

ELENI LORANDOU (Lancaster)

Non-philosophical mystique and the rehabilitation of heresis

Abstract

*In the second part of the Triptych, *Mystique non-philosophique à l'usage des contemporains*, François Laruelle puts to the test of "non-philosophy" the field of phenomena that are termed as "religious" whether Christian, Judaic or Gnostic. Non-philosophical mystique is born in the spirit of heresy rather than sanctity. It springs from the effort to join Man with himself rather than with God founding the radical cause of the new Logos in the One-in-One. Man is emptied from his identity, becomes a Christ-subject who comes to fight for the World. Future mystique ends as the amorous knowledge, an erotic a priori constitutive of the mystical subject: it is not an illusory transformation of Man or a revision of his relation to God or the World. The final aim – as I will try to show – is to transfigure the heretical experience, mystical as well as erotic of the human such as it becomes capable of a form of unison with itself as unique Other.*

Keywords: Non-philosophical mystique, One-without-God, Man-in-Man, Christ subject, Heretical fight

A non-philosophical mystique?

In the Triptych, that has been inaugurated with *Future Christ: a lesson in heresy* (2002), Laruelle does not invite us to a historical wandering to the limits of Christianity. Rather, he attempts to sketch the outline of an organon that would render the Christian phenomenon theoretically intelligible and allow it to be experienced in a human way. The second part¹ entitled *Mystique non-philosophique à l'usage des contemporains* (2007) makes this even more evident as it refrains from redesigning Christian mysticism and renewing it on a philosophical basis or from composing literary fiction on the basis of a body of traditional texts. Rather than doing a theoretical exercise, Laruelle attempts to put to the test of "non-philosophy" the field of phenomena that are termed as "religious" whether

¹ The third part has yet to be published.

Christian, Judaic or Gnostic because, as he says, "the problem concerns the plurality of universals and a capacity (*puissance*) of thought that would admit their plurality, at the conflicting origin, without relativising them by a relationship of one to the other, but rather extracting them from their warfare." (Laruelle 2011, 32) The idea is of "unloosing the original nucleus" by initiating a mystic experience that is devoid of any trace of onto-theological transcendence. Already, in the pages of the *Principles of Non-Philosophy*, Laruelle defines the "mystical" (*le mystique*) strictly in terms of a radical immanence,

We distinguish mysticism and mystique [*la mystique et le mystique*]². Mysticism is an experience of the soul's identity with transcendence. It therefore entails transcendence *within* certain immanence, a mix of the two; it does not separate the soul from transcendence through a real mode but rather ties it to transcendence; finally it makes immanence a property or attribute of the relation of the soul and of God rather than a subject-essence as such. On the other hand, we call the mystic a real and actual essence, an already-performed-without-performance as we will call it, an absolutely autonomous instance rather than an attribute, property, event or relation. This essence therefore no longer involves transcendence, rather it excludes it absolutely. (Laruelle 1996, 55)

As it is, the whole difficulty seems to lie in understanding that the simplicity of non-philosophical mystique is not something new but lies profoundly hidden in the depths of traditional mystical quests.³ More specifically, it attempts to unify on the radical basis of the Real⁴ three modes of religious experience that have ignored or even critically challenged each other: the legacy of Christian and Neo-Platonic mysticism through Eckhart and the Russian Hesychasm (with primacy to the Real as Man-in-Man rather than to God or to the Deity), the heretical thought, burdened by centuries of persecution and an eschatological/messianic sort of inspiration put in the service of a certain philosophic and religious practice of the "Last Days" (Laruelle 2007, 8). Moreover, the non-mystical project takes the form of a tentative non-Christian heresy since as Laruelle puts it, "heresy, more so than Judaism, can be the opportunity to pose this problem, the chance of freeing the universals from their competition." (2002, 32) Ancient mysticism has always been close to heresy: it

² Revised translation of the English translation by the author.

³ "But the real difficulty in understanding the simplicity of non-philosophy is profoundly hidden in the depths of philosophy itself" (Laruelle 2012, 3).

⁴ Real (One-in-One, Vision-in-One): Instance defined by its radical immanence under all possible conditions of thought: thus by its being-given (of) itself, yet called Vision-in-One or One-in-One, and by its being-foreclosed thought (Laruelle 1998, 61).

places man at the center of its device of salvation and God in its infernal periphery. Speculative and simple, it pretends to exceed philosophy and onto-theology at the same time that it uses their conditions to address all humble souls. Laruelle describes heretical thought as,

The combination of speculation and "poverty of mind", the erasure of the hierarchy between the simple and the learned, the collusion of humility and transcendence by *epekeina*, the bracketing of the meta, here is an intolerable short circuit, a heresy. (Laruelle 2007, 86)

Inspired, hence, by the spirit of heresy, we are called to posit the hypothesis of an identity that is more than speculative or dialectical, a radical identity of poverty of mind and of theory as thought by those who are devoid of any thought or doctrine. This is the unified theory of mysticism and heresy which, in its radical simplicity, is not meant to receive an ontologico-theological meaning even after conceptual explanation, "Future mystique must be born in the spirit of heresy and manifest itself as the posture of the ordinary man or the Subject-existent-Stranger (Sujet-existent-Étranger)" (Laruelle 2007, 86). The heretical subject, a stranger to the World constituted by mystical and philosophical decisions does not hold the keys for unlocking the hidden secrets of the Real; extricating himself from all dogmatic belief according to the Vision-in-One, he is an ordinary subject, an anonymous stranger, indifferent to the philosophical categories pretending to the Real.

Old-mysticism and fiction-mysticism

"Mysticism is less a heresy or a liberation from religion than an instrument for the work of unveiling, within religion itself, a truth that would first be formulated in the mode of a margin inexpressible in relation to orthodox texts and institutions, and which would then be able to be exhumed from beliefs. The study of mysticism thus makes a nonreligious exegesis of religion possible. It also gives rise, in the historical relation of the West to itself, to a reintegration that eradicates the past without losing its meaning" (Kearney 2010, 9).

The heretical feeling is in fact one of urgency, urgency to break with the market of salvation, the sufficiency of religions, God too. What non-philosophy calls "future" or "non-religious" mystique is opposed in its Christian references, its sources and its material to the "religious" or "old" mysticism. It is also called 'Fiction-mystique' (mystique-fiction) or even 'Christo-fiction' as opposed to 'World-mysticism' (mystique-monde), religious or corrupted by the spirit of the World (Laruelle 2007, 58). The aim here is to challenge the philosophico-religious sufficiency, the dogmatic consistency of the old form of mysticism and place the mystical experience free from the traces of unclaimed, dogmatic transcendence within the reach of Man-in-Man.

Laruelle calls World-mysticism (*mystique monde*) the old mysticism of philosophical and Christian style that has been accumulated in history and culture as to give a new form of World that is more of a mixture of philosophical experiences and theological dogma. The guiding definitions of the old mysticism such as "God and Man", "alone with God" program a communication of types of reality, a type of conversion and often of convertibility that makes the mystical union a philosophical servitude for man. More precisely, "they transform into insoluble questions and into a simple infinite desire for realization the performative-immanent act which is that of the Vision-in-One or the Man-in-Man"(Laruelle 2007,36). That is why an operation is required, other than the classic union of God and man, an operation which, by treating the religious relationships according to a practice of *dualization* (unilateral duality), sets at play the cloning of the subject by Man.

The purpose of a non-philosophical *mystique* bereft of transcendence and constitutive of human reality is to maintain an experimental science of thoughts and affects and to invent new statements that have God and the world as objects. It is not a question of rejecting all previous notions but instead of trying to conserve some of them in new functions by 'modeling' the construction through their unification-without-synthesis. The conditions for this modeling "must be acquired inside of a radical setting between parenthesis of every philosophical sufficiency of faith and Gnostic knowledge, lest their materiality will be destroyed" (Laruelle 2002, 128). Since the new *mystique* is one of fiction, to be invented in the way of an experimental science, it requires an object of experimentation, which, in this case, is the old mysticism. This latter, offers its conceptual and experiential material, which the fiction *mystique* is willing to appropriate first by removing its sufficiency, then its structure and meaning. In what concerns this appropriation, Laruelle explains:

It requires an impoverishment in transcendence from which we will remove not only its particular philosophical postulates but philosophy itself, as mediation presupposed necessary to the unification between a creature and God. A *mystique* without constitutive theology that is born in the spirit of humility rather than that of the capital-world will proceed by suspense of these axioms. (Laruelle 2007, 57)

Axiomatisation of philosophico-religious symptoms

The old mysticism was characterized by the sufficiency of the religious belief in God as the hyper-philosophical Real or the One with all its alienating effects. Instead of dividing man according to metaphysical clivages such as the soul and the body, non-

philosophy will *dualize* him *unilaterally* advancing through axioms, and formulating theorems of fiction-mystique. Is it then a question of returning to man what religion snatched from him? Return the mystical experience to its holder? If the old mysticism is conversion of man to God, the fiction mystique will not merely repeat it in the reverse order. Instead, "it must experience and consume it for the sake of a Man-without-God, who is always capable of an innermost experience" (Laruelle 2007, 37). Then, the call is for a mysticism that must be revised according to a new apparatus, theoretical as well as pragmatic, rather than turning itself into the object of a dialectical re-appropriation that invokes man only to re-appropriate him to God. In Laruelle's own words:

We did not come to fulfil the ancient mystique but universalize it under non-religious conditions, according to a universal sense of humanity whose messianity (messianeté), the religions, *always particular*, have never suspected. (Laruelle 2007, 38)

It is the method of ultimatum that distinguishes the two mysticisms, by inserting them in a difference so radical that is not even a "difference". To achieve this, non-mystique needs a material of symptoms to practice, to dualize according to the Vision-in-One, which is to be found in the omissions of ancient mysticism. The old transcendental terms of philosophy, generalized and formalized, obliged to part with their ontological anonymity, are emptied from their content and religious meaning only to be reborn as non-philosophical axioms and theorems. From the structure of Christian mysticism and from the onto-theo-logical realm in general, we get first names such as "Christ", "World", "son of God", etc., that are subjected to certain rules and procedures required by the Vision-in-One. They are *first names*⁵ because they designate the "persons" – in the non-conceptual sense of the term – of the Man-in-Person, of individuals who have the form of the One-in-One in-the-last-instance. Through its operation, the non-philosophical mystique addresses and transforms three fundamental problems of traditional philosophical mysticism:

- The problem of the *One* that is the cause of all mystic thesis which is no more God but the Vision-in-One or the Man-in-Person, with God being only its symptom. See-in-One, that is, in-man, ceasing to want to unite with a transcendental being.
- The problem of the *subject* properly mystical -no more the religious or philosophical creature but the "Son of Man-in-Man" or the "Future Christ". Union as a subject to the world by uniting to the Man-in-Man through the Christ-subject.

⁵ *First name*: Symbolic element of the transcendental axiomatic, formed on the basis of a philosophical concept and entering into the constitution of the axioms that describe the One (Laruelle 1998, 18).

- Finally the problem of the *World*, no more theological or metaphysical but the World of their mixture as *melange*⁶, viewed also as Hell (*enfer*).

As God is reduced to a simple theological model, the first axiom of "Vision-in-One", which is necessarily more than an axiom, becomes the very cause of mystique. The radical identity of the One is bound to be heretical because it is indefinable, indemonstrable not only in philosophy and theology, but intrinsically so.

One-without-God

"In contradistinction to mysticism, here we postulate an absolute autonomy, the Real itself, of the mystical experience in the sense whereby it is the mystical that is the core-in-the-last-instance of all possible experience". (Laruelle 2007, 56)

To free oneself from the infernal sufficiency of united philosophy and theology, is to redefine the One no longer as God but, by the first name of "One-in-One" or "in person", which in fact corresponds to the last essence of Man. In practice, non-philosophical mystique starts with the non-positional position (of) oneself of the One rather than from a supposed desire of the Other, "the mystical is not in front of us, far from us, or close behind, virtual or potential, demanding reversal, conversion, return or turn. It is in-us or rather it is us who are actually in it, in-mystique or in-One as the One itself" (Laruelle 1998, 56). More specifically, the Vision-in-One means that the One is not supported by anything - even not by itself and at the difference of the One-God or the One-in-One is without-essence, non-unitive or non-unitional.

Neither does it pretend to bring the One by the intermediary of the Other or the Same, figures of extreme transcendence. The Vision-in-One is Given-before-all-givenness, radically unreflected experience-(of)-itself, deprived by the support of the being and never constituting a mystic dimension for the flux and return of beings.

As non-intellectual, "unlearned knowledge" (*savoir indocte*) that however determines a theory, the Vision-in-One enables the concept of a heretical mysticism that is not itself a heresy.

⁶ Other first name for the philosophical Decision insofar as it is founded on reversibility as structure or limit-tendency of the *mélange*, fold, relation, correlation, synthesis, convertibility, etc. -characteristic of specifically philosophical unitary syntaxes. (Laruelle 1998, 33)

Heresy is then the intrinsic character of the Real, the fact for one to be without essence rather than a solitude of situation, that a doctrinal and institutional separation. (Laruelle 2007, 88)

Future mystique is closer to psychoanalysis than philosophy in its refusal of the supposed enjoyment of God through the medium of philosophy. It installs itself in the heart of the One, "distinguishing it from the classic (*impossible*) enjoyment of the Other as *Enjoyed-without-enjoyment* but also from the enjoyment that is now possible and determined by the Enjoyed which is foreclosed to enjoyment" (Laruelle 2007,71). This distinction is quite important because the absence of a possible enjoyment *of* and unison *in* the One are the conditions for a new determination of the unison *for* the subject. The non-consistence of the *separate-without-separation*, which is not to be confused with nothingness (*le néant*), is not a mode of ecstatic *epekeina* but the phenomenal content of it.

The non-consistency of Man-in-Man

The One-without-God can alone renew our idea of man as being heretical or separated *par excellence*. Is future mystique the simple inversion of the philosophical, the exchange of roles between God and man? The first ultimatum of man can always appear, from the philosophical point of view, as a substitution of man for the divine and a rebellion, "however vision-in-One is more than a rebellion, it is the real presupposition of any rebellion" (Laruelle 2007, 68). It is not man who is substituted for God by a kind of inversion of the fundamental relation. Taking the position of One-Man as pre-supposed radical, it is Man (calling himself the last-identity of the existing Christ subject) who is substituted for the convertibility of God and human. Instead of joining the human to God and God to philosophy, it is a move towards joining the human to itself or to leave mysticism to its non-human destiny.⁷

Traditionally, man is found separated by the world by an act of divine creation. Nevertheless, this is not exactly a sign of separation but more one of his inclusion in an enlarged world-form. In a non-mystical context, man is separated from the world not in the ordinary sense but in an immanent manner untainted by an act of separation. Heresy is not the result of a detachment from the world and a union with God, rather it coincides perfectly with the *being-performed* of the One. Humans have no more essence than to be or exist-

⁷ In The "Call and the Phenomenon" (2013:11), F. Laruelle, referring to Jean-Luc Marion, says, "He joins the human to God and God to philosophy, instead of joining the human to itself or of leaving philosophy to its non-human destiny."

ence, they have a being-giving-in Man. Their non-consistency renders them Man-in-Man, independent of God and the World, Being and the Other, but capable on the other hand of determining a certain experimental knowledge of these things Laruelle talks about the "void" of the non-mystical human figure:

Only Man is this empty identity where nothing other than him is found, except man. It is this non-consistency of Identity-without-unity where one does not even find God. Human "abandonment" means "man is abandoned (to) Man and he can only abandon God with the world and abandon Him to the World" (Laruelle 2007, 83).

Future mystique is born from the being-separated (of) the Man and his primacy over God in the spirit of the heresy rather than the sanctity. The true spirit of heresy is that God and man do not redouble each other in the worldly human order nor redouble themselves in the in-human order of God. If heretics claim mysticism, it is without transcendence first, de-deified. It is the One-without-God alone that can renew our idea of man such as a heretic characterized by, "the radical humility, the non-consistency (that) is our holiness to us, devoid of religious significance, holiness proper to the Stranger⁸" (Laruelle 2007, 83). Lastly, freeing man from his consistency ensures his ultimate freedom from the pretensions of the philosophical decision. It is the freedom of the determination in-last-humanity, the autonomy of the axiomatic decision exercised in the field of historical Christianity, its dogmas and concepts that are now liberated, if not from their content at least from their onto-theological essence. In this, non-philosophical mystique fulfills the aims of the ancient mystics.

Humans as Futures

The "old" mystics have always employed the imperfect tense in their descriptions of the One-God. Nevertheless, the immanence of Man-in-Man cannot be spoken of neither in the present of actuality nor in the memory of the past- the subject has to be a messianic *Came-without-coming (Venu-sans-Venir) a Came (Venu) that is not the object/result* of an operation of coming. This means that the Man-in-Person is never a thing accomplished or already given but a being-performed, living and acting *in-real-Time*. Down to its pragmatic

⁸ Finally found in the Stranger its strategically most adequate concept of man, more exactly of the subject as existing beyond the real immanence that it nevertheless is in its ultimate cause. Determined-in-the-last-instance by the real or radically immanent Ego, the subject exists in certain transcendental and aprioristic functions produced by the real Ego cloning them on the basis of the occasion that is the World. (Laruelle 1998,71)

action, "the Vision-in-One is in fact called in the radical future, it is the "in-Real-Time" since,"the way of the future is to be an effectuation of the universal past under the conditions of the time-world" (Laruelle, 1998, 81). This signifies that the future exists not in the sense of a time to come but in that of a transcendental identity turned towards the present. This ultimatum of time affects the mystic subject and "prevents it from coinciding unitarily with itself" (Laruelle 2007, 139). If eternity is a co-presence that traverses the temporal dimensions, the Man-in-person is an "eternal" future, meant to be determined-in-the-last-days or by the Last Days, not in the end of time but *in-real-Time*. It is by a heretical thought that time is dismantled and its three orders liberated to their manifested being.

Christ subject: the clone

Given the transfiguration of the ideas of God, Man and the World, how are we to perceive the historical figure of "Christ"? According to the non-philosophical reading of Christianity, it appears as a restricted interpretation of the Son (*le Fils*) not of God, since the One is liberated from its theistic content, but of the universal man. Non-mystique allows another use of Christ firstly as a simple symptom and secondly as a particular interpretation of the mystical subject. In this new context, He is no more a sacrificed Son of God but a Son cloned by Man and thus a messiah *for* the World who will "expose the a priori component of a philosophical dyad as a fantasy of transcendence precipitated by the indifference of the One toward philosophical thought" (Reszitaryk, 2014, 49).

The cloning of Son of Man has symptoms in the old mystique in the forms of *henosis* or deification, incarnation of *logos*, union of God and man. What all these notions have in common is, however, a synthesizing principle that relies on the convertibility of God and man. The problem that Laruelle sees here is that the confusion that affects the relations of filiation forbids thinking the science of men according to them. This results in alienating the life and threatening it by God while God lacks the human identity and is lost in a "super essentiality", in a "super consistence" (Laruelle 2007, 177). For all intents and purposes, "mysticism can no longer accept living the life of another, of God, instead of living its own life" (ibid.) From this springs the need to humanize the subject rather than deify it, since the determination in-the last-instance liberates God Himself and makes this divine a variable of the Son of Man. If *theosis* is a transcendent donation, cloning⁹ is other than

⁹ The transcendental clone is the true minimal phenomenal essence or *identity of the double*, its identity without synthesis or its being-in-One-in-the-last-instance. (Laruelle 1998, 32)

becoming-man of God, more of becoming-God of man where God is seen emerging *as* Son. In its heretical radicality, the mystic subject does not seek God. Neither does he desire Him *as* God but as transcendental identity of the subject-God. He invents the divine more than he desires it, by deducing it from the Vision-in One as "this originary cloning of the One is the surest destruction of metaphysical doubling or philosophical doublets, it is even, if we can say this, *double('s)-identity as such* [*l'identité telle quelle (du) double*]"(Laruelle 1998, 138). The surest destruction of the metaphysical double, God-man as well its radical identity is to ensure that "philosophical material is identical-in-the-last-instance with a real that is radically autonomous with respect to it, and that this identity does not constitute sameness" (Reszitaryk, 2014, 48). If the Christ subject is born from this simple articulation that is the clone, the cloned being is no really an image of God, it is the possibility for radical immanence to transmit itself without losing the nature of its non-essence. The transcendental identity of the Christ subject is not a double of the One nor in the image *of* the One but a unilateral image of the World, a wave to one side, not to two sides as the entity reflection-thing in mirror" (Laruelle 2007,180).

To break immediately with the circle God-Man means to refuse to distinguish Man from the World. Cloning is not an accompaniment of transcendence by immanence but the unilateral extension of the in-One towards the World, the diffusion of its identity to the world without an act of diffusion. There is no divine revelation but the Vision-in-One, no Son-mediator, either. The Vision-in-Man is the reveal-without-revelation involving an experimentation of the World, a revelation in the form of cloning, a birth without process, a being-born-itself. In this non-procedural process, Man-in-person seizes the world in which he exists as Son.

The heretical fight for the World

Cloning is the transcendental operation of the Real through which the transcendent World is seen in every way as given immanently but only in-last-Identity. Because the One is foreclose to "its" knowledge and even "its" thought, it is able to determine them in-last-identity as knowledge of the World and no longer of the One. Hence, the world is given "in-One" but not in the sense of a divine creation. "Being-seen-in-One" signifies being given rather than thought, or thought but insofar as thought must be also given in-the-last-instance-in-One.

Traditionally, religion despised the world and has sought, similarly to philosophy, to integrate a broader experience of the World that could be thought philosophically. Thus, expressions such as "World mysticism," "God-world," "Christ-world," all define historico-

systematic entities in a self-encompassing style. The concept of the world is transformed in non-philosophy, by being determined by the Man-in-person in the form of a theorem. It is enlarged by the fusion of two opposites, one of which is always philosophy as form-world (fusion of philosophy and the world, philosophy and mysticism, etc.) and second the transcendental identity of this concept determined and cloned by human Vision-in-One. In future-mystique, the immediate object of philosophy, which is the world, has always the internal form of this latter. The philosophical apparatus enriched by the supplement of the Christ experience supposes to reinforce the dimension of reality. This mixture is the element that allows philosophy to surpass itself with its own means and to meet the challenge of the burden of the divine and mysticism to conceptualize its ends and the type of reality to which it aspires. This will be better understood through the idea of fight *for* the world (Lutte *pour* le Monde) for which the Son-in-Man and we all, as Futures come.

The introduction of mysticism to man means that he frees himself from the sufficiency of hell by being his own kingdom and his own heavens. This is not a simple deviation from dogma or a recapture of heretical identity. Fiction-mystique aims at appropriating these heavily loaded religious concepts and heretically transfiguring them for a worldly use by the Christ subject. In the philosophical fight against representation and the mystical fight against positivity, non-philosophical mystique substitutes the heretical struggle against the world. The world as well as time is given in order to be transformed, appropriated in the identity of a clone. When the Subject Christ "clones" the One on the basis of a particular instance of philosophico-mystical material, he shows as Andrew Reszitaryk explains, "the transcendental component of philosophical decision to be identical in-the-last-instance with the real, and causes the real to assume a transcendental function a propos philosophy." (Reszitaryk 2014, 48) He measures the World according to Man-in-Man. Measured thus, "World" is whatever falls in the "World," "Time," as what falls in "Time," and the same goes for evil and even man, "it is the fall in sufficiency" (*la chute dans la suffisance*). However, in relation to what has fallen, we call "World" the identity (of) the World that extracts the sufficiency out of what falls within its domain treating it as a symptom. If the philosopher is the man who escapes *from* the world, the Christ subject goes *to* the world. His immanent identity, far from enclosing him in himself, vows him to the world and to fighting against its sufficiency. More generally, Futures (*les Futurs*) being the transcendental organon *for* the World, they come not *in* the World but *for* the World and respond to its solicitation because "our aversion for the sufficiency of the World rather than for the World in itself does not keep us away in an eidetic flight but we turn "to" him" (Laruelle, 2007, 215). It is not thus a question of a war but of a fight with the matter of the world in order to appropriate its intelligence in a new, non-consistent form. It is not as if Man had to fight

against the transcendental illusion of the World in the name of an ideal, or under a divine duty, "the practice determined by the Man-in-person is this struggle *for* the World" (Laruelle 2007, 216). In the context of this heretical fight, the world is called "Hell" (*enfer*) on the basis of an axiomatic decision; it is the *first name* of its sufficiency. This associates it less with the idea of sin than with that of *the hallucination of the Real*, understood as the faith in the sufficiency of religion and philosophical reason. Hence, "to go to the World" (*aller au Monde*) is not at all a religious withdrawal, an ascetic escapade towards God. Rather it is a reduction of faith to the world, a reduction that man offers to the world as a gift (without donation). Because, as Laruelle explains, "it suffices less of a god than of a Christ subject supporting his rigor of the human to save the world from the complacency in which it is lost" (2007, 218).

The *a priori* of erotic ecstasy

The onto-theology of union to and separation from the World and God finds a last usage, albeit a symptomatic one, in a practice of non-uniformal-unison, cloning with only the world (thus with God too). It is a practice of erotic unison pertaining to the mystic affect but the future heretic no longer aspires to divinization and even less to deification. This not because he does not desire but because he exists as ultimately performed according to a *primacy-without-primacy*. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the desire for God is now turned to a desire for the world.

By its structure, the Fiction mystique is a unified theory not only as explanation and usage of Christian mysticism, a kind of experimental science but also as an erotic and amorous pragmatic as claimed by the Neo-Platonists. If these lovers of harmony, viewed philosophy as a *happy life* and mysticism as *beatitude of the wonderer*, "the theoretical beatitude acquired a priori by the intellect will take another meaning as beatitude of the amorous union, as an erotic a priori constitutive of the mystical subject" (Laruelle 2007, 276). The beatitude sought by all the mystics of the past has changed status and is now viewed as an "extatico-erotic structure in which the amorous unison of human subjects is consumed."(ibid.), because nothing is given with man if it is not (in) himself. It is not possible to apply to Man-in-Person the method of unison that guaranteed the traditional convertibility of man to God while the opposite would still be a part of the structure of philosophical decision. Neither is it a question of trusting the mystical adventure in the hands of man rather than in God's. Rather, it is "to transfigure our heretical experience, mystical as well as erotic of the human such as it becomes capable of a form of unison with itself as unique Other" (Laruelle 2007, 277). It is not an illusory transformation of Man or of his relation to

God or the World but a transfiguration in view of acquiring a knowledge that would be identical to the constitution of his own personal existence. Hence, non-philosophical knowledge is not opposed to amorous sensibility, it is a theory made sensible in an a priori erotic way. Between its heretic cause rooted in the separated-without-separation and its erotic destination, it is here seen as entirely transformed, "what was simple means or pathos of union with Christ becomes organon of the One-in-One and structure of the subject" (Laruelle 2007, 277).

*Eleni Lorandou, PhD Candidate, Lancaster University,
e.lorandou@lancaster.ac.uk*

References

- Kearney, Richard. *Anatheism: Returning to God After God*. Columbia University Press: New York, 2011.
- Laruelle, François. *Philosophie et non-philosophie*. Mardaga: Liège/Brussels, 1989.
- Laruelle, François. *Mystique non-philosophique à l'usage des contemporains*. L'Harmattan: Paris 2007.
- Laruelle, François. "The End Times of Philosophy." *Continent*. 2.3 (2012): 160-166.
- Laruelle, François. "The Call and the Phenomenon." *Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy / Revue de la philosophie française et de langue française*, Vol. XXI, Nr. 2 (2013): 105-117.
- Laruelle, François. *Principes de la non-philosophie*. PUF: Paris, 1996.
- Laruelle, François et Collaborateurs. *Dictionnaire de la non-philosophie*. Kimé: Paris, 1998.
- Laruelle, François. *Le Christ futur, une leçon d'hérésie*. Exils: Paris 2002.
- Reszitaryk, Andrew. "Wonder without domination. An introduction to Laruelle and Non-Philosophy." *Chiasma: a site for thought*. 1 (2014): 24-53.