

RIVCA GORDON

The Problem of Joy in Sartre's Ontology

PROBABLY EVERY PERSON WILL AFFIRM that joy exists, that he or she has experienced joy, and is longing to experience it again. Language includes expressions that describe moments of joy: creative joy, the joy of knowledge, the joy of love, a joyful holiday, joy in communion, a joyful struggle. Authors, such as Shakespeare, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and D.H. Lawrence, and philosophers, such as Buber, Nietzsche, and Kierkegaard, describe joy and view it as crucial for a worthy human existence.

Nietzsche, for example, describes joy, and even commands his readers to rejoice in life, with its sorrows and difficulties. For him joy is the virtue of a whole free self who is: deep and high, strong and light, firm and elastic, courageous and sure of itself. Joy overflows from within a free self who spontaneously and passionately acts and matures; it is an expression of energy, sensuality, and self-love; it also expresses a basic affirmation of existence and a trust in other people. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche describes Zarathustra joyfully running, dancing, singing, thinking, flying, and at times acting mischievously. He calls joy in life a "Bestowing virtue":

[the] glorified selfishness, the sound, healthy selfishness that issues from a mighty soul—... to which pertains the exalted body, the beautiful, victorious, refreshing body, around which every-thing becomes a mirror; the supple, persuasive body, the dancer whose image and epitome is the self-rejoicing soul. The self-rejoicing of such bodies and souls calls itself: "Virtue."¹

¹Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1961) 208.

Such joy is not found in Sartre's writings. To the best of my knowledge, no scholar has criticized Sartre for this lack. His ontology has not been examined from the simple perspective of the existence of joy. Yet it is probably evident to Sartre scholars that according to his philosophy the statement "I am joyful" is an ontological impossibility. Such a statement, he explains, does not describe human reality, because joy, like sadness and other such ways of being, can never emerge as a whole and unified activity or feeling. A major reason for this conclusion is the negative freedom that Sartre considers to be the starting point for describing human reality. In addition, he claims, joy essentially belongs to the realm of psychology or of the emotional. Joy is essentially an impoverishment of consciousness; it is an intentional flight from freedom and its accompanying anguish.

In contrast, nausea is an ontological possibility. In Sartre's novel, *Nausea*, Roquentin, the protagonist, often experiences nausea while encountering objects and people, and confesses that nausea is the normal condition of his existence. In a profound experience in the park of Bouville, Roquentin realizes that the essential thing about existence is its contingency, that everything is unnecessary and unjustifiable, and the feeling that reveals this is: Nausea. He realizes that this abundant, infinite, unlimited, and superfluous existence does not "give the impression of generosity, far from it. It was dismal, sickly, encumbered by itself."² He becomes furious:

I hated that ignoble jelly. And there was so much of it, so much!... I knew perfectly well that it was the World, the world in all its nakedness which was suddenly revealing itself, and I choked with fury at the huge absurd being I shouted: "What filth! What filth!" and I shook myself to get rid of that sticky dirt, but it held fast and there was so much of it, tons and tons of existence, indefinitely: I was suffocating at the bottom of that huge boredom. (192-93)

²Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea*, trans. Robert Baldick (London: Penguin, 1965) 190.

In addition, in Sartre's stories collected in *Intimacy*, Lulu, Eve, Erostatus, and Lucien experience nausea as a basic existential experience. Nausea is also discussed in *Being and Nothingness*. Is it not strange that, for Sartre, nausea is basic to human existence, while joy is a problematic phenomenon, relegated to the realm of psychology? The same may be asked about true love and sincerity which in *Being and Nothingness* are vividly described as bad faith. Like joy, these experiences are doomed to fail—while nausea thrives. Why? To answer these questions, I turn to Sartre's philosophy.

In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre explains that human existence *is* freedom, and is condemned to freedom. This radical freedom is originally revealed as negative, as nothingness that haunts human existence, outside it and in its own core of being. In contrast to the things in the world, which are absolute positivity, which are what they are, human being is a constant negation of every thing, itself included; it is never any of its behaviours or actions. Concretely, as against the things in the world, "I can not say either that I am here or that I am not here Nor that I am standing, nor that I am seated."³ Thus, from all perspectives which I may consider myself—in the present, in the past, or projected toward the future—I am condemned to oscillate between being and non-being. I am incapable of stopping this oscillation; hence, I never can say that I *am* something. Hence, to say "I am joyful" is bad faith.

The meaning of the freedom which Sartre describes is that constantly I have to make myself; I have to be and not-be, say, joyful, with no possibility of ever being unified with myself or with my act. Always transcending myself and everything, I can never coincide with my own being, with my act and my feeling. Repeatedly thrown beyond myself toward a meaning which is beyond my reach, my being is never given, it is always in suspense, only a possibility. Freedom exists to the extent that I recognize that human being is a permanent disintegration, that it has to miss its act, and its goal. Sartre identifies this ontological failure that haunts human existence with concepts that are linked to nothingness: suffering, frustration, disappointment, dissatisfaction, contingency, gra-

³Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Washington Square Press, 1966) 103.

tuitousness, anguish, and nausea. Joy has no place in this list. Indeed, joy cannot come into being in a world in which freedom is primordially negative and the projects of human beings are doomed to fail.

One reason joy is alien to Sartre's thinking is that he proffers sweeping ontological concepts so as to describe human reality. He did not abandon these sweeping concepts, although they became more complex in later writings. Wilfrid Desan indicates the roots of this ontological problem when he states that

there is something almost equally striking in the way in which he [Sartre] demonstrates through seven hundreds pages the tragic adventure of the for-itself in its unceasing but impossible siege of the in-itself. Seldom has a philosopher stated this dramatic aspect of human reality. Human reality is "nothingness." It cannot succeed. It is a failure But is not perhaps this originality Sartre's weak point?⁴

A look at Sartre's discussion of the present, the realm of freedom and doing, reveals another aspect of the problem of joy. Sartre holds that it seems that what is in the present *is*, in contrast to the future (which is not-yet), and the past (which is no-more). Yet, if we try for a moment to get rid of both the past and the future, what is left is an infinitesimal moment, and actually an inseparable pair: Being and Nothingness. In every experience I am revealed to myself as a being that has a being outside itself: before, I am my past, and after, I am the future that I have to be. In the present I am not what I am, my past, and I am what I am not, my future. If, according to Sartre, I am melancholic or angry, or I have an Oedipus complex, this is always in the mode of the past, of what was and is no-more; at the same time and immediately I transcend this situation toward the future. I assume that Sartre would also hold that joy is either in the past or is transcended toward the future. In the present it is not, because

⁴Wilfrid Desan, *The Tragic Finale: An Essay on the Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960) 132.

Everything happens as if the Present were a perpetual hole in being—immediately filled and perpetually reborn—as if the Present were a perpetual flight away from the snare of the “in-itself” which threatens it until that final victory of the in-itself which will drag it into the past which is no longer the past of the For-itself [its death].⁵

Thus, if every doing in the present necessarily reveals its non-existence, that it at once is and is-not, then I can never say, “I am joyfully dancing.” The moment I say this statement, I am immediately beyond this moment, I am no longer joyfully dancing. Furthermore, even if I am joyfully dancing, my joy is still in-question. Such a situation of questioning rouses feelings of lack and frustration.

It is revealing to compare Sartre’s approach with Kierkegaard’s view on joy, in *Christian Discourses*. In Kierkegaard’s song to “The Lilies of the Field and the Birds of the Air,” joy means a way of life that is daily renewed in every detail of life. When such joy bursts from a person’s whole being, and accompanies each daily deed, the person’s existence is rich with joy. To the question, “What is joy? or what is it to be joyful?”, Kierkegaard answers: “It is to be present to oneself; but to be truly present to oneself is this thing of ‘today,’ that is, this thing of *being* today, of truly *being today* Joy is the present tense, with the whole emphasis upon the *present*.”⁶

This simple whole joy, Kierkegaard adds, cannot be proven; or its best proof is that joy in existence is absolute and unconditional. Thus, joy demands the most intense freedom, a freedom which is open to the whole present, to the full present. The full present is that meeting point of joy with the eternal, despite and within sorrow, where the fulness of time occurs, where the future and the past blend in the constant full present. Kierkegaard concludes: the more joy I experience, the more presence I have in the present, the more freedom, security, content, and truth do I live. Hence, he would hold that Sartre’s view concerning the impossi-

⁵*Being and Nothingness* 208.

⁶Søren Kierkegaard, *Christian Discourses*, trans. Walter Lowrie (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1961) 349–50.

bility of joy in the present confines the horizon of human existence; it “is a very sorry and dismal misunderstanding.”⁷

Remember that for Sartre consciousness also is revealed as a being which is a permanent lack, and as a constant annihilation of everything, including itself. Consciousness is originally an unreflective consciousness (of) something. Always at a distance from itself, it transcends itself toward an object. And what separates it from itself is nothing. Because my being constantly escapes me, I cannot be an object (of) myself or for my consciousness. Thus,

As soon as we wish to define a consciousness as a doubt, perception, thirst, etc., we are referred to the nothingness of what is not yet. Consciousness (of) reading is ... consciousness (of) reading *this book*, which refers me to all the pages still unread, to all the pages already read, which by definition detaches consciousness from itself. A consciousness which would be consciousness of what it is, would be obliged to spell out each word.⁸

Again we see that each of its affirmations obliges consciousness at once to negate it or to put it in-question. Consequently, the claim that consciousness is always consciousness (of) something means that my joy can never be gathered into a whole experience. I can neither affirm that I am joyful, nor experience it wholly. Because “as soon as I consider this totality in-itself, it nihilates itself under my regard. It is not; it is in order not to be.”⁹ Joy can never be experienced as it at once and fully springs up from within my whole being, but only as an annihilated totality, or as a constant disintegration. I may understand myself as being joyful when I am thus, but only on condition that being-joyful is put in-question. The minute I grasp myself as being-joyful, it escapes me on all sides, negated in the unity of the same act.

⁷ *Christian Discourses* 348

⁸ *Being and Nothingness* 153.

⁹ *Being and Nothingness* 131.

Sartre's not discussing joy accords with his understanding that

The being of human reality is suffering because it rises in being as perpetually haunted by totality which it is without being able to be it Human reality therefore is by nature an unhappy consciousness with no possibility of surpassing its unhappy state.¹⁰

Therefore, to long to be joyful is a flight from the failure which haunts my original condition, and an effort to eradicate the nothingness that characterizes consciousness. Such a vain effort is in bad faith.

Even if I insist that I am sincerely joyful, Sartre will respond that precisely the notion of sincerity shows that I cannot *be* anything. At first sincerity seems to be an antithesis to bad faith, because sincerity is usually identified with honesty. But, if the ideal of sincerity is carefully examined, it immediately reveals that it imposes an impossible demand: to be for myself only what I am—which is the mode of existence of things. The project of sincerity expresses no more than my attempt to either liquidate or to exploit to my benefit that I constantly must nihilate my being. The most Sartre allows to sincerity is in relation to the past, for example, I affirm that I was joyful yesterday. I have to recognize that my joy is referred to the past only, which is behind me, and that in the present I am no longer joyful. And even if I am joyful, I am at the same time not-joyful, because I have to constantly create myself as joyful. Thus, the project of sincerity, like the possibility of being joyful, is in contradiction to the ontological structure of consciousness. Sincerity is in bad faith.

Sartre also denies the possibility of love and with it joy in love. This impossibility is a result of the ontological conditions already described. Yet, Sartre adds new ontological obstacles. My original encounter with the Other totally changes my world. I suddenly experience that my world has been stolen from me by the Other, and that my body has become a means for the other. I

¹⁰ *Being and Nothingness* 140.

experience a basic ineradicable shame that reveals to me that I am condemned to be an object for the other as a subject, that I am a Being-for-others. I realize that I am constantly in danger and threatened, that I am dependent on and am alienated from the other. Sartre concludes that all inter-human relations are based on this dual relation of subject-object, on the desire of each one as subject to change the other to an object. In short, all inter-human relations are based on negative reciprocity, and are experienced within a vicious circle of constant conflict from which they can never be freed.

Can joy between two loving persons occur in this Sartrean world? No. Love reveals precisely that:

each of the lovers is entirely the captive of the other inasmuch as each wishes to make himself loved by the other to the exclusion of anyone else; but at the same time each one demands from the other a love which is not reducible to "the project of being-loved." Love thus exacted from the other could not ask for anything; it is a pure engagement without reciprocity.¹¹

The most I, as the beloved, may experience is that I am a Being-for-the-other, the lover, in the mode of possession. Moreover, I experience that the other, the lover as subject, controls my body in its entire nakedness, and possesses me as an object, his object. If the Other wants to be a lover, he or she must desire to possess the beloved's freedom as freedom; the beloved has to voluntarily agree to surrender freedom and be captivated. Hence, the lover must turn to deception, seduction or magic to attain the desired goal. Sartre concludes that the project of love is doomed to fail, or it is experienced as being-troubled and uneasiness, suffering and alienation. The project of love is in bad faith.

Thus, joy in love has no place in Sartre's world. Joy in love can occur only where there is a possibility of a positive trustful reciprocity between two freedoms, between two sharing people who directly and innocently love each other. Perhaps Sartre sensed this problem. In *Being and Nothingness* he writes that all the inter-

¹¹ *Being and Nothingness* 488.

human relations that he described are in bad faith; consequently “these considerations do not exclude the possibility of an ethics of deliverance and salvation. But this ... we can not discuss here” (534). I agree with Hazel Barnes’ response to this comment: “Still we must admit that the absence of any philosophical justification by Sartre of love as a positive existential structure of human reality is a serious lack.”¹²

The only time Sartre directly confronts the question of joy is in *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*:

But what is to be said about joy? Does it fit into our description? At first sight it would seem not, since the joyful subject has no need to defend himself [as occurs in sorrow and fear] against a belittling or dangerous change. But we must distinguish between the joyful feeling which betokens an equilibrium, or a state of adaptation, and emotional joy.¹³

While a joyful feeling is linked to ordered, organized behaviour, an emotional joy is characterized by impatient, troubled, and disordered behaviour. Hence, emotional joy, like every emotion, belongs to the psychological realm, therefore to the realm of the magical; it is a flight from freedom.

Sartre explains that we realize ourselves in the everyday world in two basic behaviours: rational and emotional. In the first, the world appears to be organized in a pragmatic and causal context, of means-ends and of possibilities we have to realize or to put in question. We act by taking a critical and prudent stand, which is directed to a definite goal, or to solving a real problem. In the second, we direct our freedom towards the emotional. In the presence of the difficulties of the rational and objective world, we decide to degrade our consciousness by imposing on it a new behaviour, emotional. In order to feel that we possess or at least symboli-

¹²Hazel H. Barnes, *An Existentialist Ethics* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1978) 320.

¹³*Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Methuen, 1971) 71.

cally come closer to the object we desire, we decide to avert consciousness away from the task demanded of us. We intentionally freeze our consciousness, so as to suddenly change the world and impose on it new meaning, emotional or magical. Emotion "is a transformation of the world ... to live it as though the relations between things and their potentialities were not governed by deterministic processes but by magic."¹⁴

True joy, Sartre emphasizes, belongs to the emotional realm. An example is a man who is dancing and singing in joy, since a woman tells him now that she loves him. His joy is a way to shift his attention from the prudent, difficult behaviour that he has to undertake, if he really wants to deserve her love. It is also a way to turn from her as a lived reality, to allow himself a rest, and suspend the time until the moment of decision. In the meantime, he is able to believe that he possesses the woman as an immediate whole object.

Joy is magical behaviour which tries, by incantation, to realize the possession of the desired object as an instantaneous totality. This behaviour is accompanied by certainty that possession will be realized sooner or later, but it seeks to anticipate that possession. The various activities expressive of joy, as well as the muscular hypertonicity and the slight vascular dilatation, are animated and transcended by an intention which envisages the world through them. This seems easy, the object of our desires appears to be near and easy to possess. Every gesture expresses emphatic approbation. To dance, or to sing for joy—these represent the behaviour of symbolic approximation, of incantation. By their means the object—which in reality one may not be able to possess except by prudent and, after all, difficult behaviour—is possessed at once, symbolically.¹⁵

¹⁴*Sketch for a Theory* 63.

¹⁵*Sketch for a Theory* 72–73.

Sartre adds that even if the woman will continue to court the man, and even if he feels that soon she will be his, she can never be “his” as an object. She always will be an object that is slowly yielding itself to him; he can never hold her as his absolute possession. As a result, his joy is in bad faith. In addition, emotional joy is not a behaviour that can vanish in accordance to our wish. The man who is rejoicing because a woman told him she loves him, cannot stop his body’s trembling. If he wants to be seized by joy, he has to be impregnated by his joy, and to believe that he is filled with an opaque and heavy joy, like a thing. For his joy to occur, consciousness has to jump into a new world: of belief. He has to believe that the qualities he desires to see as characterizing the object, the woman, are real. He has to decide to feel that she really loves him, and that he possesses her. He has to nurture this belief so as to be enchanted by the woman. He employs his body to heighten the enchantment, to feel that his joy is a state of the present, and spreads out ahead to the entire future.

The true meaning of every emotion, however, is of a body which sinks into a state of disorder and uneasiness, and of a consciousness which flees freedom, and embraces the magical. The magical is “an irrational synthesis of spontaneity and passivity.”¹⁶ Every emotion is a revelation of consciousness which spontaneously and actually chooses to use magic so as to impoverish itself and the world. Sartre summarizes:

All emotions have this in common, that they evoke the appearance of a world, cruel, bleak, joyful, etc., but in which the relations of things are always and exclusively magical. We have to speak of a world of emotion as one speaks of a world of dreams or of worlds of madness.¹⁷

Thus, the emotional is in bad faith. It can never achieve its goal. It is a vain effort.

¹⁶ *Sketch for a Theory* 85.

¹⁷ *Sketch for a Theory* 81.

Do the two joys that Sartre suggests, emotional joy, and the feeling of joy or the moderate rational joy, exhaust everyday experience? Sartre does not go beyond these two joys. He does point to a way out of the emotional realm: pure reflection. But he does not discuss this notion at any length, neither in his study of the emotions nor in *Being and Nothingness*. I do believe, however, and my reading of Nietzsche and Kierkegaard supports my belief, that Sartre has unduly confined and greatly emasculated the existential experience of joy. Both Nietzsche and Kierkegaard point to a joy in existence. This joy blossoms or bursts out from within an active, intensive, creative freedom that affirms itself and the world and has the courage to negate and question everything. A source of such joy is basic trust and openness toward the world and other people. Such joy in existence is reducible neither to the rational and objective realm, nor to the emotional and magical realm.

Sander Lee sensed this lack of profundity in Sartre's discussion of joy. His criticism of Sartre's example of the man who has just been told by a woman that she loves him is worth citing:

In choosing to dance and sing for joy ... the man is not running away from his project of enjoying the love of the woman, he is living it. To express emotional satisfaction in the face of the world is not a denial of the world, it is an acceptance that is often extremely effective in helping us to gain our goals.¹⁸

In her book, *Adieux*, Simone de Beauvoir recorded a conversation with Sartre about his relation to his body. His statements accord with his view on the body presented in *Being and Nothingness*. Sartre recalls friends who described bodily joy while skiing or swimming. For him, these joys never existed. While skiing, he primarily sensed a fear of falling; while swimming and walking, he primarily feared becoming exhausted. Despite his good health, his bodily feelings were primarily of contingency, threat, uneasiness, sliminess, and stickiness, in short, of sickness. Letting-go enhanced

¹⁸Sander Lee, "Sartre's Theory of the Emotions," *Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry* 17 (1978-79): 70.

these feelings, hence he rejected letting-go. He found that he could be freed from these repulsive feelings only by action. "What counted was the act that I performed—the act of walking or of taking hold of an object ... [that is] my body as a center of action, neglecting the aspects of sensation and passivity."¹⁹ A free bodily action means an intentionality toward the future, while letting-go is happening in the present, or is inclined toward the past, which can mean surrender and addiction.

As mentioned, in *Being and Nothingness* Sartre defines the bodily experience as an existential nausea: "A dull and inescapable nausea perpetually reveals my body to my consciousness" (445). Must we accept this sweeping generalization? Is nausea the foundation of our concrete bodily experience? My personal experience, and my reading of literature, reject this claim. Consider a moving example from D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* which contradicts Sartre's ontology.

Connie and Mellors are in love, but they will soon separate for a while. One afternoon in the late spring as a rain is falling they sit in the game-keeper's hut; he is in a gloomy mood. Suddenly, Connie opens the door of his hut, and, swiftly taking off all her clothes, she runs "out with a wild little laugh, holding up her breasts to the heavy rain and spreading her arms, and running blurred in the rain with the eurythmic dance-movement" Mellors stands laughing. Suddenly, he throws off his clothes, and jumps out towards her

wonderful cowering female nakedness in flight. She was nearly at the wide riding when he came up and flung his naked arm around her soft, naked-wet middle. She gave a shriek and straightened herself, and the heap of her soft, chill flesh came up against his body. He pressed it all up against him, madly, the heap of soft chilled female flesh that became quickly warm as flame, in contact He gathered her lovely, heavy posteriors one in each hand and pressed them in towards him²⁰

¹⁹ Simone de Beauvoir, *Adieux*, trans. Patrick O'Brian (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984) 312.

²⁰ *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (London: Penguin, 1994) 221.

Mellors raises Connie, and they fall together on the muddy wet path and joyfully make love.

Mellors' and Connie's bodily joy and joy in love contradict Sartre's sweeping notion of nausea. While they run naked, Lawrence gives no hint of a feeling of nausea toward the body; neither in relation to one's own body, nor to the other's body. Their joy is an expression of an intimate and affirming relation between two loving freedoms and bodies. The example also suggests that Sartre is mistaken when he argues that you should understand your body only as a centre of pure activity, or as a means that always acts towards a certain goal. Connie's and Mellors' love and joy reveal the body as a centre of activity, and suggest further that joy may accompany and spring up from it with celebrating its abundance and beauty. In Nietzsche's words, bodily joy can be a revelation of the Bestowing Virtue "that issues from a mighty soul ... to which pertains the exalted body, the beautiful, victorious, refreshing body ... the supple, persuasive body, the dancer whose image and epitome is the self-joyicing soul."²¹

At first glance, Mellors' and Connie's joy might appear consistent with Sartre's view. That is, their joy, like that of the man who just was told by a woman that she loves him, is purely emotional. Therefore, it is magical or in bad faith. But a sensitive and lucid glance will immediately reveal that here are two totally different and irreducible existential experiences. During their celebration of bodily joy, Mellors and Connie do not experience the subject-object relation, or a desire to possess or to use the other's body as a means to one's ends. Their joy is a celebration of generosity and sharing between two loving partners. Hence, their joy cannot be reduced to the psychological or emotional realm. The emotion is there, but it is not at the centre of the joyful event.

Sartre is also mistaken when he abhors letting-go, and identifies it with a passive addiction to the present or the past, with the desire to renounce the future dimension. Without letting-go in the present, Connie's and Mellors' lovely bodily joy could not occur. Only by fully abandoning control and giving themselves here and now to each other could their love and joy burst forth. Their joy springs up from a spontaneous active freedom in its most intensive, ecstatic form with its worthy revelations. Theirs is a passion

²¹ *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* 208.

overflowing with life and energy, gleeful laughter and dancing, and innocent sensuality. Such a sincere and authentic joy may be called: existential joy.

Here and there Sartre does relate to various ontological possibilities of joy. Unfortunately, however, he does not develop them. They are briefly described, as insights or as passing moments. Look at an example from *Nausea*.

After Roquentin's experience in the park of Bouville, he concludes that everything is over. He knows that nausea and nothingness, anguish and loneliness are the true meaning of freedom, and of his existence. He decides to leave Bouville. On the way to the train station he enters the restaurant in which he frequently dined and asks to hear once more the record with the song he loved: "Some of these days." Suddenly, he discovers something he did not know: If a creation, for example a song, may cleanse persons of the nausea of existence, then, why not attempt to create something similar? After grasping this truth he feels "something timidly brushing against me and I dare not move because I am afraid it might go away. Something I did not know any more: a sort of joy." At that moment he feels "like a man who is completely frozen after a journey through the snow and who suddenly comes into a warm room" (251).

"A sort of joy"—that is the most Roquentin experiences; it is also the most Sartre can offer.