

The University of Denver and The Iliff School of Theology

Joint Ph.D. Program in the Study of Religion

Dissertation Proposal

**THE AMOROUS IMAGINATION:  
EVENT, SATURATION, AND HERMENEUTICS IN JEAN-LUC MARION'S *THE EROTIC  
PHENOMENON***

By  
D. Andrew Yost, JD, MA

Submitted to the Joint Doctoral Committee  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Denver, Colorado  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2018

## THESIS

According to French philosopher Jean-Luc Marion, love needs rethinking. “Philosophy today no longer has anything to say about love, or at best very little. And this silence is for the better, because when philosophy does venture to speak of love it mistreats it or betrays it. One would almost doubt whether philosophers experience love, if one didn’t instead guess that they fear saying anything about it.” But what is Philosophy about, if not love?<sup>1</sup> How is it that love remains one of the most meaningful human experiences and yet we so rarely submit it to philosophical inquiry?

Drawing on Romanticism and 20th century phenomenology, this project will take up the question of love and examine its transcendental structures, describe its hermeneutical processes, and explain its role in the way the subject and the Other relate to one another. The goal of this project is to provide a phenomenological account of love as a unique kind of inter-subjectivity that does not reduce the Other to the Same and results in a radical individuation of the Other. I will examine what I call the “amorous event” and describe the way in which *the* Other becomes *this* Other; that is, how the Other becomes the Beloved. I argue that much of this has to do with the way the lover and Beloved *imagine* one another. Romantics like Stendhal, Novalis, and Shelley celebrated the imagination’s role in love but they provided no systematic account of precisely how the imagination functions as a condition for the possibility of love. Likewise, although philosophy has had much to say about the imagination, no philosopher has provided a clear and focused account of how lovers invoke the amorous imagination and its implications for subjectivity, alterity, hermeneutics, knowledge, and time. *I will argue that through the amorous imagination*

---

<sup>1</sup> Philosophy, or *philosophía*, means “the love of wisdom.”

*the subject-as-lover creatively responds to the saturating givenness of the Other-as-Beloved, individuating her and affirming the Beloved's meaning by engaging in an endless hermeneutic.*<sup>2</sup>

## CONTEXT

The amorous event is difficult to think according to the traditional categories of *eros*, *agape*, *philia*, and *nomos*. Love always seems to evade or exceed their boundaries. The conventional topology is especially problematic because it carries theological and metaphysical baggage that diverts attention away from the phenomenon of love itself, replacing the rich, lived experience of *amour* with unresolvable, logical problems. The history of the idea of love is replete with disputes and paradoxes regarding love's ontology. Can *agape* and *eros* be reconciled with each other? Anders Nygren and Martin Luther say no. Thomas Aquinas and Augustine say yes.<sup>3</sup> But none provide an account for the *experience* of love. They stop short at the *idea*. Some philosophers attempt to think love *qua* love but end up reducing it to desire, passion, or a psychological disposition.<sup>4</sup> Philosophy renders love the handmaiden of epistemology, metaphysics, or ethics. In Plato's *Symposium*, Diotima famously declares that love (*eros*) is the *desire* for the perpetual possession of the good.<sup>5</sup> But love is more than desire, disposition, or idea.

---

<sup>2</sup> A brief note on pronouns: I will occasionally use "he" to refer to the subject-as-lover and "she" to refer to the Other-as-Beloved. I am aware of the danger of heterosexual normativity, gender oppression and hierarchies, and the contested nature of sexual identity. My descriptions are not implicit prescriptions that the way we ought to talk about love is as only between "one male and one female." I do not think that is true and I wholly acknowledge love between genders and sexes and groupings other than my own. There are limits to language. The task of this project is to provide a phenomenological account of the amorous imagination as it relates to the experience of love. If my descriptions and analysis do not resonate with the reader because of the complexities of gender and sexual identity, I invite and encourage others to contribute to the conversation by critiquing my account and offering alternatives that will help us flesh out the nature of love. I could hardly imagine a better consequence of my project.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g., Irving Singer, *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*, vol. 1. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 316; Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, trans. Philip S. Watson. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 210. Luther argued *agape* is the sole source of salvation. God's bestowal of love is an unmerited act of divine grace and the sinner's only chance at redemption. Nygren agrees that *eros* and *agape* are irreconcilable, but for analytical reasons. Aquinas and Augustine both argue in favor of the *caritas-synthesis*: humankind's striving up toward God (*eros*) and God mercifully reaching down toward humankind (*agape*) accomplishes salvation.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g., Denis De Rougemont, *Love in the Western World*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

<sup>5</sup> Plato, "Symposium," *Complete Works*, ed., by John M. Cooper, (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009), 206a.

Philosophy must free itself from the confines of its own analytical categories and examine love in its fullness and on its own terms. We must overcome *eros*, *agape*, and *philia* and take up the amorous event itself.

To do so requires that we breathe new life into old ideas. Romanticism, for example, represents a watershed moment in the history of the idea of love because it introduced the novelty of the imagination as a means by which lovers engage one another and harmonize or even merge their beings with Nature.<sup>6</sup> Goethe, Keats, Shelley, and Friedrich Schlegel saw that the creative imagination was the key to sympathy. By imaginatively “reaching out,” the protean lovers could experience each other as part of themselves. They could bond with one another, transforming their world and propelling the lovers into a state of ecstatic rapture. At its idealized height, the imagination was even a way to transcend death. Sitting next to his lover’s tombstone, imagining her pulling him into the next world, Novalis contemplated the Night’s ability to dissolve boundaries and return the lover to his origin. Like the Night, Novalis believed the imaginative faculty was the amorphous site of transcendence that allowed for fusion with the Beloved, even beyond the grave. In *Hymns to the Night*, he writes: “Just a short time / And I shall be free / And lie in love’s tomb / Drunkenly” (4th hymn).<sup>7</sup> The Romantics ushered in a new way of thinking about the amorous event that up to that point had been weighed down by the theological moorings of *eros*, *agape*, and *philia*. Thanks to the Romantics’ attention to the power of the imagination we can now think about love in a way that was not accessible prior to their insights; namely, that love fundamentally involves *the creative engagement of the imagination*. But the Romantics went too far. While they celebrated sympathy as a way to dissolve the self and merge with the Beloved they

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., Friedrich Schlegel, *Lucinde and the Fragments*, trans. by Peter Firchow, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1971).

<sup>7</sup> Rüdiger Safranski, *Romanticism: A German Affair*, trans. by Robert E. Goodwin, (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2014), 77.

failed to see the violence inherent in the desire for oneness. They reinforced rather than overcame a metaphysics of the Sublime, which animated the lovers' desire for union. Despite their attention to the experiences love can bring, the Romantics rarely if ever examined love on its own terms.

Then philosophy abandoned love, or at least sent it underground. Perhaps love had proven too elusive. Or perhaps the horrors of the 20th century left no room for it. In the meantime, a new philosophical method has emerged, one that is equipped to provide an account of love: phenomenology. By bracketing metaphysics and looking only at phenomena as they appear, phenomenology avoids the categorical pigeon-holing and psychological reductionism that has plagued the philosophy of love. Phenomenology gives us access to the phenomenon of the amorous event, not merely the idea of love. But not all phenomenologies are the same. Not all provide the reduction necessary to access love because to do so requires a robust account of the Other. Husserlian phenomenology falls short. For him the subject accesses the Other only by analogy, as an alter ego. Heidegger's existential analytic fares no better. Heidegger sees the Other as always given via mediation of ready-at-hand tools or instruments that refer *Dasein* to the presence of an Other but that never confronts the Other as a phenomenon itself. Husserl and Heidegger leave little room for the Other, and certainly not for love. To think love on its own terms requires a full, phenomenological account of the Other.

Building on and contesting Husserl and Heidegger, Emmanuel Levinas deployed phenomenology to describe how the Other is given in experience and what implications the Other has for subjectivity, time, and ethics. He concluded that the brute phenomenon of the Other renders ethics first philosophy. According to Levinas, the Other is always radically other and is encountered as an infinite alterity. Western philosophy is characterized by a desire to know; viz., a desire to convert experiences into objects, to explain them within a totalizing system, and to

reduce them to the Same. Knowledge consumes. Levinas saw what the Romantics did not: love as metaphysical merging is always violent because if the Other is radically other and the task of love is to reduce the Other to the Same then the aim of love violates the very nature of the Other *as alterity*. Levinas's account of the Other goes beyond Husserl and Heidegger. But his description still falls short of an account of the lover's love of *this* Other.<sup>8</sup>

French phenomenologist Jean-Luc Marion is one of only a handful of contemporary philosophers to take up the question of love, and certainly the most well-known. Marion admits a great debt to Levinas for his insights regarding the danger of the *cogito ego* and the limits of knowledge and consuming love.<sup>9</sup> But Marion also critiques Levinas for the universal nature of the ethical injunction issued by the Other, an injunction that according to Marion renders the Other "substitutable."<sup>10</sup> Regardless of the cogency of his critique, Marion is on to something in his insistence that love renders the Other unique and unsubstitutable in a way that is not fully explained through Levinas's phenomenology. In "The Intentionality of Love" Marion attempts a description of love that goes beyond ethics. He describes the lovers' crossing gazes as that which constitutes and individuates the lovers: "To love would thus be defined as seeing the definitively invisible aim of my gaze nonetheless exposed by the aim of another invisible gaze; the two gazes, invisible forever, expose themselves each to the other in the crossing of their reciprocal aims."<sup>11</sup> Later, in

---

<sup>8</sup> Levinas himself seemed to acknowledge that the anonymity of ethics may give way to the individuation of the erotic. See e.g., Emmanuel Levinas, "Beyond the Face," *Totality and Infinity*, trns. by Alphonso Lingis, (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969); Jean-Luc Marion, "From the Other to the Individual," *Transcendence: Philosophy, Literature, and Theology Approach the Beyond*, (New York: Routledge, 2004), 52; Gschwandtner, "Ethics, Eros, or Caritas," 74.

<sup>9</sup> "It goes without saying that we owe it to Emmanuel Levinas to have ingeniously reconfigured phenomenology so as to let it finally reach the Other as saturated phenomenon." Jean-Luc Marion, *Being Given: Toward a Phenomenology of Givenness*, trans. Jeffrey L. Kosky, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 366-67, fn. 88.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g., Jean-Luc Marion, "The Intentionality of Love," *Prolegomena to Charity*, trans. Stephen E. Lewis, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002). Although I am sympathetic to Marion's broader project, I agree with Marion's critics that his critique of Levinas misses the mark. Still, Marion's desire to go beyond ethics to love and to account for the profound way the subject and Other are given to each other in and as love resonates with me. Marion's mistake is nonetheless instructive.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

*The Erotic Phenomenon*, Marion builds on this description, providing a fuller account of love through three “erotic reductions,” each of which reveals a new set of insights about the phenomenon of love as it gives subjectivity, assurance, and meaning to the lovers.

Marion’s erotic phenomenology provides a compelling account of the givenness of the subject-as-lover and the Other-as-Beloved, but his overall description of the amorous event is incomplete. He does not adequately explain the way in which the lovers give themselves over and over again, each time as a singularity and saturated phenomenon that demands an endless hermeneutic. He neglects the disruptive, retemporalizing nature of love’s encounter. He mentions but does not fully explain the anguish and assurance that is the “I love you,” an assurance that is always incomplete and yet-to-be-accomplished. He does not mention the way in which the Beloved’s death haunts the lover because of the Beloved’s radical singularity: the Beloved is the *only* Beloved that will ever be *this* Beloved. And most importantly, he does not explain how the amorous imagination functions – not as a “mere mental faculty” – but as transcendental site that generates its own phenomena, phenomena that “happen” between one subjectivity and another in the context of love, or how through the amorous imagination the subject-as-lover avoids the violence of knowledge by creatively and hermeneutically responding to the saturating givenness of the Other-as-Beloved. Marion puts philosophy in position to renew and rethink the Romantic idea of the imagination. He clears a space to provide a phenomenological account of the amorous event and lays the ground for the amorous imagination as an experience – a phenomenon – that gives itself between the lover and Beloved, between one subjectivity and another. Indeed, there is much more to be said about love.

## SCOPE

This project is limited to the following topics:

### **(A) The Imagination in Enlightenment, Romantic, and 20th Century Thought:**

I will reference the history of the idea of the imagination throughout my project, beginning with 18th Century British empiricism, continuing through the Romantic Period, and up to 20th century phenomenology. I will build my argument in light of prior conceptions of imagination but I will go beyond them by providing an up-to-date and focused phenomenology of the amorous imagination. I will rely on Kant's account of the productive imagination and Romantic authors like Stendhal and Novalis to exemplify the creative imagination at its philosophical and aesthetic height, as well as John Keats, who warns us of the creative imagination's darker side. My project will include 20th century phenomenological accounts of the imagination including Husserl's description of the imagination as an act of consciousness, Heidegger's interpretive appropriation of Kant's productive imagination in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, and Ricoeur's idea of the creative and narrative capacities of the poetical imagination.

### **(B) Jean-Luc Marion's Saturated and Erotic Phenomena**

Marion is the primary voice of my project. In *Prolegomena to Charity* and *The Erotic Phenomenon* Marion conducts a phenomenology of love. I will build on his account, adding a phenomenology of the amorous imagination as a possible answer to the question of knowledge and love, and as a theory of inter-subjectivity between lovers. I will also rely on Marion's account of the gift and givenness insofar as it relates to love and especially his idea of the saturated phenomenon (focusing on flesh, face, and event). I will appropriate and develop his idea of the "endless hermeneutic" as a response to a saturated phenomenon. I will examine the contemporary debate regarding Marion's failure to distinguish between ontological and derivative hermeneutics



and analyze the implications of hermeneutics for saturated phenomena, the amorous event, and the imagination.

### **(C) A Phenomenology of the Amorous Imagination**

I will provide a sketch of the amorous imagination. I will deduce from my description the transcendental features that provide the conditions for the possibility of love as expressed through the amorous imagination. I expect to discover a rich connection between the phenomenon of the amorous imagination and its relationship to the structure of subjectivity, time, hermeneutics, and transcendence. Drawing on Marion's idea of the saturated phenomenon, I will explain how through the amorous imagination lovers do not attempt to *know* each other but instead engage in on-going creative acts of meaning affirmation (what I call, *understanding*) that reorient the lover's sense of time and like John Donne's compass, ground the lover's subjectivity such that "Thy firmness makes my circle just, / And makes me end where I begun." I will not only describe the phenomenon of the co-imagining lover's hermeneutical process, I will also examine amorous imaginings as phenomena *themselves*. Amorous imaginings have their own structure. Paradoxically, they are generated by and given "within" the lovers but are constructed as a result of and in response to the Other-as-Beloved, who remains always "outside" and beyond the lover. This unique kind of inter-subjective experience contributes to something like what Badiou calls a truth procedure: through their amorous imaginings the lovers declare to one another and to themselves a new truth – the truth of Two – which overturns the previous distinctions that governed their lives before, when they were but One. My account will include a running commentary on the history of the idea of the imagination and make use of Richard Kearney's *Poetic of Imagining* and *The Wake of Imagination*, Edward S. Casey's *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*, Mary

Warnock's *Imagination*, and Brian Elliott's *Phenomenology and Imagination in Husserl and Heidegger*, as well as primary selections from Husserl, Heidegger, Levinas, and Marion.

### **THEORY AND METHODOLOGY**

My project will rely on three methodologies: history, philosophical analysis, and phenomenology. I will weave the three together throughout the dissertation but some chapters will emphasize one methodology over another. For example, the early chapter on the creative imagination will use history to highlight the development of the idea of the imagination in Western thought from the Enlightenment to today. The Marion chapter will rely on philosophical analysis to present the “problem” of love and explain what is at stake in providing an account of the Beloved and inter-subjectivity. This chapter and the chapter on the amorous event and the endless hermeneutic will involve philosophical analysis and evaluation of Marion and Romano's theories of hermeneutics. The chapters on the amorous imagination will rely on phenomenology. By performing an “amorous reduction,” bracketing thorny metaphysical problems, and turning my efforts toward rigorous descriptions of amorous experiences I hope to discover insights about the structures underlying subjectivity and what it means to be-in-the-world in relation to the Other-as-Beloved.

### **CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD**

This research is important for several reasons. First, it provides a systematic, philosophical analysis of Marion's idea of love and the imagination. Second, love plays a central role in the way we make meaning and therefore warrants serious philosophical reflection. At the risk of sounding trite, love matters to everyone. Third, philosophy rarely if ever accounts for the role of the amorous imagination as a way of engaging the Other-as-Beloved. This dissertation will attempt a

phenomenological investigation into the amorous imagination and its role in loving the Other. Finally, and perhaps more broadly, there is a current trend in philosophy to recover and reconsider traditional ideas like love, beauty, truth, and justice (See e.g., Deleuze and metaphysics, Marion and love, Badiou and truth, etc.) These ideas have lain relatively dormant while 20th century thinkers explored the philosophical landscape of post-structuralism and post-modernism. This dissertation will contribute to the emerging, contemporary philosophical conversation that attempts to reconceive classical ideas while also considering what we've learned from post-modern discourse.

## CHAPTER OUTLINE

**Chapter 1: *Introduction: Phenomenology, Romanticism, and the Possibility of Love:*** I introduce the historical treatment of love by philosophers as either an idealized concept or a psychological disposition.<sup>12</sup> I explore philosophy's failure to account for love and examine two "openings" in the history of ideas that make possible a new philosophical inquiry into love: Phenomenology and Romanticism. I provide short treatments of phenomenology in Husserl, Heidegger, and Levinas and outline the contours of the Romantic imagination in Stendhal, Novalis, and (maybe) Shelley. I state my thesis and explain that a phenomenology of love requires an account of the hermeneutical role of the amorous imagination. I define my terms: *amour*, the amorous event, the amorous imagination, hermeneutics, saturated phenomenon, etc., and provide a chapter overview.

**Chapter 2: *Mirrors and Lamps: A Brief History of the Imagination:*** I give a historical analysis of the idea of the imagination in Western thought. Using the "mirror and lamp" metaphor, I explain that before Kant philosophers viewed the imagination as a mirror reflecting phenomena back to the mind (e.g., Hume and prior sense impressions, Plato's Forms, etc.). I summarize Kant's account of the "lamp" of the productive imagination as is a mysterious, transcendental power that brings together the categories and sensibility into a synthetic unity. Kant marks a fundamental shift in the history of the imagination. I then turn to the Romantic imagination, examining two Romantic accounts of the imagination in Stendhal's *On Love* and Novalis's *Hymns to the Night*. Stendhal and Novalis represent early examples of the amorous imagination already at play. I summarize Heidegger's interpretive appropriation of Kant's productive imagination in terms of ontology and explain Ricoeur's theory of the poetical imagination as a way of creating new meanings and reconfiguring our narrative selves. I briefly reference post-modern theories of the imagination before setting out a set of unresolved and related questions that I will address in later sections: (a) Is the imagination always solipsistic? (b) What is the relationship between what it "outside" (the Other, the given, the world, etc.) and what is "inside" the imagination? (c) Is the imagination essentially a reduction to the Same, the ego, or the I and therefore always an act of violence? (d) What is the imagination's hermeneutic function, especially with regard to love? (e) How do embodiment and imagination relate?

**Chapter 3: *Marion and The Erotic Phenomenon:*** I provide a Marion primer, covering his theories of givenness, *l'adonné*, the saturated phenomenon, and hermeneutics. I perform a close, critical, and generative reading of *The Erotic Phenomenon*. I build on the phenomenology of the Other toward a phenomenology of the Other-as-Beloved. I pay special attention to Marion's descriptions of event, flesh, and face as saturating in terms of quantity, relation, and modality, respectively. I detail Marion's argument in *The Erotic Phenomenon* as to how the self is individuated through the erotic advance, and how the Beloved is individuated through the phenomenon of the crossing gazes. I critique Marion's description, arguing that he does not provide an adequate account of the flesh, over-emphasizes fidelity by placing it in the realm of Being, does not explain the role of hermeneutics in the erotic phenomenon, and neglects any mention of the imagination as a pivotal faculty in individuating the Other-as-Beloved. I point out Marion's accomplishments in describing the phenomenology of love and his insight into the

---

<sup>12</sup> See e.g., Singer, Irving. *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*. 2d. ed., Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987,

“endless hermeneutic.” I tee-up the contemporary debate surrounding Marion’s treatment of hermeneutics and recast the question of hermeneutics in terms of a phenomenology of love. I argue that the question of hermeneutics in the phenomenology of love must take seriously and account for the role of the imagination.

**Chapter 4: *The Amorous Event and the Endless Hermeneutic*:** I analyze the contemporary debate regarding Marion’s hermeneutics. I put Marion in conversation with Claude Romano and Richard Kearney. I summarize Romano’s eventual hermeneutics and his insights regarding the way in which events give themselves as personal, reconfiguring, inexplicable (that is, non-causal), and opening phenomenon. I summarize Kearney’s theory of carnal hermeneutics. I build on Kearney and Romano’s hermeneutics and Marion’s phenomenology in *The Erotic Phenomenon*, arguing that *amour* is a saturating event that exhibits the qualities Romano describes and emerges through the medium of embodiment. This observation has significant implications for subjectivity in line with Marion’s account of love in *The Erotic Reduction*. I expand, nuance and adapt Marion’s work in order to describe the amorous event (not just the erotic phenomenon). I argue that *amour* is a recurring, saturating event that calls the lovers to respond through an endless hermeneutic. I explain that the endless hermeneutic is (a) about understanding, not knowledge; (b) a carnal hermeneutic, and (c) a creative desire for excess. I directly argue my thesis that through the amorous imagination the subject-as-lover creatively responds to the saturating givenness of the Other-as-Beloved, acknowledging that the lover can never know the Beloved and choosing instead to affirm the Beloved’s meaning by engaging in an endless hermeneutic. I conclude by arguing the endless hermeneutic plays itself out through the amorous imagination, the existence of which is itself a condition for the possibility of love.

**Chapter 5: *Toward a Phenomenology of the Amorous Imagination*:** I provide a phenomenological sketch of the amorous imagination and its role in love, individuation, and the endless hermeneutic. First, I distinguish between perception, memory, thought, and imagination. I provide my own observations (inspired by Romanticism) of the phenomenology of the imagination, emphasizing the imagination’s role in creativity, hermeneutics, horizons within the subject’s lifeworld, and transcendence. Second, I distinguish between (a) *amour* as the phenomenon of the amorous event, and (b) amorous imaginings, themselves phenomena that constitute the lovers’ engagement in the endless hermeneutic. Third, I describe the amorous imagination. I argue that the amorous imagination is the transcendental condition that allows for the possibility for the lovers to engage in the endless hermeneutic. It is the “space” in which the lovers respond to the call of the Beloved, it is a move to traverse but not fill the distance between Lover and Beloved. I argue that the amorous imagination functions in several ways: it (i) synthesizes, (ii) retemporalizes, (iii) constitutes, (iv) beautifies, (v) narrativizes, and (vi) assures.

**Chapter 6: Conclusion: Love and Philosophy: Some Reflections:** I summarize my argument, tie together loose ends, acknowledge there is more work to be done, and signal toward other projects (a more detailed account of the amorous imagination, a close examination of the phenomenology of love and death, the dark side of the imagination, etc.)

## **BIBLIOGRAPHIC METHOD**

I've used traditional methods and sources to research my topic. My bibliographic searches are textual, thematic, and author-focused. I have and continue to draw from both primary and secondary texts to explore the ideas and locate them within the broader philosophical discourse. I started my research with a preliminary survey of philosophers or philosophical texts that take as their central concern the idea of love, focusing on works by Marion and Levinas and collecting their inter-textual references. I've also consulted experts in the field for their advice on secondary sources. Using bibliographies from primary and secondary sources I began to develop a list of relevant texts that constitute the core of my research base, including texts in the original French.

Additionally, I've searched and will continue to search the Penrose Library in the University of Denver's Anderson Academic Commons, the Taylor Library at Iliff School of Theology, and the Auroria Library where I teach, at Metropolitan State University. I've cross checked my searches on various databases including Google Scholar, Proquest, WorldCat, and the Philosopher's Index. I've relied upon critical series resources and bibliographies published by University of Notre Dame, Cambridge University Press, Ashgate Press, Indiana University Press, Bloomsbury, SUNY Press, and Routledge. I've also consulted the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

I used Boolean searches to generate my list of potential resources while looking online or in library databases. For example, I searched for related author's materials using phrases like, "(Jean-Luc Marion OR Marion) AND (Emmanuel Levinas OR Levinas); or (Emmanuel Levinas OR Levinas) AND (Heidegger OR Irigaray OR Husserl)." To search for thematic connections between authors and ideas I used phrases like, "(Jean-Luc Marion OR Marion) AND (lov\* OR other\* OR imagin\* OR saturat\* phenom\* OR ero\*)," substituting relevant terms and

experimenting with different combinations of words. Finally, I've used DU library's Compass search engine to research specific terms, and made ample use of the resource librarians.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The Phenomenology Reader*, edited by Moran, Dermot. London: New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by F. H. Peters. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2004.
- Armstrong, John. *Conditions of Love: The Philosophy of Intimacy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.
- Badiou, Alain. *In Praise of Love*. Translated by Peter Bush. New York: The New Press, 2012.
- Barthes, Roland. *A Lover's Discourse*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 2010.
- Beals, Corey. *Levinas and the Wisdom of Love: The Question of Invisibility*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *The Roots of Romanticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Blanning, Tim. *The Romantic Revolution: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2011.
- Bornemark, Jonna and Marcia Sá Cavalcante Schuback, eds. *Phenomenology of Eros*. Huddinge: Södertörn University, 2012.
- Bourgeois, Patrick L. *Imagination and Postmodernity (Studies in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur)*. Plymouth, U.K.: Lexington Books, 2013.
- Bruhn, Jørgen. *Lovely Violence: Crétien de Troyes' Critical Romances*. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.
- Capellanus, Andreas. *The Art of Courtly Love*. Translated by John Jay Parry. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1969.
- Caputo, John D. *On Religion*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion Without Religion*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- *The Weakness of God*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Caputo, John D. and Michael J. Scanlon, ed. *God, the Gift, and Postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- Casey, Edward S. *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.



Catalano, Joseph S. *A Commentary on Jean Paul Sartre's Being and Nothingness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Critchley, Simon. *The Problem with Levinas*. Edited by Alexia Dianda. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Crowell, Steven: *Normativity and Phenomenology in Husserl and Heidegger*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

----- *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths Toward Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2001.

Daly, Gay *Pre-Raphaelites in Love*. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1989. (Schwartz 2004)

Davey, Nicholas. *Unquiet Understanding: Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Davis, Colin. *Levinas: An Introduction*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul R. Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

----- *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. New York: Penguin Books, 2009.

----- *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Dupré, Louis. *The Quest of the Absolute: Birth and Decline of European Romanticism*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2013.

Elliott, Brian. *Phenomenology and Imagination in Husserl and Heidegger*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Engell, James. *The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Enns, Diane and Antonio Calcagno, ed. *Thinking About Love: Essays in Contemporary Continental Philosophy*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015.

Falke, Cassandra. *The Phenomenology of Love and Reading*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

- Ferber, Michael. *Romanticism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Ferry, Luc. *On Love: A Philosophy for the Twenty-First Century*. Translated by Andrew Brown. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2013.
- Fromm, Eric. *The Art of Loving*. New York: Perennial, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Vol. 1., New York: Random House, 1976.
- *I, Pierre Rivière, Having Slaughtered My Mother, My Sister, and My Brother ...: A Case of Parricide in the 19th Century*, New York: Pantheon, 1975.
- Gardner, Sebastian. *Sartre's Being and Nothingness: A Reader's Guide*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- Gasset, Jose Ortega Y. *On Love: Aspects of a Single Theme*. Translated by Toby Talbot. Mansfield Centre: Martino Fine Books, 2012.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Goethe's Faust: The Original German and a New Translation and Introduction*. Translated by Walter Arnold Kaufmann. New York: Anchor, 1989.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von and Stanley Appelbaum. *The Sorrows of Young Werther: Die Leiden Des Jungen Werther*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2004.
- Gorman, Francis. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Gschwandtner, Christina M. *Degrees of Givenness: On Saturation in Jean-Luc Marion*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014.
- *Marion and Theology*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- *Reading Jean-Luc Marion: Exceeding Metaphysics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Hall, W. David, 2007, *Paul Ricoeur and the Poetic Imperative: The Creative Tension Between Love and Justice*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Harpur, James. *Love Burning in the Soul: The Story of Christian Mystics from Saint Paul to Thomas Merton*. Boston: New Seeds, 2005.
- Hart, Kevin, ed. *Counter-Experiences: Reading Jean-Luc Marion*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2007.

- Heidegger, Martin. *Basic Writings from Being and Time to The Task of Thinking*. Edited by David Farrell Krell. London: Harper Perennial, 2008.
- *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 2008.
- Horner, Robyn. *Jean-Luc Marion: A Theo-logical Introduction*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.
- *Rethinking God as Gift: Marion, Derrida, and the Limits of Phenomenology*, New York: Fordham University Press, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- *Logical Investigations, Vol. 1*. Translated by John N. Findlay. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- *Logical Investigations, Vol. 2*. Translated by John N. Findlay. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Translated by David Carr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- *The Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness*. Translated by James Churchill. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Ihde, Don, 1971, *Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Janicaud, Dominique. *Phenomenology and the "Theological Turn": The French Debate*. Translated by Bernard C. Prusak. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Kearney, Richard. *Anatheism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- *Poetics of Imagining: Modern to Post-modern*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1998.
- *The Wake of Imagination: Toward a Postmodern Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- "What is Carnal Hermeneutics?" *New Literary History* 46 (2015): 99-124.
- Kearney, Richard and Brian Treanor. *Carnal Hermeneutics*, eds. New York: Fordham University Press, 2015.

- Kierkegaard, Søren. *Works of Love*. Translated by Howard Vincent Hong and Edna Hatlestad Hong. New York: HarperPerennial, 2009.
- Kneller, Jane. *Kant and the Power of Imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Kreeft, Peter. *Three Philosophies of Life*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- Large, William. *Levinas' Totality and Infinity*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Lehtinen, Virpi. *Luce Irigaray's Phenomenology of Feminine Being*. Albany: SUNY, 2014.
- Lennon, Kathleen. *Imagination and the Imaginary*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Alterity and Transcendence*. Translated by Michal B. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Phillippe Nemo*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1995.
- *Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.
- *Time and the Other*. Translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- Lilar, Suzanne. *Aspects of Love in Western Society*. Translated by Jonathan Griffin. London: Thames and Hudson, 1965.
- Mackinley, Shane. *Interpreting Excess*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.
- Makkreel, Rudolf A., *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Pure Reason*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Being Given: Toward a Phenomenology of Givenness*. Translated by Jeffrey L. Kosky, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- *In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena*. Translated by Robyn Horner and Vincent Berraud, New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- *Givenness & Hermeneutics (Pere Marquette Lectures in Theology)*, Marquette University Press, 2013

- *God Without Being*. Translated by Thomas A. Carlson. 2 ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- *Prolegomena to Charity*. Translated by Stephen E. Lewis. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations in Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998.
- *The Crossing of the Visible*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- *The Erotic Phenomenon*. Translated by Stephen E. Lewis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- *The Idol and Distance: Five Studies*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2001.
- *The Visible and the Revealed*. Translated by Christina M. Gschwandtner. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- May, Rollo. *Love & Will*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1969.
- McGann, Jerome J. "The Beauty of the Medusa: A Study in Romantic Literary Iconology." *Studies in Romanticism* (1972): 3.
- Mensch, James R. *Levinas's Existential Analytic: A Commentary on Totality and Infinity*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015.
- Moran, Dermot. *Edmund Husserl: Founder of Phenomenology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005.
- Moyn, Samuel. *Origins of the Other: Emmanuel Levinas Between Revelation and Ethics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Norton, David L. and Mary F. Kille. *Philosophies of Love*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1971.
- Novalis. *Henry Von Ofterdingen: A Novel*. Translated by Palmer Hilty. New York: F. Ungar Pub., 1972.
- *Hymns to the Night and Other Writings*. Translated by Charles E. Passage. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill Educational Publishing, 1960.
- Nygren, Anders. *Agape and Eros*. Translated by Philip S. Watson. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982.

Platoni, Kara. "The Sex Scholar." *Stanford Magazine*. Web. 22 Nov. 2015.

Popova, Maria. "Stendhal on the Seven Stages of Romance and Why We Fall Out of Love: Timeless Wisdom from 1822." *Brain Pickings*. 29 Nov. 2012. Web. 21 Nov. 2015. <<https://www.brainpickings.org/2012/11/29/stendhal-on-love-crystallization/>>.

Polt, Richard. *Heidegger: An Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Praz, Mario. *The Romantic Agony*, 2d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Richards, I.A. *Coleridge on Imagination*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965.

Reeve, C. D. C., ed. *Plato on Love: Lysis, Symposium, Phaedrus, Alcibiades, with Selections from Republic, Laws*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub., 2006.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Fallible Man*, rev. trans. Charles A. Kelbley, New York: Fordham University Press, 1986 (1960).

---- *Freedom and Nature: The Voluntary and the Involuntary*, trans. Erazim Kohak, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966 (1950).

---- *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, ed. trans. John B. Thompson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

---- *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Translated by Edward G. Ballard and Lester E. Embree. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

---- *Oneself as Another*, trans. Kathleen Blamey, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992 (1990).

---- *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, ed. Don Ihde, trans. Willis Domingo et al., Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974 (1969).

---- *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies in the Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello, S. J., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978 (1975).

---- *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan, New York: Harper and Row, 1967 (1960).

---- *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols., trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984, 1985, 1988 (1983, 1984, 1985).

Romano, Claude. *Event and Time*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2015.

----- *Event and World*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2009.

----- *There is: The Event and the Finitude of Appearing*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2016.

Rougemont, Denis de. *Love in the Western World*. Translated by Montgomery Belgion. New Jersey: Princeton, 1956.

Sallis, John. *Force of Imagination: The Sense of the Elemental*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Safranski, Rüdiger. *Romanticism: A German Affair*. Translated by Robert E. Goodwin. Evanston: Northwestern, 2014.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

----- *The Imaginary*. Translated by Jonathan Webber. New York: Routledge, 2010.

----- *The Imagination*. Translated by Kenneth Williford and David Rudrauf. Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

Schlegel, Friedrich. *Lucinde and the Fragments*. Translated by Peter Firchow. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1971.

Schwartz, Regina, ed. *Transcendence: Philosophy, Literature, and Theology Approach the Beyond*. New York, 2004.

Sharples, Robert W. *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics: An Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Simms, Karl. *Hans-Georg Gadamer*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Simpson, Christopher Ben. *Merleau-Ponty and Theology*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Singer, Irving. *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*. 2d. ed., Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.

----- *The Nature of Love: Courtly and Romantic*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: MIT, 2009.

----- *The Nature of Love: The Modern World*. Vol. 3. Chicago: MIT, 2012.

Smith, Daniel W., ed. *Essays on Deleuze*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Smith, David Woodruff. *Husserl*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

- Sokolowski, Robert. *Introduction to Phenomenology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Sousa, Ronald de. *Love: A Very Short Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Stendhal. *Love*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Stockitt, Robin. *Imagination and the Playfulness of God: The Theological Implications of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's Definition of the Human Imagination*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.
- Vaughan, William. *Romanticism and Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.
- Venema, Henry Isaac. *Identifying Selfhood: Imagination, Narrative, and Hermeneutics in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Vilhauer, Monica. *Gadamer's Ethics of Play: Hermeneutics and the Other*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Wagoner, Bob. *The Meanings of Love: An Introduction to Philosophy of Love*. Westport: Praeger, 1997.
- Warnock, Mary. *Imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Westheimer, Ruth K., and Jerome E. Singerman. *Myths of Love: Echoes of Ancient Mythology in the Modern Romantic Imagination*. Fresno, CA: Quill Driver Books, 2014.
- Wu, Duncan. *Romanticism: An Anthology*. 4th ed., Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- Zahavi, Dan. *Husserl's Phenomenology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.