

Apathea, and Becoming Chaos in Juliette

(Part of a large paper, to be published, on *The Philosophy of the Marquis De Sade - Power, Difference, and Ethics of Transformation*)

By

Fouad Kalouche

Albright College

~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~.~

I. *Apathea*

Jouissance is not a goal or an end for Sade's libertines. If there is anything close to a goal in Sade's works, an end that is not a final destination but a way of living and relating to the world, it would be *apathea*. *Apathea* would be the "Ithaca" that guides Sadean characters and their actions through an *askesis* that unleashes and proliferates passions. It is this *askesis* that allows for jouissance, but it does not end with jouissance since its main function is to destroy prejudices. Through habituation, the *askesis* of unleashing and multiplying passions aims at getting rid of prejudices associated with "the infinity of other duties, other social conventions, other barriers, that would inhibit you as much as religion." Sade continues :

"Whatever you do, prejudices will continue on troubling you, due to the thickness of the brakes you have broken : fatal effects of education ... Habituation, this second nature that often becomes more powerful than the first, which can annihilate even those natural principles that appear the most sacred, this habituation essential to vice, which I can't recommend enough, ... will make remorse dull, will shut your conscience up, will play with the voice of your heart, and you will see how all things will appear to you different !"ⁱ

The habituation in question in Sade aims at getting rid of the importance of the others (*les autres*), especially since "the false idea that we conceive of the others is always what limits us in matters related to crime ; we are ridiculously accustomed, since

our childhood, to consider ourselves nothing and the others everything.”ⁱⁱ Sade did attempt to reverse that relation, making of oneself everything and the other nothing — but he did not stop there in *L’Histoire de Juliette*. Egoism and solitude are integral parts of the Sadean *apathea* and they are associated with some kind of joy that results from not depending on the others.ⁱⁱⁱ In *Philosophie dans le boudoir*, Sade accentuates the irreducible difference and singularity of individual experiences at the expense of the others saying : “there is no comparison between what the others experience and what we feel” (*il n’y a aucune comparaison entre ce qu’éprouvent les autres et ce que nous ressentons*”), denying that there could be any “relations” (*liens*) that bind isolated and independent individuals. Actually, one’s experiences and feelings can be enjoyed at the expense of that of the others, since “a singularity of our organs, a bizarre make-up (*construction*), make the suffering of the other pleasant.”^{iv} There should be no consideration of reciprocity either, in terms of pleasure : “it is perfectly useless for a *jouissance* to be shared in order for it to be strong ... it is definitely not necessary to give pleasure in order to receive it.”^v Sade is then according no importance to the others and passions should be pursued at the expense of the others — something repeated throughout Sade’s texts — in order not to depend on anyone and anything.

The process of habituation leading towards *apathea* consists of unleashing passions and of multiplying pleasures in order to break prejudices. These prejudices include everything conventional (beliefs, mores, laws, etc.) and nature is used as a marker that guides the *askesis* through its destruction of traditional prejudices. While it is one’s singular experiences that are intensified through the process of multiplying passions, these experiences are dissociated from both conventional and natural laws. There are no limits to the *askesis* leading towards *apathea* : nature’s laws, which

supposedly inspired the process of breaking conventional prejudices, are smashed as well by that *askesis*.^{vi} The Sadean *askesis* does not end with “making oneself everything and the other nothing” nor does it end with “following the laws of nature.” The destruction (or breaking) of prejudices becomes a way of living, a way of relating to the world, that leads towards an *apathea* associated with a “nothingness.” This nothingness does not mark the absence of anything particular but rather the absence of a particular “everything” associated with stability and fixity. The *apathea* brought about by the continual process of destroying set beliefs and prejudices only settles in chaos, in the movement of constant and arbitrary change. Sade’s *askesis* leads towards a multiplicity that offers the irreducible difference he was trying to defend throughout his life. But this is not a linear progression entailing various stages — even if sometimes described as such — for the unbounded world of Sade embraces singular moments, different kinds, and various worlds. These moments, kinds, or worlds, cannot be reduced to mere “parts” nor can they be determinable in relation to an overarching totality. This is where Sade’s major philosophical contribution lies, in his depicting of a totality that is multiple and chaotic, and that allows for difference and singularity since it is “regulated” by arbitrariness and not by any set of laws, metaphysical, mechanical, or otherwise.

In what follows, I will try to present “the different meanings of *apathea*” and “the different worlds of *apathea*” as depicted by Sade. I will conclude by discussing how “there are no relations” in the unbounded world of Sade where *apathea*, as a way of living and relating to the world, aims at “becoming chaos.”

THE DIFFERENT MEANINGS OF *APATHEA*

As mentioned above, *apathea* is that insensibility towards the existence of the other, towards the value accorded to the other through years of habituation under conventional relations. The stoic meaning of *apathea* (that of the absence of emotions) is found in Sade, as is the Epicurean meaning of *apathea* (that of the absence of pain and pleasure), but Sade's privileged kinds of *apathea* are those involving the unleashing and proliferation of passions. The unleashing and proliferation of passions are part of the *askesis* leading towards *apathea*, and relations with others are the field of application of this *askesis*. In order to expound on this, it is important to consider the relations as portrayed between the major characters in *L'Histoire de Juliette*.

Juliette is the *Émile* of Sade : her learning and education takes her toward becoming chaos, not only temporarily through *jouissance*, but through an engagement with life based on letting go of control, unleashing passions, and multiplying pleasures. But unlike Rousseau's *Émile*, Sade's Juliette does not learn anything but only uncovers and follows her path towards becoming what she is.^{vii} Characters such as Noirceuil, Saint Fond, and Clairwill, who are supposedly educating Juliette, are mainly concerned with an *apathea* that seem more appropriate to the sexed world where they copy the forces of nature and inscribe nature's power unto their own. This *apathea* calculates, measures interests as well as risks, and allows to better control one's environment. Other kinds of *apathea* may be associated with the ways of living of Minski and of Durand. Their *apathea* is characterized by a sort of self-sufficiency pertaining to their control of either natural or anti-natural powers, Minski through monstrosity and

violence, and Durand through science and magic. Juliette's *apathea* is representative of the unbounded world : neither limited by purpose or aim nor serving an overall plan, her *apathea* arbitrarily wanders from purposelessness to purposefulness.

In *L'Histoire de Juliette*, *apathea* is first mentioned by Mme Delbène, Juliette's first educator who introduced her to sexual pleasures :

“Oh Juliette, the less we are sensitive, the less we are affected, and the more we draw near true independence. We are only victims of two things, either the misfortunes of others or our own misfortunes : let us start by hardening ourselves to the first ones, the second ones will no longer touch us, and nothing, from that moment, would have the right to disturb our tranquility.”^{viii}

In response to the innocent theatrical questions of Juliette, Delbène delivers the punch of her introductory lesson : “the first law nature points me to is to delight myself, *no matter at whose expense* ... the thing in the world that preoccupies me the least is the fate of others.”^{ix} This preliminary lesson accentuates the condition *sine qua nun* to any Sadean *apathea* : the leaving out of the other; the elimination of the importance, significance, or relevance of the other. Juliette learned many things from her matron, La Duvergier, and from her colleagues, when she was a common prostitute before the beginning of her uncommon journey after being sold to Noirceuil, a rich and powerful individual. But her second lesson is performed by this Noirceuil who is an associate of Saint Fond, a powerful minister to whom he will relegate Juliette. Here, a more elaborate discourse starts by showing that vice, and not virtue, is a natural movement — since laws are not natural — and ends by proving that virtue is actually vicious — but being a weak *jouissance*, Noirceuil would always opt for a stronger *jouissance* ! What is important is that, after allowing that passions are provided by nature's energy, Noirceuil mentions that the honest man considers mastering one's passions as the resolution of

the fluctuation of passions between virtue and vice.^x This traditional understanding of *apathea* is rejected and countered by a comparative evaluation of vice-related *jouissance* and of virtue-related *jouissance*. The *jouissance* of virtue is assessed as follows : “What a lack of movement ! What ice ! Nothing affects me there, nothing moves me; and, when soundly analyzed, I realize that the *jouissance* is entirely for whoever I have served, and that I only get out of it, in return, a cold gratitude.” It is definitely not a traditional kind of *apathea* that would please Noirceuil, but another kind where the other is not an obstacle,^{xi} and where passions are strongest. Noirceuil later elaborates on his theories where laws are proved to be detrimental to passions and where destruction is considered necessary. It is at this instance that he declares that “all creatures are born isolated and without any need for each other.”^{xii} He establishes that although there are no real relations (*liens*) between people, such as fraternity, there is a necessary economy of power :

“- There isn’t then any kind of real relation (*lien*) between another being and myself, and the only way I should act with such an individual is to take away from him as much as I can, while giving him the least possible?
 - Of course. ... The first law, anyway, that I find imprinted in my soul, is not to love, and even less to assist these so-called brothers, but to make use of them for my passions ... once again, this Other (*ce prochain*) is nothing to me, there isn’t even the slightest relation (*rapport*) between him and me, and if I establish any, it would be in order to have from him, by cunning, what I cannot have by force.”^{xiii}

Noirceuil tells Juliette that she needs to be strong and that it is a weakness to depend on others : “One has to learn to walk and to support oneself in isolation on the path one chooses ... fly on your own (*vole de tes propres ailes*) : you will encounter less danger.”^{xiv} Saint-Fond’s approach is quite similar, for both share the same interest in power and control. The minister lectures Juliette on how “*l’intérêt*” (interest or

advantage) is the only relation he acknowledges. Tastes can complement and cement a relation built on interest, but not always, since tastes change with time while interests are always reliable.^{xv} Mme de Clairwill is a rich, well educated, and independent woman who belongs to the circle of Saint Fond and Noirceuil. From their first encounter, Clairwill asks Juliette to unite, and to form some kind of alliance and complicity, with her,^{xvi} and eventually they do travel together and share various experiences. Clairwill describes *apathea* in relation to sensibility (*sensibilité*). According to her, sensibility is only mechanical (*mécanique*) : it involves passions and neuronal fluids (*fluide nerveux*) and is affected by education and habituation. Those whose passions are less intense and whose fluids are mediocre tend towards virtue ; others tend towards vice. Although sensibility left to flourish can commit horrific crimes — as long as it does not evolve into virtuous sentiments towards others (such as pity) — *apathy* does offer an incredible advantage. If *apathy* can dull or blunt a little the sensibility, it can provide protection for those who lack experience, since “in the case of the hardening of the sensitive part” (i.e. *apathea*) crimes will be committed in cold blood, and their perpetrators would have the time to hide their effects and would not have to fear repercussions. Those crimes committed in the “effervescence” of sensibility would not be reflected upon and would lead their perpetrator to the scaffold.^{xvii} While Noirceuil, who earlier presented a very similar argument about vice and virtue, calculated and measured passions opting for the strongest, Clairwill makes sure to include in such accounting the resulting risks and advantages. Thus *apathea*, described as “the principles that led me [Clairwill] to such tranquility, to such rest of passions, to a stoicism that allows me now to do everything and to endure everything without emotions,”^{xviii} guarantees impunity and provides a pleasure that will remain invisible.

Clairwill shares with Saint Fond and Noirceuil an *apathea* that is most appropriate for the sexuated world where invisibility and impunity are essential for power. All three do share an *askesis* that unleashes and proliferates passions in order to destroy prejudices, and it is to their advantage to work together, providing each other protection from the laws — and trying to control that law by becoming rich and powerful. “The Society of Friends of Crime”^{xxix} is an example of an association based mainly on such interests but also adding to them the advantage of creating a privileged space for people with a similar interest in unleashing passions at the expense of the “*canaille*.”^{xxx} But the three heroes fulfill their passions while keeping their own particular tastes and preferences, some of which conflict. Noirceuil used to scrupulously attend meetings of the “Society of Friends of Crime” when males were preponderant, but once a sex whose authority he abhors took control, he and Saint Fond stopped attending.^{xxxi} Clairwill, on the other hand, wants to avenge her sex, and enjoys assassinating men — but cannot do the same to women.^{xxii} Saint Fond, the most powerful of the characters, despises the female sex and only likes to see the expression of pain on women’s faces.^{xxiii} Nonetheless, there is no need for harmony between these opposing tastes and preferences : during one orgy, Clairwill was killing a boy at the same time that Saint Fond was torturing and killing a girl : “I avenge my sex, she screamed, and her barbarous hands were returning to Dormon, tied by the old ladies, everything that Saint Fond was applying to Faustine.”^{xxiv} Juliette was talking to herself at that particular moment, and it is revealing that she says the following : “...everything was exciting me equally : I had no restrictions in my perverse self, and all the commotion within me, all the suffering I was inflicting, was reaching me the same as I cannibalize a man or as I martyrize a woman.”^{xxv} Juliette does not have set preferences like those of Saint Fond

and of Clairwill.^{xxvi} Her passions are not limited by set tastes, and she can equally enjoy killing both men and women. This irreducible difference at the level of the meanings and/or kinds of *apathea* divulges that within one place (such as in the context of the orgy in question here), different worlds co-exist and interact without necessarily one overtaking or overpowering others. The place in question englobes a variety of irreducibly singular worlds (each of which in turn encompasses a variety of irreducibly singular worlds) that remain separate and different even though they are interdependent, share similar circumstances, and are situated in spatio-temporal proximity. It is impossible to dissociate words from worlds, meanings or kinds of *apathea* from worlds of *apathea*, and there are different worlds of *apathea*, englobed and englobing, situated in the unbounded world of *L'Histoire de Juliette*.

THE DIFFERENT WORLDS OF APATHEA

In one instance, after Juliette fucked her father and killed him in the presence of Clairwill, Noirceuil, and Saint Fond, her three friends find fault in her because they suspect that she does not commit crimes in cold blood but that her passions drive her towards such crimes. Clairwill says :

“... she only commits a crime in her enthusiasm, she has to be excited ; and one should never do so unless it is in cold blood. It is at the torch of crime that one should light up that of one’s passions, while it is only at that of passions that I suspect she lights up that of crime ... I would like her to find in evil, stripped of any lust, the whole pleasure that exists for her in lust ; I want her not to need any other medium in order to practice evil.”^{xxvii}

Juliette denies these accusations, but interestingly enough, a few pages later, she is experimenting with the kind of *apathea* that the other three were pushing her to

adopt. It is very clear from the text that it was the first time she had such an experience and, throughout the remaining volume depicting Juliette's adventures, no similar experience will be described. The experience in question involves a kind of *apathea* achieved during a whole night spent with Alexandrine, a beautiful young girl. Juliette describes her absence of emotions at that time :

“I was strongly firm with my ideas, the moral dominating so well in me the physical, my indifference being such ... that it was either satiety, depravation, or system, I was able, without being affected, to keep her naked in my bed for ten hours, shaking her, letting her shake me, sucking her, rubbing her and penetrating her, without even my head getting heated up.”^{xxviii}

Juliette concludes her description by saying that she only allowed herself physical pleasure. It is obvious that the only thing she did was to block out her imagination and fantasies which allowed for a physical saturation. Only a few pages after this scene, Juliette's imagination is commended as “lascivious, rich, varied...”^{xxix}. But did she control her passions during that experience ? The quote above mentions that the “moral” was controlling the “physical” in her. It is sufficient to quote Sade praising Helvétius, to understand the role passions play in the moral :

“Who doubts, as Helvétius says, that passions are to the moral what movement is for the physical ? ... Individuals who are not animated by strong passions are only mediocre beings. There will only be great passions that can bring about great men ; one becomes stupid as soon as one is no longer passionate...”^{xxx}

Thus, Juliette's crimes were still being lit at the torch of passions, and not the other way around as is the case with Noircueil, Saint Fond, and Clairwill. The *askesis* that destroys prejudices through the unleashing of passions, and that is supposed to absence the other, replaces in the case of our three heroes the other with oneself,

making of oneself everything and the other nothing. Egoistic interests drive them to copy forces of nature, replicating them in the sexuated world where only impunity and invisibility measure power. The “making of oneself everything” means that one reactively transposes forces of nature unto oneself. Committing crimes is the proof of one’s every-thing-ness, it proves the extent of one’s impunity, invisibility, and power. Thus the *apathea* proper to the sexuated world would have to lie in the crime, in the unmediated cold blooded crime that shows the extent of one’s power, how calculated and measured it could be, and how it stands in relation to impunity and invisibility. But in a world of power relations, there is always competition and a search for excess set in relation to an impossible crime.^{xxxii} A crime that is the more impossible the more one forgets the “original” crime, the one that killed nature in order to take over and appropriate her forces. Without any “guilt” for killing nature, the characters flourish in the sexuated world without having to create conventions based on taboos. They appropriate the powers of nature, in a cannibalistic way, and become power sites competing for control of conventional pockets. Their lot is the infinite repetition of the original crime from which they draw their forces, becoming vampires whose world parallels the conventional world and feeds on that conventional world. Crime becomes the element of their way of living and they derive pleasure and *jouissance* by contesting and attacking conventions and laws.

There are two other characters depicted in *L’Histoire de Juliette* who live on the margins of the sexuated world. They do not need to participate in the sexuated world or compete in it in order to realize power, since they are endowed with natural or anti-natural powers. They are “unique” in the sense that they are self-sufficient, independent, and far from being human : one is a sorceress and the other is a monster. La Durand,

whose name indicate that she is lasting, is introduced as a seer who can help people to master their destiny (*maîtriser cet avenir*) through natural and supernatural powers — magic that turns out to be pure science.^{xxxii} It is blood (*sang*) and cum (*foutre*) that she needs in order to foresee the future.^{xxxiii} She is no ordinary woman : although she is sexual, being endowed with a very long and straight clitoris,^{xxxiv} we discover later that she is not a sexuated being. While she can fuck using her clitoris, she can only be fucked in the ass : her vagina is naturally crossed (*barré*) and thus, she cannot participate in any reproductive scheme and cannot be fully a woman or a man.^{xxxv} Furthermore, Durand’s magical command of the science of “poisons” gives her control over nature:

“All of nature is at my command, responded the Durand, and she will always be at the will of those who study her : with the science of chemistry (*la chimie*) and that of physics (*la physique*) one can achieve anything. Archimedes only asked for a fulcrum (*point d’appui*) in order to lift planet Earth ; as for me, I only need one plant in order to destroy it in six minutes.”^{xxxvi}

It is through her “science” that she can command nature as well as the lives of human beings : what makes her unique of her kind (*unique dans mon genre*) is that she can spread plagues and epidemics, poison rivers and putrefy the air, and commit numerous other crimes.^{xxxvii} As a matter of fact, crime is her “element” and she only exists in order to propagate it and multiply the various ways it can be committed.^{xxxviii} But here again, she is not related to the sexuated world where crime is the affirmation of one’s appropriation of nature’s powers in a quest for impunity and invisibility. She commits crimes for crime’s sake, but especially, to affirm her own powers competing with the powers of nature and those of the sexuated world. Unlike Clairwill or St. Fond, the pillars of the sexuated world whose crimes are based on sexual differences, Durand does not care for the sex of her victims — or for the sexual nature of domination and

submission — but only for “the age, the relations, and the state of the person.”^{xxxix} She takes pleasure in destroying what nature and the sexuated world may have destined for success — but she also likes extremes making her both “natural” and “anti-natural” in orientation. She kills the young and the healthy, especially those perfected by nature ; but she also equally destroys rich and poor, fortunate and unfortunate, powerful and powerless. What drives Durand is her passion to shake, to disturb, and to perturb everyone and everything, including nature.^{xl} Even though she claims to control the lives of humans and to command the powers of nature, she is limited in her own world that is encompassed by both. She is not powerful enough to compete in the sexuated world^{xli} nor can she take control of nature ; she lives on the margins of both. By disturbing both nature and the sexuated world, she contributes towards the unbalance and arbitrariness that takes away from the regulating effects of power and she undermines any omnipotence. Durand is a destabilizing force, as nature is, but she is neither “natural” nor “anti-natural” but both at the same time, contributing to the chaos that encompasses both the sexuated world and the natural world.

The world of Minski is a lot simpler. He lives on an isolated island in a well protected castle.^{xlii} Minski’s world is not related to that of the Château de Silling, for he does not attempt to regulate his world by developing rules and regulations of any sort. He also claims that he is a unique being (*être unique*), a self-sufficient monster who was vomited by nature in order to serve her in destructions : he does not need anything or anyone, having force, intelligence, money, influence, wisdom, and total control over his world through sheer force and unregulated violence.^{xliii} Rejecting all conventions and laws, Minski only acknowledges momentary natural impulses. He is a caricature of natural needs for all he seems to do is to eat, drink, and sleep, and in between his bouts

of drinking, eating and sleeping, he kills.^{xliv} His sexuality seem to be intertwined with his killings, since he is not a sexuated being : he is endowed with an enormous penis that kills anyone he attempts to penetrate. He cannot reproduce, but even if he could, he wouldn't do it ; he cannot stand the sight of vaginas.^{xlv} "Nothing is sacred for me !" he tells Juliette, affirming that he respects no law, recognizes no virtue, and offers no guarantees to anyone.^{xlvi} Like Durand, he proclaims : "Crime, in one word, is my element (*mon élément*) ; only crimes make me live and inspire me."^{xlvii} He not only represents nature but he seems to be nature : his exaggerated corporeality and gargantuan dimensions support an anti-conventional mission led by an anarchic desire to violate "imaginary principles of human justice."^{xlviii} According to Minski, justice is a chimera, and commenting on Montesquieu's treatment of justice he states that : "there is neither God, nor virtue, nor justice in this world ; there isn't anything good, useful, or necessary but our passions ; nothing is respectable but their effects."^{xlix} Minski reiterates the truth that Sade expressed ten years before, and he lives that truth in a world where human conventions and social regulations are constantly undermined, and where total anarchy prevails. It is a world that is inevitably related to the sexuated but is not incorporated in it. Minski's world is the Chateau de Silling without the rules and regulations ; it is the site of the raw force of nature taking its course at the expense of anything and anyone. Its anti-conventional stance and its criminal passions are at the basis of the sexuated world, but they are not transposed into a sexuated realm where there is an "other." The egoism and solitude inherent to the *apathea* of Minski are pure and not self reflective : Minski is nature, with no consciousness, no self, and no other. Juliette refuses to kill Minski, for he is too "harmful for humanity" and she didn't want to act in the service of "laws and society."¹ We find a Minski, a Durand, a Noircueil, a St.

Fond, a Clairwill, and many more in the world of Juliette. Her world is the unbounded world and her *apathea* encompasses that of the others.

While egoism and solitude characterize the *apathea* of Durand and Minski, Juliette's *apathea* is characterized by a path towards becoming all and nothing. Juliette is a wanderer, a world traveler : throughout the 1200 pages of *L'Histoire de Juliette*, she is constantly on the move, going from one place to another, finding refuge only in her momentary impulses. Her aimlessness and purposelessness are traversed by temporary aims and purposes. Her *askesis* of unleashing passions and proliferating pleasures takes her towards losing herself in chaos and not in the limited spheres of a sexuated, natural, or anti-natural world. The unbounded world offers her the possibility of disappearing in “moments” that are situated in each of these worlds, but she does not stay in any for more than her impulses allow her. Such moments are not meant to designate a temporality — at least not in the traditional metaphysical sense of time; each one of these so-called moments is closer to designating a singularity embedded in a chaos of worlds englobing worlds, englobing worlds, *ad infinitum*. Juliette's *askesis* is a path that goes through the different worlds mentioned above as if they were moments englobed and integrated in the chaos that becomes her. In the first few pages of *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Juliette's path “of becoming what one is” is announced by Delbène as if her future was foreseen and pre-destined. Let us look closely at these pages where Juliette's *apathea* is described as moments towards losing herself and/or becoming what she is.

“After I have taught you how to manage the remorse resulting from the pain of having committed evil too much in the open, it is essential, my dear friend, that I show you now how to totally shut that confused voice within you which, in the calm of passions (*le calme des passions [apathea]*), sometimes still objects to the digressions (*égarements*) they have transported us to ; actually, this way is as sure as sweet, since it only consists of renewing as often [as possible] whatever caused us remorse, so

the habit of committing this action, or of combining it, entirely unnerves the possibility of it being able to bring about remorse. By annihilating the prejudice, by forcing one's self to frequently operate in a manner and a situation that initially used to bother it, this practice (*habitude*) ends up rendering its newly adopted state easy and even delicious. Egoism functions as a support ; not only one has done something that no one else dares to do, but one became so accustomed to it that one could no longer exist without it : that is, from the outset enjoyment (*jouissance*). The action once committed produces another ; and can anyone doubt the fact that this multiplication of pleasures promptly accustoms one's self to submit to the way of being that it needs to acquire, no matter how much the forced situation brought about by this action seemed difficult at the beginning ?”^{li}

The *askesis* of unleashing passions and proliferating or multiplying pleasures becomes a particular way of living that is constantly conditioning Juliette. It starts off as a means of getting used to things one abhors to do, and of getting rid of any remorse or guilt. But little by little, the process itself becomes a “second nature” that brings with it enjoyment at two levels. Habituation renders the difficult state that initially brought with it remorse “easy” and “delicious.” Furthermore, egoism makes of this habituation a self-affirming process where differentiation functions as an empowerment mechanism : one dares to do what others cannot do and, through this difference, one can feel superior to others.^{lii} To differentiate oneself from others brings with it enjoyment that cements the enjoyment brought about by the actual practice, making of such a state of being a second nature indispensable to one's existence. One can no longer exist without the *askesis* that becomes a particular way of living that constantly differentiate the libertine, in this case Juliette, from the others. And Delbène continues :

“... every day you will form new projects, and every day the execution of these projects will fill you with sensual delight that only you can experience. All the beings that surround you will appear to you as victims destined to the perversity of your heart ; no more relations, no more chains, all will disappear promptly under the flame of your desires, no voice will rise in you to unnerve the organ of your impulsiveness, no more prejudices will militate in their favor, all will be dissipated by wisdom, and you will arrive

insensibly at the last excesses of perversity via a road covered with flowers.”^{liii}

This part accentuates how the *askesis* as a way of living leads towards an *apathea* as a way of relating to the world. Such *apathea* is a unique experience of “sensual delight” where the others will appear only as victims and will be stripped of their significance, importance, or influence. *Apathea* is associated with the sapping of any/all relations or chains and with the smothering of any/all voices or prejudices that may come in the way of the wisdom and insensitivity leading towards excesses of perversity. But Juliette’s *apathea* does not stop there, always transforming like nature, always changing like the world, it is not set in any limited or bounded dimension.

“This is when you will recognize the weakness of what was offered to you in the past as inspirations of nature. Once you have toyed for a few years with what the foolish call its laws, once you have taken pleasure in smashing all of them in order to get used to their transgression, you’d find this pert, happy of being violated, becoming more supple under your vigorous desires, offering herself to be fettered by you ... presenting her hands so she can be your captive ; becoming your slave instead of being your sovereign, she will shrewdly teach your heart ways of outraging her even more, as if she enjoys being demeaned, and as if it is truly only by showing you how to excessively offend her that she artfully reduces you best to her laws. Never resist, when you get there. Insatiable in its designs on you, as soon as you have the means of taking her on, she will lead you (*conduire*) step by step from one crime (*écart*)^{liv} to another. The first one is only a path (*acheminement*) towards another by which she is preparing to submit herself to you again. Like the prostitute from Sybaris, who offers herself in any form and takes on any shape in order to excite the desires of the voluptuous person who pays her, she will teach you similarly a hundred ways to overcome her so she can in turn captivate you more assuredly. But one single resistance, I repeat, a single one will make you lose all the fruits you have reaped ; you will know nothing if you haven’t known everything (*tu ne connaîtras rien si tu n’as pas tout connu*)...”^{lv}

The unleashing of passions stops at nothing and reduces the so-called laws of nature themselves — since it is the nonexistence of limits and laws that may be the only “Law” of chaos. The *askesis* leading towards *apathea* takes Juliette not towards a goal,

an end, or a purpose, but towards a state where she can take on multiple shapes and different forms, relating to the world in a similar fashion to how the prostitute of Sybaris takes on any/all shapes necessary to please her clients. Juliette realizes that nature's laws neither inspire her nor guide her ; nature allows herself to be ill treated by Juliette, becoming her "slave" rather than her "sovereign." Little by little, Juliette's *askesis* throws off the chains of any/all laws, including those supposedly of nature. Taking on nature herself, Juliette will be led by that nature, through passions, from a crime (*écart*) to another. These crimes referred to as "*écarts*" are nothing but passions that do not concord with laws, conventional or natural. Passions are unleashed through a "path" (*acheminement*) taking from one "*écart*" to another ; this path is the *askesis* itself that stops at nothing and continues on breaking laws and destroying prejudices until anarchy allows for passions to flourish in the unbounded world. The unbounded world of Sade is the world of passions, uninhibited by any prejudices, unbounded by any laws ; passions are only regulated by the arbitrariness embedded in chaos.

Juliette's *apathea* does not aim for power, nor does it have a positive goal or purpose that involves appropriating nature's forces, serving or attacking nature. Her *apathea* is a becoming, becoming everything and nothing in the unbounded world : it is "becoming chaos." Within the sexuated world, one finds an *apathea* that has an aim and a structure, a conscious directionality necessary for any power struggle. The invisibility and impunity of the sexuated world do not come close to the "disappearance" necessary for the unbounded world — a disappearance in the multiple "moments" of chaos comparable to the multiple shapes and forms of the prostitute of Sybaris. Not only are the others left out in the unbounded domain, but so is the reflection of the others : the "self" (or consciousness) affirmed at the expense of the others or of nature. Juliette's

apathea involves eliminating the other, the self, as well as nature and any/all circumscribing and binding forces. Such *apathea* offers no “resistance” to the arbitrariness embedded in the world of chaos, and does not hesitate about, or reflect upon, any momentarily engagement that lets go of passions. Hesitation marked the downfall of Juliette at the beginning of her journey towards becoming chaos,^{lvi} but at the end of *L'Histoire de Juliette* she is no longer someone who can hesitate,^{lvii} reflect, or oppose any limits or boundaries to her passions : she has gotten rid of self, consciousness, conscience, and will. To understand what “becoming chaos” entails, it is necessary to look at how relations function in the unbounded world as experienced by Juliette.

II. Becoming Chaos

In the course of Juliette’s *askesis*, all relations are annihilated (*anéantir tous liens*).^{lviii} Juliette’s *apathea* proper to the unbounded world seem to require the annihilation of the relations proper to the sexed world in order to allow for the singular moments of *jouissance*. It is “time” that needs to be undermined, the time that carries hope and fear, past and future, possession and the other. While the illusory relations with God are destroyed by sapping hope and fear, Juliette’s *apathea* is realized by attacking possession and the other. Sade frequently deals with love, trust, friendship, and other traditional human relations and criticize them as centered around possession and the other. For these are associated with a linear and continuous time that does not concord with the discontinuous time of *jouissance*—which alone allows for becoming

chaos. Let us consider “love” (*l’amour*), for example, which is described as a relation that jeopardizes both *jouissance* and *apathea*:

“But what is the basis of this feeling? [*l’amour*] ... Desire. What are the consequences of this feeling? ... madness ... if the motivation is to possess the object, well, ... Let us enjoy as soon as we have it, and let us console ourselves if we don’t : a thousand similar objects, and often much better ones, will console us of the loss of that one ...”^{lix}

The making of the object of love a disposable one is presented elsewhere where the fear of losing that object is another important factor undermining *apathea*. But something else is presented as well, a “metaphysics of sentiment” built on a desire of union with another, where transference and identification are primary structures of “love” (be it *L’Amour* or *l’amour* with a “*petit a*”) :

“One calls love this internal sentiment or feeling that drives us, as if to say in spite of ourselves, towards any object, and makes us vividly desire to unite with that object ... to get constantly closer ... which makes us ecstatic once we arrive at this union, and makes us desperate ... tear us apart, once external motives constrain us to break such a union. If that extravagance only lead us towards a *jouissance* associated with this intensity, this ecstasy, then it would only be a temporary absurdity; but since it takes us to a certain metaphysics that, transforming us into the loved object, makes its actions, needs, desires, as dear to us as our own proper, in that alone it becomes excessively dangerous since it lets us become too detached from ourselves and makes us ignore our own interests for those of the loved object ; as if to say that in identifying ourselves with this object, it makes us adopt its misfortunes and sorrows, consequently adding these to ours. Anyway, the fear of either losing this object or of seeing it cool off incessantly perturbs us ; and from the most tranquil state of life, we cross insensibly, by adopting this chain, to certainly the most cruel state imaginable in the world.”^{lx}

Sade’s criticism of love is based on the fact that it depends on the object of love or the other : not only one is transformed into the other, taking on the sorrows of that other, but the fear of losing the object of love or of that object losing interest for us makes of love even more dangerous. However enjoyable and ecstatic the experience of

love may be, an experience described intensely as losing oneself and transforming oneself into the object of love, it takes one from the state of tranquility (the state of *apathea*) to the cruelest state imaginable in the world (the state of fear). At the heart of this argument is a distinction between a *jouissance* that is physical (*jouissance du corps*), in other words one that does not depend on the other, and a “metaphysics of sentiment” (*métaphysique du sentiment*) where sentiments are associated with others and where sublimation and transference function along with a metaphysical need of being loved (*besoin d’être aimé*).^{lxi} The object of love being the other, love is too dangerous for both *jouissance* and one’s own interests, in the sexed world, as well as for *apathea*, the state of tranquility that should not be perturbed by hope and fear, by the metaphysics of the other. Sade’s main characters repeat that they do not love, or that they love nothing: “I love nothing (*je n’aime rien*) ... We love nothing, us libertines (*nous n’aimons rien, nous autres libertins*)” says Saint Fond to Juliette.^{lxii} And Juliette says: “I love nothing, Saint Fond, I only have whims (*je n’ai que des caprices*).”^{lxiii} This “nothing” (*rien*) marks the absence of the other and the unveiling, through *jouissance*, of a nothingness that offers an everything that is multiple, indeterminable, unbounded. But it is time that distinguishes love from *jouissance*, for love carries with it the other in a possessive time, while whims or “*caprices*” are as momentary as *jouissance* is. For love could be acceptable if it is merely a physical sentiment, associated with the body, rather than a metaphysical sentiment associated with the other, as Sade writes : “let us love the body, like animals do ; but let us have no sentiment for what we believe to be distinct from the body.” Sade allows for a love that is a “physical need,” materially rooted in tastes demanded by organs (*le goût exigé par les organes*), claiming that “anything metaphysical injected into it will only be illusory, the fruit of your pride (*orgueil*) rather

than nature.”^{lxiv} And what is mentioned about “love” applies as well to other metaphysical sentiments such as “trust” or “friendship.” These too should be transformed into physical sentiments, something that is done by linking them to physical moments or momentary experiences — rather than to past memories or future projections. The move from metaphysical to physical is nothing but the transposition of a disjointed time, a time that does not keep or save.

THERE ARE NO RELATIONS

There are no lasting relations anywhere in Sade’s unbounded world. Relations are momentary, whether they are part of pleasures linked to tastes and passions or whether they are part of associations and complicities linked to interests and advantages. Relations of utility and relations of pleasures are but passing moments and, throughout Sade, the first inevitably end up with power struggles while the latter dispose of the tool of pleasure or of the accomplice and associate-in-crime. Relations of utility are elaborated upon in the part treating *Les Cent Vingt Journées de Sodome*. Wherever one’s interests or advantages are, one makes alliances and builds bridges. The same applies for relations of pleasures where tastes and preferences may require others as objects. Relations with accomplices and associates-in-crime are part of relations of utility since, for some reason, there is a need for witnesses to “realize” crimes — besides the fact that others are needed as victims. In other words the necessary “others” are not only present as victims in the sexuated world, they are also imagined as a part of a community of witnesses, of associates with whom one shares (*partage*) crimes and pleasures. Thus association and complicity fall under both relations of utility and of

pleasure since they are involved in both.

Associations are both large-scale and small-scale, while relations between accomplices are more individualistic and small-group oriented. An association such as the “Society of the Friends of Crime” provides protection to its members as well as a site to practice their preferences, the relations involved being both of utility and of pleasure. There, people ally themselves and associate themselves in performances leading to certain passions without hurting each other but building on some kind of trust.^{lxv} People with similar preferences or tastes, with similar dispositions for crimes, can also become associates. This kind of association is built on perfect resemblance and complete conformity in inclinations and mores.^{lxvi} Juliette was associated with many characters throughout her journey, the most lasting being her association with Saint Fond and Noirceuil. But there is nothing binding about this kind of relation beyond the utility and the momentary pleasure. Associates can dispose of each other if they compete in the sexuated world (e.g., Noirceuil eliminating Saint Fond) or they can separate since their association is built on temporary interests (e.g., Emma, Brisa-Testa).

While associations have rules that are observed and enforced, relations of complicity only carry sentiments that are physical. Relations of complicity are deeper and more extensive than other relationships, and require sharing experiences (e.g., committing crimes together) as well as physical feelings (e.g., love, friendship, and/or trust). A perfect example would be the complicity between Juliette and Durand : « - Je te l'ai dit, Juliette, me répondit la Durand, nos armes réunies feront beaucoup de mal aux autres; elles ne se dirigeront jamais contre nous. »^{lxvii} But even such relations can deteriorate or be transformed without any check, accentuating the arbitrariness of any/all relations. Juliette's longest relation of complicity was with Mme de Clairwill.

They shared many experiences together and promised themselves never to separate.^{lxviii} They even eliminated together one of their close accomplices in Italy (la Borghèse), throwing her in a volcano while telling her that she bore them to death.^{lxix} But actually, her elimination was a voluptuous exercise in practicing the betrayal of sentiments of trust and friendship.^{lxx} Juliette herself ended her relation with Clairwill by poisoning her. She killed Clairwill after Durand lied to her, telling her that Clairwill was planning to poison her.^{lxxi} Once she discovered the truth, Juliette reacted in the same way she reacts to everything around her : she moves on, attached to nothing and to no one.

The arbitrariness of Clairwill's death reflects the arbitrariness of any sort of attachment : relations in themselves are revealed to be illusory and resting, not on any solid ground but, on the arbitrariness of power or of chaos. Relations between humans are based on imaginary associations of powers and interests. While tastes and preferences play an important role in relations as well, these are proper to the sexuated world. Juliette's *apathea*, guided by her passions, lead her to deliver herself to the arbitrariness of the unbounded world and to its chaos. She does not have a goal or purpose that guides her life. She is not trying to attain any power; all the power, privilege, and money that she attains are incidental to the life of crime that she leads — thus “the prosperity of vice” as says the subtitle of *L'Histoire de Juliette* — and to the unleashing of her passions. Juliette has no set desires, no strict principles, no ambition or motivation. But she is not a passive agent either ; unlike her accomplices in the sexuated world who are actively looking for something, her passions take over and she becomes them. She is neither a passive nor an active agent ; she is not an “agent” at all but only carries passions momentarily on the way of becoming chaos. Throughout her path, she is moved from one “*écart*” to another by an *askesis* constantly breaking laws

and destroying prejudices in order to disappear and become chaos. Throughout her path, she inhabits more than one world and is never attached to any relation since she becomes passions that acknowledge neither self nor other, transposing themselves beyond conventional or natural time towards the eternal time associated with discontinuous but multiple “moments” of *jouissance*.

It is not nature that moves Juliette but an *askesis* associated with momentary impulses, unleashed passions, forces or drives that could relate to physical — but not metaphysical — needs. Nature has no central place in the unbounded world of Sade ; it is only a destabilizing force that contributes to the encompassing chaos. While the early Sade of *La Vérité* and *Les Cent Vingt Journées de Sodome* alluded to some kind of a “nature-centered” world, even considering nature as an inspiration or a marker than can guide human actions, the later Sade only flirts with natural “needs” (*besoins*). In the unbounded world of Sade, not only are “natural relations” rejected, but so are any/all relations between humans and nature. It is useless to refer to the innumerable instances in the Sadean *corpus* where natural or biological relations (i.e., relations of blood) are mocked, attacked, or destroyed. Throughout his life, Sade called for the proliferation of crimes and incest of any kind that erase the proper names ascribed to natural or biological relations between human beings. But it is of late that Sade started affirming that there were no relations between humans and nature — both being singular and independent forces within the unbounded world of the englobing chaos. Here is what one of Sade’s favorite mouthpieces, the Pope, says :

“The relations (*rappports*) between man (*l’homme*) and nature, or between nature and man, are thus nonexistent (*nuls*). Nature cannot enchain man by any law ; man does not depend on nature in anything ; they do not owe each other anything and can neither hurt nor serve each other ; one

produced in spite of itself : from this moment, no real relation ; the other is produced in spite of himself and, consequently, no (*nul*) relation. Once launched, man does not depend on nature ; once nature has launched, it cannot exert any influence on man. All of its laws are particular (*particulières*) ... Through his initial hurl, man receives direct laws from which he cannot diverge. These laws are those of his own self preservation (*conservation personnelle*)... of his own reproduction (*multiplication*) ... laws that depend on him ... that depend on him, but that are by no means necessary to nature from which he is separated. He is completely separate from nature to such an extent that he is in no way useful to its motion or necessary to its schemes : he could multiply his species fourfold, or annihilate it entirely, without the universe being affected the slightest.”^{lxxii}

There are no “real” relations then between humans and nature : they are both separate and independent, even if one produced the other. Even self-preservation and reproduction are inherent in human physical existence and are not related to nature, thus not considered to be “natural needs” but rather “physical needs” or laws that are particular to humans. In the same way nature’s laws are particular, Sade mentions human laws that are particular. The usage of “laws” in this context is different from the laws associated with convention as limits or barriers. The usage here is related to particular domains : while we are already familiar with nature’s laws (transformation, destruction, etc.), human laws are here described under a different light. We have seen how conventional laws are attacked as limiting and how they were contrasted with natural laws initially. But Sade here mentions human laws that are “physical needs” : self preservation and reproduction are described in the same way “fucking” and “eating” are, as laws given by nature that become particularly human :

“The savage man only knows two needs : that of fucking (*foutre*), and that of eating (*manger*) ; both come from nature : nothing of what he does, in order to attain one or the other, could be considered criminal. Everything that creates in him different passions could only be the result of civilization and society. Thus, since these new misdemeanors (*délits*) are only the fruit of the circumstances, and they become inherent to the manner of being a social man, what gives you the right, I ask you, to blame him for them?”^{lxxiii}

It is difficult not to talk of progress or development in such a pseudo-historical outlook, but Sade is more interested in differentiating between various human ways of living and he only uses historical development as a background for such a differentiation. The savage man, the man closer to nature, has only two physical needs for laws, mainly eating and fucking (these practices could be reflected upon consciously and described as related conceptually to self preservation and reproduction). Both of these needs are still related to nature (as represented by Minski) but they drive the initial passions that are supplemented with passions acquired through civilization and society. Tastes and preferences that are set through convention, as well as needs that are created through conventional laws, provide for different passions. These passions become inherent in the sociality of humans, being grounded in a historical evolution of needs resulting from social circumstances. But passions could be driven by anti-conventional needs and may lead towards ways of living aiming at the initial natural (or physical) needs, or towards a new set of natural needs inscribed upon conventional needs, or towards nothing in particular but the proliferation of passions themselves. While the second way of living associated with “natural” needs confronts the first “conventional” way of living, the third way of living is associated with the “sexuated world” and the fourth with the “unbounded world.”

BECOMING CHAOS

Society and civilization create conventional laws and set needs associated with tastes and preferences. When humans, within society, reflect upon nature, they create illusory relations with her, projecting “natural” needs that suit their purpose — described as self preservation or reproduction. Thus passions that are supposedly driven by nature, aiming at fucking and eating as pure physical needs, become an anti-conventional way of living that aims at something imagined as nature. There is no question that nature exists, it is transformation, but it is not related to humans in any way, being separate and independent. Humans are not necessary for its eternal motion nor is she anything to them but a marker or an inspiration that can guide or drive certain anti-conventional passions. While the first way of living is conventional and the second is natural, the third way represents some kind of a dialectical relation between the two : it is neither purely conventional nor purely natural in orientation, but it attempts to graft nature into convention, making a sexed world where a natural orientation recreates a conventional space where victims and victimizers are necessary. We have discussed at length how the sexed world appropriates nature in its reproduction of conventional laws, and how invisibility and impunity are indispensable for a way of living where power struggles are essential — and where the infinite repetition of the crime of killing nature and appropriating her forces is the Law. The fourth way of living does not aim at anything particular but at a particular everything — that englobes anything. The unleashing of passions at the expense of anything takes over as a process that becomes a “second nature” leading towards becoming chaos. The fourth way of living can be situated in the unbounded world where there are no hegemonic needs, but where all needs are thrown about : drives and forces create

momentary needs, momentary orientations, that can be natural, conventional, and/or sexuater. All of these flourish as encompassed moments in the unbounded world.

The distinctions among these ways of living are themselves a representative scheme proper to the unbounded world. The later Sade used the universe or chaos in a more englobing view than his earlier use of nature. Nature was and has always been in Sade a marker for transformation, change, and destruction. But the universe is equated with chaos, it is everything, an englobing non-entity that includes englobing worlds (natural, anti-natural, and sexuater), themselves englobing, each of these worlds being separate and particular, irreducible and unrelated in any way to each other. But although they are not related, they interact with each other as material forces regulated by the arbitrary effects of matter in the midst of chaos. Sade describes the universe as follows :

“The universe is an assemblage of different beings that act and react mutually and successively the ones on the others ; in it, I cannot detect any boundaries but only notice a continual passage from a state to another, in relation to the particular beings that take on successively various new shapes.”^{lxxiv}

Difference is at the basis of this universe, a difference where singular and particular beings are assembled and where they “act and react mutually and successively the ones on the others.” There is a plurality of beings, a multiplicity of beings involved in such an outlook, but this multiplicity is not reduced since the “continual passage from a state to another” is set in relation to these “particular beings” that take on “various new shapes.” The elements of this “assemblage,” although particular and different, do act and react on each other, forming thus the process of continual passage where no boundaries can be detected. The universe is nothing but the assemblage of this

multiplicity : the universe itself is a “multiplicity of multiplicities.” The worlds that we have described above are basic elements of an assemblage we called the unbounded world ; they are different beings (*êtres différents*), particular beings (*êtres particuliers*). This variety of particular beings interact with each other in various ways, successively and mutually. In the discontinuous time of *jouissance*, “moments” interact similarly : they are particular and different but, at the same time, they are acting and reacting on each other. The moments themselves, like these beings, are multiple, each representing a difference that is irreducible at all levels. The universe is the multiplicity of such multiplicities, the chaos that englobes a variety of englobed worlds — each in turn englobes a variety of englobed worlds.

Chaos is that anarchy that “opens the door to the arbitrary.”^{lxxv} In Chigi’s speech, as elsewhere in Sade, passions are described as totally opposed to any laws : it is under anarchy that “great” passions emerge, and undermining any/all laws is necessary for the proliferation of passions.^{lxxvi} Chaos is realized through the unleashing of passions which can only take place through the breaking of boundaries, the destruction of laws, and the annihilation of prejudices.^{lxxvii} Even if one were to consider human history, it is only during the moments of the “silence of the laws” (*silence des lois*) that “the greatest actions” (*les plus grandes actions*) emerged.^{lxxviii} It was humans who created laws, or who imagined natural or physical laws. The only “law” Sade admits is the lawlessness of passions : passions are grounded in the anarchy and arbitrariness inherent to forces of change and of eternal movement. Chaos is the groundless ground of passions — the always shifting *Grund* and the arbitrary *Law* of the universe.

Unlike the static world of *Les Cent Vingt Journées de Sodome*, Juliette’s world is unbounded, a world of transformation. While she may find comfort and protection with

a few powerful individuals within the sexuated world, and while she may associate momentarily with individuals representing natural or anti-natural forces, she is not set in any world. She moves swiftly from a passion to another, from a crime to another, and cannot be limited within the boundaries of any particular world. Guided by passions, she disappears in moments, becoming chaos. If the unbounded world does not contain relations, it contains side by side various worlds that are different but not reducible. These worlds are embedded in chaos and (de)regulated by the arbitrariness proper to anarchy. Each world is as significant and insignificant to the functioning of the universe: no world is central, no force more important than others. The difference at the basis of chaos cannot be reduced through hegemonic power for, in the unbounded world, there are only passions, blind forces or drives, which makes of becoming nothing (and/or anything) essential to escape the confines of the sexuated world where one is limited to being a victim and/or a victimizer. Juliette's path towards *apathea* is her path towards losing herself, losing the others, and becoming passions in order to become chaos. It is this becoming chaos that is described in the 1200 pages of *L'Histoire de Juliette* and where at the finale, the curtains are raised to present the few enduring forces of the unbounded world, themselves representing different worlds : Noireuil killed Saint Fond^{lxxxix} and became the real power behind the supreme ruler of France,^{lxxx} reaching the invisibility and impunity that are the epitome of power in the sexed world. Durand reappeared after being thought dead,^{lxxxii} lasting like her name implies, a surviving force that represents science, a simple mix of nature and/or anti-nature flourishing at the margins of the natural and sexed worlds. Nature, although not represented by Minski who is still alive and well in his own habitat, is represented by lightning (*la foudre*) that delivers the final blow to Justine.^{lxxxii} Nature is a major player, leading passions towards

chaos through transformation and destruction. Justine is eliminated by nature,^{lxxxiii} proving how unfortunate the virtuous are ; she represents stagnation and lack of change, conventional stability based on hope and fear. Chaos encompasses all of these forces that are not competing and do not have to compete. Within their own domains, they may have their particular laws, but these laws are just that : particular. Only Juliette travels back and forth, from a domain to another ; she is not limited except momentarily; she is all and nothing. She is becoming chaos, everything and nothing, englobing anything. She is at the finale, but she has been both the center and the eye of the story : everything evolves around her journey, and everyone is attempting to please her, to teach her, to offer her the world. It is as if the functioning of the universe depends on her, as if the whole story was but her dream. Or rather Sade's dream. The final words of the novel claim that Juliette, this unique woman (*unique en son genre*), died without writing down the last events of her life. This would make it absolutely impossible for any writer to offer but dreams as realities, something Sade wouldn't do.^{lxxxiv} Sade is even protecting Juliette's mystery after her death, allowing for her singularity and difference to flourish.

Conclusion

In many ways, the unbounded world of Juliette can be compared to a world of dreams. Sade's text may be a simulation of dreams, a meticulous weaving of a simulacrum of the world of dreams, a world that is more real than the real world.^{lxxxv} Where there is no control over anything ; where there is no end nor beginning — only a process constantly in movement ; where there is no rational explanation or comprehensible chain of events — i.e., predictable, causal and temporal determinations; where there is always a fluctuating intensity embedded in passions ; there lies the realm of dreams. The world of dreams, a rich world which is not ours, never ours or in our reach, but at the same time particularly us, many aspects of us. There is no freedom as there are no limits in the world of dreams. Everything is permitted and nothing is possible at the same time. There is no consciousness and power is stripped away from humans. Humans lose control and mastery. They are alive, they can feel, but they are not awake. "There are no obstacles and nothing to do there."^{lxxxvi} Nothing to do but everything.

But enough with this comparison for I will not follow the footsteps of those "great commentators" who end up reducing the words and worlds of Sade to an "aestheticism." Most readers of Sade do not want to talk of a philosophy, of a way of living and relating to the world ; they refer to a literature, a discourse, a limited exercise that is literary, imaginary, and that has no effect on "life"— except maybe as an aesthetic phenomenon. Others consider the transgression and liberation of Sade as an example for others, as a call to cross and transgress certain limits. They make of Sade a prophet of liberation, a cool person that wastes sperm and excrement to show us the nothing in a literature of evil, or a person who is writing death or who is written by death. Yet others approach Sade as the novelist of the feminine, or the novelist par excellence, or as a Christian or

religious redeemer. Some consider him under the psycho-analytical lens, a sadist, a masochist, a psychotic, a schizophrenic, an interesting case of Oedipus, Nero, or Electra complexes. And they go on, relegating Sade to a limited space, to a circumscribed category, reducing his words/worlds to footnotes, making him a specter of impossibility.^{lxxxvii}

Philosophy is at the heart of Sade's work. His major philosophical contribution is his continual reference to an englobing multiplicity that cannot be reduced to the sum of its englobed elements and where the difference and singularity of these englobed elements is protected. I have attempted to show how Sade's *apathea* cannot be dissociated from his concern with ways of living and of relating to the worlds we live in, and how depicting the various worlds is closely tied to an *askesis* that privileges the unleashing of passions. There is no distinction between theory and practice in Sade, like there is no distinction between body and mind. There are only *praxes*, but a multiplicity of them : unleashing passions, depicting passions, multiplying crimes, narration, imagination, etc. All are irreducible parts of different kinds of *askesis* leading towards different kinds of *apathea*. Every singular and different world is a multiplicity of multiplicities in Sade. But there is something that is privileged, although not made hegemonic, in Sade, and that is an "ethics of transformation," a praxis of destroying prejudices, breaks and barriers, and laws, in order to become chaos. Sade is concerned with an ethics that destroys laws and annihilates prejudices in order to allow for passions to flourish and to preserve the difference and singularity at the basis of a chaotic universe.

When Sade proclaims "*la philosophie doit tout dire*"^{lxxxviii} it is this kind of ethics that philosophy is associated with — an ethics that reflects Juliette's path towards

becoming chaos. Philosophy becomes a *praxis* that says everything and anything, but that also opposes prejudices, laws, and imagined beliefs that may limit the saying of this “everything.” In this context, philosophy is still associated with a truth, a truth of the universe where chaos and anarchy prevail and where human laws and institutions are nothing but limited and limiting pockets. Philosophy says everything to offer a multiplicity and to reveal an infinite horizon. This process is not of production, of reproduction, but it is not a process of annihilation or elimination either, for there is no destruction in the universe only transformation.^{lxxxix} The truth that is revealed, that is chaos, is not created or produced ; it is not “realized” through a *praxis*, through an *askesis*, but rather such an *askesis* and *praxis* transform one in order to reveal it. Chaos always existed and will always exist, its truth has no beginning nor end, yet it is not chaos that is revealed *per se* but an *askesis* takes someone towards it, transforming this someone. Thus “becoming what one is” takes on its fullest meaning : “becoming chaos.”

This transformation is a habituation : chaos is revealed through the moments of *jouissance*, where the englobing folds around the englobed. The multiplicity of these moments, the disappearance in moments is realized through different practices, some of which involve imagination and pertain to describing the minutest details : there is *jouissance* in disappearance in details, for attention to details reveals the multiplicity associated with chaos and eliminates limits and barriers. Thus the “boredom” of the books of Sade ! The disappearance in the details is one possible practice that helped transform Sade and led him towards becoming chaos. Sade practiced it often, along with other practices, many practices, multiple practices !

ⁱ *L'Histoire de Juliette*, dans *Oeuvres complètes*, Cercle du Livre Précieux, Tome VIII, p. 330.

ⁱⁱ *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 291.

ⁱⁱⁱ Cf., for example, *La Nouvelle Justine, O.C.*, Tome VII, p. 303, Sade's footnote: "Justine ici raisonne en égoïste; il est impossible de se le dissimuler. Elle est malheureuse, et par conséquent surprise d'être repoussée. Mais l'homme heureux, raisonnant d'après les mêmes principes, ne dira-t-il pas également: Pourquoi, moi qui ne souffre point, moi qui peux satisfaire à tout sans avoir besoin de personne, irai-je, ou froidement mériter la reconnaissance des autres, ou m'exposer, par mes bienfaits, à ne trouver que des ingrats? *L'apathie, l'insouciance, le stoïcisme, la solitude de soi-même, voilà le ton où il faut nécessairement monter son âme, si l'on veut être heureux sur la terre*" (my italics).

^{iv} *La Philosophie dans le boudoir*, p. 466-467.

^v *Justine ou les malheurs de la vertu, O.C.*, Tome III, pp. 204-205.

^{vi} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 29.

^{vii} Cf. below. Also cf. Annie Le Brun, *Soudain un bloc d'abîme, Sade*, Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert chez Pauvert, 1986, pp. 291-297.

^{viii} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 104.

^{ix} *Ibid.*, Sade's italics.

^x *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

^{xi} *Ibid.*, pp. 140-146.

^{xii} *Ibid.*, p. 173.

^{xiii} *Ibid.*, p. 175.

^{xiv} *Ibid.*, pp. 176-177.

^{xv} *Ibid.*, pp. 223-225.

^{xvi} *Ibid.*, p. 263: "Unissons-nous, nous irons fort loin."

^{xvii} *Ibid.*, pp. 265-269.

^{xviii} *Ibid.*

^{xix} *Ibid.*, pp. 401-410.

^{xx} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 371. This word so dear to Nietzsche is only mentioned once by Sade in lieu of "*dupes*."

^{xxi} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 287.

^{xxii} *Ibid.*, p. 284.

^{xxiii} *Ibid.*, p. 350.

^{xxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 351-352.

^{xxv} *Ibid.*, p. 352.

^{xxvi} Clairwill and Saint Fond represent the extremes of the sexuated world, and even though they are not enemies, they represent enemy camps: Saint Fond is a powerful government minister, who regularly enjoys torturing and killing women. It is not the killing of women that Clairwill minds, for she counters that by killing men, but it is the symbolic power that links the masculine to laws—Sade enforces that by mentioning that it was men who created the laws (*L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 90). Clairwill warns Juliette against trusting Saint Fond: “do not forget that he is of a sex that is a declared enemy of yours, and that you should never miss the occasion of avenging the outrages that he inflicted on your sex ... ” (*Ibid.*, p. 505). In a footnote, Sade proudly announces his female villains—to counter-balance the male villains of *Justine*—claiming that women are warmer and more refined evil-doers than men (*L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 394). This concern with a “sexual” equilibrium is not characteristic of Sade’s earlier works; one wonders whether his co-habitation with Mme Quesnet influenced him in that respect.

^{xxvii} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 455-456.

^{xxviii} *Ibid.*, pp. 463-464.

^{xxix} *Ibid.*, p. 500.

^{xxx} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 135.

^{xxxi} Such “impossible” crimes abound in Sade. Let me just mention an instance where such impossibility is related to a lack of the real that only guarantees true *jouissance*: “ ... il faudrait des crimes réels pour leur donner une véritable *jouissance*, et qu’il n’existe malheureusement de crime à rien. Ainsi, toujours au-dessous de leurs désirs, ce ne sont plus eux qui manquent aux horreurs, ce sont les horreurs qui leur manquent” (*L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 93-94).

^{xxxii} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 506.

^{xxxiii} *Ibid.*, pp. 506-507.

^{xxxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 507.

^{xxxv} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 431: “Par une caprice de la nature, dont Clairwill et moi ne nous étions jamais doutées, Durand n’avait jamais pu jouir des plaisirs ordinaires de la *jouissance*: elle était barrée, mais (et de cela vous devez vous en souvenir) son clitoris, long comme le doigt, lui inspirait pour les femmes les goûts les plus ardents. Elle les foutait, elle les enculait; elle voyait aussi des garçons: l’extrême largeur du trou de son cul me fit bientôt voir que, quant aux intromissions, elle se dédommageait par celle là.”

^{xxxvi} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 517.

^{xxxvii} *Ibid.*, p. 519.

^{xxxviii} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, pp. 435-439, esp. p. 437: “Le crime est mon élément; la nature ne m’a fait naître que pour le servir, et je voudrais multiplier à l’infini tous les moyens de le commettre.”

xxxix *Ibid.*, p. 438.

xl Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 439: “je moissonne avec plaisir, surtout quand la santé est parfaite, et que la nature, que j’ai l’art de contrarier alors, paraît avoir formé cet objet pour arriver bien plus sain au dernier terme de la vie” as well as: “j’aime sur cela les deux extrêmes, la richesse et la qualité, ou l’indigence et l’infortune. Je veux, en général, que le choc produise un ébranlement considérable.”

xli This is apparent in her constant need to escape from a city to another, in fear of retaliations by the powerful few who are in control of the sexuated world (e.g., the Inquisitors in Venice).

xlii *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 555.

xliii Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 560-561: “je suis un monstre, vomi par la nature pour coopérer avec elle aux destructions qu’elle exige ... je suis un être unique dans mon espèce ... assez puissant pour n’avoir besoin de personne, assez sage pour me plaire dans ma solitude, pour détester tous les hommes, pour braver leur censure, et me moquer de leurs sentiments pour moi, assez instruit pour pulvériser tous les cultes, pour bafouer toutes les religions et me foutre de tous les Dieux, assez fier pour abhorrer tous les gouvernements, pour me mettre au-dessus de tous les liens, de tous les freins, de tous les principes moraux.”

xliv *Ibid.*, pp. 562-576.

xlv *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, pp. 13-14.

xlvi *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 569-570.

xlvii *Ibid.*, p. 575.

xlviii *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, pp. 15-17.

xlix *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

li Cf. *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 27-28: “Après t’avoir appris à régler le remords né de la douleur d’avoir fait le mal trop à découvert, il est essentiel, ma chère amie, que je t’indique à présent la manière d’éteindre totalement en soi cette voix confuse qui, dans le calme des passions, vient encore quelquefois réclamer contre les égarements où elles nous ont portés; or, cette manière est aussi sûre que douce, puisqu’elle ne consiste qu’à renouveler si souvent ce qui nous a donné des remords, que l’habitude, ou de commettre cette action, ou de la combiner, énerve entièrement toute possibilité d’en pouvoir former des regrets. Cette habitude, en anéantissant le préjugé, en contraignant notre âme à se mouvoir souvent de la manière et dans la situation qui primitivement la gênait, finit par lui rendre le nouvel état adopté facile, et même délicieux. L’orgueil vient à l’appui; non seulement on a fait une chose que personne n’oserait faire, mais on s’y est même si bien accoutumé, qu’on ne peut plus exister sans cette chose: voilà d’abord une jouissance. L’action commise en produit une autre; et qui doute que cette multiplication de plaisirs n’accoutume bien promptement une âme à se plier à la manière d’être qu’elle doit acquérir, quelque pénible qu’ait pu lui sembler, en commençant, la situation forcée où cette action la contraignait?”

lii Cf. *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 556: “*je ne leur ressemble pas, et voilà ce qui me met au-dessus d’eux*” (Sade’s italics).

liii Cf. *L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 29: “Assez heureuse pour vivre dans un monde dont ma triste destinée m’exile, chaque jour tu formeras de nouveaux projets, et chaque jour leur exécution te comblera d’une volupté sensuelle qui ne sera connue que de toi. Tous les êtres qui t’entoureront te paraîtront autant de victimes dévouées par le sort à la perversité de ton coeur; plus de liens, plus de chaînes, tout disparaîtra promptement sous le flambeau de tes désirs, aucune voix ne s’élèvera plus dans ton âme pour

énervé l'organe de ton impétuosité, nuls préjugés ne militeront plus en leur faveur, tout sera dissipé par la sagesse, et tu arriveras insensiblement aux derniers excès de la perversité par un chemin couvert de fleurs.”

^{liv} Although “écart” could best be translated as “lapse,” “slip,” “divergence,” or “difference,” Sade’s usage carries a sort of criminality or perversity associated with it, mainly associated with going against laws and conventions—thus our choice of “crime” as a more appropriate designation.

^{lv} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 29: “C’est alors que tu reconnaîtras la faiblesse de ce qu’on t’offrait autrefois comme des inspirations de la nature; quand tu auras badiné quelques années avec ce que les sots appellent ses lois, quand, pour te familiariser avec leur infraction, tu te seras plu à les pulvériser toutes, tu verras la mutine, ravie d’avoir été violée s’assouplissant sous tes désirs nerveux, venir d’elle-même s’offrir à tes fers ... te présenter les mains pour que tu la captives; devenue ton esclave au lieu d’être ta souveraine, elle enseignera finement à ton cœur la façon de l’outrager encore mieux, comme si elle se plaisait dans l’avilissement, et comme si ce n’était réellement qu’en t’indiquant de l’insulter à l’excès qu’elle eût l’art de te mieux réduire à ses lois. Ne résiste jamais, quand tu en seras là; insatiable dans ses vues sur toi, dès qu tu auras trouvé le moyen de la saisir, elle te conduira pas à pas d’écart en écart; le premier commis ne sera jamais qu’un acheminement à celui par lequel elle se prépare à se soumettre à toi de nouveau; telle que la prostituée de Sybaris, qui se livre sous toutes les formes et prend toutes les figures pour exciter les désirs du voluptueux qui la paye, elle t’apprendra de même cent façons de la vaincre. Et tout cela pour t’enchaîner plus sûrement à son tour. Mais une seule résistance, je te le répète, une seule te ferait perdre tout le fruit de tes dernières chutes; tu ne connaîtras rien si tu n’as pas tout connu.”

^{lvi} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 527-528, where Juliette’s hesitation that was sensed by Saint Fond led to her downfall and her escape from Paris: “il s’agissait de faire mourir de faim les deux tiers de la France par d’affreux accaparements. Je devais avoir la plus grande part à l’exécution de ce dessein. Je l’avoue, toute corrompue que j’étais l’idée me fit frémir. Funeste mouvement, que vous me coutâtes cher! Pourquoi ne pus-je vous vaincre? Saint Fond, qui le surprit, se retira sans dire un mot. [...] Je n’ai fait qu’une seule faute, et ce sont de malheureux mouvements de probité qui me l’ont fait commettre.”

^{lvii} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 557, where Noirceuil realizes: “tu ne faibliras pas avec moi comme avec Saint Fond.”

^{lviii} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 188.

^{lix} *La Philosophie dans le boudoir*, p. 468.

^{lx} *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, pp. 480-481: “On appelle amour ce sentiment intérieur qui nous entraîne, pour ainsi dire comme malgré nous, vers un objet quelconque, qui nous fait vivement désirer de nous unir à lui ... de nous rapprocher sans cesse ... qui nous enivre quand nous réussissons à cette union, et qui nous désespère ... qui nous déchire quand quelques motifs étrangers viennent nous contraindre à briser cette union. Si cette extravagance ne nous entraînait jamais qu’à la jouissance prise avec cette ardeur, cet enivrement, elle ne serait qu’un ridicule; mais comme elle nous conduit à une certaine métaphysique qui, nous transformant en l’objet aimé, nous rend ses actions, ses besoins, ses désirs aussi chers que les nôtres propres, par cela seul elle devient excessivement dangereuse, en nous détachant trop de nous mêmes et en nous faisant négliger nos intérêts pour ceux de l’objet aimé; en nous identifiant, pour ainsi dire, avec cet objet, elle nous fait adopter ses malheurs, ses chagrins et ajoute, par conséquent, ainsi, à la somme des nôtres. D’ailleurs, la crainte ou de perdre cet objet ou de le voir se refroidir nous tracasse sans cesse; et de l’état le plus tranquille de la vie, nous passons insensiblement en adoptant cette chaîne, au plus cruel, sans doute, qui se puisse imaginer dans le monde.”

^{lxi} *Ibid.*, p. 481-482: “Si l’homme s’éclairait mieux sur ses vrais intérêts dans la jouissance, il épargnerait à son cœur cette fièvre cruelle qui le brûle et qui le dessèche. S’il pouvait se convaincre qu’il n’est nullement besoin d’être aimé pour bien jouir, et que l’amour nuit plutôt aux transports de la jouissance qu’il n’y sert,

il renoncerait à cette métaphysique du sentiment qui l'aveugle, se bornerait à la simple jouissance du corps, connaîtrait le véritable bonheur, et s'épargnerait pour toujours le chagrin inséparable de sa dangereuse délicatesse."

lxii Ibid., p. 228.

lxiii Ibid., p. 334. Sade himself writes in the April 1790 letter to his lawyer mentioned above: "je n'ai plus de goût à rien, je n'aime rien ..." (*Correspondance inédite du Marquis de Sade*, p. 264).

lxiv Ibid., pp. 491-493.

lxv Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, "STATUTS DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES AMIS DU CRIME", pp. 401-410.

lxvi Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 216: "Quand on se ressemble aussi parfaitement, quand les inclinations, les mœurs ont une conformité si complète, il ne faut jamais se séparer."

lxvii Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 254: "Cependant notre liaison se cimentera, nos arrangements se priront; leur première base fut la promesse inviolable et mutuelle de ne jamais manquer l'occasion de mal faire, de le faire naître autant que cela dépendrait de nous, et que le fruit de nos vols communs ou de nos rapines se partagerait toujours." Also cf. p. 448: "- voilà une aventure qui nous lie pour jamais, dis-je à mon amie, elle cimentera éternellement notre amitié, notre confiance, elle resserre nos nœuds pour la vie."

lxviii Cf., for example, *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 414: "Ah! mon amour, me dit Clairwil, comme il est certain que la nature nous a créés l'une pour l'autre! ... Va, nous serons inséparables."

lxix Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, pp. 416-417.

lxx Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 415.

lxxi It is interesting to remember that Durand aims at the destruction of anything that has a chance of success in the sexuated or natural worlds. The relation of Juliette and Clairwill was too good to be true, a complicity that is destined for success.

lxxii Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 171: "Les rapports de l'homme à la nature, ou de la nature à l'homme, sont donc nuls; la nature ne peut enchaîner l'homme par aucune loi; l'homme ne dépend en rien de la nature; ils ne doivent rien l'un à l'autre et ne peuvent ni s'offenser, ni se servir; l'un a produit malgré soi: de ce moment, aucun rapport réel; l'autre est produit malgré lui, et, conséquemment, nul rapport. Une fois lancé, l'homme ne tient plus à la nature; une fois que la nature a lancé, elle ne peut plus rien sur l'homme; toutes ses lois sont particulières. Par le premier élan, l'homme reçoit des lois directes dont il ne peut plus s'écarter; ces lois sont celles de sa conservation personnelle ... de sa multiplication, lois qui tiennent à lui ... qui dépendent de lui, mais qui ne sont nullement nécessaires à la nature; car il ne tient plus à la nature, il en est séparé. Il en est entièrement distinct, tellement, qu'il n'est point utile à sa marche ... point nécessaire à ses combinaisons, qu'il pourrait ou quadrupler son espèce, ou l'anéantir totalement, sans que l'univers en éprouvât la plus légère altération."

lxxiii Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 513: "l'homme sauvage ne connaît que deux besoins: celui de foutre, et celui de manger; tous deux lui viennent de la nature: rien de ce qu'il fera, pour parvenir à l'un ou l'autre de ces besoins, ne saurait être criminel. Tout ce qui fait naître en lui des passions différentes n'est dû qu'à la civilisation et la société. Or, dès que ces nouveaux délits ne sont le fruit que des circonstances, qu'ils deviennent inhérents à la manière d'être de l'homme social, de quel droit, je vous prie, les lui reprochez-vous?"

lxxiv *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome VIII, p. 51.

lxxv Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 137: "l'anarchie, ouvrant la porte à l'arbitraire."

^{lxxvi} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, pp. 133-139.

^{lxxvii} In the unbounded world of Sade, passions cannot be regulated—as in the sexed world. As discussed earlier, it is the absence of laws that offers an arbitrary, sometime cyclical, balance that is the only justice acceptable to Sade. Such justice is about change and only anarchy allows for change and transformation.

^{lxxviii} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 135.

^{lxxix} Cf. *L'Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 557.

^{lxxx} *Ibid.*, p. 586.

^{lxxxi} *Ibid.*, pp. 584-585.

^{lxxxii} *Ibid.*, pp. 583-584.

^{lxxxiii} *Ibid.*

^{lxxxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 587: “et cette femme, unique en son genre, morte sans avoir écrit les derniers évènements de sa vie, enlève absolument à tout écrivain la possibilité de la montrer au public. Ceux qui voudraient l’entreprendre ne le feraient qu’en nous offrant leurs rêveries pour des réalités, ce qui serait d’une étonnante différence aux yeux des gens de goût, et particulièrement de ceux qui ont pris quelque intérêt à la lecture de cet ouvrage.”

^{lxxxv} Cf. Lucette Finas in *Sade, écrire la crise* (Paris: Belfond, 1983), pp. 15-30, where some of Sade’s texts are compared to dreams or spaces of dreams.

^{lxxxvi} Both Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty agree on this point: “Comme Jean-Paul Sartre le fait observer lui-même, le rêve exclut la liberté parce que dans l’imaginaire, à peine avons-nous visé une signification que déjà nous croyons en tenir la réalisation intuitive et enfin parce qu’il n’y a pas d’obstacles et rien à faire” in Merleau-Ponty, *Phénoménologie de la Perception*, Paris: Gallimard, 1945, p. 500.

^{lxxxvii} Refer to the selected bibliography for references. Sade’s philosophy has always been excommunicated even by those that may be engaged in a different “ethics of transformation.” For example, there are specters of Sade in *Specters of Marx*. A footnote referring to Jean-Michel Rabaté’s *Spectrographies of Modernity* is concluded with a parenthesis: “(de Shakespeare à Sade, Mallarmé, Joyce, Beckett).” From Shakespeare to Sade. What is interesting is that the book referred to in the footnote never actually addresses Sade. Sade is nowhere in sight. Except, of course, the name “Sade” comes up twice in the 233 pages of the book: in a quote of Breton, where the name is thrown next to others as an example of “moralistes” (page 60), and in the conclusion, where the name is situated next to Stirner’s and Joyce’s. Sade is at the limit of the text, also as a reference to a reference and a footnote, in *Psyche: l’invention de l’autre*. L’autre here is Flaubert, and the reference to Sade is what is never absent but always resisted: “les vices sont des propriétés de la nature, ouvrant une référence à Sade qui n’est jamais absente du paysage de Flaubert” (page 312). It is also in a footnote dealing with death, and particularly with the will and testament of Sade, that the specter of Sade haunts the margins of the text that deals with the “limits of truth” and dying: “Aporias” (in *Le Passage des Frontières*, p. 327). Finally, the specters of Marx and of Sade are haunting the title of the text entitled *Cosmopolites de tous les pays, encore un effort!*—but they are overshadowed by the ghosts of Kant and Benjamin.

^{lxxxviii} It should be noted that the use of the sentence: “à quelque point qu’en frémissent les hommes, la philosophie doit tout dire” is quite interesting in itself as a transgression and transformation of Sade’s text. Without wanting to uphold a right or respect for Sade’s text, I just want to present the context in which this proclamation is brought about: “Pourquoi donc craindre de le publier, dit Juliette, quand *La Vérité* même arrache les secrets de la nature, à quelque point qu’en frémissent les hommes? La philosophie doit tout dire.” (*L’Histoire de Juliette*, Tome IX, p. 586)

^{lxxxix} While nature is always active (Cf. *Justine, O.C.*, Tome III, p. 316: “la nature toujours agissante, toujours active”), Justine is always passive, representing the perfect victim that believes in conventions. The sexed world is both active and passive, where the active part, copying nature’s activity, controls the passive part inherent to conventions. But chaos contains active, passive, both and neither. The categories of active and passive do not work here, as they pertain to production. While nature is pure negativity in Sade, unregulated consumption, convention, being pure positivity, is regulated production. Without power relations that allow for domination, no regulated consumption is possible. The tension and power of negativity and positivity meet in the sexed world where regulated consumption/production emerges. Within the unbounded world, it is all and nothing, for chaos is neither negative nor positive (with pockets of negative, positive, and both negative and positive). It is the absence of negativity and positivity (unimaginable absence of production and of consumption) that characterize the uniqueness of the moments of jouissance, where the encompassing unfolds around the encompassed. Juliette is active (steals, kills, etc.); she is passive (ordered around by her protectors, victimized by a few powerful, etc.); she is also actively repressing passivity as occasional participant in the power elite of the sexed world; but she is also more, she is all of these and none, she moves in between and does not settle in either. Like the prostitute of Sybaris, she can take on any shape or form, but she is really nothing in particular, for she can be anything, many things—multiplicity!

Selected Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Oeuvres Complètes du Marquis de Sade. Édition (Nouvelle) de Gilbert Lély. Paris: Cercle du Livre Précieux, 1966-67. 16 volumes.
Oeuvres Complètes du Marquis de Sade. Édition de Jean-Jacques Pauvert et Annie Le

-
- Brun. Paris: Pauvert, 1986-1991. 15 volumes.
Oeuvres. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Édition de Michel Delon et Jean Deprun. Paris: Gallimard, 1990. 3 volumes.
Lettres et Mélanges littéraires écrits à Vincennes et à la Bastille. Paris: Editions Borderie, 1980.
Correspondance Inédite du Marquis de Sade, édition de Paul Bourdin. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1971 (1929).

CRITICAL STUDIES

- Allison, David, Roberts, Mark S. and Weiss, Allen (eds.). *Sade and the Narrative of Transgression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
 Bataille, George. *La Littérature et le mal*. Paris: Gallimard, 1954.
 ————. “Sade et l’homme normal” préface à *La Nouvelle Justine*, Tome VI de l’édition du Cercle du Livre Précieux des *Oeuvres Complètes du Marquis de Sade*.
 Blanchot, Maurice. *L’Entretien Infini*. Paris: Gallimard, 1969.
 ————. “La littérature et le droit à la mort” in *De Kafka à Kafka*. Paris: Gallimard, 1982.
 ————. “Sade” préface à *La Nouvelle Justine*, Tome VI de l’édition du Cercle du Livre Précieux des *Oeuvres Complètes du Marquis de Sade*.
 ————. “L’inconvenance Majeure” préface aux *Ecrits Politiques*, Tome VIII de l’édition de Jean-Jacques Pauvert (1961-1966) des *Oeuvres Complètes de D.A.F. de Sade*.
 Boutoute, Eric. *Sade et les figures du baroque*. Paris : L’Harmattan, 1999.
 Carter, Angela. *The Sadeian Woman and the Ideology of Pornography*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
 Camus, Michel, et Roger, Philippe (éd.). *Sade: Écrire la Crise* (Colloque de Cerisy). Paris: Belfond, 1983.
 Frappier-Mazur, Lucienne. Translated by Gillian C. Gill. *Writing the Orgy: Power and Parody in Sade*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.
 Gallop, Jane. *Thinking Through the Body*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
 Hénaff, Marcel. *Sade: L’invention du Corps Libertin*. Paris: P.U.F., 1978.
 Klossowski, Pierre. *Sade, mon prochain*. Paris: Seuil, 1947.
 Lacan, Jacques. *Le Séminaire : Livre VII* (1986), *Livre XX* (1975), *Livre IV* (1994), *Livre I* (1975), *Livre III* (1981). Paris : Seuil.
 Laugaa-Traut, Françoise (éd.). *Lectures de Sade*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1973.
 Le Brun, Annie. *Soudain un bloc d’abîme, Sade*. Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert, 1986.
 Lely, Gilbert. *Vie du Marquis de Sade*. Paris: Jean-Jacques Pauvert aux éditions Garnier Frères, 1982.
 Paulhan, Jean. *Le Marquis de Sade et sa complice*. Bruxelles: Editions Complexe, 1987.
 Paz, Octavio. *An Erotic Beyond : Sade*. Translated by Eliot Weinberger. NY: Harcourt

-
- Brace & Co., 1998 (1993).
- Phillips, John. *Sade: The Libertine Novels*. London, UK and Sterling, VA, USA: Pluto Press, 2001.
- Sawhney, Deepak Narang (ed.). *Must We Burn Sade?* New York: Humanity Books, 1999.
- Sclippa, Norbert. *Le Jeu de la Sphinge: Sade et la Philosophie des Lumières*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2000.
- Thomas, Chantal. *Sade, l'oeil de la lettre*. Paris: Payot, 1978.