

The Price of ‘The Price of Messianism’: Jacob Taubes, Gershom Scholem and the Psycho-Economic Debt

*Jason Peck*

In his short prose piece “Conversation in the Mountains”, the poet Paul Celan describes an encounter between two Jews, Jew klein and Jew gross, in the mountains. As Jew Klein—described as a “Jew and son of a Jew”—leaves his house at sunset and takes with him his shadow, we are told that the shadow he takes with him is both “his own and not his own” because: “[T]he Jew, you know, what does he already have that really belongs to him, that isn’t borrowed, redeemed and not returned.<sup>1</sup>” This description of the Jew who does not have that which belongs to him, that is effectively existentially indebted, is repeated as the Jew Klein encounters the Jew Gross: “[H]e (Gross) came, came, he too, in the shadow, borrowed of course—because I ask and ask you, how could he come with his own when God had made him a Jew [...]”

Celan describes the condition of the Jew as forever having to borrow that which is not his, not returning that which is borrowed, never, and this is perhaps the most important of all the descriptions for my talk today, able to settle up debts (*ausgleichen*). Thus the Jew, for Celan, because he is a Jew, is always, already in debt. Celan makes the economic dimension of this indebtedness explicit in his use of the word “*ausgleichen*,” with its evocation of balance sheets and redemption<sup>2</sup>—redemption here meaning the kind of redemption you get at Wegmann’s when you

---

<sup>1</sup> All translations are modified.

<sup>2</sup> Rosemarie Waldrop in her translation of the piece inexplicably translates “*ausgleichen*” with the English “taken,” thus avoiding the economic overtones altogether. John Felsteiner translates “*ausgleichen*” with “on loan” thus placing the term in the proper economic register. However, Celan’s original itself is somewhat ambiguous: both “*borgen*” and “*zurückgeben*” are negated—thus letting the reader know that he has nothing that’s *not* borrowed, nor (properly) returned. However “*ausgleichen*” remains without negation, thus making it difficult to comprehend whether or not the Jew has already settled accounts but is still with those borrowed things or whether or not he has nothing that isn’t always, already in need of re-

dutifully return your aluminum cans and get that slip of paper you can redeem at the service desk, not, at least initially, with the German word “*erlösen*”, which means to redeem someone in the religious sense. But how do we know where we are when we’re talking about debts? Doesn’t Celan seem to have recourse to the theological when suggesting that Jews are indebted as such because “God made him a Jew”? Why do Jews not properly own something? Why do they still owe? What is this debt that is incurred by the Jews? And, moreover, is this a debt that is unique to the Jew or does it describe a certain ontological condition as such?

I begin with this passage because my current work is concerned with the figure of debt between the material and the theological. The *aporia* of debt (that it is neither material nor spiritual, neither merely a discourse of economics nor a theological discourse) haunts a discussion of indebtedness through a myriad of literary, philosophical and political texts that I read in my work. Though debt might be separately approached through the individual disciplinary registers (economic, political, religious, philosophical, and psychological) I insist that literature is a privileged medium through which to understand this 'indebtedness to debt' precisely because debt is a *figure*, both conceptual (capable of definition) and language bound (susceptible to semantic slippage, mobility of register, context. etc.).

The term “figure” here is taken from Erich Auerbach’s seminal study of figural and pre-figural language in Western literature. For Auerbach, the figural can both represent immanently (in a system of meaning already established) as well as have its ultimate meaning fulfilled later (insofar as such figuration will only have meaning in revelation). Debt insinuates itself in texts in a similar fashion: it rests in the material exchange, but always points to a deferment that may never be redeemed. Hence, my book studies the *poetics* of debt primarily in modernity (although

---

demption. For if something had already been redeemed for the Jew, then, by logic, the debt would be repaid.

this form of poetics begins prior to modernity as well): how the production of meaning in modernity depends upon secularized economies of both meaning(s) and money(s) that disavows indebtedness to its own essentially theological form(s).

On the one hand, theological concepts (*mercy, redemption*) always already mask their material bases (mercy=payment or fee; redemption=to buy back), with this mode of critique becoming a constant refrain in the literature and philosophy that follow. Yet, at the same time, there is an inversion of this process that also takes place insofar as discussion of debt evokes the theological through a discourse of deferment: the promise of redemption at the moment when all debts will be repaid or, in the best case scenario, wiped out completely.

The term that would serve as an intermediary between the shift from a materialist critique of the spiritual to the persistence of the spiritual in the material would be that of *political theology*. It is hardly a surprise that the term *political theology* has regained a certain currency in recent years. The re-evaluation of thinkers such as Carl Schmitt, Walter Benjamin and Ernst H. Kantorowicz as well as the recent and current work of thinkers such as Jacob Taubes, Giorgio Agamben and Hent de Vries seems to suggest that the concept is going through a bit of a renaissance. Yet the economic dimension of political theology seems to be under-theorized in its recent revival. Perhaps this is due to the fundamental, pre-modern conception of political theology that manifests itself in (at least) Schmitt and Kantorowicz's work. The great exception to this is the work of Benjamin, who attempts to conjoin an older, Baroque form of political theology with a materialist re-animation of the concept in modernity.

Moreover, it is with the concept of political theology in mind (and with a specific concentration on its economic register) that the re-emergence of the figure of the Messiah in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries occurs. If the figure of the Messiah seemingly has no meaning for a

secular age, as some have argued, then why do so many thinkers seem to evoke this concept within otherwise materialist critiques? To this end, one can find the Messiah haunting such redemptive figures as Nietzsche's *Overman*, Kafka's man from the country and, perhaps most explicitly, Benjamin's Messiah, who alone can redeem history. I argue that these thinkers aren't only interested in re-invigorating a theological discourse in modernity; rather, that the material debts they wish to elucidate are always haunted by the other immaterial debts that a materialist critique would make obsolete.

Despite arguing that literature is a privileged medium through which to discuss the intersection between the theological and economic discourses of debt, my talk today will actually have very little to do with literature *per se*. Instead, I will focus on the debate between Gershom Scholem and Jacob Taubes on the "price" paid by the Jews for adhering to a "Messianic ideal" in modernity. That being said, there is a text, quoted at length in Scholem's piece, that makes explicit the relationship between the matrix of terms surrounding any understanding of debt: the literary, the economic and the theological.

Arguably, rather than being a symptom of modernity, the conjoining of the economic, figural and theological is always already implicit in the Messianic. Maimonides in his *Mishneh Torah* (composed in the late 12th century) describes the coming of the Messiah in both the economic and the figural registers. Forestalling a possible literal translation of the natural suspension that might accompany the Messiah's arrival (he was, after all, a rationalist) Maimonides warns: "Let no one think that in the days of the Messiah anything of the natural course of the world will cease or that any innovation will be introduced into creation. Rather the world will continue in its accustomed course" (240). The Messiah's arrival will "restitute [...] the Sabbatical and *Jubilee* years [...] observed in accordance with the commandments of the Torah" (Scholem 28). One of

the multiple interpretations of the Jubilee, from ancient times onward, was the routine forgiveness of debts as well as the release of slaves into freedom (hence the long-standing celebration of the Jubilee in African American culture). However, during the exilic period of Jewish history, the notion of the Jubilee moves from the individual to the corporate state as a whole and thus redemption moves from the economic redemption of the debtor to the redeeming of the nation of Israel as such. It is in this semantic shift that the notion of a redeemer comes into play. As John S. Bergsma writes: “Already in *Issah* 6, the jubilee attracts a *messianic* sense. Although the original jubilee legislation required no individual mediator for its actualization, in *Issah* 61: 1-4 notions of an anointed *go’el* (redeemer) figure are associated with the realization of the justice, equality, and general *shalom* of which the jubilee has become a symbol or ‘type’” (3). Hence, Maimonides Messiah will “restitute” the forgiveness of collective debt of Israel upon his return.

However, the arrival will not just mean the redemption of economic debts, it will also mean the redemption of linguistic “debts” as well. Maimonides writes that after the Messiah’s coming, contrary to popular belief: “[A]ll...scriptural passages dealing with the Messiah must be regarded as figurative<sup>3</sup>. Only in the Days of the Messiah will everyone know what the metaphors mean and to what they refer” (Scholem 29). Reading this passage in Maimonides, the fulfillment of figurative as well as metaphoric language is conjoined with the wiping out of both collective and individual debts. Therefore, there is a tertiary link between the economic, the linguistic and

---

<sup>3</sup> The translation “figurative” here is Scholem’s own. In Abraham M. Hershman’s translation of the 14th volume of the *Mishneh Torah, The Book of Judges* (Yale UP, 1949) the word “figurative” here is rendered as “metaphorical.” I assume, since there is no translation cited in the Scholem essay, that all translations from Maimonides are Scholem’s own. The use of “figural” in Scholem’s translation suggests that he might have had a familiarity with Erich Auerbach’s work.

the Messianic—with all three terms being linked through the notion of something needing to be redeemed.

As a brief aside, it is worth looking at Erich Auerbach's essay *Figura*—which deals specifically with Christian typology but certainly has relevance for the Jewish tradition as well.<sup>4</sup> In contrasting the difference between figural interpretation of history and modern interpretations of history: “all history, rather, remains open and questionable, points to something still concealed, and the tentativeness of events in the figural interpretation is fundamentally different from the tentativeness of events in the modern view of historical development. In the modern view, the provisional event is treated as a step in an unbroken horizontal process; in the figural system the interpretation is always sought from above [...] Whereas in the modern view the event is always self-sufficient and secure, while the interpretation is fundamentally incomplete, in the figural interpretation the fact is subordinated to an interpretation which is fully secured to begin with: the event is enacted according to an ideal model which is a prototype situated in the future and thus far only promised (58-59).”

In the figural, history is always already redeemed insofar as that the guarantee of redemption is known in advance. If we go back to our original example from Maimonides, as he states, the metaphors and figural language, while misinterpreted in the present (he offers several exam-

---

<sup>4</sup> See, in particular, Jacob Taubes' essay “The Issue Between Judaism and Christianity”: “The Jewish people, however, not only ‘prefigure’ the story of redemption, but are an active ‘figure’ in the drama of salvation” (47). The use of “pre-figure” and “figure” here are explicit references to Auerbach's work (see for example his essay “The Justification of Ugliness in Early Christian Tradition”). However, Taubes argues, as one might expect, that Judaism doesn't prefigure or figure Christianity because “Christian history, Jesus's claim to the title of Messiah, and Paul's theology of Christ as the end of the law are not at all ‘unique events’ for Judaism, but things that have recurred in the Jewish pattern of religious existence. Christian history, as I have said, constitutes no ‘mystery’ for the Jewish religion. Christianity represents a crisis that is ‘typical’ in Jewish history and expresses a typical Jewish ‘hersey’: antinomian messianism—the belief that with the coming of the Messiah, not observance of the law, but faith in him is required for salvation.”

ples and notes their misinterpretation) are nevertheless secured by a “prototype situated in the future” (cf. Maimonides “the statutes of our Torah are valid forever and eternally”). Yet, how does that figural notion, so prevalent in Maimonides argument regarding language, effect the other side of the Messiah’s coming—i.e. the material erasure of debt as indicated by the Jubilee? In the modern period, there is an assumption that debts will (must) be repaid. In messianic notions of debt, this deferment is always already guaranteed by the Jubilee: there will be a moment when the very existence of the Messiah guarantees that all debts will be repaid, thus debt seems to exist in the figural realm precisely insofar as that debt is always promised to be redeemed, rather than constantly deferred.

This very conjoining of debt and the Messianic resurfaces at the end of Gershom Scholem’s essay “Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism”. The basic thesis of Scholem’s essay is that two forms of Messianic thinking develops in Jewish and Christian thought:

Judaism, in all of its forms and manifestations, has always maintained a concept of redemption as an event which takes place publicly, on the stage of history and within the community...In contrast, Christianity conceives of redemption as an event in the spiritual and unseen realm, an event which is reflected in the soul, in the private world of each individual, and which effects an inner transformation which need not correspond to anything outside...What for the one stood unconditionally at the end of history as its most distant aim was for the other the true center of the historical process...(1)

Setting aside for the moment whether or not Scholem’s assessment is true (or at least born out by the history of Messianism—something that Jacob Taubes will have much to say about), Scholem

sets out an inversion by which the group that seems to seek redemption inwardly (i.e. the Christians) ironically see their certain type of messianism play out historically and the group that seeks redemption in history itself (i.e. the Jews), forever waits for their understanding of history to be fulfilled.

This distinction will set up the end of Scholem's essay in what Taubes refers to as a "psycho economic calculation of the price of messianism in Jewish history" (Taubes 3). Scholem writes:

What I have in mind is the price demanded by Messianism, the price which the Jewish people has had to pay out of its own substance for this idea which it handed over to the world. The magnitude of the Messianic idea corresponds to the endless powerlessness in Jewish history during all the centuries of exile, when it was unprepared to come forward onto the plane of world history... Thus in Judaism the Messianic idea has compelled a *life lived in deferment* [...] (35)

Reading this passage through the lens of the debt/figural/Messiah matrix laid out at the beginning of the paper (suggested by Scholem's own insistence on economic metaphors: price, paying out of one's substance, etc.) there is an interesting reversal: rather than the Messiah being the one who *releases* a person or a people from debt, here the Jewish people are indebted to an idea that prevents redemption on plane of history: there's is a life lived in deferment. This is the inversion of Auerbach's Christian typology in which the figures of history are already redeemed by a secure meaning *not* deferred in the way modern, historical meaning always defers its interpretation. In short, this is one version of the Messiah of modernity, incurring debts as it defers its arrival rather than signaling the Jubilee's promise to release one from debts.



Scholem continues: “Precisely understood, there is nothing concrete which can be accomplished by the unredeemed. This makes for the greatness of Messianism, but also for its constitutional weakness. Jewish so-called *Existenz* possesses a tension that never finds true release; it never burns itself out. And when in our history it does discharge, then it is foolishly decried (or one might say, unmasked) as ‘pseudo-Messianism’” (35). What exactly does Scholem mean by the unredeemable quality of Jewish history? Scholem suggests that the Jewish people, unredeemed by a Messiah that has yet to come and, possibly, will never come, lives its life in deferment. This is the price the Jews pay for a particular form of Messianism played out on the world stage, yet unfulfilled (or, more properly economic, unredeemed) by the necessary spiritual transformation required for historical transformation. Scholem concludes his essay by suggesting that the founding of the state of Israel after the second world war represented: “a readiness which no longer allows itself to be fed on hopes. Born out of the horror and destruction that was Jewish history in our generation, it is bound to history itself and not to meta-history; it has not given itself up totally to Messianism” (35-36). The “utopian return to Zion” (as Scholem calls it) becomes the event that, while not “redeeming” Jewish history in the messianic sense, side-steps the problem of the messianic by imagining that the debt has now been forgotten. Yet, he ends the piece with a warning: “Whether or not Jewish history will be able to endure this entry into the concrete realm without perishing in the crisis of the Messianic claim which has virtually been conjured up—that is the question which out of his great and dangerous past the Jew of this age poses to his present and to his future” (36). Assuming that Jewish life is no longer “a life lived in deferment”, the modern Jew (post 1948 Jew) must be careful that someone doesn’t remind him that, paraphrasing Celan’s narrator from “Conversation in the Mountains,” there is nothing—not even his shadow—that Jew may truly call his own.

If Scholem estimates that the “price of Messianism” casts a long shadow on Jewish history, then Scholem’s essay casts a long shadow beyond its publication: specifically in Jacob Taubes’ critique entitled, appropriately enough, “The Price of Messianism.” Taubes had been a student of Scholem in the immediate post-war years, with Scholem believing that Taubes’ doctoral dissertation, *Occidental Eschatology* was a logical exploration and continuation of his own scholarship on Messianism and eschatological movements within Judaism. There was a falling out between the two of them in the 1950s and Taubes did not attempt to contact Scholem again until 1977, when he asked him to contribute to what Taubes described as an “anti-Festschrift” in Scholem’s honor. Scholem refused, but Taubes wrote what would have been his contribution to the “anti-Festschrift” and eventually published it in *three* (slightly) different versions between 1981-1982 (not to mention different German versions that exist independent of these).

The response to Scholem’s original essay already comes indebted insofar as Taubes, as much as he wishes to reject his teacher, must engage Scholem’s thought to articulate his own thesis on the Messiah. Though Scholem discusses the “price” paid by the messianic idea in Judaism only in conclusion, Taubes argues that the essay encompasses “a psycho-economic calculation of the price of messianism in Jewish history” (3). The use of the phrase “psycho-economic” here is quite fascinating since Scholem himself never uses the phrase in his own essay. Though, as I have pointed out, one can tease out a valence of the economic in Scholem’s language, neither the economic nor the psychic is addressed as such. Why does Taubes use the term “psycho-economic” here and what does this have to do with the relationship between the Messiah, the Jews and history?

Taubes’ evocation of the “economic” refers both to its inherence in Scholem’s use of “price” at the end of the Messianic Idea essay as well as the longer tradition of the word econom-

ic in religious history. Giorgio Agamben, a thinker who is indebted to both Scholem and Taubes, has addressed the genealogy of the term *oikonomia* in his recent work *The Kingdom and the Glory*. It is far beyond the scope of this paper to be able to do Agamben's far-reaching work justice, but suffice it to say that Agamben, much like Taubes, is interested in the way *oikonomia*—originally in Aristotle meant to distinguish between the management of the household as opposed to the management of the city (*polis*)—transforms, from the Apostle Paul onwards to mean the management of salvation. “Let us begin,” writes Agamben, “with an attempt to reconstruct the genealogy of a paradigm that has exercised a decisive influence on the development and the global arrangement of Western society [...] political theology, which founds the transcendence of sovereign power on the single God, and economic theology, which replaces this transcendence with the idea of an *oikonomia*, conceived as an immanent ordering [...] of both divine and human life. Political philosophy and the modern theory of sovereignty derive from the first paradigm; modern biopolitics up to the current triumph of economy and government over every other aspect of social life derive from the second paradigm” (1). Since I cannot presuppose a familiarity with the term biopolitics here, I will offer Michel Foucault's shorthand definition of biopower (the original term from which biopolitics derives) from his 1978 lectures translated as *Security, Territory, Population*: “By [biopower] I mean a number of phenomena that seem to me to be quite significant, namely, the set of mechanisms through which the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power” (1).

This might be too far afield from Taubes' use of the term in response to Scholem's essay, but we can still retain from Agamben's argument the idea that Taubes is interested in the way Scholem's central economic metaphor of price has overtones with the Aristotelian and Pauline

notions that the historical “salvation” of the Jews is at stake. By adhering to the “Messianic idea,” argues Scholem, the Jews have failed to get their “house in order” so to speak. Before moving into a discussion of Taubes’ use of the “psycho-economic” debt argument at the end of his piece (mirroring the end of Scholem’s original essay structure) it is worth looking at Taubes’ initial critique of Scholem’s basic thesis that Christianity represents an inward redemption whereas Judaism represents an outward unfulfilled redemption. “Interiorization is not a dividing line between ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity’: it signifies a crisis within Jewish eschatology itself [...] How else can redemption be defined after the Messiah has failed to redeem the external world except by turning inward” (4). As Taubes will assert in many of his writings, he understands the Christian moment not as the founding of a new religion but as an inter-Jewish crisis. Continuing his critique of Scholem’s basic thesis, Taubes concludes: “Conscience is by no means a ‘nonexistent pure inwardness’ (Scholem 2) It is inward, but exists in constant tension with the world, forcing us to construct casuistries to bridge the gap between it and the realm of the world” (5). Without supporting this fundamental distinction, Taubes invalidates the overarching structure that secures the assumption of the psycho-economic debt of Jewish history.

So, what does Taubes conclude regarding the “price of Messianism”? Or, rather, how does the history of Jewish messianism exist “in constant tension with the world” rather than being removed from it? To quote Taubes: “It is not the messianic idea that subjugated us to a ‘life lived in deferment.’ Every endeavor to actualize the messianic idea was an attempt to jump into history, however mythically derailed the attempt may have been. It is simply not the case that messianic fantasy and the formation of historical reality stand at opposite poles” (8). Taubes flips the script on Scholem by pointing out, using our fundamental economic metaphor, that the messiah does not impoverish Jews on the plain of history, but offer up one possibility of arrest-

ing an indebtedness. Or, to put it in our literary terms (borrowed from Auerbach) messianism is an attempt to *see* how the figural promise is guaranteed. In other words, believing that one can hasten the messiah's arrival actually contributes to historical understanding rather than impoverishing historical understanding.

Taubes actually believes that it was the rabbinic hegemony, and not the messianic *meshugaanim* that actually created the "life lived in deferment": "[D]uring the centuries of exile [...] the community of the 'holy people' continued to live in history 'as if nothing happened.' For all practical purposes, we existed outside history. Only those who jumped on messianic bandwagon, religious or secular, giving themselves entirely to their cause, burned themselves out in taking the messianic risk" (9). Conversely, those who took the "messianic risk" actually didn't pay the price of deferment, they were not in debt to the messianic ideal, rather might have paid a price insofar as messianism does often lead to a "blazing apocalypse". Taubes' final warning to Scholem, and to those who imagine that the messianic can be grafted onto the facile binaries of interiority/exteriority, history/deferment, is that one cannot simply lay the messianic struggle on top of the stage of history: "if the messianic idea in Judaism is not interiorized, it can turn the 'landscape of redemption' into a blazing apocalypse. If one is to enter irrevocably into history, it is imperative to beware of the illusion that redemption [...] happens on the stage of history. For every attempt to bring about redemption on the level of history without a transfiguration of the messianic idea leads straight into the abyss" (9).

In his book *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*, British anthropologist David Graeber makes the claim that, in the Jewish (and later Judeo-Christian) tradition: "Redemption was a release from one's burden of sin and guilt, and the end of history would be that moment when all slates are wiped clean and all debts finally lifted [...] if so, 'redemption' is no longer about buying some-

thing back. It's really more a matter of destroying the entire system of accounting [...] This leads to another problem: What is possible in the meantime, before the final redemption comes" (82). This question of the meantime is analogous to Scholem's "life lived in deferment" to the "price of Messianism" that have been enacted upon the Jews. Graeber, given the argument of his book, translates the metaphoric "impoverishment" of Scholem's essay into a material reality. The vision of human life as awaiting a redemption that will come some other time: "frames even spiritual affairs in commercial terms: with calculations of sin, penance and absolution [...] usually accompanied by the creeping feeling that it's all a charade because the very fact that we are reduced to playing such a game of tabulating sins reveals us to be fundamentally unworthy of forgiveness" and that "salvation can only come in another world" (84). Though Scholem doesn't explicitly deal with sin, he does suggest that the payment for "living in hope" of the messiah's redemption creates "something profoundly unreal" in Jewish history.

Taubes, on the other hand, sees the redemptive moment of messianism as a way of refusing the melancholia of the meantime, as a belief in the inherent redemptive power of changing the historical circumstances of the now. That rather than being afraid that the messianic moment in which one may live will merely become, in Scholem's words, a "pseudo-Messianism", why not, in Taubes' estimation, "pay that price gladly" so that the "catastrophic consequences of the messianic idea are to be avoided" (8). This isn't to say that that "redemption" isn't still a concern for Jews in Jewish history, rather that by jumping into the messianic idea the "psycho-economic" calculation doesn't leave the Jews merely indebted.

### *Epilogue*

I would like to end my talk by returning to Paul Celan's "Conversation in the Mountains". As I was writing my analysis of the Scholem-Taubes debate on the nature of the messian-

ic and the psycho-economic debt encountered by Jewish history, Celan's piece, with its evocation of unowned shadows and unbalanced ledger books, haunted my reading. There is, I realized only after writing my piece, a reason for this. Celan's prose piece was written in response to a missed encounter with the post-war German philosopher Theodore Adorno. According to John Felsteiner, Celan's biographer, after reading Adorno's *Notes on Literature* Celan wanted to meet Adorno and had scheduled a meeting with him in the mountains of Sils Maria in the Italian Alps. Of course, this location is not an accident since, within the history of German intellectual history, this particular location has great significance, being the residence of Friedrich Nietzsche during his most significant years of productivity. However, Adorno never made the meeting and, in a fit of disappointment, Celan noted to the literary critic Peter Szondi, that he was to meet Adorno "who he thought was a Jew." In one of the offprints of the piece Celan had acknowledged the meeting and indicated that, within its schema, Adorno was to play "Jew gross" to Celan's "Jew klein." Adorno discovered this and, in a letter to Celan, apologized for his absence admitting that if he wanted to meet the "real" Jew gross he should have waited (waited!) around Sils Maria one more week for the appearance of...Gershom Scholem. What this little anecdotal story tells us is that, indeed, the Messiah can truly appear at any moment but that this moment will be the moment of his mis-recognition. And, moreover, that this mis-recognition will, ultimately, be unfulfilled.