those who inherit the *history of being*. In other words, it is those who retain 'a belongingness to the destiny of the West' (p. 98) – those who understand this history and inherit through Old and High German. Consequently, Derrida argues this move to steer clear of nationalism only violently reaffirms the propriety of 'the West' as the origin of *Being* thus destined (*Geschickt*) as *the* future of humanity's salvation.

## Session 12

*Session 12* sees Derrida, in knowingly provocative fashion, name this discourse a 'revolutionary promise'. The new *Geschlecht*, inheritors of Old and High German and descendents of *Abendland*, and thus destined (*Geschickt*) by virtue of this unique place (*Ort*) they hold in history, is this singular subjectivity – it *may* spawn others but this is where it all begins. Derrida further argues that Heidegger's emphasis on the "Ein" (one) in *Ein Geschlecht* promises the possibility of a 'completely other experience' (p. 128): peaceful difference. Yet he concludes that it is this very demand for the *Ein*, for the singular and the securing of it, which 'guarantees the ultimate foundation of every nationalism' (p. 132) and thus reanimates the possibility of exclusion, dispossession and violence that *Ein Geschlecht* promises to release us from.

The new *Geschlecht* appear through *Schlag* – a mark or strike which clears the decomposition and inaugurates the unborne *Geschlecht* of *Abendland*. Two things remain important for Derrida. First, this mark (*Schlag*) is not only a singular mark. It announces the singularity of *Being* and the differences of all beings which might emerge from this singular *Geschlecht*. There is *both Einfalt* (oneness) and *Zwiefalt* (two-fold). Singularity does not efface difference; differences are maintained alongside the singular place (*Ort*) *even* as they are gathered into it. Second, *Schlag*, as strike or mark, does not merely mean destruction but operates as 'an opening and a path-breaking' (p. 130). This makes sense given singularity does not efface difference for Heidegger and it is the *Schlag* which clears decomposition for a new *Geschlecht* to break forth. It is for this reason that Derrida argues *Schlag* is untranslatable from German because any translation fails to carry over *Schlag*'s inextricable relationship to *Weg* (path). The mark of the singular (*ein Geschlecht*) is thus a pathway to multiplicity wherein all the new, unborne *Geschlechter* of the future gestate.

Schrijvers (2017) proposes that Derrida hopes for a unisexuality, a singular *Geschlecht* which 'resists (even his) deconstruction' (p. 2). However, *Session 12* demonstrates that even this polysemic, path-breaking (*Weg*) *Schlag*, which promises difference *alongside* singularity (*Ein*) and a future of possibility over closure, 'remains a path of return' (p. 131). Derrida argues, the pathway (*Weg*) of the *Schlag* (the mark) and the *Ein* (the one) 'gives way to the more



ancient, the more matutinal of the night before' (p. 131). That which is closest to the most Ancient civilisation (this 'first' civilisation) - Ancient Greece, the West, *Abendland* - structures *Geschlecht* (humanity, species, races, sexualities) and can be considered proper to the future *to come* of humanity and its true descendants. Proximity to *Heimat* determines *Ein Geschlecht*. Thus, this account of *Being*, for Derrida, remains an act of enclosure within the field of difference. Schrijvers misses what Derrida always targets: enclosure, the demarcation of boundaries and propriety. His hope, if one can exist, is to resist unjustified enclosure.

For Derrida, *Heimkunft* (homecoming) organises Heidegger's thought on the proper and commands and enables all possible forms of nationalism and nationalist claims. The polysemic differences of *Geschlecht* are organised *through* the singularity of *Heimkunft*. Derrida understands *Heimkunft* as a 'return to the source [which] can be a withdrawal or preparation for a new morning or new leap...this nationalist circle' (p. 132). The homecoming is then a 'path-breaking step' which clears the way forward for national and colonial exploitation to operate. It is a harkening back to the 'most original' in order to justify venturing forth and appropriating all that is ahead. It is not simply then that those improper differences outside the singular propriety of *Heimkunft* (i.e. those other, non-Western *Geschlecht* or 'races', nations, 'species') are eviscerated - they are eviscerated through their interpolation into this 'most original' logic of *Being*. The Other is only understood through the terms of the self - 'neutralising' any sense of Other-ness. This propriety of self therefore eviscerates the Other by appropriating it into the self and this 'most original' logic.

### Session 13

*Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity's* final session, *Session 13*, provides the clearest indication yet of what decomposition means for Heidegger: modernity. Derrida argues that it is against this backdrop that the new *Geschlecht* of the *Stranger* and *Elis* must be understood as an *arche-origin*. Derrida claims that Heidegger's differentiation between *Historie* (history as representation), *Geschichte* (history as that which happens but also tale or narrative) and *Geschick* (destiny) demonstrates how he constructs a certain history of Old and High German, descended from *Abendland*, as the *arche-origin* of humanity (*Geschlecht*). In naming the new *Geschlecht* as an *arche-origin* Derrida forcefully shows what has been latently pointed to

throughout the book: this new *Geschlecht* as *Stranger* and *Elis* are proprietary claims, which replay in dissimulated fashion the metaphysical trap it seeks to escape.

In *Die Sprache im Gedicht* (1953) Heidegger rallies against those who argue that Trakl's work is ahistorical because it does not contain 'historiographical objects' (p. 149). For Heidegger, there is no need for these when dealing with history of the 'highest sense' (p. 150). Failure to understand this is a 'modern and metaphysical objection [which] stems from this objectivism and this philosophy of representation that is the mark of post-Cartesian philosophy' (p. 149). The distinction between *Historie*, *Geschichte* and *Geschick* is then Heidegger's attempts to return to the past and articulate a different account of history altogether – one that Trakl apparently pronounces perfectly: 'his poem is *Geschichtlich* [historical] in the highest sense' (p. 149-150). *Geschichte* literally translates to history, story, tale, narrative, saga. Trakl's poetry may not name historical objects, but it does mark *Stranger* and *Elis*; symbols of the new *Geschlecht*, the bearer of history and the future, and the destiny (*schickt/Geschick*) of the history of 'the West'. Like the path-breaking *Schlag* (mark), these symbols carry history forth – continue its story - by returning to the 'most original' mark of humanity (*Geschlecht*) and making way for the future.

For Derrida, reanimating history cannot mean a return to an origin. *This* 'movement toward the future is a return toward the arche-origin' (p. 153). There is no undecidability nor uncertainty regarding this future. It is rather determined by the false construction of an originary moment which then legitimises ensuing violence. Here the 'arche-origin' legitimates *Ein Geschlecht* as both (a) the historical and proper subject of *Abendland* and 'the West', which has always existed; and (b) the one which is also its future and can act as its salvation. Derrida argues that Heidegger's circular account of history only serves to 'save what is proper to man' (p. 152). It designates and delimits a *Geschick* (destiny), *Ein Geschlecht*, to 'give humanity its proper stamp and make it come into itself, *into its essence*, saving it from what it is not or must not be' (p. 152). This may be an essence of becoming: the future *Geschlecht* enables the fulfilment of this promise of history. Nevertheless, this future and this promise are *always* premised upon a return that is not 'accidental or supplementary predicate of dwelling or the homeland [*Heimat*], it is the essential movement that originarily constitutes

the homeland or country as a promise of dwelling. The country begins with the promise of return' (p. 153). As such even an 'arche-origin' of becoming such as the *Heimat* of *Ein Geschlecht* (like all arche-origins) is an act of ownership over the future, which denotes what can appear within it by demarcating a past and a future (*Abendland*, 'the West' and the Occident) which do not exist. This demarcation and delimitation of the future thus marks its proper bounds. It institutes what does and does not count.

### Conclusion

After reading *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* some might be tempted to argue that if *gathering*, even in the polysemic fashion Heidegger suggests, is so problematic, it must be avoided at all costs such that nothing is ever united. As responses to *Spectres of Marx* (1994) demonstrated, some will affirm then that deconstructive politics is no politics at all. Others would lament the lack of overt references to sex and sexuality, which Krell (2007; 2012) promised were the 'proper subjects' of *Geschlecht III*. Both responses would be short-sighted<sup>ii</sup>. In refusing the propriety of gathering and affirming dissemination as a form of anti-proprietary politics, Derrida argues we cannot rely upon the histories and systems we inherit. Gathering is possible; it happens all the time. But, in 'protecting the unborne', it will necessarily exclude, and failure to acknowledge any 'arche-origin' as contingent is fundamentally dangerous. Reading sex and sexuality through this lens disavows the imposition of boundaries that binary logics of sex designate. Male and female must be understood as limits which govern the propriety of bodies, determine our political horizons and authorises violence (be it the absence of appropriate and socialised healthcare or vigilante attacks) against those who defy these limits. These borders always overlap and coalesce with those of the human, race, nation, lineage to institute forms of propriety. This is the reason, it seems, that Derrida is so intrigued by *Geschlecht* – a phrase which points to these intersecting forms of properness and cannot be reduced to any single one.

Derrida's concern throughout *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* is that Heidegger replays a metaphysical trick. A 'Heideggerian reading', *Ein Geschlecht*, *Elis*, *Abendland* cannot be reduced to the metaphysical, but neither do they entirely escape that metaphysical inclination for propriety: a proper way to write, a proper way to read the poem, a proper path

to follow and more significantly a proper locale of *Being* – a properness to humanity. It is this propriety which threads each of the sessions in *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* as Derrida elucidates the violence which is authorised by *any* stalwart defence of propriety to humanity: be it thought (over animality), a race, a sex, a sexuality, a nation, a lineage and so forth. Dissemination is positioned as the perpetual displacement of any attempt at gathering or enclosure and, as such, the perpetual disavowal of any propriety. It is therefore *the* possibility of resisting rather than replaying the violences of racism, colonialism and sexism (but also heteropatriarchy) and so forth, which attempt to designate the kinds of bodies that are proper and improper. What is most interesting then is not necessarily what this volume says about Heidegger (nor Derrida's reading of him) but the dormant political force which *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* and other earlier works (1978; 1982; 1992) reveal – that most radical energy which becomes more cautious in texts such as *Rogues* (2005). It is that energy that *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* provides today and it is this Derrida we cannot forget and must inherit.

## References

- Derrida, Jacques. 1978. *Writing and Difference*. Great Britain: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. *Margins of Philosophy*. Brighton: Harvester Press Limited.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1992. "Force of Law: The 'Mystical Foundation of Authority.'" In *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*, edited by Drucilla Cornell, Michael Rosenfeld and David Gray Carlson, 3-67. New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1994. *Spectres of Marx*. New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2005. *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1953. "Die Sprache im Gedicht." In *Unterwegs zur Sprache (On the way to Language)*. 1982. Harper Collins.
- Krell, David Farrell. 2007. "Marginalia to *Geschlecht III*: Derrida on Heidegger on Trakl." *The New Centennial Review* 7, no 2 (Fall): 175-199.
- Krell, David Farrell. 2012. *Phantoms of the Other*. Albany: Suny Press.
- Martin, Noah Gabriel. 2015. "Review of 'Phantoms of the Other: Four Generation of Derrida's *Geschlecht*.'" *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*.
- Schrijvers, Joeri. 2017. "Review of 'Phantoms of the Other.'" *Phenomenological Reviews*.

Therezo, Rodrigo. 2019. "From Neutral Dasein to a Gentle Twofold: Sexual Difference in Heidegger and Derrida." *Philosophy Today*, 63(2), pp. 491-511.

---

<sup>i</sup> My thanks to Viktoria Huegel for help with editing and proofreading, and for being kind to my butchering of the German language.

<sup>ii</sup> Rodrigo Therezo (2019) has written about the 'more radical sexual difference' that Derrida wants to think about and demonstrates how *Geschlecht III: Sex, Race, Nation, Humanity* helps us understand this.