

# 1) Concept Summary and Terminology

The call arrives transcendentally (**Emmanuel Levinas**), yet in the perceptual structure of consciousness it may be omitted or fail to be interpreted (**Maurice Merleau-Ponty**). However, the trace of a failed call arrives beyond the horizon of anticipation (**Edmund Husserl**) and remains within the subject as a remainder of the Real (**Jacques Lacan**). This remainder generates difference through repetition, and that difference opens the possibility of signification in a deferred manner (**Gilles Deleuze**). Within this deferred temporality, the subject belatedly responds to the transcendent call. Ethics persists as the responsibility to endure even the impossibility of response (**Jacques Derrida**). The ethical temporal structure constituted in this indeterminate temporality—seeking to endure the failure of the call—is referred to as *gyulchok* (결촉).

---

## a. *Gam-eung* (감응) (gam-eung ≠ affect)

*Gam-eung* refers to the Real trace left by a transcendence that has not arrived. It is the potentiality of ethics inscribed within the subject, operating at the points where the failure of the signifying network recurs. *Gam-eung* is not an emotional reaction or sensory stimulus, but rather an ethical resonance produced by a call that was not perceived, vibrating within the subject's preconscious structure. It is a wave of the Real that remains un-interpreted and un-symbolized, apprehensible only at the threshold of signification. It cannot be fixed into a single meaning or specific reaction, yet it remains as an indeterminate vibration.

For Levinas, the call of the Other functions as an ethical precedence, understood as an asymmetrical intervention exceeding the subject's freedom. This call is an ethical compulsion approaching me from beyond-being. Therefore, *gyulchok* must not fall into the equivalence of "transcendence = Real." It is never a concept that seeks to dismantle transcendence.

---

## b. *Gyulchok* (결촉)

The transcendent call of the Other does not always arrive. However, such *gam-eung*—the remainder of the Real—persists. In moments when it is subtly sensed within the subject through repetition and delay, it can be transformed into ethics. *Gyulchok* is not about the possibility of response or formalized norms, but about the traces left by the failure of transcendence, and the ethical potential that operates in that indeterminate and deferred gap.

The Other is a transcendent being arriving prior to me, and the call places me in a position of inescapable responsibility (Levinas). At the preconscious layer of *flesh*, where the world and the body intertwine, this call arrives in ways that exceed the subject's perception and sensation, remaining as a trace imperceptible to perceptual categories (Merleau-Ponty).

For Husserl, the horizon is the field of possibility that consciousness opens in constituting the world. Here, however, as calls repeatedly fail to arrive, the horizon becomes no longer a projection toward anticipation, but an unconscious boundary that endures the return of an

unconstituted outside. That is, it transforms into a site where the impossibility of constitution itself vibrates. Calls that did not arrive remain within the subject as a remainder of the Real that is not signified, rupturing the signifying network (Lacan).

This Real is not a fixed representation, but each time it is repeated, it opens a gap that makes possible the emergence of new differences (Deleuze). Only in this gap can *gam-eung* occur. It opens the possibility of ethics in ways that cannot be linguistically fixed or determined. This possibility is constituted only within the deferred temporality of a formless responsibility that endures calls that will never fully arrive.

---

## 2) Limits of Existing Concepts and Intervention

### a. The Structure of Traditional Ethics

Transcendent call → Perception → Signification (interpretation, structuring) → Response or Responsibility

Traditional ethics is premised on response, responsibility, and cognition. Emmanuel Levinas most radically dismantled this structure by reconfiguring ethics as a matter of transcendent responsibility, grounded in the asymmetrical structure in which the call of the Other precedes the subject.

However, in reality, the call does not always arrive.

Historical examples such as slavery, colonialism, and class violence were justified or rendered invisible by laws and institutions at the time, yet emerged as ethical issues only retrospectively. The call is never immediate. Moreover, the fact that it already occurred prior to recognition, and that the subject belatedly senses it and responds later, is a structure that traditional ethical theory cannot explain merely as a matter of sensitivity or immorality.

---

### b. *Gyulchok* – The Temporal Structure of Ethics ( $\infty$ )

Transcendent call → Perceptual failure → *Gam-eung* (remainder of the Real) → Repetition of Difference (each time producing new difference) → Signification or Failure  $\cup$

This structure assumes that the call of the Other does not always arrive in the same way, but instead repeats failures and disjunctions, with the possibility of arrival left open. The call repeatedly fails in perception and signification, yet the repetition of that failure is precisely the indeterminate temporality that makes ethics possible.

An invisibly intrusive call may be deferred due to perceptual-cognitive failure. Yet in the deferred time, *gam-eung* that remains as a residue opens the possibility of perception and signification through difference and repetition—not repetition of the same, but repetition producing difference—requesting transformation into the form of response or responsibility.

However, this does not arrive in a conceptually apprehensible way, nor does it lead immediately to meaning or translate into universal moral norms.

Law is merely an apparatus that seeks to institutionalize and interrupt failure after the fact. Ethical responsibility must still be borne even when it “does not make sense,” precisely because the call of the Other is always missed. *Gyulchok* transforms these repeated failures into the temporal condition in which ethics can arise, filling the gap in the linear structure of traditional ethics.

---

### **3) Precautions Against Misuse of the Concept**

#### **a. Using *Gam-eung*'s Presence/Absence as a Criterion**

The moment the presence or absence of *gam-eung* becomes a criterion for judgment, the temporal structure that *gyulchok* seeks to preserve loses its tension. *Gyulchok* does not verify the presence or absence of *gam-eung*, but rather re-questions the time when *gam-eung* was not perceived, the structural conditions in which failure occurred, and how the unspoken call was deferred or erased. *Gyulchok* never provides a definitive answer; the answer arrives in different forms each time. To judge and fix a standard is already to fail.

---

#### **b. Using Failure as a Tool for Justification**

*Gyulchok* is not a concept to justify avoidance of responsibility, nor to appropriate non-response as a philosophical excuse. Using “I did not sense *gam-eung*, so I have no responsibility” as a logic, or employing *gyulchok* to defer ethical response as a defensive move, seriously distorts the ethical tension of the concept. If an act is a clear injustice legally or socially, then ethical responsibility must not be delayed or excused.

---

#### **c. Interpretations that Remove Ethical Tension**

In establishing the concept of *gyulchok*, the balance between precise conceptualization and poetic resonance must be held within tension. Conceptualization favors structural stability and academic legitimacy, but in the process, the ethical vitality of *gam-eung* risks becoming overly formalized. Poetic form can hold the vitality of *gam-eung*, but may have limitations in institutional discourse and communicability.

Therefore *gyulchok* must be approached as a deconstructive concept-rhythm in which concept and resonance loosely co-resonate. To interpret *gyulchok* is already to fail *gyulchok*.

---

#### **d. Guarding Against Schematic Application**

If *gyulchok* is divided into overly clear steps or presented as a repeatable structure, the perceptual possibility within ethical uncertainty and delay can disappear. A schematic can briefly show it, but it can never reduce or fix it. Moreover, this structure cannot be reduced to linear causality, logical unilinearity, or completed response structures. This concept must always remain deconstructed.

---

### **e. Expression of the Pre-Linguistic**

*Gam-eung* is not an object, and it cannot be fixed. It is the possibility of ethics that arises between tensions. It is the rhythm of sensation that remains dormant or residual between existences, or within failure. To fix this under the name “pre-linguistic” or to settle it within a philosophically explainable stratum risks re-signifying *gam-eung*, causing it to disappear within the structure of language. *Gam-eung* is the tomb of words that failed to be spoken, and the lingering resonance that still drifts beside that tomb.

---

### **f. Guarding Against Dismantling/Fixing Transcendence**

The concept of *gyulchok* inherits Levinas’s concept of transcendence, but guards against any interpretation that equates it with the Real or fixes it in a single manner. Transcendence is revealed through the failure of arrival; it cannot be reduced to “something that exists” like the Real.

Transcendence does not appear as any definite object or substance, and is always sensed only in the mode of non-arrival. For that reason, attempts to inscribe it into the Real or fix it within the Symbolic order as a determined meaning harm the delay, remainder, and tension that *gyulchok* contains.

---

## **4) Philosophical Genealogy and Connection to Tradition**

### **a. Levinas**

For Emmanuel Levinas, the “call” is not an intrusion of the Real, but a structure of ethical precedence that neutralizes ontology. This transcendence arrives prior to the subject’s perception, forming an asymmetrical relation that demands unconditional responsibility. However, in reality, the call of the Other is not always recognized, and its arrival often fails.

*Gyulchok* designates the temporality of the ethical structure in which the “trace of the intrusion of a transcendence that has failed to arrive” is reproduced within the subject in the form of *gam-eung*. Even if the call does not reach immediately, this failure does not signify nullity. Rather, it leaves a remainder of the Real, and through the rhythm of repetition and deferral, acquires the potential for signification.

It is precisely in this deferred temporality that the trace of the call, which had not arrived, is transformed within the subject into *gam-eung*—at which point, the unspoken possibility of ethics opens.

---

## **b. Merleau-Ponty**

Maurice Merleau-Ponty's notion of *flesh* is the intertwining of subject and world, self and Other, mutually permeating one another sensorially. This is not a mere body or sensory apparatus, but the intersubjective layer in which sensation can occur prior to perception—the preconscious field where contact between beings takes place.

Here, *gam-eung* arises in the interstices of that intertwining, that is, as the vibration resonating at the sensory interface of the *flesh*. This vibration is an ethical potential formed within the subject before the Real is captured in language.

Thus, *flesh* is the ontological site in which *gam-eung* can occur. Depending on how this intertwining is composed—the margins of sensation, the gaps of what cannot be sensed—certain subjects may be open to perception or may fail in perception. *Gam-eung* can never be reduced to emotional reaction or feeling; it is closer to the vibration of the subject in response to the trace of the Real.

---

## **c. Husserl**

The structure of the horizon in Edmund Husserl was a transcendental temporality announcing the possibility of signification. Here, however, it is transformed into a non-constitutive temporality—a temporality of remainder—in which an outside that has failed to be signified repeatedly returns.

The remainder of the call that did not arrive, the unspoken exteriority, operates beyond the anticipatory horizon, penetrating the subject in ways that exceed the anticipatory scope of consciousness. In other words, the horizon is no longer the horizontal line foretelling meaning, but is transformed into the gap in which signification itself fails, returning repeatedly as the remainder of the Real.

This failure trembles within the subject as the temporality of ethical *gam-eung*.

---

※ The concept of *Gyulchok* was first coined by Hajin Lim in 2025 and is currently under preparation for publication as a scholarly article and future monograph.