I would like to begin by expressing my deep gratitude to Sarah Hammerschlag, Martin Hägglund, Penelope Deutscher, and Rodolphe Gasché for their extremely generous, challenging, and helpful remarks, for their provocations and invitations to develop in greater detail and sometimes in different directions a few of the themes treated in *Miracle and Machine*. It is a rare honor to have one's work read with this degree of attention and sophistication by such accomplished scholars in the areas of contemporary philosophy and theology. I knew in advance that I would not be disappointed by these responses, but for the life of me, I never expected *this*.

By a stroke of good fortune—for I do not believe there was any collusion on their part—these four sets of comments really span the entire book, addressing not only its central arguments but its guiding themes and images, even its form and style. Since I cannot possibly do justice to all these comments in just a few pages, I would like to select just a few passages from each in the hopes that they will lead to future discussions not just of my work but, especially, of theirs and of the places where our works intersect.

---

1) This response was first presented at a book panel on *Miracle and Machine* organized by Sam Haddad at Fordham University on 22 March 2012. I would like express my deep thanks to Sam for his own very generous opening remarks on that occasion and for all the time and effort he put in to organizing that event with Sarah Hammerschlag, Penelope Deutscher, and Martin Hägglund. Let me also thank here Helen Tartar of Fordham University Press, who not only encouraged and supported me in the writing of this book but, through her exemplary editorial skills and exquisite ear, helped make *Miracle and Machine* a much better book than it would have otherwise been. Finally, I would like to thank Rodolphe Gasché, who, independently of the Fordham event, wrote the long and generous review of *Miracle and Machine* published here and who kindly agreed to allow me to include my response to his review into my response at Fordham.
As the reader will have been able to surmise from these four sets of comments, *Miracle and Machine* began as something of a commentary on Jacques Derrida’s 1994–95 essay “Faith and Knowledge,” an extraordinarily inventive, synthetic, and sometimes elliptical essay in which Derrida confronts head-on the nature of religion in general and the forms it is taking on today through science and the media. The title *Miracle and Machine* was thus a sort of translation of the title “Faith and Knowledge” or “Foi et Savoir,” a somewhat mimetic and quasi-mechanical translation, I know, but also, I had hoped, a somewhat unexpected transposition of that title into a different but related idiom. But because Derrida’s essay relates this question of religion not just to science and the media but to questions of sacrifice, sexual difference, sexual violence, democracy, sovereignty, even the question of literature, this book quickly became not just a commentary on “Faith and Knowledge” but an attempt to introduce through this single text Derrida’s work in general. And because I wished not just to argue but to demonstrate that if deconstruction is to live on, it will do so only by being transplanted elsewhere, by being grafted onto seemingly heterogeneous contexts, the analysis of Derrida got supplemented by a prologue, an epilogue, and three interludes on Don DeLillo’s great American novel *Underworld*, a novel that was written at almost exactly the same time as Derrida’s “Faith and Knowledge” and that raises in its own way questions of the relationship between religion, science, the media, sexual violence, testimony, and so on.

I am very grateful to Sarah Hammerschlag for having underscored this literary aspect of the book and for supplementing my own analysis of literature and the question of testimony with the figure of Geryon from the *Inferno*. Sarah’s beautiful and instructive reading of Dante, her countersignature, as it were, gives me the chance to recall that *Miracle and Machine* was itself conceived as a sort of *Divine Comedy* in reverse. It moves in its three main parts not from the inferno or the underworld to purgatory and paradise but from a kind of paradise in Part I—the island resort of Capri where “Faith and Knowledge” was first presented in 1994, along with Laguna Beach, California, where it was completed and signed in 1995—to an earthly purgatory with its contemporary questions of politics, justice, and democracy in Part II, to the underworld in Part III, where I treat themes, questions, and figures that are just below the surface of “Faith and Knowledge.” It is there, at the end of *Miracle and Machine*, that we encounter not Dante’s Beatrice but DeLillo’s Esmeralda, a thirteen year-old girl from the Bronx who is raped and killed and whose image—whose apparition—comes to be projected onto an empty New York billboard, just like the one represented on the cover of the book. It is this image of sexual