

**MAYNOOTH  
PHILOSOPHICAL  
PAPERS  
ISSUE 4  
(2007)**

**An Anthology of Current Research from the  
Department of Philosophy, NUI Maynooth**

**Issue Editor: Cyril McDonnell**

**General Editor: Thomas A. F. Kelly**

---

Translated by Mette Lebech,  
Department of Philosophy, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.

From:

'Martin Heideggers Existentialphilosophie', in Edith Stein, *Endliches und Ewiges Sein. Versuch eines Aufstiegs zum Sinn des Seins*, Gesamtausgabe, bd. 11/12 (Freiburg: Herder, 2006), 'Anhang', pp. 445–500

---

### Translator's Introduction

The text which is hereby made available in translation originates as a lengthy appendix to Stein's main work *Finite and Eternal Being*. It was, however, left out of the first edition of this work (1950) and in the reprint of *Edith Steins Werke*<sup>1</sup> and thus the editors of the *Collected Works of Edith Stein* likewise left it for a future occasion. The omission has been emended in the new critical edition *Edith Steins Gesamtausgabe*,<sup>2</sup> and a completed English translation will follow in due course.

The essay is divided into four sections, each concerned with one of Heidegger's (until then) published works: *Being and Time*; *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*; *The Essence of Reasons*; and *What is Metaphysics?* About two thirds is taken up with an analysis of *Being and Time*, again simply divided into an 'Outline of the Argument' and an 'Evaluation'. The latter part addresses three questions: 'What is Dasein?'; 'Is the Analysis of Dasein Accurate?' and 'Is it sufficient for adequately addressing the Question of the Meaning of Being?'.

The essay is written in Stein's clear and economic style, where rhetoric gives place to reasoning, and where criticism is given straightforwardly without flattery, polemics or irony. It contains Stein's Heidegger critique, which may be read as a key to *Finite and Eternal Being* as a whole. The *Auseinandersetzung* with Heidegger opens up for regarding Stein's work as an alternative to Heidegger's development of phenomenology, an alternative which draws on the philosophical tradition instead of rejecting it.

A few critical studies of the relationship between Stein and Heidegger and of the text before us have appeared, such as, for instance: Hugo Ott, 'Edith Stein und Freiburg', in *Studien zur Philosophie von Edith Stein*, ed. by E.W. Orth (München – Freiburg: Alber, 1993), pp. 107–45<sup>3</sup>; Antonio Calcagno, 'Die Fülle oder das Nichts? Edith Stein und Martin Heidegger on the Question of Being', in *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 74 (2000), 269–85 (rewritten for the author's book, *The Philosophy of Edith Stein* (Duquesne: University of Duquesne Press, 2007)); John Nota, 'Edith Stein and Martin Heidegger', in *Edith Stein Symposium, Carmelite Studies* 4, ed. by John Sullivan (Washington D.C.: ICS Publications, 1987) pp. 50–73 (a German version is found in *Denken in Dialog: zur Philosophie Edith Steins*, ed. by Waltraud Herbstrith (Tübingen: Attempto, 1991), pp. 93–117; Lidia Ripamonti, 'Sein, Wesen bei Edith Stein und Martin Heidegger', in *Die unbekannte Edith Stein: Phänomenologie und Sozialphilosophie*, ed. by Beate Beckmann-Zöller and Hanna-Barbara Gerl-

Falkovitz (Frankfurt A.M.: Peter Lang, 2006), pp. 155–68; Mette Lebeck, ‘Edith Stein and Martin Heidegger on the Meaning of Being’, in *Edith Stein Phenomenologist and Theologian*, ed. by Kathleen Haney (forthcoming). For the purpose of critical examination, the reader is referred to these; the aim of the present publication is merely to make available an English translation of the German text.

The glossary compiled by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson in their translation of Heidegger’s *Being and Time* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967) has served as guide to translate terms coined by Heidegger in the four works covered by Stein’s critique. In addition existing translations of these works have been consulted: *Being and Time*, trans. by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967); *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, trans. by James S. Churchill (Bloomington – London: Indiana University Press, 1962); *The Essence of Reasons*, trans. by Terrence Malick (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969); *What is Metaphysics?*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull and Alan Crick in Martin Heidegger, *Existence and Being* (London: Vision, 1949). These translations have been altered whenever it was thought necessary to bring out points emphasised by Stein from the German original, or when there was some difficulty in the existing translation. *Sein*, for example, has consistently been rendered as ‘being’, not ‘Being’, and other capitalisations have also been avoided (e.g. Existence, Interpretation, Experience, Nothingness). *Seiendes* has been rendered by ‘the being’, ‘the beings’ or ‘beings’ and not by either ‘entity’, ‘what-is’ or ‘essent’. *Augenblick* has been translated by ‘moment’ and not by ‘moment of vision’; *Angst* by ‘anguish’ and not by ‘dread’, nor has it been left untranslated, *pace* Stambauch, to avoid unpalatable hybrid forms like ‘angsted’ and ‘angsting’. *Mitsein* has not been left untranslated either, but has been translated by ‘being-with’. *Mensch* has been translated by ‘human being’ and not by ‘man’; *existential* by (an) ‘existential’; *Nichts* by ‘nothingness’; *nichtig* by ‘null’; *Entfernung* by ‘distance’; *Gegenstand* by ‘object’ (not ob-ject) and *Verfall* not only by ‘deterioration’, *pace* Macquarrie and Robinson, but also by ‘decay’ and ‘degeneration’ to facilitate a smoother English expression.

Punctuation has been retained as far as possible, but sometimes the sentences have been broken up or a parenthesis introduced. Stein’s italicisation has been kept as restored by the editor of the *Gesamtausgabe* edition of *Endliches und ewiges Sein*, Andreas Uwe Müller. He draws attention to the fact that Stein uses italics to underline the importance of what is said, and quotation marks to mark either her own translation of a Greek or Latin term, a term that is under discussion, or when a metalinguistic level is indicated (p. xvii). We have departed from Müller restoration only to italicise also the titles of works by Stein left in quotation marks.

German lends itself to the precise use of pronouns (*ihrer, ihre, sein, seinen, seiner*, etc.), whereas English of course does not. Hence such pronouns have sometimes been replaced by the noun to which they refer. At other times, however, ‘it’, ‘this’ or ‘these’ stands in, even if it opens up some ambiguity, which may be less present in the German text. ‘He’ and ‘she’, and their derivatives, are used as equivalent, when not referring to a specific person.

Many thanks are due to Sarah Borden for her careful reading of the translation, and for her many helpful suggestions to improve it in different ways. Thanks are also due to Pat Gorevan and Cyril McDonnell for their contributions to the readability and completion of the text.

## BEING AND TIME

It is not possible in a few pages to give a picture of the riches and the power of the often truly enlightening investigations contained in Heidegger's great torso *Being and Time*. Perhaps no other book has influenced contemporary philosophical thought in the last ten years so strongly as this one,<sup>4</sup> even if one repeatedly gets the impression that only the newly-coined *words* are picked up, without realisation of their radical meaning and incompatibility with other conceptual tools often thoughtlessly used as well.<sup>5</sup>

Here we shall merely attempt to outline the fundamental structure of the work so as to be able to make a judgement about it, insofar as that is possible.

### *A. Outline of the Argument*

The work has as its aim to 'raise anew the question of the meaning of being'.<sup>6</sup> The reasons advanced for aiming in this manner are the *objective-scientific primacy* of the being-question: 'Basically all ontology [...] remains blind and perverted from its ownmost aim, if it has not first adequately clarified the meaning of Being, and conceived this clarification as its fundamental task';<sup>7</sup> and the claim that until now no satisfactory solution has been found, nor has an appropriate manner of questioning been achieved. The significant attempts in Plato and Aristotle have not been able to advance towards the goal, because the ontology of antiquity generally regarded a *specific way of being* — *the being-present-at-hand* — *to be being as such*. As a consequence being was presupposed as the most general and self-evident, neither yielding nor needing a definition. The ontology of Antiquity was retained throughout the Middle Ages and also by the most influential attempts of modern times: Descartes and Kant.

In order to obtain an answer to the question concerning the meaning of being, one must question *beings*, and not any being, but *that being to whose being the asking for the meaning of being and a certain anticipatory ('pre-ontological') understanding of being belongs*. This being, 'which each of us is himself' is called 'Dasein',<sup>8</sup> 'because we cannot define Dasein's essence by citing a "what" of the kind that pertains to a subject-matter, and because its essence lies rather in the fact that in each case it has its being to be, and has it as its own'.<sup>9</sup> As its understanding of being concerns not only its own being (which is called *existence*), but also the being which is not Dasein, 'Fundamental Ontology, from which alone all other [ontologies] may arise, must be sought in the *existential analytic of Dasein*'.<sup>10</sup> Thus the first part of the work is dedicated to the interpretation of Dasein: its first section contains a preparatory analysis of Dasein, the second will show 'temporality as the meaning of the being we call Dasein'.<sup>11</sup> Whereas the understanding of being belongs to the being of this being, 'time needs to be explained primordially as *the horizon for the understanding of being, and in terms of temporality as the being of Dasein, which understands being*'.<sup>12</sup> A third section was to have treated of 'Time and Being', in the sense that not only Dasein were to be conceived as temporal, but *being as such* should have been 'conceived in terms of time'.<sup>13</sup> It seems that this section was written together with the two previous ones (more than once reference is made to its sub-sections); but it was never

published. Equally, the entire second part — necessitated by reference to the historicity of Dasein and its understanding of being as a ‘destruction of the history of ontology’ (Kant–Descartes–Aristotle) — remains merely announced.

## 1. The Preliminary Analysis of Dasein

The *preliminary investigation* designates as a characteristic of *Dasein’s being* that it is *in each case mine* (i.e. is as such individual and not a universal); that it *relates to itself* and that its being or its *existence is its essence*. What belongs to the structure of this being is designated as an ‘*existential*’. The existentials correspond to the categories of the *present-at-hand*. Dasein, however, is not a present-at-hand, not a ‘*what*’, but a ‘*who*’. It ‘has’ no possibilities as ‘attributes’, but ‘is’ its possibilities. Its *proper being* is its *having-to-become-itself*. The expressions ‘I’, ‘subject’, ‘soul’, ‘person’, even ‘human being’ and ‘life’ are avoided, because they either signify a reification of Dasein (the ontology of Antiquity and Christian dogmatics mistakenly place Dasein under the categories of the present-at-hand according to Heidegger), or intend a kind of non-thingly being which remains unclarified.

Dasein is then contemplated in its *everydayness*. To it belongs essentially the ‘*being-in-the-world*’, of which different things are emphasised: the ‘in-the-world’, the ‘who’, who are in the world, and the ‘being-in’. With ‘world’ is not understood the totality of all objects present-at-hand, nor a certain area of beings (like for example ‘nature’); but *that wherein a Dasein lives*, which is not to be understood in terms of anything else than Dasein. The ‘*being-in*’ has *nothing* to do with *spatiality*. It is an existential, something that belongs to Dasein’s mode of being as such, independent of the spatial extendedness of the body. ‘Being-in-the-world’ is characterised by ‘*concern*’ (in the many senses of ‘enduring’, ‘achieving’, ‘obtaining’, and ‘being apprehensive’). Knowing is also a kind of concern. One falsifies its original character if one sees it as a relationship between present-at-hands (*subject* and *object*). It is a kind of in-being, and admittedly not the fundamental one, but a *modification of the original in-being*. The original in-being is a *dealing* with things, whereby these are regarded not merely as something ‘present-at-hand’ but also as ‘equipment’ which is there to be used for something (material, tool, item of practical use): as ‘*ready-to-hand*’. All of these are understood to be something ‘*for...*’; revealed by the sight that is *circumspection*. The theoretical attitude is in contrast a non-circumspect mere-seeing. In frictionless dealings with things which are ‘ready-to-hand’, these stay unobtrusive, inconspicuous, docile. Only when something shows itself as useless does it stand out and impose itself, in contrast with what is used, but just not ‘available’. What imposes itself as useless discloses its *being-present-at-hand*. Failure or uselessness becomes a *referral* from the individual to the *totality of equipment* and to the *world*. Concern arises always already on the basis of a familiarity with the world. Dasein understands itself as a being in the world and understands the *significance* of the world. It has with everything in it a *certain involvement*, and at the same time ‘one lets it be involved’, i.e. one ‘sets the things free’, when they do not directly provoke attack and reformation.

Every item of equipment has its *place* and its *region* in the totality of equipment where it belongs: it is ‘in its place’ or it is ‘lying about’. This is *spatiality*, which belongs to the items of equipment as such; it is not to be

explained by a space of indifferent places already present-at-hand into which things are put. But because of the unity of the totality of involvements all places combine to form a unity. *Dasein* is also *spatial*. But its spatiality signifies neither that it has a position in objective space, nor a place like the ready-to-hand. It is determined by ‘*distance*’ and ‘*directionality*’. ‘Distance’ (suppression of the far-away) means the bringing of ready-to-hand into its proper nearness.<sup>[14]</sup> ‘Directionality’ means its having directions in the environment (right, left, up, down, etc.) and its encountering all things spatial. By this, space is not yet made to stand out, however. Space is neither ‘in’ the subject, nor is the world ‘in’ it as in an already present-at-hand. Space belongs to the world as something that co-structures it. In an attitude where *Dasein* has given up its original concern while still ‘contemplating’, it can be brought out for it and seen as ‘pure homogenous space’.

The *who* of *Dasein* is no present-at-hand substance, but a *form of existence*. ‘[T]he human being’s substance is not the spirit as a synthesis of soul and body; it is rather *existence*’.<sup>15</sup> It belongs to *Dasein* to *be-with* other beings who also have the form of *Dasein*. This [being-with] is not a finding of other subjects that are present-at-hand, but is instead a being-with-one-another which is already presupposed for learning and understanding (empathy). To *Dasein*’s understanding of being belongs the understanding of others. ‘This understanding, like any understanding, is not an acquaintance derived from knowledge about them, but a primordial, existential kind of being, which makes such knowledge and acquaintance possible in the first place’.<sup>16</sup> So *Dasein* is from the start *with-being-there-in-the-world*. Its subject — and the subject of the everyday *Dasein* generally — is not its own proper self, but a *they-self*: it is not a sum of subjects, nor a genus or kind, but — just like the authentic *self* which is covered over in the they-self — an *essential existential*.

Having clarified the ‘*world*’ and the ‘*who*’, the *being-in* can now be better grasped. *Dasein* means being *there*, and that implies being here as distinct from over there: openness to a spatial world; it means further ‘being there for itself’. This openness is claimed to be the meaning of the ‘talk of the *lumen naturale* in man’, it ‘means nothing other than the existential-ontological structure of this being, that it is in such a way as to be its “there”. That it is “illuminated” means that *as being-in-the-world* it is cleared in itself, not through another being, but in such a way that it *is* itself the clearing.’<sup>17</sup> Being open does not rely on reflective perception, but is an existential, something that belongs to *Dasein* as such. We find in *Dasein* the *state-of-mind* and *understanding* as equi-primordial. The ‘state-of-mind’ refers to an internal mood. *Dasein* is always in some ‘mood’ or other; it comes neither ‘from the outside’ nor ‘from the inside’, but is a way of being-in-the-world. And it reveals to *Dasein* its ‘thrownness’: it finds itself as being in the world and thus in this or that mood. ‘The pure “that it is” shows itself, but the whence and the whither remain in darkness.’<sup>18</sup> ‘Finding itself’ — that means nothing else, than that it is open to itself. This openness is one of the meanings of *understanding*. It harbours moreover an ‘understanding of [...]’, i.e. a possibility or ability, which as belonging to its being is transparent. ‘*Dasein* is not a present-at-hand which in addition possesses a competence; it is rather primarily its being-possible.’<sup>19</sup> Existential understanding is that from which both thought and intuition derives. In addition to understanding its own possibilities, the inner-worldly possibilities of significance for *Dasein* are also understood: *Dasein*

constantly *projects* its being unto possibilities. It *is in* this projection always already that which it is not as yet, because of its understanding of being.

Understanding may develop into *interpretation*, i.e. into an understanding of *something as something*. Such interpretation may not necessarily express itself linguistically. Simple understanding is always presupposed as an understanding from within a totality of meaning; in such a totality of meaning is implied a *fore-having*, a *fore-sight* and a *fore-conception* pointing in a certain direction.

Being, which is opened up to Dasein, has a meaning. What is understood are the beings themselves; meaning is not *in-itself*, but it is rather an existential determination. Only Dasein can be *meaningful* or *meaningless*. What is not of Dasein is *nonsensical*, and only it can be *absurd*. Meaning is structured by interpretation and already in understanding disclosed as susceptible of being structured. When a ready-to-hand stands out from its context and is having something attributed to it, the interpretation is changed into *expression*. This implies three things:

1. *Pointing out* a being or something relating to being;
2. *Determination* of beings (predication);
3. *Communication* as letting-see-with.

Founded in understanding, *speech* and *hearing* belongs to the being of Dasein — to its openness and its being-with. The understood totality of meaning is expressed by its structure through speech. What is spoken is the *language* (of which speech is the existential foundation). That *about which* we speak, are beings.

In the everyday Dasein of the ‘they’, speech has deteriorated into *idle talk*. In idle talk there is no original understanding of things, but a mere *understanding of words*, whether in hearing or in talking. What is understood, is not the beings but rather the talking as such.

*Original appropriation of beings* is *sight*: in the form of original prudently concerned understanding, knowing or contemplative gazing. As sight relates to curiosity, so speech relates to idle talk.<sup>[20]</sup> *Curiosity* is the craving to see for the sake of seeing, not in order to understand; it is restless, relentless, leading to distraction. Idle talk and curiosity are closely linked, idle talk determines what one must have read and seen. Add to this the third characteristic of deterioration, *ambiguity*: that one no longer knows the difference between original and mere inauthentic understanding. *Deterioration* is a mode of being wherein Dasein is neither itself, with things or with the other, but only pretends to be all this. ‘This kind of *not-being* has to be conceived as the kind which is closest to Dasein, in which Dasein maintains itself for the most part. This is why Dasein’s deterioration should not be taken to be a *fall* from a purer and higher *primal status*.’<sup>21</sup>

Until now the investigation has clearly shown *existentiality* and *facticity* to be the constitution of Dasein’s being. Existentiality designates the specific characteristic of Dasein, that to its being belongs a relation to itself, that it is ‘brought before itself and becomes disclosed to itself in its thrownness’; facticity designates the thrownness which ‘as a kind of being, belongs to a being which in each case *is* its possibilities, and is them in such a way that it understands itself in these possibilities, projecting itself upon them’. ‘The self, however, is proximally and for the most part inauthentically the they-self [...]. *Accordingly Dasein’s average everydayness can be defined as the falling-open thrown-projecting being-in-the-world, for whom its ownmost potentiality-for-Being is an issue, both in its being alongside the world and in its being-with others*’.<sup>22</sup> Now an attempt is made

to grasp the thus presented understanding of being in its *totality*, and to show the intimate relationship of its individual features designated by *existentiality* and *facticity*. To this end Dasein's *fundamental state-of-mind*, in which this relationship could become clear, is sought. There must be 'in Dasein an understanding state-of-mind in which Dasein is specifically disclosed to itself'.<sup>23</sup> It will be shown that *anguish* meets this condition. While fear always is directed towards something threatening in the world, anguish is not anguish for something in the world, but for being-in-the-world itself. Yes, it is anguish that brings the 'world' as such in sight. It is anguish 'for' being-alone-in-the-world (as 'solus ipse'), i.e. for an authentic being from which Dasein in its deterioration flees into the world and the 'they'. Even from the point of view of this turning away can anguish be detected with hindsight. That *about which* Dasein is anguished is its possibility for being in the world. The deterioration is a deflection of its own free possibilities to be towards being-by-the-world and to the 'they-self'. In the possibilities it is always already 'ahead of itself' — and this belongs to being thrown; its being-ahead is named '*care*' and is the foundation for all concern and solicitude, all wishing and willing, all addiction and urge.

According to Heidegger it is a reversal of the order of being to want to understand the being of Dasein in terms of *reality* and *substantiality*. According to him the tradition understands reality to be nothing but 'the being of beings that are present-at-hand within-the-world (*res*) [...]';<sup>24</sup> one could also take it in a wider sense including the different ways of being of innerworldly beings. As the understanding of being is something that belongs to Dasein, there is understanding of being only when Dasein is. From this it follows that being itself, if not beings, is dependent on Dasein. The *substance of human beings* — understood as caring — is claimed to be their *existence*.

If *truth* and being belong so closely together as tradition has always held since Parmenides, then the original meaning of truth must also be obtainable from the analysis of Dasein. The common definition of truth as *adequatio rei et intellectus* does not manage to point to an equality or similarity between subject and object or between ideal judgement content and fact, through which speaking of an agreement can be justified. *The assertion states something of the thing*: it is *the same* thing of which something is taken to be true and of which something is stated. Truth is equivalent with *being true*, and that means *being revealing* (*ἀλήθεια*<sup>25</sup> — revealedness). It pertains thus originally to Dasein. Only in a derived manner is *revealedness* of beings in-the-world to be designated as truth. This is because of *Dasein's openness: it is in the truth*. Likewise, however, — in its deterioration — it is in *falsity* when covered over by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity.

The *assertion* is a *pointing* to beings growing out of understanding and interpretation. As asserted, however, it becomes ready-and-present-to-hand, and as such it is brought into relation with the ready-and-present-at-hand of which it is an assertion: in this way is achieved the accord between knowledge (= judgement) and beings (= *res*). The modification must be understood to stem from the fact that all truth must first be wrought from beings; that revealedness in contrast with hiddenness — as something unusual — demands proof. The *truth of judgement* is thus *not the most original* [form of truth], but is indeed derived. In its original meaning truth is an existential. As such *truth is only when Dasein is*. There can only be *eternal truths* if there were an *eternal Dasein*, and only if the latter were proven to exist, *would* the former be shown to be. On the other hand truth must



be, as it belongs inextricably to Dasein. We must 'presuppose' it, as we 'presuppose' ourselves, i.e. as always already found thrown into Dasein.

## II. Dasein and Temporality

The preparatory investigation of Dasein is at an end. It should serve the purpose of disclosing *the meaning of being*. To suffice for this it should have conceived *Dasein in its totality and authenticity*. Recapitulating, the question is raised whether this has been achieved with the determination of Dasein's existence as care. It is decided, however, that something essential is still missing. If Dasein is concerned with its own possibility, this obviously entails that there is something which it is not yet. In order to be grasped in its totality, also its end — *death* — must be grasped, something which only is possible in being towards death. In order to show moreover the authenticity of Dasein, it must be indicated how it testifies to itself, and this happens in *conscience*. Only when the authentic possibility of Dasein's being can be accounted for in its entirety is the analytic of Dasein's original being secured, and this is only possible when Dasein's *temporality* and *historicality* have been accounted for. The death, conscience, temporality and historicity of Dasein are thus the objects of the following investigations.

The specificity of Dasein's being as *care*, in which it is ahead of itself and according to which something of its being always remains *outstanding* seems to exclude an understanding of Dasein in its totality. It must therefore be shown that *death can be grasped*, and that as a consequence the entirety of Dasein can be grasped along with it.

The experience of the death of others is not an authentic experience of death. We experience their not-being-any-more-in-the-world, a transition from Dasein to something which comes close to sheer being-present-at-hand but which nevertheless does not coincide with it, as what is left behind is no mere body-thing, nor is it something merely dead; but for us being-with and care are still possible in relation to the one who has 'died'. And the ceasing to be is only a ceasing for us; it is not understood from the point of view of the one who is dying, *we do not experience the dying of the other*. While standing in for the other is — to a large extent — possible in the being-in-the-world which is concern, *no one can take upon herself the death of another. As the ending of Dasein* it is itself an *existential*, and it can, in so far as it can be *experienced at all, only be so as mine*, not from the point of view of others'.

The 'outstanding', which belongs to Dasein's being and which matures in death, is not the outstanding of a not yet ready-to-hand, which becomes disposable of its kind (like an outstanding debt). It is not the immaturity of the fruit which is consumed in the ripening, and it is not like the unfinishedness of the road ending only at the goal. The ending that lies in death is also not a disappearing (like the rain that stops). It cannot be understood in terms of anything else but the being of Dasein itself, i.e. in terms of care. *Dying* is neither identical to the 'perishing' of a living being, nor to the *demise* as a passage from life to being-dead, but it is the *mode of being* in which Dasein *is* towards death.<sup>26</sup>

'The existential interpretation of death takes precedence over any biology and ontology of life. But it also founds any investigation of death which is historico-biographical, or ethnologico-psychological. [...] On the other hand there

is in the ontological analysis of being-towards-the-end no anticipation of our taking any existential stance towards death. If death is defined as the “end” of Dasein, i.e. of being-in-the-world, this does not imply any ontical decision as to whether “after death” still another being is possible, whether higher or lower, or whether Dasein “lives on” or even “outlasts” itself as “immortal”. Nor is anything decided ontically about the “other-worldly” and its possibility, any more than about the this-worldly; [...]. But the analysis of death remains purely “this-worldly” in so far as it interprets the phenomenon merely in the way in which it “enters into” any particular Dasein as a possibility of its being. Only when death is conceived in its full ontological essence can we have any methodological assurance in even *asking* meaningfully and with justification *what may be after death*.<sup>27</sup> *Being towards death* is prefigured in care as the being-ahead-of-one-self. It belongs as originally to Dasein as being-thrown and expresses itself most clearly in *anguish*; but it is mostly hidden, as Dasein flees it in the mode of deterioration towards the present-at-hand. What *impends* is the *possibility-not-to-be*, the ownmost possibility of being free from all relations; but it impends not as something exterior imposing itself but as an ownmost possibility to be. The everyday idle talk of ‘the they’ makes this an event which ‘the they’ comes across, from which, thus, one’s individual self can feel secure.<sup>[28]</sup> Idle talk makes anguish out to be fear of a threatening event and thus as something which one ought not to indulge in; it does not let the courage to anguish before death come up, but hides Dasein’s ownmost, non-relational possibility to be. In that the ‘they’ accords to death only an empirical certainty (as a fact of general experience), it hides Dasein’s own *authentic certainty* belonging to its openness: the specific certainty *that death is possible at every moment*, even if temporally undetermined. *Dasein is*, with this certainty, *already given* in some kind of totality.

The *authentic being towards death* is no concerned wanting-to-make-available, no waiting for a realisation; it envisages the ability-to-not-be as pure possibility, in that it *anticipates* it as its *ownmost* possibility, which it must take up itself *independently* of all relations, and which therefore reveals to it its authentic being together with the inauthenticity of average being and the other’s authentic possibility to be. From inside the *anguished* state-of-mind this possibility poses a threat. But for its totality it has significance, ‘as anticipation of the unrepeatable possibility opens up all its presented possibilities with it’, ‘it harbours the possibility of an existential anticipation of the whole of Dasein’.<sup>29</sup>

Dasein’s authentic possibility for being whole, announcing itself in the anticipation of death, needs, however, *an attestation of the possible authenticity of its being* from Dasein itself. Such is found in *conscience*. From being lost in the ‘they’ Dasein must be called to itself. The voice of conscience has the character of a *call*. *Called* is *Dasein* itself *silently*, despite the they. *The calling* is again *Dasein*, but the appeal is not accomplished ‘by’ me, rather it ‘comes upon me’: Dasein in its anguish concerned with its own possibility to be as care, is the caller. The self is, for the Dasein lost in the they, a foreigner; from this stems the *foreignness* of the call. ‘The appeal to the self [...] does not force it inwards upon itself, so that it can close itself off from the ‘external world’.<sup>30</sup> ‘The call points *forward* to Dasein’s possibility to be [...]’ It ‘calls us back by calling us forth’.<sup>31</sup> It speaks not of occurrences and gives nothing to talk about. When it speaks of *guilt*, this *guiltiness* designates an *existential: a reason for a not-being’s being*. (This is fundamental to all having of guilt.) Dasein, as thrown into existence (i.e. a being as project), is reason for its being: it is delivered over to being as reason for

the possibility to be. As it always stays behind its possibilities, as it in being *one* is *not* being another, it is *essentially* always reason for not-being and therefore always *guilty* (in a sense which is not oriented towards evil, but is presupposed for good and evil). The correct understanding of the call of conscience is thus *wanting to have a conscience*, to willingly act from the *freely-chosen ability to be*, and thus to be responsible. 'In fact all action is necessarily *conscienceless*, not only because it may fail to avoid some factual moral indebtedness, but because it for the null reason of its null projection already has, in being-with-others, become guilty towards them. Thus the wanting-to-have-conscience becomes the taking-over of that essential conscience-lessness within which alone the existential possibility of *being* 'good' subsists'.<sup>32</sup> 'Thus conscience manifests itself [...] as an *attestation* belonging to Dasein's being, in which it calls Dasein face to face with its ownmost possibility to be.'<sup>33</sup> When the habitual interpretation of conscience as 'good' or 'bad' reckons things passed or warns against things in the future, this (mis)represents the call of conscience from the point of view of everyday concernedness, directed at the present-at- or ready-to-hand and fleeing from authentic being. The *correct understanding* of the appeal of conscience is as a *mode* of Dasein, indeed as *its openness*. The corresponding state of mind is *uncanniness*, the appropriate 'talk' to *remain silent*, in both of which Dasein takes upon itself its possibility-to-be. The whole is to be designated '*resoluteness*', and this means a 'distinctive mode of openness',<sup>34</sup> which is identical to *original truth*. Dasein is not by this released from its being-in-the-world, but is only now authentically *situated* and hence capable of *authentic being-with* and authentic solicitude.

In the wholeness which is hidden by anticipation, the *temporality of Dasein* marking all its fundamental determinations shows forth. '*As being towards the end which understands*, i.e. as anticipation of death, resoluteness becomes authentically what it can be.'<sup>35</sup> Being resolved means to be hidden and hide in the possibility to be, i.e. to be in the truth and to appropriate in being conscious the taking-of-something-to-be-true. The current 'situation' is not to foresee and it is not given beforehand as a present-at-hand; it 'merely gets disclosed in a free resolving which has not been determined but is open to determination.'<sup>36</sup> Hearing the appeal of conscience means Dasein's reverting back to authentic being, as well as the acceptance of its ownmost possibility to be in death, coming with anguish and uncertainty. To make this authentic being shine forth is not easy: it must first be weaned from the dissimulating everyday attitude.

With the term 'care' is designated the *entire structure of Dasein* (*facticity* as thrownness, *existence* as self-anticipation including being towards the end, *deterioration*). The *unity* of this whole expresses itself in the *self* or *I*: it is not to be understood as 'res', nor as 'res cogitans'; nor does it speak from the I, but it expresses itself silently in care, and it is 'independent' in authentic being. It belongs to the meaning of care, i.e. to the being of 'a being for which this being is an issue', that this being understands itself in its being. 'The meaning of Dasein's being is not something free-floating which is other than and outside of itself, but it is the self-understanding Dasein itself.'<sup>37</sup> The understanding of self is understanding of the ownmost possibility to be and this is possible because Dasein *comes to itself* in its being. Likewise it is *what it has been*, and it is this *by something present*: future, having been (past), and present are its *outside itself* or the *ecstases* of its *temporality*. The *future* has *primacy*. With it Dasein, future and

temporality are given as *finite*. What in relation to this original time the infinite means still remains to be shown.

If the being of Dasein is essentially temporal, this temporality must be noticeable in all that belongs to its constitution of being. *Understanding* as projection is authentically oriented towards the *future*, insofar as it anticipates. In contrast *everyday understanding* as care has only authentic future in that it expects the cared-for. The *moment* is the *authentic present*, in which the self recollects itself and opens up a situation by its *resolution*. Authentic understanding takes *having-been-being* upon itself, while concern lives in *forgetfulness* of the having-been. The temporality of inauthentic understanding in which the self is closed up is thus a forgetting-making present-expecting.

The *state of mind*, which being-thrown unveils and which accompanies every understanding, is founded *primarily* on *having-been-being*, even if it is directed towards future things; for example, anguish is authentically, and fear inauthentically, flight from having-been-being and from the lost present into the threatening future that must be faced. It is essential to the having-been which belongs to the state-of-mind of anguish that it brings before Dasein its 'repeatability': Anguish 'brings back to the pure "that" of the most authentic individualised thrownness. This bringing back has neither the character of an evasive forgetting nor that of a remembering. But equally does anguish not imply a repeat taking over of existence in resolution. On the contrary, anguish brings back to thrownness as something that can *possibly be repeated*. And in this way it is revealed *with* the possibility of an authentic possibility to be, which, in repetition must come back to its thrown "there".'<sup>38</sup>

*Deterioration* has its *temporality primarily* in the *present* where curiosity always tends to be occupied with something; its *emptiness* stands in the greatest possible contrast to the *moment* of authentic being.

To *temporality* belongs at all times all three *ecstases*, and these are not to be understood as *one next to the other*.

'The being which bears the title Dasein is "cleared"',<sup>39</sup> not through a 'present-at-hand implanted power', but in that 'ecstatic temporality clears the there *primordially*'.<sup>40</sup> Through it the unity of all existential structures becomes possible. From it being-in-the-world is to be understood, [as well as] the meaning of the world's being and its transcending.

Prudent concern and theoretical understanding are modes of being-in-the-world. It is characteristic of the *temporality of prudent concern* that the wherefore of the *present* and *retained* totalities of involvement are *expected*. The current concern takes off from inside a totality of involvement. Its original understanding is called *overseeing* and has its 'light' from Dasein's possibility to be. Practical *deliberation* concerning the involvement relations of the ready-to-hand is a making present of possibilities. In the transition to *theoretical knowledge* lies not only an example of praxis — theory requires no less its own praxis — but a revision of *what is now present-at-hand*: outside its relations and its place, in an indifferent space. This is thematisation, in which the uncovered present-at-hand can be set free and meet us as an object; a special making-present founded in resoluteness — 'in the disclosedness of the "there" the world is disclosed along with it'<sup>41</sup> — and in Dasein's transcending of thematised being.

To Dasein belong the three *ecstases* and being-in-the-world, which is itself temporal. *Dasein's being* as thrown, concerned, making present, and even as thematising and objectifying, always *presupposes a world* in which something

present-at-hand or ready-to-hand can be met. On the other hand, *without Dasein* there is *no world* either. 'It is existing its world'.<sup>42</sup> The 'subject' 'as an existing Dasein whose being is grounded in temporality',<sup>43</sup> obliges us to say: the *world* is *more objective* than every possible object.

Dasein's *temporality* is not one in which space is coordinated to time. But the *spatiality* of Dasein is temporal. Dasein is not at a point in space, but rather takes up space (and not only that which the body fills. 'Because Dasein is "spiritual", and *only because of this*, can it be spatial in a way which remains essentially possible for the extended corporeal thing').<sup>44</sup> It is directed out in space and uncovers regions wherefrom and whereto it expects something and where things become present. Its temporality makes it possible for it to take up space. In the approaching making present which gives preference to deterioration, the yonder is forgotten and it appears hereafter only as a *thing in space*.

*Everyday Dasein* has its own special temporality. It is as Dasein 'is for the most part'; running its course 'like yesterday, so today and tomorrow'; and in addition including an habitual calculation with time. Everydayness thus means temporality; as 'this makes possible the *being* of Dasein, an adequate conceptual delimitation of everydayness can succeed only in a framework in which the meaning of being in general and its possible variations are discussed in principle'.<sup>45</sup>

Because understanding of being is necessary to disclose the meaning of being, and as understanding of being is something that belongs to Dasein's constitution, the analysis of Dasein is used as a preparation for the investigation of the meaning of being. The analysis has so far determined the *being of Dasein as care* and therewith as *being towards death*. For the sake of completion, moreover, *birth* and the *relationship between birth and death* is to be included. This relation is not to be conceived as a succession of real moments in time. Dasein's temporality with its three equally real ecstases shows that Dasein does not primarily order itself according to time, its being is a self-stretching to which birth and death always belong, and to which these are what happens. This happening, which follows from Dasein's temporality, is a pre-condition for history (= the science of what has happened). *Historicality and being-in-time both follow from original temporality*; therefore history is also secondary in time.

According to common linguistic usage *historical* has a fourfold sense; it signifies: 1. What has *passed* (and that as either what is no longer influential or what remains so); 2. That *wherefrom* something comes about or descends; 3. The whole of that which is *in time*; in particular: 4. The *being that is human* ('spirit', 'culture'). The four senses are taken together in the affirmation that: 'History is that specific occasioning of existent Dasein which comes to pass in time, so that that which is "past" in the being-with-one-another, and which at the same time has been "handed down to us" and is continually effective, is regarded as "history" in the sense that it gets emphasised'.<sup>[46]</sup> But *primarily historical* is *Dasein*, which is not 'past' (no longer present-at-hand), as it never was 'present-at-hand'; and *secondarily* all that is *internal to the world* of a having-been Dasein (it is called the 'world-historical'): for example, equipment that still is present-at-hand when the world in which it was ready-to-hand no longer is.

*Dasein exists in possibilities that are handed on* and into which it is *thrown*, but which it nevertheless takes upon itself in *free resolution* as its *destiny*. By *destiny* we designate 'the primordial happening of Dasein, which lies in authentic resoluteness and in which it hands itself over, free for death itself, in a

possibility which it has inherited and yet has chosen'.<sup>47</sup> 'Fate as the powerless superior power of the concealed preparing itself for adversity, ready for anguish in a projection of itself on its own being-guilty requires care as its ontological condition for its possibility, that is to say, [it requires] *temporality*.'<sup>48</sup>

'Only a being which, in its being, is essentially *futural* so that it is free for its death and can let itself be thrown back upon its factual "there" by shattering itself against death, that is, only a being which, as futural, is equiprimordially *having-been*, can, by handing down the inherited possibility, take over the own thrownness and instantaneously be for "its time". Only authentic temporality which at the same time is finite makes something like fate, that is to say, authentic historicity, possible.'<sup>49</sup>

'*Repeating is explicit handing down*, that is to say, the going back to the possibilities of the Dasein that has-been-there.'<sup>50</sup> It allows not only a returning to what was previously real. 'It does not abandon itself to that which is past, nor does it aim at progress. Both are indifferent to authentic existence in the moment.'<sup>[51]</sup>

In *being-with* others Dasein has part in the *destiny of the community*. Fate and destiny are being-towards-death. Thus *all history has its gravity in the future*, which only inauthentic historicity covers up.

The *innerworldly present-at-hand* is historical not only insofar as it is in the world, but insofar as *something happens to it* (which is fundamentally different compared to natural events). In the *inauthentic sense* of everyday concern the distracted Dasein collects its life from these particular happenings. In the *authentic being* of resoluteness it lives in its fate and in faithfulness to its own self.

History is existentially founded in Dasein's essential historicity. Its theme is neither what merely happens once, nor something universal which floats above it, 'but the possibility which has been factually existent':<sup>52</sup> The possibilities which drive history, which are from the itself historically determined Dasein, are repeated. Nietzsche's tripartition [of history] in *monumental*, *antiquarian*, and *critical* is necessary, and corresponds to the three ecstasies of temporality.<sup>53</sup>

The final chapter will show what significance *temporality and internal time* have for *the origin of the vulgar concept of time*. Before all measuring of time, Dasein *counts on time* (which it *has, has not, loses*, etc.). It finds time first in the inner-worldly ready-to-hand and present-at-hand, and it understands itself as a present-at-hand. The *origin of the vulgar concept of time* derives from Dasein's temporality.

Everyday 'concern' always expresses itself temporally as expecting-when, retentive-then and present now. Thus it dates all 'then, when...', 'at the time that...', 'now, as...'. The irresolute Dasein always *loses* time and *has* therefore none. The resolute never loses time and thus always has some. 'For the temporality of resoluteness has [...] the character of a moment [...]. This kind of temporal existence has always time *for* what the situation demands of it'.<sup>54</sup> Because Dasein exists *with others*, who understand its now, then, etc., as also dated by others, *time* is not understood as one's own, but as *public*.

*Counting on time* is founded necessarily in Dasein's basic constitution as *care*. 'Dasein's being thrown is the reason why public time exists;<sup>55</sup> time 'in which' there is — within-time — present-at-hand and ready-to-hand. As *brightness* belongs to the sight of the world into which Dasein is thrown, Dasein *dates* according to day and night ('it is time to ...'), *counts* time in days, and

*measures* these by the position of the sun. The time which is based in concern is always ‘time to ...’; it belongs to the world’s worldliness and is therefore called ‘world-time’. It is *datable*, *tense*, and *public*. To read the time is always a now-saying expressing a making-present. In the *measuring of time* its being made public is accomplished, according to which it always and at any time is given for everyone as ‘now, now and now’. It is dated according to spatial measurement relations, without thereby becoming spatial itself. Only through the measurement of time do we arrive at *the* time, and to every thing in *its own* time. It is *neither subjective nor objective*, as it makes world and the being of the self possible. Only Dasein is *temporal*; the ready-to-hand and the present-at-hand exist merely *within time*.

The above serves as a foundation to show the *origin of the vulgar concept of time*: with the openness of the world time is made public and busy. Insofar as Dasein counts on *itself*, it counts on time. One regulates oneself according to time by the use of the clock, by reading the pointers. In this lies a present retention of then and a making present of later. The time that shows itself in this ‘is the *counted* expecting, counting following of the travelling pointer showing itself.’<sup>56</sup> It expresses the *Aristotelian* definition of *time* as the *number of movement*: it stays with the natural understanding of being without making it into a problem. The more concern loses itself in the equipment provided, the more naturally it counts on time, without paying attention to it itself, and it takes it ‘as a sequence of constant *present-at-hand*, simultaneously passing away and coming along now’, ‘as a succession, as a stream of now [...]’.<sup>57</sup> This world-time = now-time, lacks the datability (= meaningfulness) of *temporality*: This is *original time*. Because time is seen as a present-at-hand now-succession, one calls it the *image of eternity* (Plato). The tension of world-time, which follows from the extendedness of temporality, remains covered up. Because every *now* is understood both as a *just now* and an *immediately*, time is understood to be *infinite*. This is founded on *care*, which flees from death and ignores the end. One speaks of the passing away, but not of the beginning of time, as one cannot conceal the evanescence of time to oneself: Dasein knows it from ‘its “fleeting” knowledge about its death’.<sup>58</sup>

Also in the *irreversibility* of time is revealed its origin from temporality, which is primarily futural.

The *moment* cannot be explained from the vulgarly understood *now*, nor can the datable then and at that time. In contrast, the *traditional concept of eternity* can be seen to originate from it *as a standing now*. From the point of view of *original temporality*, *God’s eternity can only be understood as infinite time*. In the juxtaposition of *time and soul* or spirit in Aristotle, Augustine, Hegel an approach to the *understanding of Dasein as temporality* is opened up.

\*\*\*

The analysis of Dasein was the way to prepare the question of the meaning of being. The difference between Dasein-like and non-Dasein-like being has hitherto not been elucidated; nor has the fact that ontological interpretation, which since time immemorial has been directed on thingly being, has again and again deteriorated. Everything was ordered to show temporality as the basic constitution of Dasein. Thus the investigation ends with the question: ‘Is there a way which

leads from primordial *time* to the meaning of *being*? Does time itself manifest itself as the horizon of being?'<sup>59</sup>

### B. Evaluation

The goal of the entire work was nothing else but to ask the question of the meaning of being in an appropriate manner. *Is* thus the question with which the work rings out identical with this question that was put aside, or is a doubt expressed as to whether the way chosen was the right one? Whatever the case is, it invites us to look back at the road taken and to question it.

It will not be possible to give attention to all the difficulties which the quite short abstract lets shine through.<sup>60</sup> To this end a large volume would be necessary. Here we shall merely concentrate on the main features of the thought and attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What is 'Dasein'?
2. Is the analysis of Dasein accurate?
3. Is it a sufficient foundation for posing the question of the meaning of being in an adequate manner?

#### 1. What is Dasein?

It can hardly be doubted that Heidegger wants to understand *Dasein* as *the human kind of being*. We could also say: 'human beings', as Dasein often is called 'a being', without opposing the being, as 'that which is', with being itself. It is also directly said that the *essence* of human beings is *existence*. That means nothing else than that something is claimed for human beings which according to the *philosophia perennis* is reserved for God: the identity of essence and being. The human being is nevertheless not simply put in the place of God; 'Dasein' does not simply mean being, but a particular way of being, in contrast with which there are others: the present-at-hand and the ready-to-hand, and also something which here and there is hinted at, but which is not further discussed. The human being, however, is conceived as a little god insofar as it is claimed to be the being distinguished among all beings as *that* being from which alone information about the meaning of being is to be hoped for. God is spoken of only now and then in footnotes, and then only in a dismissive fashion: that divine being is something which could have significance for the meaning of being remains completely excluded.

The choice of the name 'Dasein' for human beings is *positively* founded on the fact that it belongs to their being to be 'there'; i.e. being open to itself in a world in which it is always 'directed' towards a 'yonder'. The *negative* reason is that the traditional and dogmatically determined definition of human beings as 'consisting of two substances, soul and body',<sup>61</sup> which is implied by the name human being, should be excluded in advance. That the human being has a body is not disputed, but nothing further is said about it. In contrast, the way in which the 'soul' is spoken about indicates that this is a word behind which there is no clear meaning. This must not be understood to suggest that what we have here is a materialist outlook. In contrast: it is clearly stated that the 'spirit' (this is admittedly also a word we ought not to use) has priority.<sup>62</sup> Apparently the analysis



of Dasein should give us the clarity that until now no ‘doctrine of soul’ has been able to.

What is left of the human being, when it is abstracted from body and soul? That another quite large volume could be written about this is perhaps the best proof of the distinction of essence and existence in human beings.<sup>[63]</sup> That Heidegger does not get away from this distinction, even when he denies it, is shown by the fact that he constantly speaks of the ‘being of Dasein’: something which would have no meaning if by ‘Dasein’ was meant nothing else than the human kind of being. Moreover, he also speaks about something that belongs ‘essentially’ to Dasein. And when ‘being-in-the-world’ is set forth as belonging to Dasein, and ‘who’ is distinguished not only from the ‘world’ but also from ‘being-in’, then it is expressed that the word *Dasein* is used for different things intimately belonging together to the point where they cannot be without the others, and yet without being identical. Thus we must say: ‘Dasein’, for Heidegger, designates sometimes human beings (referred to as ‘whom’ or ‘self’), sometimes the being of human beings (in this case the expression the ‘being of Dasein’ is often used). This being, in its difference from other modes of being, is called *existence*. If we think of the formal structure of beings, as shown in our investigations — ‘something that is’ — then ‘something’ expresses the ‘who’ or ‘self’, the ‘that’ is articulated by body and soul, whereas the ‘being’ becomes valid in *existence*. Sometimes the analysis is concerned with the self, but mostly, however, it is dedicated to being.<sup>64</sup>

## 2. Is the Analysis of Dasein Accurate?

It is nowhere expressly said — even though it probably is presupposed as self-evident — that the analysis as a whole does not claim to be complete. The fundamental determinations of the human being — e.g., state-of-mind, thrownness, and understanding — must be very undetermined abstractions, as they do not take account of the specificity of the psychosomatic being into consideration. (The ‘state-of-mind’ seems particularly important to me in order to ascertain what is bodily and what is of the soul, and how these relate, but its full meaning cannot be completely clarified, if it is not seen in its unfolding as relating to the being of body and soul). This incompleteness does not exclude, however, that what is said is genuinely informative about the human way of being. The description of the already mentioned fundamental constitution and its changing between the two different modes of everyday and authentic being must be described as masterly. It is probably largely thanks to this that the book has occasioned a strong and lasting effect. Is, however, this fundamental constitution to be evaluated as an analysis of the human being which proceeds as far as it can? Does the investigation not in many places and in surprising ways halt in front of references which present themselves in a direct and imperious manner?

The human being is designated as *thrown*. With this it is expressly made clear that the human being discovers itself in Dasein, without knowing how it came to be there, that it is not from and through itself and that it also cannot expect information concerning its origin from its own being. With this, however, the question concerning the origin does not completely disappear. One might try by whatever power to silence it till it dies or to prohibit it as meaningless — it always inevitably arises again from the displayed distinctiveness of the human

being and requires a something which is founding without being founded, something which founds itself: One that throws the 'thrown'. Thus thrownness reveals itself as creatureliness.<sup>65</sup>

Especially plausible is the exposition of *everyday Dasein*: being-in-the-world, the concerned commerce with things, the being-with others. It must also unhesitatingly be conceded that human life 'firstly and for the most part' is life with others in traditional forms, before one's own and authentic being breaks through — a thought which Max Scheler already emphatically stressed. Are the reasons for this fact sufficiently illuminated, however, through the distinction between the 'they-self' and the 'authentic self', and the designation of either as 'an existential' or 'form of existence'? What we are to understand by an 'existential' is repeatedly stated: that which belongs to existence as such. And by existence we are to think of the being of beings, in which their being is in question, i.e. the human being as distinct from other modes of being. In contrast, the expression *form* is left completely unclarified. And we know from the investigations of this book how much in need of clarification it is.<sup>[66]</sup> Thus we cannot gain from the expression *form of existence* any information about the meaning and the mutual relationship of the two 'selves'. That a who or a self belongs to existence seems obvious. But what characterises this 'existential' against another (as, for example, 'being-in-the-world' and 'understanding')? And again: what is the relationship between the they-self and the authentic self *at the level of being*? Is it not clear that in the constitution of being in human beings the 'self' plays a very special role, which it shares with no other existential? And has not Heidegger made the necessary clarification of this special role impossible in advance by declining to talk about 'I' or 'Person', while instead enumerating the possible meanings of these terms? With due regard to earlier clarifications we may well dare to affirm: what Heidegger intimates with the 'self' is the *personal being* of human beings. And it is the distinction of personal being before all else that belongs to being human, that the person as such is the bearer of all other 'existentials'.

Can both the 'authentic self' and the 'they-self' be claimed to be person in the full sense? It seems to me that one takes 'idle talk' too seriously if one wanted to show the 'they' this honour. In order to get to the heart of the matter, we must further investigate what in fact is meant by the 'they'.<sup>[67]</sup>

In common parlance one often uses *one*, in the same sense in which I just used it here: '*one* takes idle talk too seriously...' Instead it could have been said that '*whoever* would, *he'd take* [idle talk too seriously]'. It is an expression of undetermined commonality of a hypothetical character: to 'taking seriously' as a personal attitude belongs a personal bearer; but it is not affirmed as a fact and not attributed to a specific person. The statement: '*one* uses the word usually in this sense' affirmatively establishes a fact. It concerns moreover a personal attitude: to a series of individual cases which are both experientially established and yet still to be expected, and to an undetermined circumference that common experience allows one also to affirm with a special certainty. Often the speaker designates him- or herself, as well as the one or those addressed, equally by 'one': for example: 'one could go for a walk on Sunday?' This can be due to a certain shyness to express the 'we', which in fact is meant, and it can thereby give expression to a not yet fully confessed or secretly guarded community; perhaps this is also a shyness which would like to hide from one-self as well as from the addressee the claim which lies in the question, the feelings of the questioner that

he perhaps goes further than what he ought to, or which could gain acceptance. With this we touch something that seems to lie in the Heideggerian 'one'. The speaker knows him- or herself to be ruled by a common law, or at least by a rule of assessment. He or she has an impression of what 'one ought' and 'ought not' to do. And in this the 'one' has a common meaning: it designates an undetermined circle of human beings, to whom the speaker knows himself or herself to belong.

To sum up we can say: 'one' means:

1. A certain group or an undetermined circle of individuals, ultimately all human beings, for whom something is valid as a common fact, or who are concerned by a common rule of attitude;

2. The individual insofar as he stands under the common law or knows himself to do so.

Should we conclude from this that the individual flees from his own self into the one [the they-self] and shifts its responsibility onto it? Let us stick to the examples Heidegger himself gives: 'One' prescribes, what 'one' ought to have read. It stands here in both senses: referring to the one that dictates, and the one concerned by the dictate. Those who 'must' have read this or that book are those belonging to a certain social stratum within a certain culture: 'barbarians' need not; our builders, insofar as they still live according to their state and do not claim to build cities, need not either; but the 'cultivated European' must. Many levels are here to be observed: some things are expected from the professor, the students, the lady of society, others are limited to a scientific speciality. Who determines what must be read? It is also those who belong to the same level, though not all those who make the claim theirs, but a small selection of predominant individuals. It is here much as it is in a state: here there is 'authority' and 'subjects'; it is simply not laid down by law and in fact not at all determined who belongs to one group and who to the other. At any rate, in one case as in the other, the 'one' is not existing outside of and next to the individual human beings, nor is it an authentic self; it designates a 'community' (in a wide sense of the word, including every kind of structure grown out from individuals as something that includes them),<sup>68</sup> as well as the members belonging to them as such. The 'predominant' individuals belong to a wider community but form among themselves a more restricted one.

What can then the flight into the 'one' [the they-self] mean? Who flies? Why and whereto? The individual flees — so we heard — before his or her ownmost and authentic being, which is a lonely and responsible one, into the community, and unloads his or her responsibility onto it, whether unto the more restricted one or the wider one. This can, strictly speaking, only be called a 'flight', when the individual is awake to authentic being and is conscious of responsibility. The first 'Dasein', in which the human being finds him or herself — 'thrown' — is not, however, the lonely one, but the communal one: the 'being-with'. According to its being the human being is co-originally individual and community-oriented, but its conscious life as an individual begins later than the communal life in time. The human being acts with and like what he sees others do, and is led and drawn by this. And this is perfectly in order as long as nothing else is demanded of him. A call is needed to awake the ownmost and most authentic being. If this call has been felt and understood, and if it has not been paid attention to, then the flight from authentic being and from responsibility first begins. And only then does being-with become 'inauthentic' being: or better said perhaps 'counterfeit' being. Being-with is not as such counterfeit.<sup>69</sup> The person is

just as much called to being a member as to be an individual; but in order to be able to be both in its *own* particular way, ‘from within’, it must first step out of the imitating mode in which it lives and is bound to live at first. Its ownmost being is in need of the preparation provided by the being-with others in order to be, in its turn, guiding and fruitful for others. This must be ignored if one does not want to acknowledge *development* as an essential feature of the human way of being; and one *must* ignore development if one denies human beings an essence different from their Dasein, the temporal unfolding of which is its existence.

If it is recognised that the individual needs the community’s support — right from becoming awake to his or her own identity ‘as such’ and ‘in a specific sense’ (i.e. as a member) — and that to a community belong *leading* spirits, who form and determine its lifeforms, then it is no longer possible to see ‘the they’ as a form of deterioration of the self and nothing else. It does not designate a person in the strict sense of the word, but a plurality of persons linked in community who fit themselves into its forms by their Dasein.

Responsibility begins with the awakening of the individual to its own life. One can speak of the responsibility of the community, which is different from that of the individuals. But this is borne for the community by its members, and to different degrees: it is borne by all those who are capable of it, i.e. those who are awake to their own life, but it is borne first and foremost by the ‘leader’.<sup>70</sup>

Now to the question of ‘what one must have read’. In a community there are certainly human beings who are more qualified than others to judge what may contribute to genuine spiritual education. They carry then in this regard an intensified responsibility, and it is thus appropriate when those who are less able to judge let themselves be led by them. In the reference to ‘the they’ lies the remains of an understanding of the fact that every community must preserve a treasure of acquired wisdom for which the individual, with his or her narrow field of experience and modest depth of insight, does not suffice, but [which he or she] on the other hand cannot renounce without substantial loss. Deterioration, however, consists in this: the ‘predominant’ often are not at all those with professional expertise, and they let their unprofessional judgement be broadcast in an irresponsible manner. On the other hand, however, the mass also subjects itself irresponsibly to the judgement of non-professionals and lets itself be bossed around when instead an independent, responsible attitude is called for. *Irresponsible* does thus not mean here that human beings have no responsibility, rather it means that they close their eyes to it, and moreover seek to pretend it is not there. In this really lies a flight from one’s own authentic Dasein. That it is possible is founded in the human being itself — we can happily say: in the essence of the human being — in that its life encloses a richness of possible kinds of attitudes and that freedom allows for choosing between drawing back and engaging oneself, between taking a stand in this way or that. It is, however, also founded in the natural bonding of human beings with each other, in the drive to ‘participate’ and to make oneself ‘count’: the drive of the ‘strong’ to force others to follow, the drive of the ‘weak’ to fit in and assure themselves a place by ‘justifying the other’. In this is expressed the care for one’s own possibility, in which, according to Heidegger, ‘existence’ really consists. What is meant by this remains to be seen, but the question of ‘deterioration’ must first be further clarified.

Deterioration does not consist in communal life as such, nor in the letting oneself be guided, but in undiscerning collaboration ignoring the ‘call of

conscience', at the cost of the authentic life to which one is called. When Dasein deteriorates, neither its individual, nor its community life is genuine. Yet it sounds very strange when Heidegger declares that the deteriorated Dasein ought not to be understood to have fallen from a purer and higher original state.<sup>71</sup> What meaning can 'deterioration' have, if there is to be no reference to a 'fall'? (This is a parallel to 'thrownness' without a 'throwing'). The reason advanced also is poor: *because* deteriorated being (it is even called 'non-being') is the closest kind of being to Dasein's, in which the latter exists for the most part, deterioration ought not to be interpreted as a fall. When the average everyday human being is characterised as deteriorated, this is only possible in contrast with authentic being, of which we must also have knowledge. And in relation to deteriorated being, authentic being is, *qua being*, more original. A further question is how the temporal relationship is to be conceived. This issue is obscured by Heidegger, as he does not observe the difference between the breakthrough from a previous level of development to authentic being and the turning back from a degenerate condition. It is possible in the natural order of things to rise from an earlier incomplete developmental stage to a more perfect being. From a degenerate condition, however, no more perfect stage can be reached, according to the natural order. All decay also temporally presupposes a fall: not unconditionally in the being of the individual, but as a historical event from which it results. The special kind of fall which we know from Revelation cannot be derived from this. But we must say, however, that the teaching of the Church concerning the Fall is the solution to the puzzle which has arisen from Heidegger's exposition of degenerated Dasein.

Wherefrom comes then the required knowledge of authentic being? It is announced in the voice of everyone's conscience. This voice calls Dasein from being lost in degenerate being-with, back to its authentic being. The caller must, in Heidegger's view, again be Dasein. If the call sounds as if it comes *upon* me, and not *from* me, this is explained by the authentic self being foreign compared to the self lost in the 'they'. What, however, testifies, against appearance, to the fact that the one called should also be the caller? As far as I see, nothing does apart from the fundamental attitude that issues from and dominates the whole work: that the 'solus ipse' is distinguished above all other being, that it is that from which all answers concerning being is to be expected, the ultimate origin beyond which there is nothing further. The uninhibited investigation of this 'solus ipse', however, again and again comes up against references testifying to the fact that it is itself not the ultimate: not ultimately fundamental and not the ultimate light.

We will not further concern ourselves with the call of conscience, but dwell instead on the affirmation that there are two forms of being: degenerate and authentic, and then ask of what authentic being consists. The mode of Dasein which corresponds to the call of conscience is 'resoluteness'; a special kind of 'openness' or 'being in the truth', by which the human being takes upon itself its authentic being, which is an 'understanding being to the end', an 'anticipation of death'.<sup>72</sup>

We have now reached the essential feature of 'Dasein' which Heidegger obviously has privileged. That it is always 'ahead' of itself, that it is concerned with its possibility to be (expressed by the word 'care'), that the future has priority among the three 'ecstases' of its temporality, all this is merely preparatory references to the fundamental attitude: that the human being has its ultimate possibility in *death* and that its openness, i.e. its understanding of its own being, from the very first includes this ultimate possibility. This is why anguish is

perceived to be its fundamental state of mind. An answer to the question that concerns us, of whether the analysis of Dasein is accurate, can therefore not be possible without probing what is said about death.

We must first and foremost ask: *What is death?* Heidegger answers: *the end of Dasein*. He immediately adds that with this no decision should be favoured as to the possibility of a life after death. The analysis of death remains purely 'of this world': it looks at death only insofar as it belongs to this world as a possibility of the particular Dasein. What comes after death is a question that can only be asked meaningfully and with justification when the ontological essence of death has been grasped.<sup>73</sup> Much is strange in this discussion. If it is the ultimate meaning of Dasein to be 'being towards death', then the meaning of Dasein should be clarified by the meaning of death. How is this possible, however, if nothing else can be said of death than that it is the end of Dasein? Is this not a completely fruitless circularity?

Moreover: does the possibility of a life after death really remain open, if one sees death as the end of Dasein? Dasein has here been taken in the sense of *being-in-the-world*. One should thus be able to say: it is possible that the *being-in-the-world* of human beings ends, without them thereupon ceasing to be in another sense. But this would run against the sense of the previous analysis, which, although underlining other *existentials* besides *being-in-the-world* (e.g. understanding), did not regard these as separable. Furthermore: if something of what has been shown to belong to *the being of Dasein* remains while other things cease (and how could one then speak about *living on?*), one could no longer speak about the end of Dasein.

Finally: could we speak about having grasped the ontological essence of death as long as one leaves it open whether it is the end of *Dasein* or the transition from one mode of being to another? (We must here understand the word *Dasein* as Heidegger has used it in the entire previous investigation, to mean not only the end of earthly existence but the end of human beings as such). Is this not rather the decisive question concerning the meaning of death and therefore decisive for the meaning of Dasein? Should it transpire that no answer to the question is to be gained from the analysis of Dasein, then it would be shown that the analysis of Dasein is incapable of clarifying the meaning of death and thus of giving sufficient information concerning the meaning of Dasein.

As it happens Heidegger quickly passes over the question of what death is, and concentrates on the question of how it can be experienced.<sup>74</sup> He claims that it cannot be experienced as the death or dying of others, but only as an 'existential', as belonging to Dasein. (As dying also is designated as the 'ending of Dasein', there is apparently no sharp distinction to make between death and 'dying'.) We will now treat these questions: 1. Is there an experience of one's own death? (Heidegger says yes!) 2. Is there an experience of the death of the other (Heidegger says no!) 3. How do the two relate?

According to Heidegger's interpretation dying is 'that way of being in which Dasein *is* towards its death',<sup>75</sup> and by this is not meant its 'demise' as transition from life to death, but something belonging to Dasein as such, which co-constructs it as long as it lasts. Do we not meet another ambiguity here: on the one hand, death and dying are an end towards which Dasein is proceeding and, on the other hand, it is this proceeding itself? In the first sense, death is always yet to come; in the second, Dasein is itself a continuous dying. Both meanings are

acceptable, but we must be clear which one is in question when we speak about death or dying.

We now take death in the sense of what is yet to come for Dasein. Do we have an experience of it? Certainly, and even as an experience in the body; dying means to experience death in the body. In a completely literal, non-metaphorical sense, we can only have this experience when we die. In the meantime much of it is already anticipated in life. What Heidegger calls 'dying' — 'being towards death' or 'anticipation of death' — testifies to this. (That he does not take into account this anticipation as compared with authentic dying is linked to his general overvaluation of the future and devaluation of the present. With this is also connected the fact that he completely omits consideration of the phenomenon of *fulfilment* fundamental to all experience). We must here distinguish between anguish as the state which reveals to human beings their 'being towards death' and the 'resoluteness' that takes it on. In resoluteness, anguish has reached understanding. Anguish as such does not understand itself. Yet Heidegger interprets it as both anguish *for* one's own being and as anguish *about* one's own being. Does 'being' here mean the same in these two cases? Or more correctly: is it the same being *wherefore* and *where-about* one is anguished? That wherefore one is anguished is the possibility not to be, to which anguish testifies: it is the experience of *the nothingness of our being*. That about which one is anguished, and likewise that about which human beings are concerned in their own being, is being as a *fullness, which one would like to preserve and not leave behind* — of which there is no mention in Heidegger's entire analysis of Dasein and through which it would nevertheless first be founded. If Dasein were simply not-being, then no anguish would be possible *for* the ability-not-to-be and *about* the possibility to be. Both are possible because human beings share in a fullness from which something continually slips and something is continually won: both life and death. In contrast, authentic dying means the loss of fullness right to complete emptying, and death means emptiness or nonbeing itself. We now have to ask whether the understanding of the possibility of one's own nonbeing and even the insight into the inevitability of death would grow out of anguish, if this were the only way in which our own death was anticipated. Rationally we can only conclude from the not-ness of our being to the possibility of nonbeing, not to the necessity of an expected end. In the pre-theoretical understanding of being which belongs to human beings as such, there is a purely natural and healthy 'life-feeling', a certainty of being that is so strong that, when unbroken by anguish, one would not believe in death were it not for other testimonies. There are, however, such other testimonies, and they are so convincing that the natural certainty of being is annihilated when confronted with them. These are first and foremost one's own near-death states: severe illness, especially when it brings sudden or progressive deterioration of powers or the threat of immediate, violent death. Here is where the real experience of dying sets in, even if the end does not come in the cases where the danger passes.

In severe illness, which brings us face to face with death, all 'concern' stops: all the things of this world, with which one has been concerned, lose importance and fade completely from view. This also means a separation from all those who are still caught up in concern; one stops living in their world<sup>76</sup>. Another care may replace it, as long as the inevitability is not yet understood or recognised: the exclusive care for one's own body. But that will also end (even if it is possible that someone might stay prisoner to it and even be 'surprised by

death' in the midst of it), and then there is finally only one important question: being or not-being? The being now in question is most certainly not 'being-in-the-world'. That has already ended when one actually sees death eye to eye. It is the end of bodily living and of all connected to bodily life. Beyond that, however, is a large, dark gate: one must pass through it — but what then? This 'what then?' is the real question of death that is experienced in dying. Is there an answer to this question even before one passes through the gate?

People who have faced death and then turned back are an exception. Most are faced with the fact of death through the death of others. Heidegger claims that we cannot experience the death of others, and we do of course not experience it in the same manner as our own death. Yet the dying and death of others are fundamental to our knowledge of these and thus also for the understanding of our own being and of the human being as such. We would not believe in the end of our lives and we would not understand anguish, yes, in many anguish would not even erupt (without it being disguised as fear for this and that), if we did not constantly experience the fact that others die. As children we usually first experience death as being-no-longer-in-the-world. People, who have belonged to our close or distant environment disappear, and we are told that they are dead. As long as we do not experience any more than that, anguish is not awoken, nor is the horror of death. On this basis, what Heidegger calls 'one dies', can grow: a knowledge that all human beings one day will be cut out of the world in which we live, and that also such a day will come for us. It is a fact that we do not doubt. But we do not either have a lively experiential faith in it: it is not a happening that is embraced with a live expectation. Therefore it leaves us cold, we are not concerned about it. For these first years of childhood this carefreeness is natural and healthy. If it is maintained, however, into maturity and perhaps through one's whole life, then one must say that such a life is not *authentically* lived. A full human life implies an understanding of being which does not ignore 'the last things'. Even a thoughtful child is soon disturbed by the disappearance of people in its neighbourhood and wants to know what it means to be dead; and the explanation one gives him will induce reflection upon death. Perhaps already this suffices to shatter the carefreeness of 'one dies'. It is certainly shattered by seeing someone dead. Even attending funerals can have this effect on a sensitive child. The clearing of the coffin that first was covered in flowers, the carrying away and the lowering of the coffin into the grave, make one shudder in the face of the finality of the farewell, perhaps it also awakes a horror at the wrenching away of the soul.

If religious education has not given death a new meaning through reference to eternal life, seeing the dead adds wrenching away of the soul to the interpretation of death as being-no-longer-in-the-world. This is so particularly when one understands vital liveliness to predominate in living human beings, as compared with the spiritual expression. Heidegger must ignore this contemplation of death as it would force him to consider body and soul in their mutual relationship, something which he excluded from the start. Human beings have, since time immemorial, spontaneously met the experience of death with the question of the *destiny of the soul*.

The question is definitely awoken when one sees not only the dead, but lives through the *dying process* with the person dying. The one who has once witnessed a difficult death is for always lost to the indifference of 'one dies'. It is the powerful sundering of a natural unity. And when the struggle is over, then the



human being, who has fought or in whom the fight has taken place, is no longer there. What is left of her is no longer 'her self'. Where is she? Where is what made her into this living human being? If we cannot give an answer to this question, the full meaning of death is not clear to us. Faith knows an answer. But does there exist, within the realm of our experience, something that affirms it? In fact there does. Heidegger rightly says that no human being can take away someone else's death. It pertains to *Dasein*, and every single one has *her* death as she has *her* *Dasein*. And so what one sees at various deathbeds is in no way is the same thing. I do not refer to this case being a difficult fight and that one being a mild falling asleep. I refer to the fact that many a dead person lies there, after the fight, like a victor: in majestic calmness and deep peace. So strong is the impression on the survivors that the pain over the loss fades in comparison to the importance of what has happened. Could the simple cessation of life, the transition from being to not being, bring forth such an impression? And could it be thought that the spirit, which has impressed this seal on the body, does not exist anymore?

There is a dying in which something else happens: in which all signs of struggle and suffering disappear, even before bodily death sets in. Here the dying person is illumined by another life in a manner visible to all those who surround him. He is illuminated as his eyes see into a light out of reach for us: Its glory still lingers in the body whose soul has been wrenched away. Anyone who had not heard of a higher life, or who had lost belief in such a life, would in this sight meet the likelihood of its existence. The meaning of death as a transition from life in this world and in this body to another life, from one mode of being to another, is revealed to him. Then, however, *Dasein* — as being towards death — is not being towards the end, but towards a new [kind of] being: even though it is reached through the bitterness of death, the violent sundering of natural existence.

The consideration of death should help us to understand *authentic* being, to which the human being is called back from its everyday living. Authentic being reveals itself as a being to which the human being tunes himself by reference to a different being, and loosens himself from everyday being, in which he first finds himself. In this manner we have three ways or degrees of being within *Dasein* itself, which we — from the point of view of faith — can understand as natural life, life of grace, and life of glory. It is obvious that if one replaces the life of glory with non-being, then for the life of grace the being to an end is replaced with a stepping into nonbeing. We must now ask whether within *Dasein* itself — and not only from within its dying and death — reference can be found to an 'authentic' (i.e. 'fuller', not 'more empty') being. Such suggestions can be found in Heidegger, in expressions from which one can clearly see that authentic being means more than the anticipation of death. 'Resoluteness' involves understanding one's own possibility, which renders the human being capable of 'throwing' herself forth, as well as an understanding of the factual 'situation' and its demands. Living 'authentically' means to realise one's ownmost possibilities and to meet the challenges of the 'moment', which always expresses the given life-conditions.

How should we understand this, if not in the sense of the realisation of an *essence* or a *specificity*, which is *given with* being human (i.e. *with* which one is thrown into *Dasein*), that, however, for its development needs free co-operation and hence is entrusted to one? What else can the concepts of the 'moment' and the 'situation' mean apart from an understanding of an *order* or a *plan*, which the

human being has not herself projected, but in which she nevertheless is included and plays a role? All this means *a bond between Dasein and a being which is not its own*, but which is the foundation and goal for its own being. It also means a *breaking open of temporality*: the ‘concerned’ bustling that dwells on no particular thing, but always hastens towards the future does not do justice to the ‘moment’. Herein is expressed that all moments present a fullness that should be brought out. Much is hereby said. First, that the ‘moment’ is not simply to be taken as a mere ‘moment in time’, a section between ‘stretches’ of past and future. It rather designates the way in which the temporal touches something which is not itself temporal, but which reaches into its temporality. Heidegger himself speaks of the interpretation of time as the ‘image of eternity’, but only in order to exclude it. From the standpoint of an understanding of time that knows of no eternity and declares being as such to be temporal, it is impossible, however, to clarify the meaning he gives to the moment. ‘In the moment’ — and this does here mean a moment in time — something meets us that perhaps no other moment will offer us. To ‘bring it out’, i.e. to take it up completely into one’s own being, we must ‘open’ ourselves to it and ‘hand ourselves over’ to it. It is moreover necessary that we do not relentlessly hasten on to something else, but stay with it until we have brought it out or until a more pressing claim obliges us to renounce it. ‘To dwell with...’ means that we, because our being is temporal, ‘need time’ to acquire the timeless. That we, however, despite our being’s fleeting nature, can take the timeless up into ourselves, *maintain* something (what Heidegger calls *having-been-being* is a maintaining), proves that *our being is not simply temporal*, that it does not exhaust itself in temporality.

The relationship between the temporality of our being and the timeless it can take into itself and realise — according to the possibilities decided in it — is no simple equation. Our earthly existence does not yearn for the realisation of all our possibilities, nor to take up all that is offered to us. The decision for a possibility and the letting go of others is designated by Heidegger as a being guilty, which is unavoidable and to which we must consciously acquiesce, as we ‘resolutely’ take our existence upon ourselves. He fails to distinguish this guilt, founded in our finitude, from the avoidable and therefore sinful denial of an obligation. It is probably also a much too idealised picture of the ‘resolute one’, when he affirms that he never ‘loses time’ and always ‘has time’ for what is demanded of him in this moment. Even the holy one, who comes closest to this ideal, will often say that the necessary time is lacking for him to fulfil all that is required of him, and he is not capable always of clearly discerning the best choice among the different possibilities open to him.<sup>77</sup> He will find rest in the confidence that God preserves the one who is of good will from a tragic mistake, and makes his involuntary errors serve a good end. But he also is convinced of his own fallibility and that God alone is the unrestrictedly *open* one.

The inability of our temporal being to fully unfold our essence, to express what we are bid to assume into ourselves and possess ‘as a whole’, points to the fact that the ‘authentic’ being which we in temporality are capable of — ‘resoluteness’ freed from the ‘deterioration’ of everyday mediocrity and obedient to the call of conscience — is still not our final authentic being. In this connection we should remember a saying of Nietzsche: ‘Woe to the one who says: end! For all desire wills eternity, wills deep, deep eternity.’ Desire must here not be taken in a narrow and lowly sense. It must be thought of as the deep liberation in which the fulfilment of yearning is experienced. Heidegger does not want ‘care’ to be

understood as a state of mind, and not ‘in the sense of a worldview-ethical judgement of human life’,<sup>78</sup> ‘but purely as the specificity of the human being: that humans by their being are concerned with their being’. But it is probably no coincidence that the word ‘care’ has been chosen, and that his investigation, on the other hand, leaves no room for what gives human life fullness: joy, happiness, love. Dasein is for him emptied to the point of being a sequence from nothing to nothing. And yet, it is rather the fullness that first really makes it understandable why the human being is ‘about its being’. This being *is* not only a temporal extension and therefore constantly ‘ahead of itself’; the human being always *requires* being given new gifts of being in order to be able to express what the moment simultaneously gives her and takes away. She does not want to abandon what fulfils her and she would like to *be* without end and without limits in order to possess it entirely and definitively. Joy without end, happiness without shadows, love without boundaries, the most intense life without sleep, the most powerful action which at the same time is complete stillness and freed from all tension — that is *eternal bliss*. This is the *being about which human existence is*. The human being reaches out in faith, as she here is promised, that she will be in the full sense when she is in full possession of her essence; this promise speaks from her deepest essence, because it reveals the meaning of her being. To this belongs ‘openness’ in a double sense: as transition from all possibilities into reality (the perfection of being) and — in the Heideggerian sense — as unlimited understanding of one’s own being and absolutely all being, limited [only] through the limits of one’s own finite being. In both [of these senses] the ‘recollection’ of the temporal extension into a unity, referred to by Kierkegaard and Heidegger as the ‘moment’, is necessary. The mode of being in which the difference between the moment and duration is surpassed and the finite reaches its highest possible participation in the eternal is a midway between time and eternity that Christian Philosophy ‘has designated as Aion (aevum)’.<sup>79</sup> Hence there is no more thorough distortion of the idea of the eternal than in Heidegger’s remark: ‘If *God’s* eternity can be *constructed* philosophically then it may be understood only as a more primordial and ‘infinite’ temporality’.<sup>80</sup> A being that has reached full possession of its own being is no longer concerned for it. And also: to the extent that it is freed from the disfiguring tension of care for its own existence in order to embrace abandonment and the relaxation of the self-forgetting gift of self to eternal being, to this extent even its temporal being is already filled with the eternal. Care and temporality are therefore in no way the final meaning of the human being, but rather — according to their own testimony — what must be surpassed as far as possible, in order to reach the fulfilment of the meaning of being.

It is clear, then, that the entire understanding of time given in *Being and Time* needs to be revised. Temporality, with its three *ecstases* and its extension, must have its meaning clarified as the way in which the finite gains participation in the eternal. The significance of the *future*, so strongly emphasised by Heidegger, must be explained in two ways. First as Heidegger does — as the *care* for its preservation stemming from understanding the flux and nothingness of one’s own being; secondly as a direction towards a *fulfilment yet to come*, a transition from the dispersion of temporal being to the gathering of authentic, simple, eternity filled being. Moreover, the *present* must be accorded its rightful position as the *way of being open to fulfilment*, which — like a flash of eternal

light — opens up the understanding to being's fulfilment, and the *past* as the way of being that gives an impression of *durability* in the flux of our being.

There is of course much more to say about Heidegger's analysis of being. But we have come far enough to answer the question of whether it is accurate: it is accurate in a certain sense, in [the sense namely] that it reveals something of the basic constitution of the human being, and sketches a certain way of being human with great clarity. I know of no better expression for this way of being, which he calls *Dasein* and understands to pertain to all human beings, than *unredeemed being*. Unredeemed is both its deteriorated everyday being, and that which he holds to be its authentic being. The first is the flight from authentic being, the avoiding of the question: 'being or not being'. The second is the decision for non-being against being, the turning down of *true*, authentic being. With this is said that *the human way of being as such is caricatured*, despite it being elucidated in its ultimate depths. The exposition is not only defective and incomplete — because it wants to understand being without reference to essence and sticks to a particular way of being — it is also deceptive in regard to its subject-matter, because it isolates this from the totality of ontological relations to which it belongs, and thus cannot reveal its true meaning. The description of 'everyday' being is ambiguous, as it comes close to the mistaken affirmation that community life as such is 'deteriorated', and that 'authentic' being means lonely being, whereas in fact both solitary and community life have their authentic and deteriorated forms. And the description of 'authentic being' replaces it with its denial.

### 3. Is the Analysis of Dasein a Sufficient Foundation for Addressing the Question of the Meaning of Being Appropriately?

Hedwig Conrad-Martius says about Heidegger's approach that it is 'as if a door, so long left unopened that it can hardly be opened anymore, is blown wide open with enormous strength, wise intention and unrelenting stamina, and then immediately closed again, bolted and so thoroughly blocked that any further opening seems impossible'.<sup>81</sup> He has 'with his conception of the human I worked out with inimitable philosophical clarity and energy the key to an ontology which, dispelling all subjectivist, relativist and idealist ghosts could lead him back into a truly cosmological and God-borne world.' He establishes 'being first and foremost in its full and complete rights' even if only in one place: the I. He determines the *being of the I* by the fact that it '*understands being*'. Thus the way is cleared to bring out the understanding of being that belongs to the human being — undisturbed by the 'critical' question of how the knowing I can reach out beyond itself — but also to bring out the being of the world and all created being, which in turn grounds the understanding of divine being. Instead of this, the I is thrown back on itself. Heidegger justifies his taking the analysis of Dasein as point of departure with the fact that one can only ask a being for the meaning of being, if it belongs to its meaning to have an understanding of being. And as 'Dasein' not only has understanding for its own being, but also for other beings, one must start with an analysis of Dasein. But does not the opposite follow from this reasoning? Because the human being understands not only its own being but

also other beings, it is not referred to its own being as to the only possible way to the meaning of being. Surely the self-understanding of being must be questioned, and it is advisable to take one's own being as point of departure, so that the understanding of being can be laid bare in its root and critical reservations be encountered from the start.<sup>[82]</sup> But the possibility always persists of beginning with the being of things or with primary being. One will not get from this a sufficient explanation of the human being, but only references to it that must be checked. On the other hand, the human being also gives only references to other ways of being, and we must 'question' these if we want to understand it. They<sup>[83]</sup> will of course not answer in the same manner as a human being answers. A thing has no understanding of being and cannot talk about its being. But it is and has a *meaning* that is expressed in and through outer appearance. And this self-revelation belongs to the meaning of thingly being.

Heidegger cannot accept this however, as he recognises no meaning distinct from understanding, but dissolves meaning in understanding — although meaning is seen as related to understanding. (We will have to speak of this later.) That one cannot reach understanding of other ways of being from the starting point of the human being, if one does not approach this latter without prejudice, is shown by the darkness in which the being-present-at-hand and the being-ready-to-hand are left by Heidegger. In fact the human being is caricatured already in what it shares with the being of things: in the deletion of its essentiality and substantiality.

It is obvious that Heidegger's investigation is borne along by a particular and presupposed understanding of being, not only by a 'pre-ontological understanding of being' which belongs to the human being as such and without which no questioning of being is possible. [It is] also not [borne] by any genuine ontology, as Heidegger himself would have understood it: research which with persistent focus on being brings this to 'speak'. From the start everything is meant to demonstrate the temporality of being. Hence a barrier is raised everywhere where a view could open onto the eternal; therefore there cannot exist an *essence* distinct from existence that could develop in existence, no *meaning* distinct from understanding that is grasped in understanding, no 'eternal truth' independent of human understanding. In all these the temporality of being would be broken open, and this is not allowed to happen, even though existence, understanding, and 'discovering' cannot be understood apart from something that is independent of them and timeless, which enters time through these and in these. Language takes on a particularly bitter and spiteful tone when such urgent references must be toned down: for example, when 'eternal truths' are designated as belonging 'to those residues of Christian theology within philosophy which have not yet been radically extirpated'.<sup>84</sup> In such passages, an anti-Christian feeling comes through which is generally mastered, however, perhaps in a struggle with [Heidegger's] own, far from dead, Christian being. It also shows in the manner in which the philosophy of the Middle Ages is treated: in minor side remarks which it seems superfluous to discuss in earnest, as dead ends where the right question about the meaning of being got lost. Would it not have been worthwhile to investigate whether the real question of the meaning of being lives in the discussion of *analogia entis*? In a more serious investigation it would also have been clear that tradition did not understand 'being' in terms of mere 'being-present-at-hand' (i.e. thingly persistence). It is moreover very conspicuous how the discussion of the concept of truth in the sense of the tradition is simply said to pertain to judgement,

when Saint Thomas, in the first *Quaestio de veritate* answering the question: ‘What is truth?’, distinguishes four senses of truth, and in no way considers the truth pertaining to judgement to be the primary, even if [he considers it to be] primary in relation to us. When he, with Hilary, denotes *the true* as ‘*being that reveals and explains itself*’, it reminds one specifically of Heidegger’s ‘truth as revealedness’. And where is the justification of talk about truth as an ‘existential’, if not in relation to the first truth? God alone is without restriction ‘in the truth’, while the human spirit, as Heidegger himself emphasises, is equally ‘in the truth and in falsehood’. The critics of *Being and Time* have seen it mostly as their task to demonstrate the rootedness of this philosophy in the leading spirits of the previous century (Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Karl Marx, Bergson, Dilthey, Simmel, Husserl, Scheler, etc.). It seems lost on them to what extent the struggle with *Kant* has been decisive. (The *Kant*-book has made that clear.) And of no less importance is the constant reference to the original questions of the Greeks and their transformation in later philosophy. It would be worthwhile in a separate investigation to assess Heidegger’s relation to Aristotle and Scholasticism, from the way in which he quotes and interprets them. That cannot, however, be our task here.

When we look at the work in its entirety, we are left with the impression that it attempted to show the human being as the ultimate foundation to which all other ways of being lead back, but that the original attempt became questionable in the end. It will be good to compare this with Heidegger’s later publications on the question of being, in order to see whether this impression remains.

## KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF METAPHYSICS<sup>85</sup>

This book sets out, on Heidegger’s own account, to show not only what Kant in fact has said, but what he ‘intended to say’.<sup>86</sup> It is also meant to show that *Being and Time* is a ‘repetition of the Critique of Pure Reason’, i.e. a new attempt to found metaphysics through which the ‘own primordial possibility’ of the Kantian attempt is disclosed.<sup>87</sup>

We will not here investigate whether this interpretation, which must ‘necessarily resort to violence’,<sup>88</sup> interprets Kant truly. Our task is only to find further clarification of the question raised in *Being and Time*: the question of the meaning of being. The question, with which the first part of *Being and Time* rings out — ‘is there a way which leads from original *time* to the meaning of *being*? Does time manifest itself as the horizon of being?’<sup>89</sup> — must probably be designated as the real theme of the *Kant*-book. The entire investigation is intended to let a positive answer to this question come through.

Traditional metaphysics, on which Kant bases himself, has combined the question of *beings as such* with the question of the *totality of beings* and ‘the excellent realm of beings as such [...] through which the totality of all beings is determined’.<sup>90</sup> The question of being as such is an earlier one. But in order to ‘be able to understand the essential determination of beings through being, being itself must first be grasped.’<sup>91</sup> Should ‘the question, “what does being mean?” find an answer’ it must be clarified ‘*from where* originally an answer can be expected at all’.<sup>92</sup> Hence the question: ‘*From where at all are we to grasp something like*

*being* [...]?’<sup>93</sup> is still more primordial than the question concerning beings as such and being as such. We are thus ‘driven back to the question concerning the essence of the understanding of being as such’.<sup>94</sup> In order to show the possibility of a knowledge of beings, the *founding of metaphysics* must be an ‘elucidation of the essence of a relation to beings, in which these show themselves as such.’<sup>95</sup> *Ontic knowledge* (= knowledge of beings) becomes *possible through ontological knowledge*, i.e. through an *understanding of beings’ constitution of being*, which lies before experience. As it belongs to the essence of human reason to transcend itself towards beings, and as this fundamental constitution of the human spirit is called ‘*transcendence*’, the *fundamental ontology* which must achieve the founding of metaphysics is called *Transcendental Philosophy*. Thus *transcendence* is brought to the *centre of the investigation*: Because metaphysics — the questioning of being — lies in ‘human nature’,<sup>96</sup> the foundation of metaphysics must disclose that in the constitution of [the] being of human beings, which is the reason for their understanding of being. Fundamental ontology is therefore ‘analysis of Dasein’ and especially of its transcendence. In transcendence, however, *the finitude of human beings* announces itself. It is what makes all finite knowledge possible: a turning towards ... which *builds a horizon* through which (i.e. in which) the objectivity of an object becomes possible. ‘Transcendence makes the beings themselves accessible to a finite being.’<sup>97</sup> ‘In transcendence, *Dasein* manifests itself as need of the understanding of being [...]. This need is the innermost finitude that carries Dasein.’<sup>98</sup> The human being is ‘in the midst of other beings in such a way that the being that she is not and the being that is herself always already are manifest to her.’<sup>99</sup> ‘*Dependent* on the being that she is not, the human being is, at bottom, *not even* master of herself.’ With her existence ‘there occurs an *irruption* into the totality of beings such that, by this even, the beings become manifest in themselves, i.e. manifest *as* beings — this manifestation being of varying amplitude and having different degrees of clarity and certitude. However, this prerogative [...] to be in the midst of beings, *delivered up to them as such, and of being answerable to oneself as a being*, involves in itself the *necessity* of a need for an understanding of being’. The human being must, insofar as it is, be able *to let be*, and for this she must ‘have already projected that which she encounters as a being.’<sup>100</sup> Existence (i.e. the human way of being) ‘is in itself *finitude* and, as such, is *only possible on the basis of the understanding of being*. *There is and must be such as being only where finitude has become existent*’.<sup>101</sup>

The most original action of the finite spirit is the building of the horizon in which beings can meet. This action is ‘*completing presentation*’. It ‘produces the immediate aspect of the now as such,’<sup>102</sup> which belongs to any seeing of the present, and likewise of the not-any-more of the past or then, which is united to the now and presupposed for all retaining. The seeing of the present, and the remembering of what has been, are inseparable: to these belong thirdly the understanding of the present and the past as *the same*: it relies on a ‘search’, a ‘prospecting proceeding’. This ‘prospects the horizon of proposedness in general’, it is ‘the original *formation* of that which makes all intending possible, i.e. the future’.<sup>103</sup>

And so, that which is formed as the *horizon of beings* is *time*. The *forming of the horizon* is, however, taken to engage *original time*: ‘Time is pure intuition in that it spontaneously pre-forms the aspect of succession and, as a creative taking, proposes this aspect *as such to itself*. This pure intuition *concerns itself*

with that which it intuits (forms) [...]. Time is, according to its nature, pure affection of itself.’<sup>104</sup> ‘Time is not an active affection engaging a present-at-hand self; but as pure self affection, it forms the essence of all self concernedness. So far, however, as the power of being self-concerned belongs to the essence of the finite subject, time as pure self-affection forms the essential structure of subjectivity [...]. As pure self-affection, it originally forms finite selfhood in such a way that self-consciousness becomes possible.’<sup>105</sup> ‘Pure self-affection provides *the transcendental origin-structure of the finite self* as such.’<sup>106</sup> The I is, like time itself, not ‘in time’. From this it does not follow, however, that it is not temporal, but ‘that it renders *time itself as such* possible according to its own essence.’<sup>107</sup> The ‘abiding and remaining’ of the I do *not* mark it as *substance*, but belong essentially to the letting-be of things which the I accomplishes. ‘This abiding and remaining are *not ontic* assertions concerning the immutability of the I but [...] *transcendental* determinations [...]. The “abiding” I is so called because it as the *I think*, i.e. the *I represent*, proposes subsistence and persistence to itself. As I, it forms the correlative of subsistence in general.’<sup>108</sup> Because the pure obtaining of pure present sight is the *essence of time*, the *abiding and persisting* I is ‘the I *in the original forming of time*, i.e. as *primordial time*’. The ‘*full essence of time*’ comprises therefore two things: ‘*pure self-affection*’ and *that which springs from it*, and which can be caught sight of within the usual ‘counting on time’<sup>[109]</sup>.

Original time is the ultimate foundation to which the human understanding of being is led back. The reference to the understanding of being is, however, founded on the *finitude* of humans. This is why the question of finitude as the *basic constitution of the human being* becomes the fundamental question of the foundation of metaphysics. (Only in *this* sense is it possible to make ‘anthropology’ the ‘centre of philosophy’.)<sup>110</sup>

Thus Heidegger regards it as the essential task of fundamental ontology ‘to show how far the problem of the finitude in human beings and the enquiries which it calls for necessarily contribute to our mastery of the question of being, [...] it must bring to light the essential connection between being as such (not beings) and the finitude in human beings.’<sup>111</sup> This essential connection is seen in that ‘the constitution of being of all beings [...] is accessible only through understanding in so far as this [latter] has the character of *projection*.’<sup>112</sup> With *transcendence* (or ‘being-in-the-world’) ‘the *projection* [...] of beings in general happens.’<sup>113</sup> In that ‘Dasein’ needs understanding of being, it ‘is “cared for” that the possibility that something like Dasein can be.’ The ‘transcendental need’ is ‘as innermost finitude carrying Dasein’.<sup>114</sup> And *care* is the name for the structural unity of Dasein’s essentially finite transcendence.

For the *critique of care* (and thus of the entire Dasein-analysis as fundamental ontology and foundation of metaphysics), Heidegger has himself handed us the perspectives; they should ‘show that the *transcendence* of Dasein and consequently the understanding of being does not constitute the innermost finitude of human beings, so that the foundation of metaphysics does *not have* an essential relation to the finitude of Dasein, and finally, that the basic question of the laying of the foundation of metaphysics is *not* opened up by the problem of the inner possibility of the understanding of Being.’<sup>[115]</sup>

As these three perspectives strike the core of Heidegger’s existential philosophy, we will now dare to test their validity. The first question goes like this: ‘*Is Dasein’s transcendence and hence the understanding of being the*



*innermost finitude of humans?* In order to answer the question, we must be clear about what is meant by ‘transcendence’, ‘understanding of being’, and ‘finitude’.

What ‘transcendence’ means has been thoroughly dealt with. It is synonymous with ‘being-in-the-world’ — or more accurately: what founds it; the human finds itself as a being in the midst of beings, and the being he is himself is disclosed to him along with other beings, as he forms a horizon in an original turning-towards, in which beings can meet. This ‘formation of the horizon’ is thought of as *understanding of being*, and indeed as understanding projection of a being’s constitution of being. Transcendence and understanding of being thus coincide.

They should also, however, coincide with ‘*finitude*’. What is meant by this is not so easily exposed. Various things are excluded which should *not* be meant by it: 1. The finitude of humans should *not* be determined as *temporality*; it also does *not* mean *imperfection*: imperfections do not let the essence of finitude be seen, they are perhaps only some of its *distant factual consequences*. 2. Finitude must *not* either be interpreted as *creatureliness*: ‘And even if we succeeded in doing the impossible, i.e. in proving rationally that the human being is created, then the characterisation of the human being as an ens creatum would only point up the *fact* of this finitude without clarifying its *essence* and without showing how this essence *constitutes* the fundamental constitution of being of the human being.’<sup>116</sup> We are convinced, with the tradition, that the ‘impossible is possible’, i.e. that createdness can be proved rationally — perhaps not the special kind of creation which is presented by the biblical narrative of creation (with regard to this actual historical happening we talk about the ‘*mystery* of creation’), but the necessity, not to be *per se* or *a se*, but *ab alio*, which follows from the fact that the human being is ‘*something*’, but ‘*not everything*’. Is this not precisely the *authentic meaning* of *finitude*? Heidegger touches on this when he finally brings up the question: ‘Is it possible to develop the *finitude* in Dasein, even as a *problem*, without presupposing *infinity*?’<sup>117</sup> He must immediately add a further question: ‘What is the nature of this “presupposition” in Dasein? What does the infinitude thus “posed” mean?’ With these questions he addresses what, as ‘pre-ontological understanding of being’, has given purpose and direction to our above efforts regarding the meaning of beings: *Finitude can only be understood in relation to Infinity, i.e. to the eternal fullness of being. The understanding of being of a finite spirit is as such always already a breakthrough from the finite to the Eternal.*

With this we have in advance answered more than the question under discussion concerning the relation between transcendence and finitude. We must now take our thinking to its conclusion. ‘*Ens creatum*’ has not only the meaning of the actually created, but also that of something which is essentially conditioned by the infinite. Herein lies the *meaning of finitude*: to be ‘*something and not everything*’. This meaning of finitude, however, is not only fulfilled in humans but in every being which is not God. *Thus finitude as such and transcendence do not simply belong together.* Transcendence means the breakthrough from finitude, which a *spiritual*, and, *as such*, knowing *personal* being, is given in and through its understanding of being. Heidegger sometimes speaks of the *specific* finitude of human beings, but without ever saying what he understands by it. In order to explain it, [he] would have to abolish that which distinguishes the being of human beings from that of non-personal spiritual beings and finite pure spirits.

We come now to the second question: *is the foundation of metaphysics ultimately concerned with the finitude of Dasein?* Heidegger has not given up the old sense of ‘*metaphysica generalis*’ as the doctrine concerning ‘beings as such’, but only emphasised that it is necessary to clarify the meaning of being in regard to it. In this we agree. He has, however, taken a step further and claimed that one, in order to understand the meaning of being, must investigate the human understanding of being, and as he found the ground for the possibility of the understanding of being in the finitude of human beings, he saw the task of founding metaphysics to lie in a discussion of human finitude. Against this, reservations must be made from two sides. *Metaphysics concerns the meaning of being as such, not only of the human being.* We must of course question the human — that is our own — *understanding of being as regards the meaning of being.* But this means that we must ask what it intends when it speaks about being. And this question may not be replaced by the other question of how such understanding of being ‘happens’. The one who neglects the question of the meaning of being implicit in the ‘understanding of being’ itself, and ‘projects’ it carelessly as the human *understanding of being*, is in danger of cutting himself off from the meaning of being: and as far as I can see, this is what Heidegger succumbs to. We will have more to say about this. Then consider this other point: We saw that the understanding of being did not belong to finitude as such, as there are finite beings which have no understanding of being. The understanding of being belongs to that which distinguishes spiritual and personal beings from other kinds of being. Internal to this, the *human being’s* understanding of being must be distinguished from that of other finite spirits, and all *finite* understanding of being must be distinguished from *infinite* (divine) understanding of being. What *understanding of being* is *as such*, however, cannot be explained without clarifying what the *meaning of being* is. Therefore it remains that for us *the fundamental question for the foundation of metaphysics is the question of the meaning of being.* What significance the human understanding of being has for the meaning of being is important for the evaluation of the role which the finitude of human beings must play in the foundation of metaphysics. This coincides with the third question which it remains for us to discuss: *whether the fundamental question of the foundation of metaphysics is contained in the problem of the internal possibility of the understanding of being.* The problem is not yet dealt with by the fact that we have designated the question of the meaning of being as the fundamental question. These two are intimately connected: to ask for the meaning of being presupposes that we, the questioners, have an understanding of being, that such [understanding] is ‘possible’. To investigate this understanding of being in its ‘inner possibility’, i.e. according to its essence, is to presuppose that the meaning of being is accessible to us. For understanding means nothing else than having access to some being. Meanwhile it is possible to ask the question of the meaning of being without also asking how the understanding of being is achieved, since we in understanding something are turned towards the meaning and not towards the understanding. It is, in contrast, not possible to investigate the understanding of being without including the meaning of being. If disconnected from accessible meaning, understanding is no longer understanding. In any case we have a shift in the meaning of ‘*foundation*’, if one considers the question of the understanding of being — and not the question of the meaning of being — as the fundamental one. It would still be possible, however, that the meaning of being

also would be clarified in a faithful and sufficient investigation of the understanding of being. Is this the case in Heidegger?

Heidegger says that the human being must be able to *let* beings *be* and must also 'have projected that which he encounters as beings.'<sup>118</sup> Moreover: 'such as being is and must be only where finitude has become existent'. Finally: 'the being of beings is only understandable [...] if Dasein on the basis of its essence *holds itself into nothingness*.'<sup>119</sup> In order to be able to understand this last sentence, we must seek information as to what is meant by *nothingness*. At a previous occasion<sup>120</sup> that which pure knowledge '*knows*' — the pure horizon — was designated as a *nothingness*. And it was said of it: 'Nothingness means: not a being, but yet "*something*" [...]' What is seen in pure intuition (space and time) is called 'ens imaginarium', and this expression is explained as follows: 'the ens imaginarium belongs to the possible forms of "*nothingness*", i.e. to what is not a being in the sense of being present-at-hand.'<sup>121</sup>

According to all these explanations what is understood by nothingness is not '*absolutely nothing*'. As there is talk of various forms of nothingness and these are not further explained, it remains unclear what kind of '*something*' was meant earlier. If we take all the passages quoted together, and moreover remember what was said about 'original time', no other interpretation remains possible than that by '*nothingness*' is here meant a being's '*constitution of being*', which is *projected with understanding* by human beings, i.e. *being itself*. If this really is what is meant — and everything points towards it, in the Kant-book even more clearly than in *Being and Time* —, *then beings and being are torn apart in a manner suspending the meaning of being*: if we designate a thing as a being (even Heidegger admits thingly being which he calls the *present-to-hand* to be a form of being), we mean that *it itself is*, that it has being independently of our understanding of being. Heidegger has correctly emphasised that in *being-a-what* (essence, *essentia*), *that-being* (reality, *existentia*) and *being-true* always means something different, and that it is necessary to clarify the reason for this division of being and the meaning of being. (This in fact is the big question of the 'analogia entis'.) In any case we always mean by *being* something which is something, is essential, is real or true, is itself and not something in which it is captured at the same time by our understanding of being. Yes, even our own being is something which we *come upon*. Heidegger seeks to justify calling the human understanding of being an *accepting intuition*, a 'thrown project'. But his whole effort is centred on characterising the 'project' as such. 'Thrownness' (= finitude = referredness to other beings) is pictured as the fundamental constitution of the human being, but it does not obtain the clarification it could, and which would be able to disclose the meaning of being and of the understanding of being. Heidegger expressed the conviction that Kant would have recoiled from the results of his critique of pure reason. To this he adds the remarkable question: 'do our own efforts [...] not evidence a secret evasion of something which we — and certainly not by accident — no longer see?'<sup>122</sup> He regards it thus as possible that his own foundation of metaphysics 'holds back from what is decisive.'<sup>[123]</sup> With this the point towards which we steered has been reached. Heidegger's existential philosophy withdraws and stops in front of what gives being meaning and towards which all understanding of being is directed: in front of the 'infinite', without which nothing 'finite' and the finite as such can be comprehended. That it is a withdrawal and a making halt, and [that it is] not a simple oversight, is seen from the fact that following Kant *finite knowledge, appearance or object and being as*

*such* are opposed: ‘The term ‘appearance’ refers to the being itself as the object of finite knowledge. More precisely: *only for finite knowledge is there such a thing as an object. Only such knowledge is exposed to the beings which already are.*’ Infinite knowledge, in contrast, ‘reveals beings to itself by letting them arise and has at the same time the arisen ‘*only*’ in the letting-arise i.e. as revealed *arisen* [...]. They are beings as beings *in themselves*, i.e. not as objects’. ‘The being of *the appearance* is the same being as the being as such’, but as ‘object’ it discloses itself ‘in conformity with the manner and scope of the possibility to accept which is at the disposal of finite knowledge;’<sup>124</sup> and it belongs to finite knowledge that it ‘as *finite* also necessarily *conceals*...’<sup>125</sup> In what follows, however, this opposition [between finite and infinite knowledge] has been dropped. Only finite knowledge is talked about, and the being which it accepts as an *object*. Thereby are, however, ‘beings in themselves’ replaced by ‘objects’, and the formal structure ‘projected’ by finite knowledge for the ‘object’ claimed to be being itself. Is this shift to be justified by the fact that human reason as finite is circumscribed by the limits of finitude and must renounce the *claim* to understand and say something about ‘beings as such’ and ‘infinite’ reason? Is it not rather so, that the knowledge of one’s own limits is necessary for breaking through these? Knowing oneself as ‘finite’ means knowing oneself as ‘something, and not everything’, but by this ‘everything’ is envisaged, even if not ‘comprehended’, i.e. enclosed and mastered by human knowledge. Human understanding of being is only possible as a breakthrough from finite to eternal being. Finite being as such must be known from the point of view of eternal being. But since the finite spirit only glimpses eternal being without being able to comprehend it, finite being, and also its own being, remains uncomprehended, a *magis ignotum quam notum*: the eternal embarrassment, the ἀεὶ ἀπορούμενον which we met as starting point for Aristotle’s metaphysics, and which comes to an end in Heidegger’s foundation of metaphysics.

If the Kant-book was written in order to answer the question with which *Being and Time* rang out: whether a way led from original time to the meaning of being, whether time is the horizon of being, then it obviously did not reach its goal. The ambiguity of time, being both seeing and seen, ‘projection’ and ‘projected’, and likewise the shimmer of what is called the *horizon*, already bars the way to the meaning of being. If the road taken at the end of *Being and Time* became questionable, looking back on it from the perspective of the Kant-book makes it even more questionable. And what has since appeared in print changes nothing in this regard.<sup>[126]</sup>

## THE ESSENCE OF REASONS

Like the Kant-book, so too the two small writings *The Essence of Reasons*<sup>127</sup> and *What is Metaphysics?*<sup>128</sup> should serve the purpose of clarifying the previous great work, refuting misinterpretations [of it] and clarifying some points that had been left in the dark, while drawing up earlier lines that were merely indicated and continuing them on. Thus being-in-the-world is more clearly conceived under the name of *transcendence* in the treatise concerning the essence of reasons. Transcending means hereafter that Dasein constantly *goes beyond* all beings, also itself, in the direction of the ‘*world*’; i.e. not towards the totality of all beings, nor towards the entirety of all human beings, but towards *being* in its totality. World is

‘essentially Dasein-related’<sup>129</sup> and Dasein ‘is in the essence of its being “forming the world”’.<sup>130</sup> As the language of Scripture (the letters of St. Paul and the Gospel of St. John), as well as that of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, is used to clarify the concept of world, it can give the impression that the obvious anti-Christian feeling of *Being and Time* has been surmounted.<sup>131</sup> In the foot-notes we are also assured that ‘the ontological interpretation of Dasein as being-in-the-world tells neither for nor against the possible existence of God’<sup>132</sup> and that Dasein should not be construed to be *the* ‘authentic’ being as such: ‘ontological interpretation of being in terms of the transcendence of Dasein is by no means ontical derivation of non-Daseinal [beings] from beings qua Dasein.’<sup>133</sup> In regard to the second [criticism], the critics have in fact not left ‘being-present-at-hand’ and ‘being-ready-to-hand’ in the darkness in which Heidegger left it, but rather developed it in a way not foreseen by him. And by a quite faithful and sufficiently far-reaching interpretation of the essential ‘self-transcending’, a view of ‘Dasein’ could have been gained which, at least, left open the possibility of a ‘being-towards-God’. But actually no such interpretation is carried through in *Being and Time* or in this later treatise. In fact the interpretation which *being* received in the Kant-book — even more evidently than in *Being and Time* — leaves no possibility open for any being [Sein] independent of Dasein. When, furthermore, transcendence is interpreted as *freedom*, by the power of which Dasein projects world and its own possibilities, and in connection with the establishment of the *finitude of Dasein* (witnessed by the limitation of its *really* realisable possibilities) the question is raised: ‘And does the essence of freedom announce itself as *finite* in this?’<sup>134</sup> This (quite likely rhetorical) question excludes [the possibility] that the being of Dasein pertains to *all* personal being and it denies it to God: at least to the God of the Christian Faith and also to that of the other monotheistic religions. That ‘Dasein is *thrown* among beings as *free* possibility to be’; that it ‘does not stand within the power of freedom itself to be according to its possibility a self which it actually is according to its freedom,’<sup>135</sup> this insight serves here as little as earlier as the point of departure for proceeding towards an unthrown thrower who would be infinitely free.

## WHAT IS METAPHYSICS?

The Freiburg inaugural lecture *What is Metaphysics?* centres on the discussion of *nothingness*. For the reader of the Kant-book, this is not as surprising as it might be for an unprepared member of the audience, as a questioning of ‘*nothingness*’ was already called for in the investigation of the understanding of being of the *horizon*, which makes being accessible to ‘*Dasein*’. As meanwhile the meaning of nothingness still remains obscure, it is worthwhile to go through the new developments dedicated to it.

All *science aims at beings*. The break-through to the totality of beings which belongs to human existence breaks beings up into what they *are* and how they *are*, and thus helps ‘beings to come to themselves’.<sup>136</sup> ‘That to which the world-relationship refers are *beings themselves* — and nothing else.’ And now this apparently barely escaped ‘nothingness’ is grasped in a surprising fashion: ‘*But what about this nothing?*’<sup>137</sup> Reason cannot decide about it. *Nothingness* can *not* be understood as *negation of the totality of all beings*, as ‘nothing is more original than the not and the negation’.<sup>138</sup>

The *'fundamental happening of our Dasein'*, which discovers being in its entirety, is the *being in a state of mind* or the *mood*; authentic boredom, for example (not when one is bored with this or that thing, but [when one is bored] 'simply'). The mood in which the human being is brought face to face with *nothingness*, is — as we already know — *anguish*: as beings fade and *we fade away ourselves*, anguish reveals nothingness. It reveals itself in anguish, not *as a being* and *not among beings*: it 'meets [us] *as part of the totality of beings*'.<sup>139</sup> This [totality] is *neither destroyed* nor *denied*, but it becomes *obsolete*. Nothingness 'does not aim at itself: it is essentially rejecting. This rejecting from itself is, however, as such the letting-fade referring to the vanishing of beings in their totality. This rejecting referring to the vanishing totality of beings, as which nothing crowds around us in anguish, is the essence of Nothing: the *nihilation*. It is neither destruction nor does it spring from negation. *Nothing nihilates of itself*.'<sup>140</sup> It reveals beings 'in their till now hidden *strangeness* as simply *other* in contrast with nothing.'<sup>141</sup> In the clear night of anguish's nothingness, beings are revealed *as such* in all their *original* evidence: that they are *beings* — and not nothing [...]. *The essence of nothing as original nihilation lies in this: that it alone brings Dasein face to face with beings as such*.'<sup>142</sup> 'Nothing is that which makes the revelation of beings as such possible for human existence. Nothing does not merely provide the conceptual opposite of beings, but belongs originally to the essence of *being itself*. It is in the *being* of beings that the nihilation of nothing occurs.'<sup>143</sup>

A witness to 'the steady and extended, and yet dissimulated evidence of nothing in our existence' is the *negation*. It expresses itself in 'a *no-saying* about a not', but does not manage to bring a nothing out of itself, as it 'can only negate when there is *something there to be negated*.'<sup>144</sup> This, however, is only possible, if 'all thinking as such is already *on the look-out for the not* [...]. The not does not arise from the negation, but the negation is *based* on the not which derives from the nihilation of nothing.'<sup>145</sup> Negation is also not the only negating attitude; counteracting, disdaining, renouncing, prohibiting, and lacking are also grounded on the not. 'The permeation of Dasein by nihilating attitudes points to the steady, ever-dissimulated manifestness of nothing.'<sup>146</sup> The most repressed anguish which it makes manifest is brought forth in the *audacious Dasein*. 'But this occurs only for the sake of that for which *it spends itself*, so as to safeguard the *supreme greatness* of Dasein.'<sup>147</sup> The anguish of the audacious is not opposed to the joy or to the pleasant enjoyment of the satisfied Dasein. 'It stands [...] in secret *union* with the serenity and gentleness of creative longing.'<sup>148</sup>

'The extendedness of Dasein into nothingness [...] makes the human being the *stand-in* for nothing. So *finite* are we that we cannot, by our own choice and will, bring ourselves originally face to face with nothingness [...]. The extendedness of Dasein into nothing on the basis of hidden anguish is the overcoming of the totality of beings: transcendence [...]. Metaphysics is the *enquiry over and above* beings, with a view to get it back for conceptualisation *as such* and *in totality*.'<sup>149</sup> *The question of nothing concerns metaphysics in its entirety* as 'being and nothing hang together [...], because *being* itself is essentially *finite* and only reveals itself in the transcendence of Dasein extended into *nothing*.'<sup>150</sup>

The *metaphysics of Antiquity* understood 'nothingness' as unformed matter, as in the expression 'ex nihilo nihil fit', and let only the object count as being. *Christian dogmatics* denies the phrase and affirms instead: ex 'nihilum fit ens

creatum' and understands by 'nihil' the absence pertaining to non-divine beings. 'The questions concerning being and nothing as such remain in both cases unasked. Thus there is no need to be worried by the difficulty that if God creates "out of nothing" he, above all, must be able to relate himself to nothing. But if God is God, *he* cannot know nothing, assuming that the "absolute" excludes from itself all nullity.'<sup>151</sup>

In Heidegger's interpretation the sentence takes on 'a different meaning, and one appropriate to the *problem of being itself*, so as to run: *ex nihilo omne ens qua ens fit*. Only in the nothingness of Dasein can the totality of beings come to itself, according to its most authentic possibilities, i.e. as finite.'<sup>152</sup> All questioning of beings relies on nothingness: 'Only because nothingness is revealed in the very basis of Dasein is it possible for the utter *strangeness* of beings to dawn on us.'<sup>153</sup> *Metaphysics* 'is the *fundamental phenomenon in and as Dasein itself*'. It happens 'through a special *thrust* of its own existence, into the fundamental possibilities of Dasein as a whole. For this thrust the following things are determinating: *firstly*, the leaving room for the totality of beings; *furthermore*, the letting go of oneself into nothingness [...] and *finally*, the letting swing out of the floating where it will, so that it may continually swing back again to the *basic question* of metaphysics, which is wrested from *nothingness* itself: *Why is there any thing at all — why not far rather nothing?*'<sup>154</sup>

\*\*\*

It is obvious: This speech, which is designed to inspire rather than to teach people who are not trained in the subject, falls short of the rigor of a scientific treatise. It casts floodlight here and there, but gives no serene clarity. Thus it is difficult to take anything concrete from it. The manner of speaking has in several places even mythological tones to it: nothingness is spoken about as if it were a person that should be helped to claim rights that had always been suppressed. One is brought to remember 'Nothingness, the nothingness that at first was everything'. But it would be fruitless to stick to such obscure phrases.

Perhaps we will only reach clarity on this matter if we take our lead from the various interpretations of the sentence 'ex nihilo nihil fit'. Did metaphysics in Antiquity really mean unformed matter when it spoke of the nothingness out of which nothing comes? In that case the above sentence could not make sense, as it states that everything 'formed' was 'formed' out of unformed matter. It distinguishes between not being simply (οὐχ ὄν) and non-being, which in some sense is — namely according to its possibility (μη ὄν).<sup>155</sup> And this is the material out of which all that, which in the *authentic* sense is, is formed. That from which nothing can come, has also no possible being; it is *absolutely* nothing.

In which sense then is the phrase: 'ex nihilo fit ens creatum' to be understood? Here too '*nihil*' does not mean the matter to be formed. The doctrine of Creation in fact denies the availability of a material before Creation. According to Heidegger Dogmatics intends by 'nothingness' the absence of all extra-divine beings. We will leave the question open of whether the meaning of 'nothingness' is fully brought out in this way. In any case nothing can be made from nothingness understood in this manner as though 'from' some pre-existing material. Nothing is 'taken from' it. 'Creation' means, rather, that all that the creature is, including its being, stems from the Creator. The phrase can thus only

be understood to mean that the Creator in creating is unconditioned by any other being, that there in fact are no beings like the Creator and the creation. What about the difficulty that God must relate to nothingness in order to create from nothing? It must be conceded that God must know of nothingness in order to create something. But this knowledge does not mean nothingness in any absolute sense, as all knowledge, including that of nothingness, is positive as such. God knows nothingness as the opposite of himself, i.e. as the *opposite of being itself*. And this 'idea of nothingness' is presupposed for Creation, as everything *finite* is 'something and not everything', a meaning whose being includes non-being. Is it true therefore, when Heidegger claims that Christian Dogmatics questions neither being nor nothingness? It is true insofar as Dogmatics as such does not at all *ask*, but instead *teaches*.<sup>156</sup> That does not mean, however, that it does not concern itself with being and nothingness. It speaks of being when it speaks of God. And it speaks of nothingness in several connections, for example when speaking of Creation, and when by 'creature' referring to a being whose being includes a non-being. Thus we can say that 'being and nothingness' belong together; but not because *being* essentially is *finite*, but because nothingness is the opposite of being in the most original and authentic sense, and because all finite being falls between this most authentic being and nothingness. As we are 'so *finite* [...] that we [...] cannot bring ourselves face to face with nothingness through our own decision and will', the manifestation of nothingness in our own being indicates the breakthrough from this our finite, non-existing being to infinite, pure, eternal being.<sup>157</sup>

And thus the question in which the being of the human being expresses itself changes from '*why is there being at all, and not rather nothing?*', to the *question of the eternal foundation of finite being*.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Ed. by Lucy Gelber and Romaeus Leuven (Freiburg: Herder, 1986); as it had already been published separately in Vol. VI (1962).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 11/12, ed. by Andreas Uwe Müller (Freiburg: Herder, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Klaus Hedwig for averting my attention to this article.

<sup>4</sup> Maximilian Beck (*Philosophische Hefte* 1, Berlin, 1928, p. 2) says that in it all living problems of contemporary philosophy are thought through in the most consistent manner to their final conclusion.

<sup>5</sup> Georg Feuerer, *Ordnung zum Ewigen*, Regensburg, 1935, is completely conditioned by Heidegger's thought, but without ever mentioning his name, and interpreting his expressions in such a manner as to give the impression that the whole without further ado can be brought into harmony with the basic Christian truths.

<sup>6</sup> *Sein und Zeit*, p. 1. [Hereafter, abbreviated as *SZ*. Page-numbers refer to the German edition only, as they are reproduced in Macquarrie & Robinson's English translation.]

<sup>7</sup> *SZ*, p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> *SZ*, p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> *SZ*, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> *SZ*, p. 13.

<sup>11</sup> *SZ*, p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> *SZ*, p. 17.

<sup>13</sup> *SZ*, p. 18.



---

[<sup>14</sup> Macquarrie and Robinson explain their translation of the terms ‘Entfernung’, ‘ent-fernung’, ‘Entferntheit’ in *Being and Time*, n. 2, pp. 138–139 (relating to *SZ*, p. 105). I follow their translation and refer the reader to their reflections, of which I here reproduce some: ‘The nouns “Entfernung” and “Entferntheit” can usually be translated by “removing”, “removal”, “remoteness”, or even “distance”. In this passage, however, Heidegger is calling attention to the fact that these words are derived from the stem “fern-” (“far” or “distant”) and the privative prefix “ent-”. Usually this prefix would be construed as merely intensifying the notion of separation or distance expressed in the “fern-”; but Heidegger chooses to construe it as more strictly privative, so that the verb “entfernen” will be taken to mean abolishing a distance or farness rather than enhancing it. It is as if by the very act of recognising the “remoteness” of something, we have in a sense brought it closer and made it less “remote”.] [Endnotes in square brackets, as in this one, are translator’s notes.]

<sup>15</sup> *SZ*, p. 117.

<sup>16</sup> *SZ*, p. 123.

<sup>17</sup> *SZ*, p. 133.

<sup>18</sup> *SZ*, p. 134.

<sup>19</sup> *SZ*, p. 143.

[<sup>20</sup> Stein has the idly talked about (*das Geredete*) in stead of idle talk (*das Gerede*). We take this to be a mistake, however.]

<sup>21</sup> *SZ*, p. 176.

<sup>22</sup> *SZ*, p. 181.

<sup>23</sup> *SZ*, p. 182.

<sup>24</sup> *SZ*, p. 209.

[<sup>25</sup> Because this translation is being made available on-line, standard Microsoft Basic Greek symbols are being used, and not Stein’s original Greek lettering. CMcD–Editor.]

<sup>26</sup> *SZ*, p. 247.

<sup>27</sup> *SZ*, p. 247-8.

[<sup>28</sup> ‘Das Man’ or ‘Man’ can be translated by ‘they’ (as do Macquarrie and Robinson) or by ‘one’, which is the more grammatically correct.]

<sup>29</sup> *SZ*, p. 264.

<sup>30</sup> *SZ*, p. 273.

<sup>31</sup> *SZ*, p. 280.

<sup>32</sup> *SZ*, p. 288.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> *SZ*, p. 297.

<sup>35</sup> *SZ*, p. 305.

<sup>36</sup> *SZ*, p. 307.

<sup>37</sup> *SZ*, p. 325.

<sup>38</sup> *SZ*, p. 343.

<sup>39</sup> *SZ*, p. 350.

<sup>40</sup> *SZ*, p. 351.

<sup>41</sup> *SZ*, p. 365.

<sup>42</sup> *SZ*, p. 364.

<sup>43</sup> *SZ*, p. 366.

<sup>44</sup> *SZ*, p. 368. [Stein’s text mistakenly reads *möglich* in stead of *unmöglich*, yet that mistaken reading also makes sense, albeit in a slightly different manner.]

<sup>45</sup> *SZ*, p. 372.

[<sup>46</sup> *SZ*, p. 379, according to Uwe Müller p. 381]

<sup>47</sup> *SZ*, p. 384.

<sup>48</sup> *SZ*, p. 385.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> *SZ*, p. 386.

[<sup>51</sup> Ibid.]

<sup>52</sup> *SZ*, p. 395.

<sup>53</sup> Following the discussion of historicity, reference is made to the connection with the work of Dilthey and the ideas of Count Yorck [Stein has York].

<sup>54</sup> *SZ*, p. 410.

<sup>55</sup> *SZ*, p. 411.

<sup>56</sup> *SZ*, p. 421.

---

<sup>57</sup> *SZ*, p. 422.

<sup>58</sup> *SZ*, p. 426 [p. 425].

<sup>59</sup> *SZ*, p. 438 [p. 437].

<sup>60</sup> The abstract keeps close to Heidegger's own exposition and terms: retaining all the ambiguity that attaches to these. For a critical appraisal, this approach must be abandoned, as it would otherwise be impossible to gain clarity. In contrast to this approach stands the reflection: 'the meaning of all that Heidegger teaches becomes other when one discusses it in a language foreign to its own' (Maximilian Beck, *Philosophische Hefte* I, p. 6). If one were to stop because of this difficulty, one would have to renounce entirely making sense of the book and evaluating it. Alfred Delp, *Tragische Existenz* (Freiburg: Herder, 1935) is an example of how difficult it is to understand the work, so much so that its exposition is unsatisfactory on essential points. On p. 53 is claimed that Dasein=*res* even if Heidegger stresses that Dasein should not be conceived as *res*. On p. 54 it is claimed that the being of external things is limited to the being of equipment. That Heidegger distinguishes 'being-present-at-hand' from the 'ready-to-hand' of equipment, as having its own mode of being (even if he does not clarify this distinction) – seems to have been completely overlooked.

<sup>61</sup> *Denzinger* 295 and 1783. [Heinrich Denzinger, Clemente Bannwart, Johannes Baptista Umberg, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, a common reference work often used by Stein.]

<sup>62</sup> Compare with what has been said above concerning Dasein's spatiality, *SZ*, p. 368.

[<sup>63</sup> Stein has 'Dasein' for what is here translated by 'existence'. We translate with existence because Dasein means existence, and because Stein is referring to the classical distinction between essence and existence.]

<sup>64</sup> Heidegger himself would not agree with the distinction outlined here. In his Kant-book he attempts to show that the I is not different from original time. (Compare with the following.) It is also identified with the 'I think'. In this is expressed that one should no longer distinguish between the pure I and its being (or life). But with this is betrayed my understanding of the original meaning of I, and Heidegger's own expressions contradict his point of view.

<sup>65</sup> Heidegger underlines in the Kant-book (p. 226) that thrownness concerns not only coming-to-Dasein, but completely dominates Da-sein. Still it designates *also* the coming-to-Dasein. Concerning thrownness and creatureliness, compare the following.

[<sup>66</sup> Stein clarified the notion of form in *Finite and Eternal Being*, to which this essay is an appendix, Chapter IV, §§ 3–4.]

[<sup>67</sup> *Das Man* is translated by R and M. as 'the they', but grammatically 'the they' cannot function as can *das Man*. A more literal translation would be 'the one', which can be used grammatically as *das Man* is used, but which sounds strange when rendered as a substantive. In the following, when Stein makes use of the grammatical possibilities of *Man*, we shall translate it by 'one', although we shall sometimes add 'the they' for clarity.]

<sup>68</sup> We do not need to go into the question here of whether there also exists subhuman and superhuman communities.

<sup>69</sup> There are places in Heidegger which show that he also recognises a *genuine* being-with and even attaches great importance to it, but within the boundaries of the 'they-self' and the inauthentic self, it does not come fully into its own.

<sup>70</sup> Compare Edith Stein, 'Individuum und Gemeinschaft', in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, ed. by Edmund Husserl, Vol. V (1922), p. 252 ff. and Edith Stein, 'Eine Untersuchung über den Staat', in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, Vol. VII (1925), p. 20 ff. ['Individual and Community', in Edith Stein, *Philosophy of Psychology and the Humanities*, tr. by Mary Catharine Baseheart and Marianne Sawicki (Washington D.C.: ICS Publications, 2000), p. 279 ff., and Edith Stein, *An Investigation Concerning the State*, tr. by Marianne Sawicki (Washington D.C.: ICS Publications, 2006), p. 34 ff.]

<sup>71</sup> Compare *SZ*, p. 176.

<sup>72</sup> *SZ*, p. 305.

<sup>73</sup> *SZ*, p. 247.

<sup>74</sup> This corresponds to the replacement of the question of being by the question concerning the understanding of being.

<sup>75</sup> *SZ*, p. 247.

<sup>76</sup> Heidegger has himself mentioned Tolstoy's novel *The Death of Ivan Ilych* in a note (p. 254). In it is not only the breakdown of the one dies (whereto Heidegger refers) masterly exposed, but also

---

the deep rift between the dying and the living. In *War and Peace* this does not happen with the same crass realism, but perhaps with even clearer focus on the essential.

<sup>77</sup> It is well known how major crises of conscience may be caused by vows always to do the more perfect deed.

<sup>78</sup> See his Kant-book, p. 226. [Martin Heidegger, *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, Gesamtausgabe I Abt., Bd. 3 (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klosterman, 1991) (henceforth referred to as: KPM, § 43. Stein is using the first edition. Whereas the texts of the first, second and third editions are unchanged, the page numbers have changed each time. We will therefore give the page numbers of the translation only: Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, trans. James S. Churchill (Bloomington – London: Indiana University Press, 1962), henceforth referred to as ‘Churchill’, p. 245.]

<sup>79</sup> See [Thomas Aquinas] *Summa Theologica* I, q. 10, a. 5 corp..

<sup>80</sup> SZ, p. 427, n. 1. Compare with difference between true and apparent eternity in Hedwig Conrad-Martius, *Die Zeit, Philosophischer Anzeiger* II, Bonn, 1927, p. 147.

<sup>81</sup> Hedwig Conrad-Martius, *Heideggers Sein und Zeit* (Kunstwart, 1933).

<sup>82</sup> This is why Stein takes the being of the I as the point of departure for the ontology she works out in *Finite and Eternal Being*.]

<sup>83</sup> Stein speaks of only one other way of being here, but for grammatical clarity it has been rendered in the plural, which is consistent with her meaning.]

<sup>84</sup> SZ, p. 229. The question of Christian Philosophy need not here be taken up again, as it was sufficiently treated in *Finite and Eternal Being*, Introduction, § 4.

<sup>85</sup> Stein is making use of the first edition, Bonn, 1929. As this is not widely available, the paragraph number has been included with the reference to the translation.]

<sup>86</sup> KPM, p. 193. [§ 35, Churchill, p. 206.]

<sup>87</sup> KPM, p. 195. [§ 35, Churchill, p. 208.]

<sup>88</sup> KPM, p. 193. [§ 35, Churchill, p. 207.]

<sup>89</sup> SZ, p. 438 (In the previous p. 66).

<sup>90</sup> KPM, p. 6 (see p. 211). [§ 1, The quotation from Heidegger runs in its entirety: ‘Sie [die erste Philosophie] is sowohl Erkenntnis des Seienden als Seienden ( $\delta\nu \tilde{\eta} \delta\nu$ ), als auch Erkenntnis des vorzüglichsten Bezirks des Seienden ( $\tau\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ), aus dem her sich das Seiende im Ganzen ( $\chi\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\nu$ ) bestimmt’. Churchill, p. 12. Stein’s adaptation seems uncharacteristically clumsy, although the meaning is relatively clear.]

<sup>91</sup> KPM, p. 213. [§ 40, Churchill, p. 230.]

<sup>92</sup> KPM, p. 215. [§ 40, Churchill, p. 232.]

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> KPM, p. 216. [§ 40, Churchill, p. 233.]

<sup>95</sup> KPM, p. 9. [§ 2, Churchill, p. 15.]

<sup>96</sup> KPM, p. 162. [§ 31, Churchill, p. 176.]

<sup>97</sup> KPM, p. 113. [§ 24, Churchill, p. 124.]

<sup>98</sup> KPM, p. 226. [§ 43, Churchill, p. 244.]

<sup>99</sup> KPM, p. 218. [§ 41, Churchill, p. 235.]

<sup>100</sup> KPM, p. 219. [§ 41, Churchill, p. 236.]

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. The latter phrase is underlined by me. [Churchill, p. 236.]

<sup>102</sup> KPM, p. 171. [Churchill p. 184.]

<sup>103</sup> KPM, p. 178. [§ 33 c), Churchill, p. 191: ‘erkundet den Horizont von Vorhaltbarkeit überhaupt’.] What is said here is the Kantian pure synthesis, in its three modes of Apprehension, Reproduction and Recognition. (I have on purpose avoided the Kantian expressions in the text.) Heidegger’s analysis of time far exceeds that of Kant, and must be compared with Husserl’s *Lectures on the Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness* (Husserl’s *Yearbook*, IX, 1928; it also appeared in a separate printing), published by Heidegger not long before the appearance of his Kant-book.

<sup>104</sup> KPM, p. 180 f. [§ 34, Churchill, p. 194.]

<sup>105</sup> KPM, p. 181. [§ 34, Churchill, p. 194.]

<sup>106</sup> KPM, p. 183. [§ 34, Churchill, p. 196.]

<sup>107</sup> KPM, p. 184. [§ 34, Churchill, p. 198.]

<sup>108</sup> KPM, p. 185. [§ 34, Churchill, p. 198 – 9.]

<sup>109</sup> ‘Zeitrechnung’ literally means ‘counting with time’, or the ‘counting of time’ apart from designating the order we indicate by A.D. or B.C. We could have translated ‘keeping of time’, thus

---

expressing some of the reality evoked, yet, ‘counting on time’ was chosen as it designates the most central meaning available in ordinary English.]

<sup>110</sup> *KPM*, p. 199 ff. and p. 210. [probably Churchill, p. 211 ff (section four) and p. 222 (§ 38).]

<sup>111</sup> *KPM*, p. 212. [§ 39, Churchill, p. 228.]

<sup>112</sup> *KPM*, p. 223. [§ 42, Churchill, p. 240.]

<sup>113</sup> *KPM*, p. 225. [§ 43, Churchill, p. 243.]

<sup>114</sup> *KPM*, p. 226. [§ 43, Churchill, p. 244. Churchill’s translation has been altered. The German reads: ‘dass überhaupt so etwas wie Da-sein sein kann’.]

[<sup>115</sup> § 43, Churchill p. 246.]

<sup>116</sup> *KPM*, p. 210. [§ 39, Churchill, p. 227.]

[<sup>117</sup> § 45; Churchill p. 254.]

<sup>118</sup> *KPM*, p. 218. [§ 41, Churchill, p. 236.]

<sup>119</sup> *KPM*, p. 228. [§ 43, Churchill, p. 246.]

<sup>120</sup> *KPM*, p. 114 ff. [The two f’s suggests that Stein is quoting from memory. In fact I have not been able to retrieve the quotation, nor anything said about the horizon in those approximate pages. What comes closest to the following quotation is: ‘Ist das Sein nicht so etwas wie das Nichts?’ § 41. It could be rendered as Stein does: Heidegger asks whether being is not something like nothing is, which clearly presupposes that nothing is something, just like being is, which is the sense Stein retains. The quotation marks here should therefore be taken with a grain of salt.]

<sup>121</sup> *KPM*, p. 136. [§ 28; Churchill, p. 150.]

<sup>122</sup> *KPM*, p. 235. [§ 45; Churchill, p. 253.]

[<sup>123</sup> These brackets are not quotation marks. Stein is merely reiterating and emphasising the consequences of what Heidegger affirmed in the previous sentence.]

<sup>124</sup> *KPM*, p. 28. Herewith it is neglected that infinite knowledge also spans finite knowledge and the object as it appears to finite knowledge. [§ 5; Churchill, p. 35-6.]

<sup>125</sup> *KPM*, p. 30. [§ 5, Churchill, p. 38.]

[<sup>126</sup> Stein died during the War. What she would have made of Heidegger’s later thought therefore remains an object for speculation and further study.]

<sup>127</sup> In the *Husserl-Festschrift*, Halle, 1929. [The edition used here is Martin Heidegger, *The Essence of Reasons. A Bilingual Edition, Incorporating the German Text of ‘Vom Wesen des Grundes’*, trans. by Terrence Malick (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969). *Vom Wesen des Grundes* is henceforth abbreviated ‘WG’ and its translation ‘Malick’.]

<sup>128</sup> This is the public inauguration lecture, which Heidegger gave on the 24 July 1929 in the Aula of the University of Freiburg im Bressgau, published by Cohen in Bonn, 1930. [We will make use of *Was ist Metaphysik?* (Frankfurt a.M.: Klosterman, 1969), the pagination of which is different. This edition is abbreviated henceforth as ‘Klosterman’. Translation is taken from ‘What is Metaphysics?’, in Martin Heidegger, *Existence and Being*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull and Alan Crick (London: Vision, 1949), p. 357 – 8. The work is henceforth abbreviated ‘WM’ and the translation ‘Hull and Crick’.]

<sup>129</sup> *WG*, p. 96 [Malick, p. 86 – 7.]

<sup>130</sup> *WG*, p. 97 [Malick, p. 88 – 9.]

<sup>131</sup> Perhaps this turn can be explained from the fact that the treatise of *The Essence of Reason* is conceived in Heidegger’s Marburg-time, under the strong influence of the protestant theologians, from which it probably also received some notice.

<sup>132</sup> *WG*, p. 98, note 1. [Malick, p. 90 – 1.]

<sup>133</sup> *WG*, p. 100, note 1. [Malick, p. 98 – 9.]

<sup>134</sup> *WG*, p. 104. [Malick, p. 110 – 1.]

<sup>135</sup> *WG*, p. 110. [Malick, p. 128 – 9.]

<sup>136</sup> *WM*, p. 9. [‘in seiner Weise dem Seinenden allererst zu ihm selbst’. Klosterman p. 26; Hull and Crick p. 357 – 8]

<sup>137</sup> *WM*, p. 10. [Klosterman, p. 26; Hull and Crick, p. 358.]

<sup>138</sup> *WM*, p. 12. [Klosterman, p. 28; Hull and Crick, p. 361.]

<sup>139</sup> *WM*, p. 18. [Klosterman, p. 34; Hull and Crick, p. 368.]

[<sup>140</sup> *WM*, p. 18. Klosterman, p. 34; Hull and Crick, p. 369]

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.* One gets the impression that nothingness here is meant in a more radical sense than in the Kant-book. The relationship between nothingness and being is adjusted correspondingly.

<sup>142</sup> *WM*, p. 19. [Klosterman, p. 34; Hull and Crick, p. 369.]

<sup>143</sup> *WM*, p. 20. [Klosterman, p. 35; Hull and Crick, p. 370.]

<sup>144</sup> *WM*, p. 21. [Klosterman, p. 36; Hull and Crick, p. 372.]

---

<sup>145</sup> *WM*, p. 22. [Klosterman, p. 36; Hull and Crick, p. 372.]

<sup>146</sup> *WM*, p. 23. [Klosterman, p. 37; Hull and Crick, p. 373.]

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*

[<sup>148</sup> *WM*, p. 23. [Klosterman, p. 37; Hull and Crick, p. 374.]

<sup>149</sup> *WM*, p. 24. [Klosterman, p. 38; Hull and Crick, p. 374.]

<sup>150</sup> *WM*, p. 26. [Klosterman, p. 39; Hull and Crick, p. 377.]

<sup>151</sup> *WM*, p. 25. [Klosterman, p. 39; Hull and Crick, p. 376.]

<sup>152</sup> *WM*, p. 26. [Klosterman, p. 40; Hull and Crick, p. 377.]

<sup>153</sup> *WM*, p. 28. [Klosterman, p. 41; Hull and Crick, p. 378.]

<sup>154</sup> *WM*, p. 28. [Klosterman, p. 42; Hull and Crick, p. 380.]

<sup>155</sup> See Aristotle's *Metaphysics* A 1003 b and N 1089 a-b.

<sup>156</sup> Said more precisely: Dogmatics can ask whether something belongs to the faith or not, but what is accepted as dogma is no longer in question for Dogmatics.

<sup>157</sup> The reader of Heidegger's writings is necessarily left with the impression that his existential philosophy aims at exposing 'the essential and necessary finitude of being and all beings'. In contrast to this stands a remarkable oral utterance, wherein he rejects such understanding. His justification has reached us in the following manner: 'The concept of being is finite; but this teaching says nothing about the finite or infinite character of beings or of being itself. Any being, which, in order to understand beings, needs a concept of being, is finite, and if an infinite essence exists it will not need a concept of being to know being. We humans need conceptual philosophy in order to bring being to light, because we are finite; and our particular nature as finite beings, yes, even the essence of this particularity of finitude, is based on the necessity of using the concept of being. God, in contrast, as infinite, is not such that he is subject to the necessary limits of knowledge. God does not philosophise. But the human being is defined by having to conceptualise being in order to relate to being and thus he makes use of the concept of being' (See the account of R.P. Daniel Feuling O.S.B. in *La Phénoménologie*, Journées d'études de la Société Thomiste, I, Les Editions du Cerf, Juvisy, 1932, p. 39). Here the sharp distinction between being and understanding of being is made, the distinction we lacked in the writings, and thus the possibility for eternal being is left open. As this exposition only relies on oral utterances, which have no grounding in Heidegger's writings, it is only referred to here in a note. On the other hand, since it stems from a talk that was aimed at preparing a public report concerning Heidegger's phenomenology, it seems too important to omit.

