

Hope

Adam Hernas

Translation of „Nadzieja” in: Adam Hernas, *Czas i obecność* [Time and Presence], Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera 2005, pp. 49-94.

Translated by Artur Rosman

Adam Hernas (b. 1964) holds a PhD in philosophy, and is a lawyer unaffiliated with any academic center. He studied philosophy under Józef Tischner. He has carried out his own research and published articles in the monthly *Znak*, *Logos i Etos*, and *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* [The Philosophical Quarterly]. He is a co-founder of the Tischner Institute.

*Hope is the mother of the dumb, sister of fools,
those who don't know how
to count their chances*

*aunt of disheveled beautiful souls, who
easily forget every loss*

*cousin of failures who lose
themselves at every turn*

*confidant of madmen who await
miraculous turns of fate*

*Those who stand solidly on their two feet
need no hope*

*they calmly wait for tomorrow to bring them,
without fail, a handful of yesterday's joys.*

For them everything has already come true.

*When they awake in their beds, free
of doubts, the sweetness of the dawn
of the world, which has passed, greets them.*

Hope is not anticipation. However, in practice we are accustomed to using these words interchangeably. Hope is often understood as a less certain form of anticipation, meaning, awaiting an event whose coming is not judged to be entirely certain. When we take up such an anticipating hope we are convinced there is a high probability the event will happen.

We also have a certainty, proper to anticipation, that this event, should it happen, will be an event in time. It will be event incorporated into the chain of other events that are formed by time. Hope as anticipation is not only directed by a simple intention of fulfillment, but it is also aided by a desire for what is anticipated to factually take place. When we hope we actually anticipate weakly, but we aid ourselves with a desire that our anticipations will be fulfilled. This empowering desire has to, as it were, equalize the risk of non-fulfillment, which casts its shadow on this type of hope. When we desire something to be accomplished, in a certain sense we exercise the will to influence the flow of events, counting that the course of future events might depend upon the intensity of our desire. Thus, we could call such hope: the desire for the fulfillment of an anticipated event within quotidian time.

On the other hand, there is also anticipation of the kind which is conscious from the start that the object of its anticipating might not at all be fulfilled within time. These types of anticipation break out of the realm of the quotidian, because they allow the possibility of non-fulfillment, meaning, they allow for a type of time different from what we know from our past, which usually marks out the temporal norm for our future. Something that we anticipate might not occur and such an eventuality is taken seriously into consideration. All the same, this type of anticipation is also called hope. Even though the object of this type of anticipation has a chance of being fulfilled, and it might even be very likely that it will happen, there always remains a real margin of possible non-fulfillment. This distinction, of which we are aware even on the level of ordinary reasoning, marks out the proper difference between hope and anticipation, which puts them on two opposite poles of human experience. The hope we are addressing here is entirely unlike anticipation.

Within the perspective proposed here, hope is an opening that does not spread out like a horizon; it rather changes everything we have had before our eyes until now. That is, hope opens up the proper dimension of the future. Entirely unlike anticipation, which allows us to expect the continuation of time, hope opens up a future that might yet be filled up with time, but for which there is no guarantee.

Thus, something more than just time past is at stake here. That which has been until now, the uniform world of everydayness, can still endure in its form of anticipations permanently fulfilling themselves, but its meaning undergoes an important shift. The world of everydayness takes on the meaning of a place that one leaves, a place constitutes

a springboard for a jump into the dimension of the unknown. The past²³¹ realized in the everyday can be a reading of the future which does not need to be its simple, temporal continuation.

The past fulfilling itself in the ordinary human “now,” will allow the future to unfold before us as the extraordinary. The past, in a certain sense, will enter into the dimension of the future; then it will become that which “now” remains behind, and thus what is seen from this qualitatively new perspective of the future will show itself as ultimately finished and exhausted. The future does not guarantee a continuation of time.

The continuity of time is a matter of what has passed. That which eventually might occur in the future can also fall into this continuity of time as that which will pass next. *Ipsa facto* the future also contains within itself the same possibilities as time past. However, this is just one of many possibilities. The future opened up by hope in its innermost core is something other than time, at the very least it is other than time in the sense we defined when speaking of the everyday.

Certainty and Trust

When anticipating in the everyday we have the certainty that the object of anticipation will fulfill itself in temporal everydayness. With the advent of hope this basic law which regulates the flow of time is disrupted at its foundation. The dimension of the future opened up by hope lies beyond the reach of ordinary anticipating, thus the principle of certain fulfillment of intentions cannot touch it. The future is unexpected and that is why it is also uncertain.

It is a certain kind of unknown, both in its temporal character and in its relation to the temporal in general. It can show itself as not only different from the everyday, thus different from that which has already happened in time, but also different from all predictable temporality; it might show itself to be completely atemporal. Hope, by giving us access to the dimension of the future, introduces the hitherto unknown element of radical risk into the human world.

The future is an unknown that slips through our mind’s certainties, which are rooted in the memory of time past. From now on man will have the impression of encroaching upon foreign terrain, to a place totally different from his ordinary dwelling in time. This kind of future is unknown, because nothing in the memory correlates to it. Everything that has happened until now always took on the final form of everydayness, of a chain of mutually tied moments of time called instants. There are no gaps within the continuum of everyday time, nothing is missing. A future which is not the object of ordinary anticipation does not fit into such a perspective, because it threatens to disrupt this time-continuum, it brings into this order the peril of chaos.

Granted, the future opened up by hope, despite everything, does not drag on its coattails a catastrophe of the world of everydayness, but it can

²³² bear witness to a deep disposition of man to live in hope, and at the same time it shows that the future which goes beyond the project of everyday time is the hidden property of human existence. This does not negate the truth that man is capable of living his life in the world of everydayness without ever facing a future opened up by hope. His hope can remain an unrevealed disposition screened by the anticipation of certain things.

The future which breaks down the feeling of certainty produced by anticipation has a point of contact within the everyday thanks to *trust*. This is because hope, by opening up such a future, simultaneously awakens trust in it. Man, standing face to face with the unknown which has never appeared within the world of the everyday, does not fall into despair, nor is he paralyzed by fear of it.

Quite the contrary, his life continues in the ordinary world given over to the same law of passing. Yet, only now does the possibility of a real risk awaken which an uncertain future places before him. What can happen will no longer be a repetition of a known past, its inevitable reminiscence, instead it can bring totally new things, different from those that came before, unpredictable, which cannot be expected at all. Despite this risk and with full consciousness of it, the man who has hope has trust in the future.

Above all, this trust depends upon the conviction that everything that the future can bring, everything it might bring, in the final balance *will not turn against man*. It is also a conviction that the world of the everyday is not an illusion, which must disappear in the face of something different, rather it will survive every trail of the future in some form that is difficult to imagine.

To put it another way, within this conviction the temporal character of the future is at stake, meaning, that the future will become a significant fragment of an individual human time, even if it will not be the domesticated time of everydayness. In trust man trusts time, he trusts that the unknown future will be his future, that it will be a different dimension of the same time which he has known until now in the form of the past and present.

Trust which also takes place in the present is a kind of buckle that joins the everyday with the newly-opened dimension of the future. It includes the future in a certain synthesis of time, three-dimensional time which cannot be pictured as a flowing stream. This kind of time is the background which is difficult to describe, upon which this flowing occurs and thanks to which everydayness can be experienced as a flowing and passing.

Hope opens up a future worthy of trust

The “future” which we experienced in the world of the everyday could only depend on the certainty of that which has already happened and preserved itself in our memory. Only hope allows us to really throw aside

the whole ballast of the past. It seems that the future opened up by hope ²³³ is somehow valuable to man and hides within itself some kind of as-yet unrecognized meaning.

Man trusts something he does not yet know, nor can expect, he trusts that what will happen will not turn against him; on the contrary, he trusts that he will find himself within it. Hope pushes him into the future without promising any concrete events. It makes his anchoring within everydayness more and more doubtful, while the character of his temporal existence increasingly finds itself within the metaphor of a wayfaring toward the unknown. The future demands him to leave the everyday not in the sense of changing his form of existence, nor does it demand him to live a different life. Notwithstanding, the opening up of his future beyond his previous horizon already factually signifies a movement beyond everydayness. When man has hope, when he carries within himself a hidden disposition to have hope, man always already belongs to the future.

What has been circumscribes a world given to man, one which he somehow encounters. That which will be and what might be constitutes a kind of calling which he answers. It is as if the future is provoked by a person who has hope, through trust it undergoes a kind of assimilation and becomes human time, a new dimension of human time, which is a qualitatively new way of experiencing time. Perhaps man must mature into his own future. Perhaps an anchored dwelling in everydayness is necessary in order to begin this journey into the unknown without any certainty of fulfilling anticipations.

Perhaps hope comes in a moment of maturing into accepting the unexpected, of accepting that *anything can happen*. Perhaps the future, as a dimension of time, does not move closer to us at all, but it is we who step out to meet it and through that movement of forever stepping forward we awaken within ourselves the conviction that time flows toward us, bringing ever-new, often surprising, things. Perhaps the future consists of man moving his own time into the dimension of the unknown. Perhaps the future becomes a dimension of time through the fact that temporally conditioned man is present in regions which are not subject to the laws of time.

When man abandons his everydayness he takes his time with him, which he seemingly shifts into a non-temporal future. In some measure, through this move, he temporalizes that which initially did not fall under any norm of time. In this instance hope gives him a trust that the time he takes with him will endure every confrontation with the unknown and the other; what's more, that this unknown and other can be seen with the human eye and lived within the changeable human body. Within this perspective we should conclude that the future becomes the future of man, becomes the measure of human time through this temporalization, through man's presence encroaching into what is beyond the horizon of everydayness.

The man who hitherto lived in everydayness now, in some sense, takes his everydayness on a trek. All that he will encounter which is new and different along the way he will attempt to see through the time of the everyday that is familiar to him. Even this shows his trust in the future, because he always seriously considers this possibility of looking at the future through time, he expects the future in a way that is analogous to waiting for an event in time.

He assumes that the future will be intertwined in a substantial relation with his everydayness, and also that everydayness will endure every trial to which time itself can be submitted. Therefore his trust in the future is also a trust in time and an ultimate trust in himself as a temporal being. Hope finds footing in man which is his conviction, newly awakened, that he is capable of temporalizing the unknown future without regarding what it will factually turn out to be.

The man who has hope recognizes an innate tendency to confront the unknown within himself. This tendency depends upon including the future in the structure of three-dimensional time by assimilating the element of the unexpected. The unexpected must become part of one time along with the certainty of anticipation and the uniformity of passing. Human time in light of the future is no longer just the measured and regulated flow of moments.

The future, as the outcome of every confrontation with the unknown, brings into our representation of time a second, totally new, dynamic, directed, so to say, against the current of the stream. To put it more simply, time, in order to be able to flow, must first, like a spring of water, break out of its source. The confrontation of time-bound man with the unknown is precisely this kind of beating source of the beginning of time.

The human tendency to confront the unknown is also in this sense a disposition to commence time. Three-dimensional time, if we can still call it that, begins and flows from a source in the future toward what once was and remains in the memory.

This movement is an exact reversal of the usual direction we ascribe to time, which is usually turned toward the future. At first glance this direction would also seem to disagree with what has already been said about moving out of everydayness and moving it beyond its horizons. Temporal originariness of the future comes from man’s crossing the line of the horizon, which actuates time’s flow, as if his daring and decisive step actuates the movement of an avalanche. Time is born within the unknown.

Let’s repeat once more: hope does not anticipate the future, but it allows one to trust that the future will be temporal, or more precisely, that the future will “be” at all, that it will happen. Trust of the future is a trust in this eventfulness, of that “will be.” Trust appears in a situation when the possibility of “not-being” also opens up, the possibility of something other than time.

Thus, it is a trust despite endangerment, or against endangerment.²³⁵ The man facing a situation that endangers his time by the opening up of the future need not look for some new basis of trusting time, because this trust is born within him along with hope. The disposition to awaken the time of the future depends upon this. He enters into the unknown with the experience of the everyday world, and through hope he brings to life the temporality of the future, or to put it another way, he gives a temporal shape to that “will be.”

When saying “the future will be,” using the very “to be” in the mode that predicates the future tense, we express the whole risk tied to the future, the risk which was absent in the intentional anticipations of the everyday. The phrase “will be” also contains an emphasis upon a “nevertheless,” yet it also unveils the many surrounding possibilities of “will not be.” We should underscore that the threat of the possibility of “not being” concerns the world of everydayness, which in the act of future time forming is, so to say, circumvented.

This threat remains in play so long as we are still tied to the everyday. This is because feeling the threat is a reaction to our persistent attachment to everydayness. The more decidedly a person abandons the everyday dimension, the easier it is for him to trust the future and see it as the possibility of “will be,” rather than the threat of various “will not bes.”

Hope leads man from the element of passing, that is, from the element of engagement, into the flow of time, into the element of a new temporalizing, the element of communing with the source of time. These elements co-constitute the specific nature of human existence. This is why we should understand the experience of time much more broadly than we can within the universally accepted metaphor of a flowing river.

Man, in principle, cannot avert shocks. When we have hope, we immediately find ourselves in the situation of an outsider. The potential evassion, any retreat back into the world of everydayness is not a matter of free choice, it can only take place as the *event of losing hope*. Things are this way, because hope changes the temporal surroundings of man and make it so that his proper point of reference is the future lying beyond the horizon of everydayness. The future shows itself to be the dimension to which his whole existence was orientated, even when he lived in the world of the everyday without any other perspective of time outside of actual passing.

Hope puts human time on trial. Within this trial the future forms itself as a new dimension. The unknown is encompassed by the horizon of time. However, within this horizon the possibility of time’s end also appears. In a certain sense hope always takes this possibility into consideration. The end of time is not some extraordinary fact that unhappily concerns man.

It is an element of his human condition, the condition of a being exposed to passing. Man always stands facing the end, but only hope puts this right in front of his eyes. When man has hope he seriously

236 accepts this perspective as his own. Remaining within this necessary tie with time, man simultaneously stands face to face with the possibility of time ending, and he also faces the possibility of some kind of atemporality.

Even when after a confrontation with the unknown time is restored, that is, when the future is forming, they maintain continuity with everyday time; therefore the perspective of time ending is in no way overcome. Hope does not allow us to forget this perspective. Perhaps as a result of hope weakening, or its gradual loss, the future likens itself to everydayness, which, like the passing of the present, has no end at all. Such a future, deprived of the possibility of time's end, loses its own original specificity of a separate dimension of time and falls under the reign of the past.

From this we can conclude that the human future cannot be deprived of the tension of confrontation. Hope puts the whole person at risk. Future time is born from this substantial uncertainty and risk. When we confront the awakening of the future we always stand facing the beginning of our time. Time, in all of its dimensions, fully occurs in front of man, in his presence and his participation. When we are exposed to the unknown, taking up the risk, time's further impossibility, we become ourselves. This is the secret of the future, which constitutes a qualitatively different aspect of time, and which cannot be reduced to a measured passing of moments and an unnoticeable aging within everydayness.

Readiness for Everything

When we go further down this road we note that hope unveils within us a readiness to stand within a completely new and uncommon situation. A jolting out of a situation of everydayness does not cause a substantial change in man himself. This might point to the fact that man somehow belongs to the future, that hope just allows him to finally really understand this anterior belonging to the future. Man rediscovers himself as the same living being in the situation of being faced with an unknown future, even though such a situation never takes place in everydayness. It moves beyond the threshold of ordinariness with significant competence, even though everydayness never gave him any occasion to gain it. In a certain sense hope reveals him to be a restless wanderer posing as a resident of a stable world.

The things that are impossible from the perspective of ordinary anticipation becomes possible in a different mode within the world of hope. Within hope there is the possibility of a timeless time. It is possible to endure in a situation of a radical uncertainty. Hope, by taking away certainty, grants trust. An authentic future opens up only when, despite the impossibility of tomorrow, you trust time. With hope, man perceives the possibility of time beyond everydayness. He also perceives a chance for

himself beyond time marked by everydayness. He ultimately discovers ²³⁷ this chance within himself.

Hope whispers that what can be is not certain at all, but thanks to the fact that it can be at all, it can occur in time, it is worthy of trust. The future as the field of such possibilities is the place of the continual birth of time. The unexpected is embraced within the human sense of time, and it is readied to be filled out with time. In this way a proper sense of the future opens up before man, as yet totally unknown, but possible as human time, as the third, qualitatively different, dimension of time.

The future is entirely different from the present and past, it is a different quality within the frame of one conception of time. This crucial difference depends not only upon continuing the structure of passing, but rather upon opening up the possibility of atemporality, i.e. something that never becomes time, something that the temporal synthesis cannot encompass. Hope always takes this possibility into consideration.

Atemporality is not foreign to man, even though man possesses no positive knowledge of it, nor has he ever, in a palpable sense within worldly life, experienced it. Atemporality, which nevertheless must signal control over the fact of one's own death, is at the very least assimilated in a certain way to the human world when the proper dimension of the future opens up before man.

Hope, which gives us the future, should not be understood only as a time-forming instinct, because its job does not end with the opening up of the closed horizon of everydayness. Every hope signals a transcendence of time in general, when time is understood as a synthesis of the three dimensions.

Hope, as if an afterthought, makes way for the forming dimension of the future. Above all, its gaze is turned toward the invisible depth of atemporality, or to put it another way, hope gazes into *eternity*. It gives man the future as a foretaste of eternity, by moving man out of the everyday world. In this way hope moves above the beginning of time, reaching for the immeasurability out of which which time flows.

This is a kind of piercing through time. Hope follows the steps of anticipation, dissolving the moment of anticipation's fulfillment so there comes about a place for future time; furthermore, it pierces through the beginning of time and reaches into atemporality. Perhaps the already-mentioned synthesis of time is only possible because man is conscious of the nearness of eternity, is conscious of touching that which remains beyond the control of his time.

The element of madness and irrationality contained within hope is often the focus of our attention. "Hope is the mother of the stupid," as the Polish proverb goes. It happens that sometimes it stands in actual opposition to sound reason and the logic of concrete anticipations. Within the world of the everyday it is a foreign power that threatens order. Everydayness does not leave a free field of play, it hermetically seals all aspects

238 of reality. Hope is capable of turning this world upside down, because it shows the boundless free fields which nothing can fill up.

The future opened up with hope does not fit into linear representation. It is not a simple extension of the past and present. Within it time is just beginning; in a certain sense, there rages a battle for its possibility. This is because future time forms itself within the collision between trust and uncertainty. Trust, in a certain sense, receives for both time and man some crumbs of eternity that are inaccessible to anticipation. When man reaches the horizon of everydayness, in a natural way and without hesitation he takes a step toward the unexpected, all the while trusting, despite absolute uncertainty. This stepping toward transcending the time of everydayness can also be called the future.

By making man face eternity, hope does not directly give him new time, instead at first it takes away his time. It also takes away his comfort of safely dwelling by shaking his ordered world to its roots and by awakening within him the dormant passion of the wanderer. On the other hand, it is thanks to hope that man gains for time and for himself, as a temporal being, something of eternity itself. By crossing over the horizon of time, not only does he not lose anything of his character as a temporal being, on the contrary, in this unique way he takes his time-making habit into regions where there is no time. We can thus say that by entering the unknown, man humanizes eternity through his attempts to temporalize it. This finds its reflection in the well-known understanding of eternity as a “permanent now,” of time arrested and immobile. Here eternity as seen a specific state of everydayness, as the uninterrupted occurrence of the same now, the occurrence of a moment that drags no past behind it. This example is a testament to just such an attempt to create a temporal order right in the middle of the atemporal. The horizon of everyday time is something like the furthest frontier from which man can look at the infinity of atemporality with his space-time determined gaze.

This does not mean that the horizon of everyday time is somehow shifted. The future will never fall into this horizon, it will never really become everydayness. It is specific in that it provides energy to sustain the movement of the flow, but it does not participate in the flow itself. The future is like a spring of time that emerges from eternity, discovered, and at the same time pushed forth by the act of transcending the time of everydayness and encroaching upon the infinity of eternity. This is the future that hope opens up. It is a future that surges out toward eternity and seemingly leaves behind itself a free field for possible time which man can enter without concern.

In a certain sense hope is also a distant, attentive gaze, which sets our field of vision to the things which will soonest take place. Time is born in direct proximity to man’s presence. The future in this sense is very close, you can almost reach out your hand and touch it, it is that which can always happen in just a moment, further on, it can take on the form

of the passing of moments. Therefore it is a dimension of time which in every moment can fill up with anticipations, and as ready time it can fall into the form of everydayness. This transformation into time will signal that the future has already become the present. ²³⁹

Hope outpaces all intuitions of time. Its constant referent is the atemporal infinity of eternity. By opening up man onto the future, it opens him up to eternity, and in some sense it also show him that eternity is not foreign to him. Only when we have hope can we fully understand the essence of temporality, only then can we understand the continuity of time's three dimensions and the way in which the future comes alive. It becomes apparent that human time depends upon this diachrony of hope that joins within itself time and atemporal eternity.

Nothingness

We say that hope leads us, that it directs us. We have used the phrase "hope leads one out of everydayness," in a similar sense above. It points to an important aspect of the dynamics or the motives of activity. Hope causes man to move from where he stands, convinces him that he is capable of taking every risk. When he loses hope, or when hope leaves man, activity withers away.

Man returns to his previous state and he feels a loss of motivation to act. When hope is lost, so is the future perspective, which leads to a kind of regression into everydayness and again a surrendering to the laws of time passing. A man deprived of hope falls back into the uniformity of time passing, he loses sight of the moment when time begins. Time once again becomes for him a homogeneous environment that fills up the whole world, right to the horizon. The location of lost hope is once again taken over by anticipating that which has already been.

It seems that a simple and easy return to the world of everydayness is not possible. Hope leaves a lasting mark on man. After all, the confrontation with the unknown of the future is lodged deeply in his memory and continually returns in the form of thoughts about the boundaries of time. It is impossible to remove this substantial disturbance that came as a side-effect of undermining the foundations of time understood as stable and regular change. The unclear idea of eternity tore right into the middle of the temporality, and can only be expelled by a feeling of *nothingness* that decays time.

Nothingness, to which we cannot relate, which does not allow us to make way for the future; it becomes a real trap for the man that falls into it. It destroys the whole order of everydayness, does not allow man to return to a quiet life. The breakdown of hope, the sudden loss of contact with the atemporal, causes man to be directly threatened by nothingness, thrown into a defensive stance. To save his temporal existence he can refer to the structure of passing as something constant in time.

The nearness of time's beginning cannot be regained in this way. Nor can distance toward everydayness be gained in this way either, because it can only be ensured by hope. Without hope, only the horizon of everydayness can be encountered, nothing else. When we say that the place of the unknown of the future is taken over by nothingness, we do not point to any positive character of nothingness. Nothingness signals an emptiness that cannot be filled up with the unexpected or the unknown; consequently, it points toward the emptiness of an impossible future.

This is tied in a peculiar way to the fact that, without hope, man has no trust in time beyond the horizon of everydayness. A future without hope can only be the trace of a lost trust—only an empty intention of anticipating, a lack in which one searches in vain for symptoms of a squandered fulfillment, an absence which does not point to any previous presence.

Nothingness also signals a loss of the freedom hope gave to man. By opening up the future before man, hope freed him from everyday time; it simultaneously gave him the freedom of relating to the open infinity of the atemporal. Therefore we can speak of a loss of freedom here, which once was found both in the sense of liberation and in the sense of free action. After hope is lost, everydayness can only be a wasteland, never chosen, a sad necessity of existing and passing. So long as man remembers hope's different type of time, he will be bothered by the hollow emptiness of nothingness.

A final return to everydayness must then signal a forgetting, a reduction of memory. It indeed does seem that such a return to everydayness, a lasting loss of hope, totally locking oneself up in the past, is always possible. After all, man is capable of forgetting, he can cast away disturbing memories, cover the tracks of memory. This is a survival capability when hope is lost, and a natural defense against despair. Forgetting hope distances man from the danger of nothingness and allows him to regain a feeling of safety and dwelling within the world.

Nothingness is in tension with hope, such that whenever hope weakens, nothingness starts to creep into the space opened up by the retreat of hope, but when hope totally disappears, then nothingness also disappears. We could say that nothingness feeds upon hope and when it achieves its goal of destroying hope, then it shows itself to be *nothing*, an emptiness without meaning. It is as if it hides behind the horizon, which remains totally inaccessible to man without hope.

Hopelessness

When man attempts to find himself upon returning to everydayness, he involuntarily introduces into this order something of the future, which the hope he lost opened up to him. This is because he awaits the "unawaitable" precisely in the same way that you wait for regular events that happen in everydayness. To put it another way, he tries to regain access to the

atemporal without hope participating in the process. He does not fall into illusion, because these attempts are accompanied by a full consciousness of the impossibility of achieving this goal. ²⁴¹

So it is anticipating the unanticipatable with full consciousness that cannot be accomplished. These attempts are seemingly taken up against oneself, against sound judgment, which tries to tell one to come to terms with the loss, and acknowledge that hope is not at one's free disposition. Hopelessness is marked by this twofold drama. On the one hand, it is marked by the affliction of hope lost, on the other, with the desperation of a consciousness acting against itself. Powerlessness after a loss comes into play along with helplessness toward oneself, toward one's existence which was derailed from the everydayness of being, where one no longer recognizes everydayness as one's world and cannot come to terms with it.

When we say that "things are hopeless" we have in mind a certain state of suspension between the future opened up by hope which was recently lost, and everydayness to which we cannot return. Man struggles with himself, unable to escape from this stagnation right in the middle of time.

Thus, hopelessness is the inability to see any options that might change the situation. The attempt to regain the future without hope failed. The will, by definition unconstrained by anything, simply has nothing to desire, surrounded by an aura of impossibility, it ceases to desire anything. Time goes by, but man does not participate in it, does not experience it, because he is overtaken by the painful remembrance of loss. Man is incapable of dealing with this remembrance, and to some degree it paralyzes him, thereby taking away his ability to see things normally. In hopelessness he surrenders to the influence of powers of which he knows nothing, because he lacks the ability to direct himself.

One should not stay in a state of hopelessness for too long. This is because whatever happens within it is a matter of chance. Whether he will find himself again in everydayness, or fall into despair or melancholy, or whether he will regain hope somehow, will not depend upon him. Yet, at least he seems to be fully aware of this randomness.

Despair

We say that man falls into despair. This might suggest that despair is some kind of trap that one can always fall into without knowing about its existence. Man only reflects when he sinks into despair, falling every deeper into its bottomless abyss.

Despair is not a simple opposite of hope as we are wont to think; however, there is no place for despair in the world of hope. Loss of hope is not a straight path to despair, yet it does expose man directly to its danger. Despair means a reversal of order, turning everything topsy-turvy.¹ The

¹ The Polish etymology of the word "despair" is tied with the core meaning of "opak" the Polish word for "topsy-turvy," that is: in opposition, inversely, back. The word "opak" in

²⁴² world of hope, opened up to the dimension of unexpected atemporality, shrinks under the influence of despair and transforms itself into a space of ruined everydayness. Despair looks upon a world submerged in chaos, empty, with no place for man. It is as if nothingness takes on the shape of reality in the progressive process of annihilation. The human world collapses and disappears. Man disappears with it. His presence undergoes some kind of incomprehensible levelling.

When compared with hopelessness, despair is much more intense, marked with a madness that is starting to materialize. The memory of a lost hope and the recollection of a world of hope nearly destroys man from the inside like a fatal illness. He cannot free himself from them, cannot forget them, he is somehow compelled to continually reminisce and sink into painful remembrance. Within despair there is also the awareness of a lost battle for hope, of an effort in vain. This leads to greater agony, which pushes man into making new attempts to change this tragic situation.

Man despairs, but he does not inhere in despair. This might signal that the reversal of the world's order is the accomplishment of man alone; despair does not drag him into a trap with no exit, rather he himself, through his aggressive action, sinks into despair, he rolls down a slope. The despairing man is deprived of any points of reference whatsoever. His world is suspended in a vacuum. He is totally surrounded by nothingness.

Living with the memory of a loss and continually recollecting the past, he sinks in a vain repetition of the present moment. The continual recollecting of his loss of hope becomes the content of his everydayness. His time does not flow or pass, instead it stubbornly returns, he reels ever more rapidly into his circling. He is tortured by the void—the progressive disappearance of presence. Man defends himself against a final crisis through this recollecting, in a way deluding himself that this can help him regain what he has lost. However, he is not capable of noticing that the trap he finds himself in hinges on this precisely. Through recollecting, he only strengthens the process of negation, when endangered he grasps at memories. The shrinking horizon limits his life-space. The world slowly collapses through the power of gravitation directed toward the interior.

Despair hides within itself a substantial duality. On the one hand, there is the feeling of loss that fulfills itself without the participation of the will, and a feeling of misfortune, abandonment, without any cause; on the other hand, there is the conscious activity of man which causes this fatal process of sinking into despair. Man despairs after losing hope, but his despair at the same time distances him from hope and closes his access to it. The path of return to the world of everydayness is also cut off.

Admittedly, it also happens that man attempts to devote himself to a normal life, he returns to an ordinary rhythm of time flowing.

the sense of inverse also had the meaning of "repetition." Cf. A. Bruckner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* [Etymological Dictionary of the Polish Language], Warsaw 1993, pp. 380 & 465.

But his despair will continually remind him, and behind the facade ²⁴³ of this apparent stabilization the destructive battle with oneself will continue. Everydayness will mask within itself the conflict of elements. Man, while eating his daily bread, will irreversibly continue sinking into despair.

Normal living within the world is no longer possible for him, it will not become the path of an effective escape. It can only be a pretense, an ersatz stabilization, because his real struggle in which he will be always fully engaged as a person, is taking place in a different region of his soul. The flowing time of everydayness is not his time. His time is the present of remembrance. It seems that it is impossible to get out of despair using one's own powers. Some kind of event is needed, some intervention to break the movement of this vicious circle.

The distinction presented here between hopelessness and despair is supposed to show the subtle boundary separating the sphere of possibility and impossibility of regaining a normal world and everyday time.

When this boundary is crossed there are no alternatives left in man's disposition. In the state of hopelessness, when consciousness of lost hope is still too fresh to subject it to the reflection that gets the process of recollecting going, forgetting and returning to normalcy, to the world of indifference toward the unexpected, is still possible.

Man can forget all that knocked him out of everydayness, can still act as if nothing really happened; he can also maintain this distant memory, which nevertheless loses its primordial importance. When the boundary is crossed, when passive hopelessness becomes the act of despair, the everyday world ceases to matter at all to man. The uniform passage of time no longer is possible for him. In a certain sense, the touch of hope and the experience of the dimension of eternity was deep enough that the person was permanently cut off from his initial environment. Rescue from despair, wherever it comes from, must lead to a renewed awakening of hope within him. Hope must again live in his heart. His time must again become three-dimensional time, whose source beats in the future. Man must again have free access to this spring.

Melancholy

In melancholy it is as if man stands across time, which no longer flows for him, he remains within the present moment, deprived of the past and with no springboard into the future. The man deprived not only of hope, but also ordinary anticipations attempts to wait something out, but he does not know anything about what he has to wait out.

His life plays out within the tight fissure of the present and the memory of a loss, between nostalgia and everydayness, between the lost future and the past which cannot possibly be repeated. Much like in the state of hopelessness and the state of despair, what was lost remains in man as an unbearable memory, and simultaneously as a dramatic aware-

244 ness of the impossible, which does not allow one to simply find himself in the world of the everyday.

The lost hope has caused something like a depreciation of this world. In melancholy it seems totally worthless, or even unattainable for a person living in this altered and unreal state. When he lived in hope, he directed himself toward the atemporal. When this point of orientation disappeared, he inevitably had to go astray. Here is the source of the sadness and depression associated with melancholy, but also that sickly, paralyzing nostalgia after the lost measure of things.

Man does not anticipate anything, nor does he expect anything. He is aware that for him no tomorrow exists; instead he is condemned to an incessant “now” that oppresses him. This awakens doubt in him, whose essence is doubt of time and of oneself; doubt which takes the place formerly occupied by the trust in the future that hope used to give. Doubting does not push him into activity, as was the case with despair; on the contrary, he falls into apathy, into total immobility. Doubly knocked out of time and eternity, with which he permanently marks out a boundary that is impossible to grasp, which at the same time constitutes the line of a horizon that cannot be crossed in any direction. The man caught in a trap of this peculiar gravitation can only move through the power of inertia like some kind of heavenly body along its necessary and unchangeable orbit.

It seems that not only loss of hope can make man melancholy. In reality every substantial shock that throws us off the tracks of a normal life in everydayness can become the foundation for melancholy. This is especially the case in situations that endanger our lives, experiences of death easily awaken man’s awareness of the impossibility of living in an everyday world. The shock that man experiences is doubtless based upon his sudden relocation vis-a-vis the atemporal dimension.

It is like a brief touch of eternity, which only leaves behind the impression of the incommensurability of everything that has happened up to that moment. Man does not lose hope immediately, nor the perspective of facing and entering eternity. Yet, everyday time and the whole past somehow close behind him. He is held captive in the present moment when he succumbs to the shock and lingers in it. Melancholy is thus also an expression of a certain awkwardness of man deprived in time and in passing, but also the expression of an exile from everydayness, the lostness of an outcast who cannot rest anywhere, who has been deprived of time, of his own time.

Much like in the case of hopelessness, an escape from melancholy is possible both through forgetting about hope and through rejecting that experience of atemporality because of a tragic shock. Another way out is also possible, through regaining the former hope. The return to everydayness, on the other hand, seems to be only possible through forgetting. The return to atemporality is the only path of redemption. However, melancholy can lead man into despair, thus he can pass into a state of active conflict with himself.

Melancholy, unlike despair, is a passive enduring in suspension. It ²⁴⁵ is also described as sadness and depression. Whereas despair signals a fatal continual acting, melancholy is an existential apathy, an immobility which moves into getting used to and picking up the habit of being in such suspension. We do not expect any change when we are in melancholy. It must be survived in itself. Man does not feel actively pressed to fight it. In a certain sense, he is disarmed and made drowsy by it. Man needs a force to come from the outside to rescue him.

Despair and melancholy can lead a person to suicide. Whereas in the instance of despair suicide is an act of final desperation, in melancholy it is most likely the effect of rational calculation. The person stuck in melancholy needs a rational motive and backing in a certain logic. Unlike with despair, the helplessness in dealing with melancholy is not enough to take such a step.

Man must first figure out what constitutes this situation of sickly powerlessness in which he finds himself. Suicide might well be the last movement of activity before he dissolves irrevocably into the sweet non-being of melancholy. This might well be the last gesture of freedom, a final manifestation of the freedom which has been devoured by the deadly disease. It seems that he has no intention of freeing himself from this fatal existential disease by this gesture of achieving something entirely different, no intention of going down the path of some imagined, miraculous rescue. It is a purely pointless act. It is a fact that a liberation from melancholy would require some hope to be awakened in man. At the same time, hope itself signals a departure from melancholy. Opening up to the unexpected is in every instance the liberation of man.

Hope and Death

As we have already mentioned, in everydayness death is anticipated in a specific way. As the final filling out of the past it belongs to the order of ordinary passing. When it becomes the object of anticipations, then it is awaited just like any other even in everyday time. The death at stake here is natural death, tied to the biological constitution of man, and such a death constitutes an element of human everydayness. It is an ordinary event that befalls people, from the point of view of a single individual, it always happens to others; thus it is an event that always takes place somewhere off to the side.

It can actually cause unease, it might be the cause of fear for oneself, it can also, to some degree, bring man closer to that which is beyond time; however, it usually does not concern him directly. Man fundamentally agrees to this order of things objectively endangered by death. The world of everydayness thus presupposes the acceptance of death. Death is not a substantial problem of everydayness, and thus it does not become the focus of evaluating reflection. In some sense, everydayness is simply indifferent to the fact of death. Death does not destroy the stable order of

246 time, because death is an event after which time, for all its observers and witnesses, continues to flow.

Moreover, it is the conviction of those who are exposed to the danger of death, the continuation of everyday time after their death somehow falls within the range of their expectations. It is comprehended as a temporal event which contains the necessity of the further extension of the same time. Perhaps this is the origin of our representations of death as a passage into a different reality, a reality circumscribed by the same, continually flowing, time, or as a certain formal transformation of matter, after which man still maintains his deep temporal structure. From this perspective even after our death “things will fall into place,” everything will have its further continuation.

On the other hand we should note that within the world of everydayness, man possesses a clear intuition of non-existence. After all, he realizes that before he came to be, time flowed on.

The past, fulfilling itself in everydayness, leads down a straight path to the unavoidable finale, to the exhaustion of the existential sequence, into which is written the basic motif of passing being. The human being is a kind of cumulation of time, as a supply of contents in the process of appearing and fulfilling the past, and succumbs to a gradual exhaustion. In this sense the whole of man’s everyday life is contained within the nucleus of the past.

Man, by living within everydayness, realizes his own past, he actually lives through the time of the past directed at its ultimate fulfillment through death. This kind of death is the closest to man, it is so close to him that it does not rouse any instinctive opposition, because it belongs to the essence of his humanity. He lives in everydayness and acts as if death did not exist, as if his hasty engagement in passing had no meaning whatsoever for him.

Perhaps this is the most important in all of this: death in everydayness has no particular meaning, it is neither the object of intellectual inquiry nor the source of considerable life dilemmas. It is an indifferent occurrence that strictly belongs to the order of passing. Man carries his own death within himself, just as he carries his joys and sufferings. He finds himself in dying just as he finds himself when he experiences joys or sufferings. In dying man remains himself to the end, as if he has always already possessed the disposition to *be a human being in his own dying*.

Yet it is possible to await one’s own death as a liberation. In a situation of senseless and unbearable suffering, death might be anticipated as the only rescue, as the only exit from the trap of time. It seems that then the object of anticipation is the temporal event of death, which will transform this state of helplessness into a non-temporality free of pain.

Anticipating relief and the end of pain must, after all, be related in some way to what will occur after death, i.e. toward some kind of non-being, toward some type of nothingness. The relief from suffering achieved through cutting off life can be thought and imagined only from

an external perspective that is beyond time, from within another time and another everydayness which is no longer present in us. We thus anticipate an event that will carry us into the blessedness of a non-temporal existence or non-existence in time, which will restore the harmony of passing undisturbed by the screams of the dying, while it will allow those who died to rest after the pains of dying in an eternal everydayness. ²⁴⁷

Death as a rescue from that terror of the present which makes other dimensions of time impossible, fits into time, it is the final event in time that we can anticipate. However, when we anticipate death the intention of our anticipating reaches beyond death itself, it reaches ideal time, toward an ideal present without suffering and death, where we will be able to carry on our lives undisturbed. Thus, we again await everydayness.

In the world of hope the perspective of human life is shifted beyond the horizon of everyday passing. When we stand facing eternity, in open confrontation with the atemporal, we not only leave everydayness behind, we also immediately gain distance from the future which is opening up for us. The source of time, springing out of a tight crevice, in a place where everydayness rubs up against the atemporal, is in a certain sense at the disposition of man.

It is as if time comes to be right before his eyes, in his direct presence. Hope carries man above his own time without depriving him of his anchoring within it. We can say that hope is a sudden raising of the spirit which recognizes its own region as being beyond everydayness. We must underscore that hope does not anticipate anything, does not mark out any goals that need to be achieved. It only opens up man to atemporality, to eternity, which, as it becomes apparent, is not all that alien. The future is a kind of side-effect of this crucial opening.

Here we could risk saying that the future is the result of introducing into this unknown and atemporal space some grain of human ordinariness, some reminiscence of everyday time. In this sense, the future would be the temporal form of man's entering into a certain eternity, it would be a temporalizing of atemporality, of an atemporality which was seen for the first time by a human gaze and experienced by the whole changeable and passing human existence. This is why we conceive of the future as a displacement, as a leap caused by the movement of encroaching, transcendence, as a dynamic giving the movement of passing its beginning.

The hope we are talking about here, understood in radical opposition to anticipation, to expecting something, meaning, opposed to all different forms of everyday temporality, decidedly looks beyond man's death. Every hope, even the weakest and briefest, aims into a different dimension beyond time. This is why we can say that hope orients man toward atemporality, that it turns his attention away from ordinary events, his own death included.

It gives him a certain kind of signal, often quite weak and hard to recognize, through which it reminds him about himself and awakens within him the conviction of belonging to another world. Hope does not

248 build any expectations, nor does it confirm the certainty of time, but it gives us the *strength to endure events*, which shakes the pillars of the ordinary world, which do not allow us to continue an ordinary life within the world. This also relates to death. Sudden death steals into the everyday world in the form of murder, disease, and catastrophe, and then devastates the whole order of time which man has domesticated.

Hope does not prevent this devastation; on the contrary, it forces its very conclusion in order to more easily bring man across into that other side of time, to help him tear himself away from ordinary things that he depends on like addictions. It thus helps to clear the foreground by taking away man's support in everydayness. It does not destroy all that remains in man's memory as the taste of life in harmony with passing, as a living past. We can only suppose that a man who has hope when facing his own death in all truth will not avoid it; yet his presence beyond the time of everydayness will not be totally obliterated by the end of existence as it accomplishes itself in everydayness. Will hope reveal itself as his salvation?

When we say that hope allows us to endure situations that endanger everydayness we also have in mind protection against despair. After all, every destruction of a world must in the final analysis also touch the person who belongs to that world. The human reaction to the loss of this natural point of departure is despair. Hope can save man from the crisis of despair, even in the ruins of the everyday world. A man protected from despair has the power to endure the worst cataclysms.

It would seem that concrete testimonials of survival in the middle of the hells that modern times have given us might be a confirmation of the thesis that hope gives man an anchoring point that lies somewhere outside the world—the world where the source of the destruction originates. When living within a different dimension of time than this impossible everydayness, man is capable of resisting the attacks of despair which come from the core of a frustrated present. Through this unique communion with eternity, through a relation with the dimension of the atemporal, he maintains a distance toward the whole process of destruction and effectively finds the power to endure. *Hope allows man to face eternity in such a way that even his own death is survivable.*

The proper reference point of hope is not the temporal future at all, nor time, understood as a continuation of a certain "now." It is as if it moves above such a time toward a totally different order that no longer fits into any continuum of homogeneous moments. The opening up of the dimension of the future for man occurs only when we break beyond the temporal horizon. In the same way, death moves above the fact of death conceived as an event in time or, more generally, above the truth about human mortality conceived as temporal passing.

The end of earthly existence, which is always an event in time, actually does not directly concern the man who is led by hope beyond this ordinary time. This obviously in no way changes the fact that three-dimensional time, or time pointed in the direction of the future, depends

upon this essential movement of hope. This is the meaning that allows us ²⁴⁹ to speak of a time-creating function of hope, and when we pay attention to its source deepest inside of man, we are reminded of the time-creating essence of man.

The future is a dimension of time, that is, human time, so long as man has hope. The world of hope is different from the world of everydayness, but there is no radical conflict between them. The future is in the hands of the man who confidently stands facing the atemporal with hope, but he also needs the reference to eternity in order to take time into his grasp, and also in a certain sense to control its passing. To put it another way, hope, by opening him up to something more than time, hands time over to him. It also allows him to confidently face his death, just as he stands facing eternity without concern.

From the perspective of hope, death is not the fundamental threat to man. His real crisis is lack of hope and despair. This is because despair signals the fall of the world of hope, which is of ultimate concern for man. It is not clear whether fear of despair, fear of this kind of adversity, is not also inscribed in hope itself, whether the movement of transcending everydayness, whether the movement of overtaking the temporal event of death is not in the least determined by the feeling of endangerment by despair, whether this confident facing of eternity is not also, or maybe above all, standing face to face with the austere possibility of falling into despair.

The fact is that hope can always be lost, just as with the universal conviction that you have to hold onto hope, because it guides man and allows him to survive the greatest torments. Having hope, man does not fall into despair because of the irreversible necessity of dying, even though he humanly worries about death and feels the greatest anxiety before it. Death, which breaks down the mechanism of the fulfillment of anticipations that lies at the foundations of everydayness, does not touch hope, because it is not within the order of anticipation.

Death foreshadows that some anticipations will no longer be fulfilled, thus it foreshadows the end of the whole chain of anticipations which have built up human time, but at the same time it leaves the unexpected untouched, it leaves eternity untouched. Hope is actually not some deciding solution, it is no exit from the necessity of dying; after all, it does not allow you to simply anticipate something after death, rather it opens up man and it sensitizes his spiritual nerves to the dimension of atemporal eternity.

When man has hope, he does not expect something after death, he has no definite "hope for something." It only gives him *freedom* from the end of his own time. The man experienced in being exposed to the non-temporal no longer fears the end of time, the time which he continually leaves behind. Therefore, hope and death do not meet face to face like two warring sides, fighting to the death.

Instead, they pass each other indifferently like two different worlds temporarily connected through the clamp of human presence. This means that the dying person, who maintains hope till the end, is more than just

250 his dying. The life which ends in everyday time does not at all signify the end of the non-time of the future opened up by hope. It often happens that a person dies maintaining, until the end, a kind of remarkable, untouched vitality; he does not surrender to death while dying, even though he does not anticipate any concrete form of salvation. This might point to the fact that, even though hope is not some cure that brings immortality, it still tears man even in his last moments from a world condemned to extinction. The man who has hope lives in a measure of eternity even in the moment when he is dying in time, when his time is decisively running out. What happens to hope after the temporal death of man, and who knows?

Everydayness Transformed by Hope

Everydayness abides by its own laws. Nothing can happen within it outside of time. The atemporal can in no way be thought within its frames. The everyday is totally packed with events which do not challenge the persistence of the temporal order of the world. Everydayness, as the order of natural passing in which man always feels home, in a sense dulls his sensitivity and pulls him into forgetting about the atemporal, which in fact substantially endangers this order. On the other hand, everydayness also marks man's arranging himself according to time, a kind of symbiosis, in which man gains a naive carefreeness that relieves him of the gravity of being. Being at home marks a kind of co-temporalizing of time. Man, as already mentioned, does not feel compulsion in passing, but instead somehow co-creates his own everydayness with the aid of time.

The man who has hope discovers himself in a transformed everydayness. While living within it, at the same time he participates in something beyond it. The horizon which has been closed up till now has broken and the stream of time which circled in its peripheries has now found a release. Human time, the time of everyday matters, now all of a sudden is flowing toward the unknown, beyond the punctured horizon into the future, which no longer is just the completion of the past.

Thus, hope transforms everydayness, it is as if it liberates time and gives the future to the everyday, but simultaneously it is the man of hope when facing the unexpected who puts time into this new and different form of movement. Everydayness is freed from the past and furthermore from the all-pervasive certainty of fulfillment. Now it serves for moving toward the unknown, it inclines toward the atemporal, and at the same time it opens up access to the future.

This moving away from everydayness and inclining toward atemporal eternity marks the birth of future time. The future begins where the past has been abandoned as a guarantee of time and, in general, the temporality of occurrence is also abandoned. Living in a transformed everydayness we live by the future, and we also constantly break the tie which entangles man with the closed time of what has already passed. It signifies a constant distancing, a rebounding.

Therefore, living in the everyday, one simultaneously lives un-ev-²⁵¹ erydayness, because by anticipating one is no longer totally certain of the fulfillment of one's anticipation. Passing ceases to be the only form of this time. When man is aware of atemporality it is as if he forestalls his own time, and in a certain sense he comes to possess the beginning of time. Therefore this time is not only a time of passing and flowing, but also a beginning, a continuous beginning anew. The perspective of time beginning is written into the stable order of everydayness. Time is born right in front of the man who gazes into eternity, but is at the same time rooted in the everyday world.

Time forestalled by hope thus has its beginning. However, when it is lived from inside of everydayness we must say that it moves toward some kind of conclusion. Therefore, on the one hand time begins in the future, on the other, it has its end in that future. Everydayness without hope, oriented toward living through the present moment, is free from this view of both the beginning and end of time. Its time neither begins nor ends, because all of everydayness is submerged in time.

This is also the reason why the man who lives in the ordinary world asks questions about neither the beginning nor the end. These types of questions are meaningless to him. Substantial reflection upon time can only be awoken when man liberates himself from the control of time. Awareness of the limits signified, above all, by biological death, but also by the experience of time's beginning that comes with hope, are the things that give man the necessary distance for such reflection.

It will always be a balancing act on the verge of eternity and death, of hope and despair. Transformed everydayness, incorporated into the world of hope, loses its neutrality and becomes an equally important fragment of this cosmic drama. The reflexive synthesis gives a dynamic picture of three-dimensional time, in which everydayness also finds its place. In all certainty they cannot be enclosed within the image of a line divided up by a zero-point that marks out the privileged moment of the actual present. The dynamics of each dimension of time are different. Their interweaving is not a simple synthesis of the continuum of moments.

Time pulses, its center of gravity edges toward the side of one of the dimensions, depending on where man himself resides, whether he has hope, whether he falls into despair, whether he is thinking about his past, or whether he lives within his own everydayness. So long as man remains submerged in everydayness, so long as the simple fact of passing constitutes his only environment, so long he is deprived of access to a full access to time, of the sort of time which is a bunching up of various tensions, rather than the uniform and measured tendencies of passing. The time of everydayness transformed by hope does not flow uniformly, instead every time it is born anew each time from the center of uncertainty.

Hope totally changes the character of time's movement. Everydayness merely becomes a point to lean on, from which one can leap, and step forward toward the atemporal. Time seen from the interior of such

252 an altered everydayness in accordance with the image of a flowing river would still flow ahead, but only to the edge of the horizon; after that it would fall in a cascade of moments that separate, thereby losing the uniform structure of a continuum.

Hope does not take away man's everydayness. It is given back to him right after he suddenly was torn away from it. The everydayness which he gets back is no longer the same everydayness, because man no longer is the same man. Breathing in air, eating his daily bread he continuously belongs to the everyday world; however, his living and experiencing of time undergoes a crucial change. After all, his time has opened up to atemporal eternity, the closed horizon of everydayness is broken, the past no longer hermetically seals the whole world, into which the atemporal has broken, the future and the source of time have revealed themselves to man, the beginning of time is taking place right before his eyes. Hope has given man future time.

The time of everydayness undergoes a change, because the way in which man anticipates changes too. His anticipation has lost the primordial certainty of fulfillment, because hope has implanted in him the radical uncertainty of time in general. When man anticipates now, he takes into consideration the strange possibility of non-fulfillment. It is possible that time will no longer flow, it is possible what probably will happen will not be a simple continuation of the same time, it will no longer be of the essence of the past, which as a rule revealed itself to him with every "now."

Transformed anticipations attest to the loosening of their relation to the past. Through these changes a subtle reorienting of human temporality is accomplished toward the future dimension, a dimension which gives time totally different characteristics. Anticipations touched by a symptom of uncertainty do indeed attest to the enduring penetration of the atemporal world, they attest to time's encroaching upon the territory of the atemporal and unexpected.

Anticipations which accomplish themselves in concrete time, and at the same time constitute the basic structure of that time, once penetrated into the open cosmos of atemporality tend to introduce a provisional temporal order within it, and attempt to assimilate it in some way by including it in everydayness.

In this way the future opens up—time which is not entirely certain, but which, as an attempt to gather within a human environment something of eternity, belongs peculiarly to one human temporality.

The future, in spite of our common understanding, is not what will happen, but that which factually can occur, and as possible, it constitutes the object of uncertain anticipating. Thus, it is the possibility of time without a final guarantee, the possibility of a time, which also marks to the same degree the possibility of something other than time. Therefore, the possibility of further fulfillment of the past in the form of everyday time is also here the possibility of non-fulfillment, the possibility of something other than a past that unveils itself. The future is something like a mo-

ment when time suspends itself, which has not flowed yet, but which has ²⁵³ a waiting riverbed down which it can always flow. It is also something like a hidden spring of time, within which some important work is being accomplished before the eruption of the ready form of time.

Hope gives man the *courage to anticipate more*, but this courage can also potentially lead him down the wrong path. This is because when anticipating something more than ordinary fulfillment in time, he might anticipate in the same way as before, that is, by leveling every object of anticipation into the frames of the imperative of certainty of fulfillment. By feeding on hope in this way, man feeds an illusion.

The site of the unexpected is taken over by an illusory object of concrete anticipation. When this happens anticipations based on hope can take on the form of anticipating fantastic and mythical events in time. What lacked courage to become the object of ordinary anticipation takes on real shape within the imagination through hope, and is left to the whims of the gullible intentions of such anticipation. Then hope seems to whisper in man's ear that anything can happen.

The imagination tells him that he can anticipate everything. The unexpected is brought down to the world of everydayness in the form of phantasms, products of the imagination and myth. Hope, morbidly shifted onto such concrete anticipation, will be snuffed out by the hard logic of the way expectations are fulfilled. Then the world opened up to atemporality gradually begins to close, its dimensions start shrinking, only to finally return to the form of an everydayness now filled out with illusory anticipations of an unreal time.

Where Does Hope Come From?

Hope awakens within a man domesticated in the world of everydayness as a certain kind of response in a situation where the further continuation of the time he lives in shows itself to be endangered and uncertain, or even impossible. An event that shakes the order of everydayness, that ruptures the stable structure of anticipation, requires a defensive reaction.

It can equally lead to man's closing himself in the present moment, which gives him the refuge of actual enduring without a future; on the other hand, it can lead him to take a courageous risk and aim for the unknown, for what cannot be anticipated. In the first instance time stops flowing, if it flows, then it flows right by him, without his participation.

Passing time then ceases to be the effect of the cooperation of man with time we have mentioned above. Then man lives "under time," under the current of the flowing river. He protects himself from time by escaping into the hideaway of the present moment, which in practice means he escapes into the past, and the world of his own memory. In the second instance, when the defensive move is hope, man in a way moves into the future, it is as if he lives out of the dimension of the future, thus, he lives at the source of time.

First, he leaves his everydayness behind him like scorched earth that is uninhabitable, soon he returns to it in order to resettle it, to take it over again as a land regained, but this time under new laws. Regained everydayness becomes the place of accepting the unexpected, which within the temporal perspective lacks the attributes of certainty. In this way everydayness becomes the home of a hope deprived of naïve anticipations.

It seems that man is less pushed into the arms of hope which he might discover in a critical moment as a last ditch rescue, than he himself reaches for these dispositions and capabilities, which he has always possessed, even though he was not fully aware of it. The disposition for living in hope is just the ability to endure and exist in the conditions of a world deprived of further temporal perspectives; it is also the ability to be human, if you will, until the very end of time.

Thanks to hope it is possible to live without a future, understood as a time in which anticipations are fulfilled. But at the same time it is only thanks to hope that the future is possible as a separate dimension of human time, a dimension that cannot be reduced to one specific mode of the present or the past. In the measure in which human time depends upon a continuity that must be continually exceeded, in which the atemporal is temporalized, hope is written into its deepest structure.

Human time, three-dimensional time, is the time of memory, experience and hope. The proper future presupposes hope and rests upon it even when, in all of its uniqueness as the other, the irreducible dimension of this same time has not yet been uncovered at all.

One of the crucial moments which decides about the transformation of a human world locked within everyday time is undoubtedly the acquirement of knowledge about one's own individual death. As we have said, everydayness copes with the general fact of death by always relegating it to the dimension of a concrete event, which occurs in time as the contingency of someone else's death. People always die somewhere on the peripheries, their finite lives fall into the past, remembered by us as the time which has passed, and after which many other things happened.

Recollections of the dead arrange themselves into a history of an everydayness which has passed, but which all the same continues within us. However, the awareness of one's own individual mortality cannot be squared with everydayness in a similar way. When death touches us directly, the whole order of our life is questioned. Awareness of the nearness of death does not let a man live peacefully, it does not allow him to await the end of his life as a future event that will definitely occur, and after which time will continue to flow heedless, without him.

Events which awaken this awareness, such as suffering, illness, situations of direct mortal endangerment, that affect both ourselves and those closest to us, who participate directly in our lives, not only take away our ability to maintain a distance, in a single moment they envelop the whole person, they both close off the way back home and any possibility of evasion.

Death takes possession of man, takes away ground from under his feet, ground on which he stood with certainty before then. A man torn from everydayness in this manner can discover within himself the courage to face the unknown when he stirs the hidden strata of hope within himself. 255

Obviously, in concrete instances this discovery of hope can occur in different ways. Other people can awaken hope within us, people whom we encounter as witnesses of hope, who give us this vision of an open future; it can also be discovered as a religious truth and then it is inextricably tied to faith, and can appear thanks to the experience of love.

Religious Faith awakens hope, but at the same time it rests upon it. Hope feeds off the meaning that faith gives to the whole eternal dimension. Faith gives man the right to cross the horizon of everydayness without concern, because what resides beyond this horizon is biased toward him, that is, it has a congenial meaning for him. Eternity is ready to accept people.

Atemporality is sensible, and within the boundaries of faith, it is comprehensible. Thus, hope allows him to enter with his sense of everyday time into a field already prepared by faith. Man finds his bearings better within the future when he has some picture of atemporality. In this instance faith, by having a certain vision of the atemporal, reduces the scale of the risk that is inextricably attached to hope. Hope alone is much more like playing in the dark, based upon trusting oneself, whereas faith is an answer to an impulse coming from the inside, thereby giving man an important point to hook onto.

Faith is not burdened by the same degree of risk as hope. This is the reason why hope awakened by faith gains an additional reassurance that is much more concrete than the naive trust in oneself and in time opened up to the future. Man underpinned by faith leaves his ordinary world for good when hope allows him to take his everydayness on this pilgrimage. Eternity, as the object of faith, can truly become human time and a truly human future only through hope.

An encounter: the other person can be anticipated as the one whom we know well and whom we expect to see in an unchanged form; that is, just as we know that person from the past without regard for whether that past is very distant or very near. That same person cannot shock us with anything, is predictable in his behavior, and always appears as the same, identical, person. Even if he has changed physically during his absence, we quite easily recognize the person we knew in the past. The world he represents with his person, which he brings with himself, is the same world in which we live. Meetings in everydayness therefore usually occur in the shadow of time past. In the other we always recognize some kind of common past, some kind of time experienced together. The occurrence of such an encounter serves to confirm what already was, it serves to strengthen an identity based upon memory.

When we meet someone we do not know, someone we are not totally certain about—a distant acquaintance, totally unfamiliar, someone encoun-

256 tered by chance, a foreigner, somebody touched by a recent misfortune—it is hard to rid ourselves of worries and anxieties when facing otherness. This otherness is multi-dimensional. This concerns both a certain incalculability of that person and my own personal reaction to his foreign world that opens itself before me. Otherness also touches our time as provocation against our anticipations. The encountered person is someone alien to us, someone who cannot be easily fitted within our sustained order as a new element. The sudden appearance of the other can take apart the space of everydayness and change the whole topography of the world. It is as if the other comes from a totally different time and dimension of the world. This encounter with him can move us to our depths and open up a distinct reality. The other person can bring along his hopes, his visions of the future, which we never before took into consideration, but he can also awaken our own, previously unknown, hope.

Hopes live in various worlds that are distanced from each other and know nothing about each other. This is why they need these sorts of confrontations in the form of encounters which were never anticipated nor foreseen in the dimension of ordinary everyday time. The encounter of different worlds is the neuralgic point of true hope's birth, and thus also the beginning of a future that is not a repetition, and of a time that comes to us from the future as that which cannot be anticipated at all.

Hope and love meet in the uncommon situation of *being situated against eternity*. Love, which always signifies a readiness for death, a readiness to make sacrifices, is by nature diachronic. He who experiences love is somehow pushed into atemporality, no longer able to participate in the ordinary world along with the conditions that hitherto have ruled it. The whole world is subordinated to love, as its unique creation upon which love imprints its forms.

The variable development of events, the sped up play of feelings, the dramaturgy of moods are in this sense the material upon which everything that is truly significant is reflected. Love may awaken hope, but it can also endure independently of hope, without the gaze right into eternity proper for hope. This is why we can say that love comes out from beyond time and beyond eternity, or to put it another way, it does not belong to time, nor is it interested in eternity. Unlike hope, love does not give a basis for access to the movement of temporalizing eternity.

Love simply does not occur in the regular sense; this is why an analogy to some form of temporality is inappropriate here. Just like time, as occurrences constitute for it a kind of negative occasion to manifest indifference to what changes and passes. The fact that it places man outside of time, just as its neutralization of death as the ultimate risk means that love cannot put man in despair, even when it does not give him any hope.

Despair's characteristic suspension between an impossible everydayness and a lost eternity does not come into play here, because love does not allow man to draw back toward an indifferent living in the world of everydayness. On the other hand, despair can be the consequence of a

certain development of human feelings and passions which have never ²⁵⁷ reached the level of true love.

Hope awakened by love gains from this dislocation of man from everydayness, and also from the fact that he is exposed to the direct risk of his own death. Simultaneously, love frees him from fear of death and hope opens up before him the atemporal dimension, and allows him to enter it without worries.