Aleksandar Mijatović, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Rijeka

Sagittal Engagement: Event, Transgression and Actuality in Foucault's Interpretation of Kant

"Faire la révolution est vraiment quelque chose qui n'est pas à faire", concludes Foucault in the commentary of Kant's essay *Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?* (1784) given in the lecture *Gouvernement de soi et des autres* (1982-1983). Foucault's conclusion links his discussion on the notion of modernity and Kant's notion of the event developed in *Streit der Fakultäten* (1798). That Foucault's conclusion is important for understanding his notions of actuality, engagement, critique and the subject of revolution introduced during the 1980s in the Collège de France lectures. The presentation will consider the interpretation of Kant's essay on *Aufklärung*, given in Foucault's lecture *Gouvernement de soi et des autres* and his essay *Qu'est-ce que les Lumières?* (1984). Foucault's notions of modernity, limit and event developed during the 1980s will be defined beginning with the notion of transgression from his 1963 essay *Préface à la transgression*. That early notion is the basis of sagittal conception of engagement.

In *Qu'est-ce que les Lumières?* Foucault links Kant's notion of *Aufklärung* with Baudelaire's notion of *la modernité* elaborated in *Le peintre de la vie moderne* (1863). In *Gouvernement de soi et des autres* Foucault brings in the commentary of Kant's essay without mentioning Baudelaire's notion of the modernity. In the presentation, Baudelaire's notion of *la modernité* will be compared with Kant's notion of the event. It will be argued that starting from the connection between *la modernité* and the event, Foucault develops the conception of sagittal engagement.

Igor Cvejić, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, Belgrade Foucault and Kant's 'lost chapter'

The opening paragraphs of Foucault's *Introduction to Kant's Anthropology* contain interesting remarks about a missing chapter – a chapter which was probably lost in a post between Konigsberg and Jena. Namely, this missing chapter was concerned with intellectual pleasure and displeasure. As Foucault isn't convinced by the legend of a lost chapter, he presumed that the "vanishing" of the chapter had something to do with the shift that occurred in Kant's thought after

1790. From Foucault's text and published manuscripts of Kant's lectures we know that both the legend that the chapter was lost and a claim that it was there until 1790 were most likely forged. This is an interesting question: how important is this chapter, or its absence, for Foucault's interpretation of Kant's *Anthropology* and the changes which occurred in Kant's thought at the time of its writing? This question might be rather interesting given the fact that we're not provided with an explicit answer.

I would try to deal with these questions mostly by concentrating on one of Foucault's examples: his interpretation of Kant's understanding of marriage and sexual relationship. As a second step I would compare this analysis with Foucault's later work, and the relation between the will to knowledge and pleasure/displeasure in the *History of sexuality*.

notes