

HEIDEGGER AND THE MEANINGFULNESS OF QUESTIONING AND THINKING

by

Derek Beamer

A thesis submitted to the Department of Philosophy
In conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
(September, 2017)

Copyright © Derek Beamer, 2017

Abstract

What does it mean to question and think? Questioning and thinking are two activities which we consider imperative to doing philosophy and the two activities that we involve ourselves in most of the time, albeit without much thought given to that involvement. Are questioning and thinking those activities normally thought of as those belonging to reason alone and among the ranks of various mental activities? I would like to argue that, according to Heidegger, questioning and thinking carry a different essence than just mental activities, all the while still being imperative to philosophy. The following study seeks to investigate Heidegger's reconceptualization of the themes of questioning and thinking and the meaning that lies therein. My aim is in the vein of a reconstructive exposure: to lay out and follow along Heidegger's thought behind his conceptions of questioning and thinking and, through building them back up, to expose their deeper meaning, new understanding, and potential for interpreting the situation of one's "historical time." In order to argue this deeper meaning, new understanding, and interpretation, I put forth the following statement: where we find questioning, there too do we find thinking, meaning that if we take questioning to be that activity which opens up one's situation, it is then thinking that confronts the opened-up situation as a struggle against it. This struggle against, however, is not to be conceptualized as a struggle against something so as to end it. On the contrary, the struggle against is that which runs up against the confrontation opened-up through questioning; a running up against that, while a struggle, nevertheless is intimately related to the confrontation that it struggles against. Ultimately, what is revealed through questioning and thinking is the "place" which most concerns the being who questions and thinks: the *always-already there*.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my deepest gratitude and heartfelt thanks to my supervisor Paul Fairfield of the department of philosophy at Queen's University for his invaluable help and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. Much of what is contained in this thesis stems from our many discussions revolving around the study of a few of Heidegger's writings and lectures and if it were not for these fruitful discussions, the thesis would not be in its present form.

I would also like to give thanks to Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg for all their support during my university career.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this thesis to my mother, sister, and brother. Thank you for all your love, encouragement, and support throughout this writing process—without you, this could not be possible. I also wish to dedicate this to my uncle Glenn McConini who passed away suddenly this year.

Migwetch,

Derek Beamer, September 2017

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract | i |
| Acknowledgements | ii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 1: The Elucidation of the Idea of Questioning and Questionableness - The <i>Seinsfrage</i> | 9 |
| Chapter 2: Thinking as the Struggle Against the Confrontation: The Re-turn to Being-There..... | 58 |
| Conclusion: The Relation Between Questioning and Thinking: A Synthesis | 101 |
| Bibliography..... | 106 |

Introduction

Nearing the end of the nineteenth century, Friedrich Nietzsche, witnessing the beginning of the end of “traditional” values, sought to establish, in the face of impending meaninglessness and nihilism, new values that would bring a sense of urgency to the people of Europe and to actively create something “great” that would set them apart. While this moment had not reached its zenith, Nietzsche saw this as something that was to come and which we must prepare to face whether we like it or not. Despite Nietzsche’s awareness of this impending moment, he felt that this statement of urgency had come too early for the ears of the modern European, for who would take seriously such a statement as “God is dead”? However, this proclamation which Nietzsche had placed in the mouth of Zarathustra or the so-called “madman” contained a bitter-sweet tone: while it was great that we were finally coming to a time that we could be released from the shackles of traditional values which were becoming increasingly meaningless, this freedom *from* brought with it a burden and responsibility *to* something. This burden and responsibility that was placed upon us was to “name” ourselves, so to speak, in the face of (or in spite of) this increasing meaninglessness through the creation of values. This called for a more or less “noble” enterprise (hence his emphasis on nobility in *Genealogy of Morals*) to confront this meaninglessness, take on the burden and responsibility, and to create.

This moment that Nietzsche often wrote of is what we know as a “crisis,” and the turn of the twentieth century was certainly an event which brought along with it many a crisis concerning what it means to be human, which was tied to the crisis of the unity of the sciences seeing that, although dealing with objectivity, was something that was carried out by human beings. The turn of the century not only brought significant changes and challenges to academic circles, but to everyday life in general. Ushering in the new century was the First World War, a war that produced warfare tactics that had never been witnessed before. Cities reduced to rubble,

farmland transformed into battlegrounds, countless people including both soldiers and civilians killed, and the ever-increasing importance and veracity of technology coming into focus were just some of the fallout from the First World War. Ultimately, the turn of the century provided an environment riddled with confrontational change, but also was ripe for new ways to philosophize. If Nietzsche was giving a warning of the crisis, thinkers such as Heidegger who found themselves within the midst of the crisis (Heidegger in his lifetime witnessed two world wars which ravaged Germany) were then responding to it.

Crisis, etymologically stemming from the Greek meaning “decision,” was for Heidegger of utmost importance. He saw the crisis as that decision-moment which provided the possibility for philosophy. The question is then: was philosophy as one of the activities intimately concerned with being human then burdened with the responsibility to address and respond “back” to the crisis? It was not enough for philosophy to simply arrive on the scene of the crisis and begin philosophizing without further ado. There must be a way to position oneself so as to “genuinely” respond to such an event, and what better activities to look at (which are imperative for philosophy) than questioning and thinking? Not only are they a necessary part of philosophizing, they are two activities that we do most often and otherwise take for granted. The following study is then concerned with analyzing and laying out what Heidegger means by the concepts of questioning and thinking. However, the study goes further than stopping at an analysis of two concepts as this might lead to a misunderstanding that the themes of questioning and thinking in Heidegger’s thought that, while interesting in their own right, are unrelated to each other. I would like to suggest that questioning and thinking in Heidegger’s thought are related to each other and constitute a much deeper meaning than meets the eye. The study does not just deal with questioning and thinking in the way that they are commonly talked about. As with much of what Heidegger has written and lectured on, the themes and concepts that find their

way into his thought are brought before a new understanding and given new meaning—and the themes of questioning and thinking are no exception. What is being asked in the study is not simply what questioning and thinking are, according to Heidegger, but what meaning they hold or, to put it differently, what rank do questioning and thinking find themselves in. Are they in rank based on their roles in mental/psychological activities and their relative abilities to bring about abstract ideas? Not at all. Instead I propose that Heidegger’s work on questioning and thinking demonstrates that these activities are tied to something far more fundamental and intimate than just an activity carried out here and there. This is accomplished by looking at Heidegger’s reconceptualization of questioning and questionableness in terms of what he called in *Being and Time* the “*Seinsfrage*,” and looking at thinking as “poetic thinking” which received most attention in Heidegger’s later period. Therefore, the reader should be aware that the themes of questioning and thinking are not to be taken *as such*. Rather, questioning and thinking are always in regards to something else—their object. But this idea of object must itself be reconceptualised from the “in itself” thing “out there,” isolated in its objectivity, to the object that not only is in relation to the being who questions and thinks but is somehow in need of that being who questions and thinks. This idea is indeed provocative. Hopefully the following analysis of questioning and thinking in Heidegger’s works brings such an idea into focus.

The study includes two chapters, the first of which deals with questioning while the second deals with thinking. What is at stake in the first chapter is both to analyze Heidegger’s work on questioning, questionableness, and the *Seinsfrage* and to demonstrate his reworking of what it means to question, which is not always to be taken up by abstract ideas but to open up a situation. The second chapter concerns primarily Heidegger’s work on thinking, where thinking no longer is just the mental activity that it has been thought to be but now is a poetic activity. The point of poetic thinking is to face what is opened up through questioning; this is what

constitutes the relation between questioning and thinking. What is opened up (and how) by questioning and faced with poetic thinking is in turn how a historical time chooses to interpret or “navigate” itself.

A word now must be given regarding how the content of the study stands with other Heideggerian scholarship. What is presented in this study is nothing out of the ordinary, and much of it has been covered previously in other books and articles on various aspects of Heidegger’s thought (to secure an original footing in one’s interpretation of Heidegger given the breadth of secondary work is a difficult task in itself). However, there is one idea that has received little to no attention, and that is to entertain the possible synthesis of the *Seinsfrage* (questioning and questionableness) and poetic thinking in his thought. Much of what has been written on the roles of questioning and thinking have treated both activities in isolation from each other and have not ventured to mine the potential intimate relation shared by both for each other. When one looks at what is written on questioning and questionableness (or the *Seinsfrage*) and compare that with what is written about thinking (or poetic thinking), much more has been written about the latter, although the former receives some notable mentions. In “The Question Concerning Technology,” Heidegger states: “For questioning is the piety of thought.” Elsewhere he expands on this idea by saying that questioning is submissive or obedient to thinking. Such language suggests that thinking has some “higher” position over questioning, yet this is not the case and an interpretation that conveys this “higher than” view (which some scholarship has done) misses the mark in not only understanding the above quotation but Heidegger’s work regarding questioning and thinking. I suggest that questioning and thinking cannot be separated from each other and must be thought in relation; where there is questioning, there too do we find thinking.

This statement forms part of the argument for this thesis as questioning and thinking, for Heidegger, cannot be kept apart. The other part of the thesis concerns the meaning of the relation between questioning and thinking. Questioning and thinking are not carried out merely for the sake of themselves. Rather, they are activities that attempt to “get at” something by following it, and it is precisely this that sets up how a historical “time” is to interpret itself. Given the aforementioned crisis that Heidegger was facing, how we are to interpret ourselves was an important issue for him.

Much of what has been written in Heideggerian scholarship regarding this issue of how a historical time is to interpret itself has been dealt with by linking it back to Heidegger’s work on thinking (or poetic thinking), however, much has left out questioning and questionableness (or the *Seinsfrage*) and its role in this historical interpretation. Again, I suspect this is due to passages such as those quoted above, which when misinterpreted can lead to the problem of taking Heidegger to have left behind questioning (and the *Seinsfrage*) and opted for thinking instead.

While the study pulls from many of Heidegger’s early and later lectures and writings where it is evident that the dominant theme of the early Heidegger was the *Seinsfrage* and the dominant theme of the later Heidegger was poetic thinking, I maintain that, although it might not be the case that poetic thinking was always present in his earlier work, it is very much the case that questioning, questionableness, and the *Seinsfrage* were always present in his later work. It is, then, important to note that their roles were not subordinated to thinking in his later period. This apparent “subordination” was the result of Heidegger changing direction in his thought where what was needed in his thinking was to address that activity which proceeded from questioning. This change in direction, or “turn,” is my own interpretation on this much-debated topic in Heideggerian scholarship. It is widely held that Heidegger made a “turn” [*Kehre*] in his

thought which led to the distinction between the early and later Heidegger. While the early Heidegger was said to be most concerned with Dasein, the later Heidegger sought to turn towards Being itself without being mainly concerned with Dasein. I argue that questioning is what is most concerned with Dasein (seeing that it opens up the situation which Dasein finds itself within) and that it is this being concerned with Dasein which constitutes the reworking of questioning from abstract ideas or questions. However, poetic thinking (while not turning away or forgetting Dasein) attempts to directly address that situation which is opened up *by* Dasein in questioning. Therefore, thinking is *not only* that activity which focuses on Dasein; it focuses more on the *situation* that is revealed. From this, we can then consider moving from questioning to thinking as the “turn” that Heidegger made in his thought. What the reader must keep in mind, however, is that although there is a somewhat definable “turn” in Heidegger’s thinking, he also has mentioned that while he himself notes of this “turn,” what was at stake in his work has remained the same. I argue that what has remained the same for Heidegger is that what he is attempting to address in both his early and later works is what I call the “always already there”; if questioning opens up the always already there then there too do we find thinking which proceeds to what is always already there.

The theme of the study is both an argument and a call for clarification at the same time. In the discussions regarding Heidegger’s thoughts on the meaning of philosophizing itself, we cannot forgo the theme of questioning and the *Seinsfrage* and not take Heidegger to be leaving behind questioning for thinking. It is the synthesis of questioning and thinking that is philosophizing which constitutes how a historical time interprets itself. For this reason, although I would like to bring questioning into the debate on Heidegger’s work on the meaning of philosophizing, I must also include thinking as the two cannot be separated.

It may appear off-putting at first glance to speak of questioning and thinking in this manner, as we associate these activities with something that we do every day, or at least something that we do without much thinking about it. It should be noted that Heidegger in no way intends to do away with this more everyday understanding of questioning and thinking. What is at stake, for Heidegger, is not siding this way or that when it comes to different understandings of certain phenomena. On the contrary, Heidegger seeks to broaden the understanding of these phenomena by recognizing that while there are more common ways to think about these activities, he also wants to raise them (or push them) to their highest potential. There are two reasons for this. First, an issue that Heidegger sometimes would deal with was when particular ways of doing things were thought of as being all-encompassing or, in other words, they were absolutized. This, of course, left no room for other ways of thinking about a particular phenomenon other than the way absolutized, for example, the difference between “calculative” and “poetic thinking.” Heidegger does not want to forget about calculative thinking as this way of thinking has proven to be useful and has merit in some disciplines. However, Heidegger urges us to see that *in addition* to calculative thinking there can be other forms of thought, namely, poetic thinking. It is not that one would replace the other (this would be too easy and hasty a judgement) with another form of thinking; rather, both ways of thinking can co-exist. Second, something that a few scholars have noted is Heidegger’s propensity to elevate phenomena on a “grand” scale, or what is sometimes talked of as inflated language. Depending how one takes it, some may find Heidegger’s philosophy to be deliberately confusing the reader when what he is after could be explained in much simpler terms, and that Heidegger has philosophized on a grand scale in order to make things much bigger than they actually are. On the other hand, some see it that Heidegger needed to philosophize on such a grand scale as what he was attempting to say had not been thought before or at least not exactly in the way that he

saw it. If we take it that Heidegger was in some way responding to a crisis then we can also see that it was possible that he *had to* philosophize the way that he did; the situation called for such philosophizing. From this, the reader should see that Heidegger's tendency to elevate themes and concepts in his work to their highest potential is not to confuse readers or relegate other themes and concepts to a lower level. The point is to take a phenomenon that may have fallen out of view due to other phenomena dominating thinking at that time or something which we may take for granted (and not give much thought to at all) and bring new meaning to it or see it in a new light. If we wish to keep with Heideggerian terminology, we can say that this grand philosophizing is a way to open up and reveal what is completely ordinary and to demonstrate its ordinariness, to direct our gaze towards what is always already there; we need not always look at what is the "biggest" thing. Sometimes we need simply (for the time being) to turn towards what is closest to us.

Chapter 1

The Elucidation of the Idea of Questioning and Questionableness – The *Seinsfrage*

1.1 Introduction

The following chapter serving as the beginning of the present study investigates and ultimately outlines the idea of “questionableness” [*Fraglichkeit*], questioning, and the notion of the *Seinsfrage* that can be found in Heidegger’s early writings/lectures leading up to, and including, *Sein und Zeit* [Hereafter: SZ], as well as some of the writings/lectures following SZ. From this investigation, I will argue that the idea of questionableness and questioning provides the grounds that serve as the basis for what Heidegger in SZ I.2¹ writes of as “repetition” or “retrieval” [*Wiederholung*]. What this chapter aims at as a whole is two-fold: (1) to provide the beginning considerations for the rest of the study so as to put some of Heidegger’s later writings into perspective; and (2) to give thought to a possible goal that Heidegger was after in his writing of SZ, that being to work out the question of the meaning of Being [*Sein*] or the *Seinsfrage*. It will be demonstrated that the *Seinsfrage* is not *just* a question (as it is *the* question to be asked) and not *just* concerning the act of questioning. Rather, the *Seinsfrage* is Heidegger’s attempt at providing an account of the beginning considerations for thinking about how one *is able to* encounter and question the *questionableness* that arises from our *being-in-the-world* [*In-der-Welt-Sein*]. In other words, SZ is Heidegger’s beginning step towards a working out of, what I would like to call, a “positionality” which encompasses a critique of one’s ability to/of “remaining-open” as a genuine possibility of understanding *Dasein*’s situation, insofar as possibility denotes *possible-abilities-to-be*. Finally, it will be argued that this “positionality”

which Heidegger is attempting to work out is what he takes as a “beginning,” however not just any beginning, but one which has *Dasein*, questionableness and questioning (the *Seinsfrage*), and the meaning of Being at its heart.

1.2 The Crisis of the Sciences² – Heidegger’s Response

Before the idea of questionableness and questioning can be approached in Heidegger’s thought, it is necessary to investigate what exactly gave way to the idea of questionableness and Heidegger’s re-working of what it means to question. In other words, it is necessary to clarify what Heidegger was responding to in his early writings that allowed him to develop such thought. In the spring of 1915, Heidegger completed his *Habilitationsschrift* [Habilitation thesis] that allowed to him to teach philosophy in the University. Titled “Duns Scotus’s Doctrine of Categories and Meaning,” the thesis was an attempt to seek out a possible predecessor which anticipated the phenomenological methods of Edmund Husserl. More specifically, what Heidegger saw in the writings and school of Duns Scotus was a philosophy which aimed to account for the difference between the thing or content of thought (“heterogeneity”) and the act of thought itself (“homogeneity”), which Heidegger sees an affinity with Husserl’s distinction between *noesis*, the act of intention, and *noema*, the content of the intention. Moreover, Heidegger presents Duns Scotus as a thinker who, in a similar vein to Husserl, “...explores the field of pure consciousness and then, from it, conjures up the structure of the entire world,”³ who uncovers the innerworkings of thought itself—the *thought of thought*. However, something lies even deeper in his thesis, that being what exactly bridges the gap between heterogeneous things and the homogeneous acts of thought which differentiate, combine, and compare things. Duns Scotus proposes that what exists as a bridge between these two areas is *analogy*, a certain “pointing towards something” which Duns Scotus takes to lie in language. The point being, this

relation as analogy Duns Scotus takes to be the same between the world and God. While the world and God cannot be identical to each other, there certainly exists an intimate relation between them. It is the case that the world points to God.

In his biographical book outlining the various phases of Heidegger's thought, Rüdiger Safranski notes that Duns Scotus' answer of the relation between the *prima intentio* and the *secunda intentio* as analogy served as a crucial aspect "in the later developmental phases of his [Heidegger's] thought" where the "conviction that not univocal logic but the spoken language, in its historicity, manifold meaning, and also its poetic form, is the more adequate organ of philosophy."⁴ Although Heidegger takes away something crucial to his later thought, he ultimately distances himself (to an extent) from scholasticism, evidenced by an added conclusion to his thesis where Heidegger placed emphasis on "life" and the "living spirit" where "the theoretical attitude of the mind' is not everything; 'a gathering up of the totality of the knowable' is not enough, because what matters is the 'breakthrough into true reality and real truth.'"⁵ In addition, Heidegger also makes the comment elsewhere that scholasticism has the inability "to place itself, with a jerk, above its own work"⁶, as Safranski notes, "Heidegger sought 'free mobility'" in this particular criticism aimed at scholasticism.⁷ What exactly is this "free mobility" that Heidegger is after? Is it the longing for an abstract stance or point of view? Certainly not. Where was Heidegger to go then to seek out this so-called "free mobility" if it was not to be found in scholasticism?

In 1916, the University of Freiberg saw the arrival of the "master of phenomenology," Edmund Husserl, who brought the study and method of phenomenology to the attention of the young Heidegger where in a few years after this introduction Heidegger was to become Husserl's assistant. Phenomenology for the young Heidegger proved to be an attractive way of thought insofar as it, for the time, provided him the possibility for this "free mobility." In

addition to this possibility, although the need for “free mobility” is not to be thought as entirely separate, Husserl’s phenomenological method also served Heidegger’s concerns regarding how one goes about investigating “things,” namely the “sciences” [*Wissenschaften*]. In some of his early writings and letters, Heidegger makes it clear that his goal in thinking was to distance himself from what he saw as the philosophy of his day. This was mainly the philosophy that was being taught in the universities which consisted in, in his eyes, thinking about matters relating to culture or moving away from what called out to be thought. In his 1921 letter to Karl Löwith, Heidegger expresses the distance that he feels towards those thinkers who “philosophize” with a view toward “objectivity” in the sense of positing an “objectivity of the in-itself” [*An-sich-Objektivität*] which would only serve to “take our own facticity and ‘twist it around,’ if you like, putting a false construction upon it.”⁸ This does not mean, however, that Heidegger saw himself leading a movement of thinking towards something completely against objectivity and objective rigor [*gegenständliche*]. Rather, Heidegger sought to think radically about the *matters themselves* which required a certain “*objectively rigorous*” approach to thinking and questioning.⁹

Heidegger’s point is expressed in the letter to Löwith where he writes, “What I want in my teaching at the university is for human beings to *take action and become engaged*... Will we continue to fret in our moods and brood over possible new cultures [*Neukulturen*, not *Urkulturen*], or will we *sacrifice* ourselves and find our way back to our *existentiell* limitation and facticity, rather than reflecting our way off into programs and universal problems?”¹⁰ It is clear from this that Heidegger wanted to “bring back” thinking and questioning to what it had so far been removed from: the *matter* [*Sache*] *itself* (meaning [*Sinn*]) and our relation to it.¹¹ This is something that the sciences (and how they had been conceptualized) had largely ignored and became entrenched in their own investigations unable to move outside of them, or at least to understand that there was *not just* the individual particular “sciences” and their respective modes

of analysis. Hence, Heidegger was attempting to ground the sciences in what allowed them to be sciences in the first place, a project which his mentor Husserl had undertaken. The issue was not with the sciences themselves and that each had their particular method of investigation, it was rather an issue with how the sciences *are thought*. Being mostly disjointed from each other, the problem had arisen (and this problem is one which Heidegger would deal with in both his “early” and “later” writings) that the methods used by the sciences were often “absolutized” and left no room for other modes of investigation, thought, and questioning, as well as not adequately encountering what allows the sciences to be.

Heidegger’s review of Karl Jaspers’ *Psychology of Worldviews* gives us another glimpse into what Heidegger sees as the way to go about elucidating the way of investigation that seeks to get at the “matter itself.” The review was not much of a review as it was more of a critical commentary which seeks to elevate the positive aspects of the work. Although both Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan note, regarding Heidegger’s aforementioned letter to Löwith in the following year, that Heidegger had made the comment that, “The more I read Jaspers’s book [*Psychology of Worldviews*], the more flaccid it becomes. The positively new in it is more in the order, in the ‘catalogue,’ which is basically unphilosophical.... For we do philosophy not in order to hoard information and propositions, but in order to structure life. And this does not aim to be a worldview philosophy!”¹² Heidegger’s emphasis here on “life” should at once remind us of his added conclusion to his *Habilitationsschrift* where he made a similar emphasis in the face of the thought of the scholastics, which he believed to be too abstract.

Coming back to Heidegger’s review, although he claims to reveal what is positive, he ultimately criticizes it which left Jaspers puzzled.¹³ The main thrust of Heidegger’s critique lay in his argument that Jaspers never went far enough and “deceives himself” in thinking that *the* way of attaining the rigor of investigation that the sciences miss out on is through “sheer

observation;” as Heidegger explains, “Sheer observation does not give us what it wants to give, namely, the possibility of radical confirmation and decision, and, what in its sense amounts to the same thing, a rigorous consciousness of the necessity of methodological questioning.”¹⁴ Moreover, Heidegger also saw that Jaspers, while attempting to “get out” of the purview of the sciences through his analysis of *Existenz* and the so-called return to life as an object of investigation, falls short in that he narrows down the problems of a psychology of worldviews to “the problems of a particular science.” This for Heidegger meant that Jaspers had not adequately gone deep enough into the “problematic of philosophy”¹⁵ and remained in the area of the sciences. It should be noted however, that both Heidegger and Jaspers have a similar directive, that being to “move beyond” the sciences as *the main* mode of investigation and to seek out a ground of investigation in a form of radical questioning and thinking which challenged the common-day philosophy and brought thinking and questioning back to the “matters themselves,” which Safranski writes of in detail in MH.

The point of Heidegger’s distance from the philosophy that was being done in the universities was that he found that this way of philosophizing left much to be desired. A new “beginning” of philosophy was in order.¹⁶ How exactly was this to be done? Was it simply the case that one needed to only start anew and move on from what has previously been worked upon? Not entirely. What was instead required was a “going back” through what had been established prior to the present day which “moved beyond” them, but in a way that did not *forget* them by keeping them in view. It was this going back by way of moving beyond as a form of overcoming which served as the method of the search for this new “beginning.” Thus began Heidegger’s “destruction” [*destruktion*] of the tradition of Western metaphysics, as noted by John van Buren in *The Young Heidegger: Rumour of the Hidden King*.¹⁷ Van Buren also notes that through Heidegger’s *destruktion*, he set out to uncover the genesis of certain characters

found in Greek thought which the history of Western metaphysics often re-inscribed (through Western metaphysics itself), that being medieval thought and modernity, and “then to call for the end of philosophy and a transition to another beginning.”¹⁸ While it finds its discussion most explicit in *SZ*, the method of *destruktion* for Heidegger starts earlier on with the realization that a new beginning was necessary. If we were to commence a new beginning then we would need to go to the “first beginning” set forth by the Greeks to gain a directive. However, one must be careful in seeking out this new beginning through the “first beginning” as the point of going back is not to assume or revitalize the “first beginning.” Rather, this new beginning must be more of a “first beginning” than the first beginning of the Greeks (more about this later). At this point in the chapter, I would like to move on to some of Heidegger’s early lectures leading up to the publication of *SZ*. It is here that we will begin to see Heidegger’s “method” and his *Sache*.

1.3 On the Way to the Path of *Destruktion* – Heidegger’s Early Lectures

Focusing our investigation now on some of Heidegger’s early lectures leading up to *SZ*, we can see Heidegger attempting to formulate a question as a way of entering into (or opening-up) the discussion of how one could go about investigating things in a way that differs from the sciences, yet does not completely push such sciences out of view. It should be noted that there were a few themes that Heidegger was working on in this period between his final lectures at the University of Freiburg and his transfer to the University of Marburg. As Scott Campbell points out, these themes can be grouped into three thematic projects: (1) the meaningfulness of life; (2) religious experience; and (3) language and the Greeks.¹⁹ While what follows cannot adequately cover all of these early lectures or all three thematic projects, I will narrow the analysis of the study to two of Heidegger’s early lectures, that being *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* and *Ontology—Hermeneutics of Facticity*, as well as the theme of the meaningfulness of life.

Heidegger knew that to develop a stance on the meaningfulness of life would have to involve some sort of philosophy, but *philosophy of what?* Or better yet: *philosophy as what?* Was it philosophy *tout court*? Perhaps, but only if philosophy had some directive, namely Being (or the meaning of Being) itself. Regardless, by looking at some of Heidegger's early lectures, we see that he was, for the most part, involved in the study of phenomenology and hermeneutics. Was phenomenology and/or hermeneutics the philosophy or method Heidegger was looking for? This we shall soon find out.

Heidegger's involvement in phenomenology and hermeneutics often required him to go back to other thinkers who he argued belonged to the history of Western metaphysics to see how they thought about things, more specifically, how they positioned²⁰ themselves towards the object of their investigation. As Heidegger makes it clear in various lectures and writings throughout his life, there has been a serious neglect of, not only the Being [*Sein*] of beings [*Seiendes*], but the question of the meaning of Being itself in the history of Western metaphysics. There is a lack of understanding "for the meaning of the questions—and yet they are being posed everywhere..."²¹ For example, the sciences focus their investigations on areas that concern certain forms of beings [*Seiend*] as certain modes of being, as well as objects in their being and thus science is "the founding disclosure, for the sheer sake of disclosure, of a self-contained region of beings, or of being."²² However, they either take the Being of the beings or the *meaning* of the Being of beings for granted as it is never questioned given that, according to Heidegger, they were not positioned to do so. What was it then that accounted for this *forgetting* of this question? From this, what is "it" that one must position themselves towards so that the question is not neglected? For Heidegger, the beginning steps towards a possible answer lies, at least of the "early Heidegger," in the thought of the school of Aristotle which he saw as

performing something similar to a phenomenological investigation (although still vastly different).

Before we can move on, a word must be given on this idea that Heidegger kept an involvement with phenomenology. First and foremost, it is evident from early writings and lectures that Heidegger's take on phenomenology varied from the phenomenology put forward and practiced by Husserl. This is evidenced in a lecture that Heidegger gave where he gives the example of a phenomenological approach to experience of the lectern at which he is standing. Do we see the lectern as a combination of brown surfaces, set at certain angles? No. Is the lectern just a "box" or a "bigish box"? No. Rather, the experience of the lectern is that of a situation where, for students, they are to be spoken to, for the professor, from where they are to speak. As Heidegger puts it, "I see the lectern at a single stroke, as it were; I don't only see it in isolation...".²³ The difference here between Husserl's phenomenology and phenomenology as Heidegger sees it is where the phenomenological method is aimed towards. While, for Husserl, the various "parts" of things can be analyzed, ultimately leading to an eidetic reduction which should shed light on the transcendental ego, Heidegger saw phenomenology as a way to elucidate how the things we interact with everyday appear to us. In other words, what Heidegger is after here is to uncover the way, not only how we interact with things, but most importantly how these things appear to us that does not rely on a theoretical view or scientific attitude²⁴, that is their meaning or meaningfulness.

To carry on with looking at Heidegger's involvement with phenomenology, we can see that he saw Aristotle's notions of *phainomenon* and *logos* as something worthy of analysis, especially in regards to phenomenology (literally, phenomeno-[*phainomenon*]-logy [*logos*]). The beginning section of Heidegger's 1923/24 lecture titled *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* is of particular interest. In this section, Heidegger (rather quickly) goes over what

Aristotle means by *phainomenon*. He states that “Φαινόμενον [*phainomenon*] means: something that shows itself. Φαίνομαι [*phainomai*] is the same as ‘to show itself,’ Φαίνω [*phainō*] the same as ‘to bring something to the light of day.’”²⁵ This “what shows itself” is for Heidegger the way in which Aristotle thought about “seeing;” it was about how the particular entity in question appeared. But then the question arises: what do we do with the appearance? Here, Heidegger provides an answer that continues the distinction between the methods of investigation of the sciences and the method which he is after:

If it is *explicitly* a matter of grasping existence, of retaining it, of securing what shows itself in itself, then we remain in the context of science. In this context the meaning of Φαινόμενον [*phainomenon*] comes to a head: what shows itself in itself, with the explicit claim of serving as the basis for all further questioning and explicating. What matters for science is σώζειν τὰ Φαινόμενα [to save the phenomena]: what shows itself in itself is thereby pressed into a fundamental position.²⁶

What we can see in this passage is that Heidegger has clearly set out a way of thinking about this appearance which involves the sciences; that being the sciences make attempts to grasp and hold firm the appearance as it stands or shows itself. He remarks later in the section that the sciences grasp the existence of certain entities that “does not leave anything uncovered.”²⁷ While Heidegger does not intend this to be a negative comment on the methods of investigation of the sciences (he would say that he is simply getting at the “essence” of them), he does intend this to be a part of a directive to point towards what he is aiming at elucidating insofar as what Heidegger is attempting to work out is nothing like the sciences. Does this mean that Heidegger was seeking out a method that takes things in in their appearance? Yes, however, it is not as simple as just being passive towards phenomena. There is something that arises which calls out to us and we respond—*actively respond*. It is with this that we come closer to understanding the idea of questioning and questionableness in Heidegger’s thought, which will become much clearer in the coming sections.

In keeping with his early lectures as his attempts to work out a possible method, Heidegger talks of “becoming free *for* existence” and “becoming free *from* the discipline and traditional possibilities.” It is this “becoming free for existence” that constitutes an investigation of that existence as “destruction.”²⁸ Destruction for Heidegger is the “path of interpretation of existence” insofar as freeing existence up requires a “*dismantling*” where concepts are traced back “*to their distinctive origin.*”²⁹ What is accomplished in this specific path of investigation is not only an uncovering of the origins of these concepts, it also demonstrates the “inadequacy” that these concepts have for existence in its “known knowledge,” or as Heidegger puts it, “an elucidation of how existence’s self-obstructing is enacted in history.”³⁰ Moreover, in the method of destruction, what is brought to the fore is how every philosophy is, in some way or another, about existence, hence as I noted earlier, Heidegger often sets out to see how different thinkers in the history of philosophy have positioned themselves to their object of investigation. It acts as an indicator to their relation to existence, which is the “basic character” of that existence, that being *being-there* [*Da-sein*].³¹ Of course, while every philosophy may be about existence, this does not mean it opens itself towards this existence. In most cases, as Heidegger will make explicit in SZ, these philosophies have covered over this existence. This *turning towards* existence itself Heidegger finds in the reflexive investigation of Descartes where Heidegger sees that Descartes, in his skepticism, “places himself face to face with the void [*das Nichts*] and seeks to maintain himself in this situation. That means, however, in relation to the end-situation itself, that he is not only placed *before the void*, but also inserted *into the void*, devoid of *any possibility* of still encountering something.”³² What is then left to be encountered in the “nothing” is the “*being of the one searching itself*” and it is *only* the being of that being which is found or at least encountered in this “nothing.” In other words, what comes through this type of investigation is

the *being-there* of the being who searches, or for our purposes, who engages in questioning as it is questioning which opens-up this situation.

But what about the rise of questionableness? Something akin to questionableness that Heidegger (interestingly) takes note of is the *dubitare* [“doubt”] that is found in the one searching for oneself. It is not *just* the *dubitare* which is encountered but the *esse* that is given in the *dubitare*. Therefore, the being of the being who engages in questioning arises in the face as well as *in tandem* with questionableness. This is why there cannot be *just* a question (or even *the* question). Even though a question can be posed and it is “out there” so to speak, it just does not float in space. There are two reasons for this: (1) what a question is posed “against” is certainly not empty space. Something must give rise to a question, especially (as we will see in the coming section) to *the* question—*Seinsfrage* [question of the meaning of Being (*Sein*)]. (2) The question is not posed to simply remain or hang “out there.” The question, that is the *Seinsfrage* in particular, must, in a way, *return* or “come back” to something. This something, to give a quick answer, is questionableness *and* the rise of questionableness (or we can say the shining-forth of questionableness) which comes through from being, especially *being-there* as the existence of Dasein. Van Buren in TYH makes this connection between questionableness and being, stating it as the “questionableness *of* being” various times throughout the book, however, not exactly from the place which the present study finds its directive.

Coming back to Heidegger’s IP lecture, the point of highlighting Heidegger’s thinking-with Descartes *is not* to suggest that there is a major affinity between Descartes and Heidegger.³³ Rather, the point of this highlighting is only to demonstrate the path of Heidegger’s thought through the early lectures and to demonstrate the working out of his method and the idea of questionableness as something which we come up against, yet return to in our questioning or our method, which cannot be removed from *us* who carry out this questioning, this investigation, and

this method. Ultimately, Heidegger argues that Descartes “perverted” the “*specific being*” that he found in his meditations, that being what Heidegger calls “*having-oneself-with*,” since Descartes was looking for *certainty* and took this “specific being” and turned it into a formal proposition which served for Descartes as a “formal-ontological proposition.”³⁴ This for Heidegger was the indication that (1) the question of being was neglected in Descartes’ thought and (2) insofar as the sciences, as I pointed out Heidegger’s thoughts on the matter, seek to “grasp” their object (and we can take it, to ground a sense of certainty of the object of their investigation). This was, for Heidegger, a “formal-ontological proposition:” the sciences and their method of making certain a formal ontology fall short in their ability to get at the *matter itself* [*Sache selbst*]. Surprisingly little has been written on Heidegger’s relation to Descartes. Most of what has been written tends to focus on the aforementioned section of SZ where Heidegger discusses Descartes’ neglect of the world. Some authors, such as Sean J. McGrath in *The Early Heidegger and Medieval Philosophy*, come close to what Heidegger has to say on this specific aspect of Descartes, namely how Heidegger saw Descartes, not only as having a “reductionist ontology” of the *res cogitans*, but as on the search for certainty.³⁵ However, McGrath does not include a discussion on the importance that Heidegger places on Descartes’ encountering this “*specific being*,” which albeit provides the foundation for Descartes’ need for certainty. However, the neglect of such a discussion moves over what Heidegger sought to elucidate in what Descartes encountered in his doubt: the position of the being who engages in questioning radically in their being as questionableness.

Other lectures that Heidegger held leading up to SZ, like his 1923 lecture titled “Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity” deals with the topic of, as the title may suggest, hermeneutics and its role in this method which Heidegger is seeking to work out. Of particular interest pertaining to the present study is Heidegger’s discussion of hermeneutics as the way of

making *Dasein* (*being-there*) “accessible.” “Accessible”—is this what Heidegger is really after? The published lecture begins with a foreword (which was not delivered in the actual 1923 course) that is most prevalent for the present study: “Putting forth *questions*—questions are not happenstance thoughts, nor are questions the common ‘problems’ of today which ‘one’ picks up from hearsay and book learning and decks out with a gesture of profundity. Questions grow out of a *confrontation* with ‘subject matter.’ And subject matter is *there* only where eyes are.”³⁶ This connection between questioning, questions, and a sense of confrontation of some sort that Heidegger makes echoes what we said earlier regarding Heidegger’s conclusions on the connection between the *dubitare* and *esse* found in Descartes’ meditations. What does this unheard foreword mean both for the lecture itself and the present study? Was it simply thought unworthy of mention in the actual lecture? Perhaps. Although this possibility should not deter us from taking it seriously and treating it as just an unworthy paragraph would be far too hasty a judgement for what is at work in this particular thought that Heidegger has given. For us, the significance of this comment is quite clear: there does appear to be the notion in Heidegger’s thought which acknowledges the relation that exists between questioning and a confrontation of some sort, as well as a difference between certain types of questioning. Moreover, the confrontation is with a “*subject matter*” which is “*there* only where eyes are.” The subject matter is what we have already established earlier when Heidegger writes of getting at the “matter itself.” However, this “only where eyes are...” we have only eluded to but have not ourselves fully taken on. For the lecture itself, it is this note of “*there* only where eyes are...” which serves as its directive and significance. Hence, this note will guide the rest of the chapter.

It is clear from reading through the lecture that much of what is contained in it is thematic of what was to be discussed in SZ. What is of interest to us here is Heidegger’s discussion of hermeneutics and “hermeneutical questioning.” It is also in this lecture that Heidegger actually

uses the term “questionableness” [*Fraglichkeit*] (distinguishing between “fundamental questionableness” and “ontic questionableness”) which arises in hermeneutics and hermeneutical questioning as *interpretation*. But interpretation of *what*? It is, according to Heidegger, an interpretation of *being-there* itself. Furthermore, this interpretation is *part of the being-there* and is not some abstract view but one that gives itself over to the situation uncovered. Therefore, hermeneutics and hermeneutical questioning arise out of existence and investigate that very existence as its *being-there*³⁷. This investigation, however, is not a traditional one in the sense that it has an object in the traditional sense. If this interpretation interprets the *being-there* which it arises out from, this *being-there* is not a mere object to be grasped and secured for certainty, as we have previously shown.³⁸ With this hermeneutical questioning, Heidegger notes that it develops a “radical wakefulness” for *Dasein* in its *there-being* and that “Only in hermeneutics can the position be developed in which we are in a *position to question radically*, without having to be guided by the traditional idea of man.”³⁹ What of this idea of being in a “*position to question radically*” which leads to a “radical wakefulness”? First and foremost, it intimately deals with questionableness. This intimacy which *Dasein* has with questionableness is due in part to the fact that *Dasein*’s *being-there* lies *always-already in questionableness*. However, this situation is covered over by modes of being which Heidegger deems as “publicness.”

By situation I mean not just questionableness itself—this would be far too simple. The situation accounts for *Dasein* as lying *in* questionableness—not just questionableness or *Dasein*, but both at the same time. This situation is that which is the case for Heidegger as *Dasein* is always-already intimate in its being as *being-there in* questionableness. Yet, this is only a one-sided thinking through of the intimacy that *Dasein* shares with questionableness. The other part of the intimacy is the coming into view of the intimacy itself, something which we might, by a more popular term, deem as “awareness.”⁴⁰ At least for the “early Heidegger” he refers to this, if

we note above, as “radical wakefulness.” We can quite easily state that we share some form of intimacy within questionableness, but this is not enough for Heidegger. Our investigation into the “matter itself” must commence from this intimacy which requires not a scientific view which seeks to grasp and make an object of what is viewed⁴¹ but a view which takes the “matter itself” *and* its coming into view, or its *meaningfulness* and takes it as it *is*.⁴² In his article, Campbell also makes note of the connection between Heidegger’s early thought and his working out of a method and how this method seeks to look at “human life” not as a “theoretical or objectified object”⁴³ which we have just demonstrated. While this is correct, Campbell’s article misses two crucial aspects of this area of Heidegger’s thought, that being the idea of questionableness lying at the core of the *being-there* of the being who questions and the role of *destruktion* in the coming into view of this questionableness.

Bringing back the idea of “radical wakefulness,” it is this radical wakefulness which pulls us out of such “publicness,” that we can then be in position to “question radically.” Insofar as this comes out of the existence of *Dasein* as *Da-sein* (*there-being*) itself, it questions itself in its questionableness as the questionableness comes into view. *Dasein* does not need to look further in its investigation than its “*there*,” as what is meaningful, this “matter itself” does not lie back somewhere at some arbitrary point in history (this is exactly the source of Heidegger’s critique of historicism in *SZ*). As it will become clearer in the following section, what is meaningful is *always-already* “*there*.” However, there certainly is a history of thought which we (and Heidegger) take as the tradition of Western metaphysics and the thinkers of this tradition have, to varying degrees, attempted to devise an answer to this questionableness, to what is questionable, and to what is the meaning of Being. But as Heidegger has and will continue to demonstrate, they have largely covered it over and ultimately have forgotten it. Hence, Heidegger in his thought through as a moving-towards the “matter itself” must take on the tradition through a

destruction [*destruktion*] that, as we have pointed out earlier in this section, “frees up” existence or Dasein as *being-there* for the investigation into what is meaningful, this “matter itself” as it is *always-already there*, insofar as “*there*” is the *there* of the *Da* of Dasein, the very existence which this investigation must commence from and *return to* as an encountering of the questionableness that lies in its very being. Something is already given which is *there* that we must *turn towards*. Interestingly, McGrath has pinpointed this *turning towards* in two places: (1) in Heidegger’s interpretation of Meister Eckhart’s concept of “devotion” [*Hingabe*] as “being given over (*hingegen*) to God” and Husserl’s well-known statement “to the things themselves!” as “a dedicated submission (*Hingabe*) to the subject matter [*Sache*].”⁴⁴ While this is all well and good, important aspects and details are missing. Let this be the indicator that the study must move ahead in looking at SZ where Heidegger attempts to work out this situation.

Of course, we now see that Heidegger was attempting not to forget the methods and modes of investigation of the sciences and more generally the scientific attitude, but to *overcome* them by way of seeking out something that they often miss or take for granted. In other words, Heidegger wanted to bring forth this something, what we have been calling the *Sache* or *Sache selbst* as what allows for these investigations into certain forms of being [*Seiende*] and most importantly, it is this *Sache* or the *Sache selbst* and our relation to it which has been largely forgotten. Therefore, for Heidegger, a radical form of questioning must be in order; some way of thinking about things that keeps in mind this *Sache* or *Sache selbst* is required. These goals served as the basis for Heidegger’s *magnum opus*, *Sein und Zeit*. Of course, there were other motives that lead Heidegger to write SZ. However, for the present study, I would like to focus on this particular motive of working out the question concerning the meaning of Being and what this means for the idea of questionableness and the activity of questioning.

1.4 The Raising of the “Question of the Meaning of Being” in *Sein und Zeit* – Beginning Considerations

SZ begins with an unnumbered page containing a quotation from Plato’s *Sophist* that, as Thomas Sheehan argues in his book MSH, sets the tone for the whole treatise. It reads: “For manifestly you have long been aware of what you mean when you say the expression ‘being’ [*seiend*]. We, however, who used to think we understood it, have now become perplexed.”⁴⁵ While we already demonstrated an understanding of Being, as Heidegger notes, it is exactly this prior understanding which constitutes a certain *incomprehensibility* regarding Being.⁴⁶ This being perplexed of course arises with a particular question and questioning (in the face of questionableness) which we have already outlined above, that being the questioning of the meaning of Being (or to-be) [*Sein*]. The inclusion of the quotation from the *Sophist* about being perplexed not only serves as an important starting point of SZ but also of the sense or feeling which the reader of the project finds themselves in as they work their way through the treatise. Put differently, it is not just the content of SZ that is perplexing, it is the study itself as a way of thought to be followed which is to prove to be perplexing, which Dennis J. Schmidt also proposes (he interestingly notes that the first readers of SZ understood this aspect of it which has now been, rather ironically, forgotten⁴⁷).

While it is easy to take the content of an author and think of it as merely a book, to do this with SZ (and many of Heidegger’s lectures and writings for that matter) would be a mistake. From what we demonstrated, Heidegger wants to avoid an investigation or (better) a way of thinking that takes what it seeks or what it encounters as an object in the traditional sense, that is as an object that lies there in its objectivity. This way of thinking is for the sciences.⁴⁸ What Heidegger is doing in SZ is certainly not a science. He does not want to distance himself from the matter. Instead, he wants to bring himself (and the reader) to an opening encounter or

confrontation with the matter. Although one should remember that this aim is not limited to SZ alone as in the lecture HF (1923), Heidegger was already, as I pointed out, talking about a “radical wakefulness.” However, as Schmidt argues, although the project does not use the exact term “radical wakefulness,” one of the aims of SZ was to “reawaken” this perplexity, or as I have it, questionableness or the questionable, that “opens up the question of the meaning of being.”⁴⁹ Therefore, we can look at the content of SZ as a project which seeks to view the relation that arises (that is *always-already there*) between the *Seinsfrage* and questionableness, that which has meaning: the *Sache selbst*. This is why directly after the *Sophist* quote, Heidegger titles it “The Exposition of the Question of the Meaning of Being”, with the first chapter of the introduction reading “The Necessity, Structure, and Priority of the Question of Being”, and the first section of the Chapter One is titled “The Necessity of an Explicit Repetition of the Question of Being”. Moreover, the first part of SZ is titled “The Interpretation of Dasein in Terms of Temporality and the Explication of Time as the Transcendental Horizon of the Question of Being.” If the untitled first page sets the tone for the treatise then the introduction and the first part certainly puts it into motion.

Titles aside, the notion of questions and the act of questioning are important for any study for how is a project supposed to take its directive without some form of a guiding (or as we shall see in the second chapter, a grounding) question? For SZ this is true, however, exactly *what* question serves as the guiding (or grounding) question is what Heidegger pays particular attention to and for a very important reason, which should be expected. As we noted above, Heidegger took interest in the different ways in which we investigate beings [*Seienden*] and their being [*seiende*]. While this was well and good, Heidegger took issue with the neglect that he saw of Being [*Sein*] and most importantly the meaning of Being as these investigations seemed to focus on a definitive (or definable) being for their study and answer(s) which were then often

placed into categories in the name of certainty (recall his thoughts on Descartes in his IP lecture). However, what about the “what” that “connects” these different categories of being? Moreover, as Hans-Georg Gadamer interestingly puts it:

He [Heidegger] asked how a finite, frail human Dasein—one whose death is certain—could understand itself in its Being in spite of its temporality, indeed, how it could experience Being, not as a privation, as a defect, or as a merely fleeing pilgrimage of earthlings’ journey through this life toward a participation in the eternity of the divine, but rather as the distinguishing feature of being human.⁵⁰

This is what Heidegger argues has been forgotten and the forgotten-ness of this forgetting itself has been forgotten, despite the times’ firm belief of its proficiency in the study of metaphysics, insofar as metaphysics involves the study of beings as beings. While this connection “sustained the avid research of Plato and Aristotle [from then on it] ceased to be heard *as a thematic question of actual investigation.*”⁵¹

The question of the meaning of Being has not just been encountered by Heidegger. Other important thinkers have approached it, however they all seem to have moved away from any thoughtful and meaningful engagement with it. Heidegger argues that there exists certain “prejudices”⁵² that take the question of the meaning of Being and deem it entirely unnecessary to pose as a worthy question, despite it providing the possibility for all other modes of investigation. It is this question which is, according to Aristotle, of first order as *protē philosophia* [first philosophy] (as a side note, this “first philosophy” is what we know as Aristotle’s “metaphysics”). Heidegger in a lecture course after the publication of SZ titled *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (1929/30) addresses the title and content “metaphysics” as the referent to Aristotle’s first philosophy and argues that it was an “embarrassment” to the school of Aristotle who were able to take and organize the individual studies of beings, what

were called *epistemē* [sciences], however had trouble with his first philosophy as it could not find a home in any of the individual sciences. Hence, it was given the name of its place in Aristotle's thought, that being *ta meta ta physika* and therefore first philosophy as metaphysics gained its designation partly based on its title and its position *after* the physics, although Heidegger takes the "meta" in *metaphysika* in a way other than a position in Aristotle's work; he takes it as the notion of "going over from one matter to another."⁵³ Therefore, not all was lost in the organization of the school of Aristotle. However, the meaning of *ta meta ta physika* changed with the Latinization of the Greek into *metaphysica* where *ta meta ta physika* no longer just indicated a position in the thought of Aristotle, nor the content in turning towards the matter. Rather it constituted a way of thinking which "turns away from the φυσικα [*physika*] and turns toward other beings, toward beings in general and toward that being which properly is."⁵⁴ In other words, metaphysics as we have come to know it began as a scholastic enterprise,⁵⁵ where metaphysics carries the tone of being an abstract subject. If anything, this attitude towards Aristotle's first philosophy for Heidegger is indicative of the neglect of the question of the meaning of Being; the investigation into what "connects" the multiple categories of being (denoted by the individual sciences) as Heidegger sees Aristotle's first philosophy as his attempt to get at the meaning of being as such.

All of this talk of "turning towards" which then fell to "turning away" sounds like Heidegger is after one thing and one thing only, which is misleading, although necessary to understand where Heidegger's worries lay. It should be noted that Heidegger does not intend on doing away with beings and only focusing on Being as such (or the meaning of Being for that matter) as this would allow for an investigation into beings to fall into neglect where those very beings are a part of the situation that Heidegger is confronting in his thought. While Being and beings may be "different," they certainly exist within a relation to each other and we cannot have

one without the other. This, Heidegger will express as the “ontological difference” where the tradition of Western metaphysics (and theology) have not taken note of this crucial difference and have often fallen to the side of beings when investigating some form of ground. This critique is made explicit when Heidegger, in SZ, writes of “onto-theology.” When questioning Being, thinkers have often grounded beings in another being—God, or the “highest being.” While this may at first glance appear to be a suitable answer, Heidegger is quick to remind us that the Being of a being cannot be another being, however, the Being of a being is the Being of another being. In other words, the Being of our being cannot be grounded in another being similar to us; even God who, being *the* “highest being” is still *a being*.

In the beginning sections of the introduction to SZ, Heidegger draws a distinction between the investigations of the sciences and what provides the possibility for them in stating the different priorities of the question of the meaning of Being—*the ontic and ontological priority of the Being-question*. In terms of the ontic priority, Heidegger writes of the role of the sciences as they “have this being’s (the human being’s) kind of being...,”⁵⁶ which Heidegger calls *Dasein*. The question of the meaning of Being in the ontic sense thus constitutes an *existentiell* understanding for *Dasein*, but not an *existential* one, insofar as *existentiell* means the everyday engagement of *Dasein* with other beings like and unlike itself (e.g. other *Dasein* and innerworldly beings respectively) and *existential* refers to the structures of *Dasein* itself. Therefore, the ontic priority of the question about the meaning of Being lies in its ontic-existentiell investigation of beings [*Seiendes*]. On the other hand, the ontological priority of the question is largely concerned with the “categories” of beings and, in Heidegger’s own words, precedes the “positive sciences.”⁵⁷ However, and this will serve as the jumping-off point, even with the ontological priority of the question, ontological investigations, if they have not “previously clarified the meaning of being sufficiently...,”⁵⁸ remain in the dark so to speak. They

are able to explicate the different categories of being, but miss the meaning behind those categories of being. Even though Heidegger has stated the ontic and ontological priority of the Being-question, we must remember, as I have shown up to now, that the sciences [*epistemē*] through their investigations elucidate the different ontologies of beings or the categories of being. If both the ontic *and* ontological investigations are, while being adequate in their own way, inadequate for investigating what Heidegger sees as the *Sache* then what is it exactly that Heidegger is doing in *SZ*? This is what Heidegger expresses as *fundamental ontology* as it is to get at the ground of beings while moving beyond (but not forgetting) the study of ontology itself. As I noted in the end of the previous section, a study was needed (like fundamental ontology) that for Heidegger was the study and investigation into that which allows for the categories of being *to be*—*that which is always-already there*. As Sheehan rightly puts it, “In short, ‘fundamental ontology’ (*SZ I in toto*) was to show that and how meaningful presence—‘being in general’—is made possible by and occurs only within human openedness as the clearing.”⁵⁹ But before Heidegger can dive into fundamental ontology, it is necessary that he first work out, not only what allows for us to question as a being who questions, but to show the *necessity* of such a situation.

1.5 Questionableness, Questioning, Concern [Care], and the Question of the Meaning of Being

Before I tackle the idea of care (concern) as the being of *Dasein* and its connection with questionableness and questioning, I will first quickly make note of the tripartite structure that Heidegger gives to the question of Being. In every question there are certain aims of seeking which the questioning action sets to bring about, that being to know beings as such in their *thatness* and *whatness*,⁶⁰ which are brought to the fore by three structures of questioning, that

being *what is asked about* [*Gefragtes*], what is to be *interrogated* [*Befragtes*], and what is to be *ascertained* [*Erfragtes*].⁶¹ What is being asked about in the project of SZ is the Being of beings, what is being ascertained in the questioning is the meaning [*Sinn*] of Being, and who is being interrogated throughout all of this is the beings themselves who are *concerned* in their being—this “who” is none other than *Dasein*. This should not come as a surprise as we have already established Heidegger’s wanting to turn an investigation onto the very existence which gives rise to such an investigation. It is *Dasein* who is the being who carries out the action of questioning, and as Heidegger puts it quite directly: “Thus to work out the question of being means to make a being—one who questions—transparent in its being.”⁶² It should also be noted that this type of inquiry is metaphysical in nature insofar as metaphysical inquiry follows Heidegger’s thoughts about metaphysics discussed above. While he may not make it clear in SZ, in a later lecture titled “What is Metaphysics?”, Heidegger argues that metaphysical inquiry must be “posed as a whole” while keeping in mind that “the questioner as such is also there within the question, that is, is placed in question” and therefore the inquiry must be “from the essential position of the existence [*Dasein*] that questions. *We are questioning, here and now, for ourselves.*”⁶³ If it is understood that the project of SZ is to work out the question of the meaning of Being, which Heidegger makes clear in the untitled first page of the treatise then it must necessarily involve an analysis of that being who questions, however this analysis must also remain *preparatory*,⁶⁴ not only in the sense of its position within the work, but also that which serves as the basis for *a turn toward* or the *grounding of a position*⁶⁵ for an encounter or confrontation with a certain “matter.”

Two things are worth noting here. (1) The movement from the preparatory analysis of *Dasein* to the meaningfulness of the meaning of Being as a turning towards is reminiscent of what was discussed previously regarding Heidegger’s thoughts on metaphysics as *meta-physika* in the Greek sense in FM where the “*meta-*“ denoted the notion of “moving beyond” as an “over-

coming.” Of course, this moving beyond or over-coming is not to be thought of as a moving on where what comes before is forgotten and tossed aside for the new matter of investigation.⁶⁶

Heidegger expresses a similar thought in an earlier lecture titled “Phenomenology and Theology,” where in speaking of the difference of ontic sciences and ontology, he writes, “Their [ontic sciences] characteristic feature lies in the fact that the objectification of whatever it is that they thematize is oriented directly toward beings, as a continuation of an already existing prescientific attitude toward such beings. Ontology, or the science of being, on the other hand, demands a fundamental shift of view: from beings to being. *And this shift nevertheless keeps beings in view*, but for a modified attitude.”⁶⁷ This again was the Latinization of the *meta-phyiska* into the scholastic *metaphysica* which Heidegger deemed turned away rather than *turning towards* the certain matters of investigation. (2) The mention of a “*turning towards*” particular matters at work in Heidegger’s thought as early as SZ (since “*the turn*” [*die Kehre*] is most usually in Heideggerian scholarship located *after* SZ) finds affinity with the position which Sheehan holds that what the majority of Heideggerian scholarship takes as “*the turn*” is the second out of *three* so-called “turns” and that the first out of the three occurs before the second turn. Referring to this as “*Kehre-1*,” Sheehan argues that this particular turn is characterized by “reciprocity” [*Gegenschwung*] in that there occurs an “oscillation between human existence (*Dasein*) and meaning. We can express that reciprocity in a chiasmic formula: without human being, there is no meaning, and without meaning, there is no human being.”⁶⁸ Moreover, Sheehan points out that the *Kehre-1* was planned to take place in the transition from SZ I.1-2 to SZ I.3, however, since SZ I.3 was unpublished for reasons pertaining to Heidegger’s uneasiness regarding the transcendental framework that it was planned to take on,⁶⁹ it got pushed into his later writings which worked out the notion of the *clearing* [*Lichtung*]. Even though Sheehan does not propose that *Kehre-1* in terms of what I have done above (although what it means for

Heidegger's project remains the same), the point of raising this affinity between the present study and Sheehan's proposition is two-fold: (1) to highlight an underlying theme within Heidegger's thought (which will be of importance in chapter 2); and (2) from this, the directive for the rest of the study, that being to demonstrate that talk of the question of the meaning of Being *cannot* simply remain in an analysis of the question as such, nor the act of questioning, but must necessarily move *beyond and from* the question as such and the act of questioning towards the matter [*Sache*]*—*the role of *questionableness* and its relation to the meaning of Being. In addition, to make clear the position which one must be *in* to encounter and confront, not only what is questionable, but what is *meaningful*.

It is understood that the question of the meaning of Being, while certainly being a question, is not merely a question among questions. On the contrary, as what I have hitherto demonstrated, the question of the meaning of Being stands and holds a first-order position as *the* question. However, it is a question which, while a definitive answer may be sought (and indeed it has and perhaps it will be), a definitive answer *cannot be secured* in the name of certainty. It is precisely this refusal⁷⁰ of being secured that is the questionableness which we seek to elucidate in this chapter. The point is not to jump head first as it were into the *what exactly* this questionableness “does with us.”⁷¹ Rather, the method of the study is to *lead into* this questionableness as a way of *encountering* it. To do this, we return to our remarks regarding the *interrogation* of Dasein. We may put it thus: Dasein is the being who is *concerned*⁷² in its being and is hence the being who questions itself and the world around it. Moreover, Dasein is the being who, in its concern, has witnessed and continues to bear witness to its being. This leads us to ask: what does Dasein find in its interrogation? Or a more Heideggerian way of putting it: how does Dasein find itself [*Befindlichkeit*]? Instead of progressing through SZ as it has been written,

I would like to begin with Heidegger's analysis of *care* [*Sorge*] (concern) so as to bring the other parts of SZ into perspective of the goal of this chapter.

1.6 Anxiety in the Face of Questionableness

Ending SZ I.1, Heidegger's analysis of concern [*Sorge*] demonstrates that it is the being of Dasein, but how so? The ontological-existential determination of concern cannot be discussed purely on its own, as Heidegger even in his analysis repeatedly demonstrates concern with other structural aspects of Dasein, including *anxiety* [*Angst*], *disclosedness* [*Erschlossenheit*], and the *call of conscience* [*Gewissensruf*]. Hence, the investigation will continue taking into account these different structural aspects of Dasein along with concern. Heidegger considers anxiety as a "fundamental attunement" of Dasein when it is disclosed to itself and where Dasein can come to understand itself, that is its *being-there*.⁷³ The disclosedness, while being characterized partly with the disclosing of the "there" of *Da-sein* is also characterized by Dasein's existentially-ontic *turning away* from its "there,"⁷⁴ which Heidegger calls "falling prey" [*Verfallen*]. Thus, disclosedness is *not just* a revealing of Dasein itself but is also a matter of *closing off* itself from itself. These two phenomena are not separate, but rather are part of the same structural aspect of Dasein. In other words, without one, the other cannot be understood and therefore each provides understanding for the other. What anxiety does in the disclosing of Dasein in its "there" is provide the possibility of "fear" where Dasein can "shrink back" in what is disclosed in fear.⁷⁵ However, Dasein can also shrink back from itself when it turns away from itself. What is the difference? When we fear something, we are *fearing some thing*. An object or "innerworldly being" must have a threatening character to be feared. In anxiety, on the other hand, the shrinking back is not because of some thing or innerworldly being as an object which is found to be *objectively present* as its mode of being [*Vorhandensein*]. As Heidegger repeats throughout

the treatise, Dasein is unlike other beings found in the world, that being innerworldly beings, but like other beings similar to Dasein itself. In other words, the being of Dasein is unlike the being of innerworldly beings. Hence, while the being of Dasein is concern, the meaning of Being, as Sheehan points out in MSH, is *temporality* [*Zeitlichkeit*]. Therefore, anxiety is the “shrinking back” in the encounter that Dasein has with itself in its temporality, that being its finitude (more on this in the coming chapter). In addition, insofar as the basic constitution of Dasein is *being-in-the-world* [*In-der-Welt-Sein*] or *being-there-in-the-world* and anxiety is a phenomenon in the face of Dasein itself, the “about” of anxiety is *being-in-the-world*.⁷⁶

At this point, what proves to be interesting in Heidegger’s analysis is that he states what one is anxious about, even though outlining that it is Dasein’s “there” (or itself) as it is *being-there-in-the-world*, is “completely indefinite.”⁷⁷ How could something be outlined yet be completely indefinite? This complete indefiniteness refers to the irrelevance of things-at-hand in anxiety as in anxiety these objectively present innerworldly beings are no longer important.⁷⁸ What this means is that what Dasein has come to know in its surrounding world [*Umwelt*] through Dasein’s “circumspective heedfulness” [*Umsicht*]⁷⁹ dis-appears and what the anxiety is anxious about cannot be found in the typical way in which things are found. Therefore, Heidegger argues that anxiety “does not know” what it is anxious about and the anxiety-inducing “source” appears to be “nowhere”.⁸⁰ This of course would raise questions as if anxiety is the disclosing of Dasein to itself in its “there” as *being-there-in-the-world* as *being-in* as such, how could there be a “there” and a “nowhere” at the same time? Heidegger addresses this problem briefly, stating: “There, what is threatening cannot come closer from a definite direction within nearness, it is already ‘there’—and yet nowhere. It is so near that it is oppressive and takes away one’s breath—and yet it is nowhere.”⁸¹ To build on this answer, we must remember that anxiety is primarily a mode of attunement of Dasein, that being which “first discloses the *world as*

such.”⁸² Moreover, and most important for this study, is that this double play of “there” and “nowhere” is what first gives us a glimpse into this questionableness, especially when coupled with the first answer given above concerning the world as *such*. A certain “nothing” or “not” [*Nichts*] surrounds innerworldly beings in anxiety where what shines forth, as things-at-hand- “sink away,” is the world. Put differently, while this “nothing” appears as the “nowhere” in anxiety, it is grounded in the “there” of *Dasein in the world* where the world is *as such*.⁸³

In later lectures that followed the release of SZ, Heidegger plays and further develops this idea, stating that the “beginning” of Western philosophy, i.e. the Greeks, were more or less “stunned” by the “is” and the meaningfulness that ensued from it. While material from Heidegger’s later writings and lectures will make up the second chapter, a quick inclusion from one of his later lectures will prove beneficial here. In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger opens the lecture by posing what he deems *the* question as *the fundamental question of metaphysics*: “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing? That is the question.”⁸⁴ Such a question and thus the act of questioning does not *just* appear out of “nothing;” it also appears from the *world as such*. Moreover, the question and act of questioning is borne “out” of the opening of this “conjunction” between the “nothing” and *world as such*; what shines forth is (the meaning of) Being and the ensuing *questionableness*. Commenting on that necessary relation that lies between *Dasein* and “nothing” in “What is Metaphysics?”, Heidegger notes that “*Dasein*” means “being held out into the nothing,”⁸⁵ namely when it asks the question (the metaphysical question) of the “nothing” that “puts us, the questioners, ourselves in question.”⁸⁶ This “question of the nothing” is a similar formulation to the question “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?” as they both concern the “nothing” which surrounds beings and that *Dasein* has the potential to directly experience.

However, something appears strange, namely that Heidegger is invested in working out the question of the meaning of Being in SZ, however, the question to be asked shortly after the release of SZ is a question that concerns beings and, mainly, the “nothing.” It would be too hasty a judgement to simply conclude that Heidegger changed his position or that he abandoned the *Seinsfrage* for the question concerning beings and the nothing as if both were completely different questions. Perhaps the wording is different. Nonetheless, what Heidegger is after never changes (what this underlying aspect that Heidegger is after cannot be discussed in detail in this chapter and its mere mention will suffice for us here and will be covered in the second chapter of this study). How do we take or “hold” ourselves to this questionableness? With this question, we now take ourselves to the notion of concern which leads us to the ending chapters and sections of SZ, namely the ideas of “repetition” and “retrieval” [*Wiederholung*], as well as “anticipatory resoluteness” where those ending parts themselves serve as a jumping off point to some of Heidegger’s later writings. In addition, this will provide us with material to move on to the next chapter of this study.

Heidegger takes the phenomenon of *being-in-the-world* as essentially concern,⁸⁷ therefore if Dasein is *being-there-in-the-world* then the being of Dasein is concern. Concern, according to Heidegger, is a “primordial structural totality” that lies “before” every factual attitude and position of Dasein, that is, it is always already *in* them as an existential *a priori*.⁸⁸ Concern functions as a “primordial structural totality” insofar as it encapsulates three moments of the existence of Dasein, that being “thrownness” [*Geworfenheit*], *being-ahead-of-oneself*, and interpreting oneself and innerworldly beings as meaningfully present. However, Dasein’s fleeing into the They-self [*das Man*] covers over the structural totality of the existence of Dasein as its interpretation of itself and situation is carried out through Dasein’s relation to things-at-hand and the ways of being set out by the they. It should be noted that there are moments in which, as we

have previously discussed, Dasein is disclosed in its “there.” Heidegger writes of this as being torn away from the they by Dasein’s “conscience,” which comes from Dasein itself and calls out to Dasein, thus bringing itself to itself *as it is* in its “there.” As the call [*Ruf*] “summons” [*Auruf*] Dasein to itself in its “there,” the three moments of its existence are disclosed to it. In its thrownness, that being its “already-being-in,” Dasein is anxious about its own “potentiality-of-being,” which it is summoned forth by the call of its own being—*concern*, out of falling prey to the they, which is constituted by the world that is “already being taken care of.”⁸⁹ Dasein exists in its facticity as thrown into its existence insofar as existence is rendered as *ex-istence*⁹⁰ as projecting itself into its potentiality-to-be, which it falls prey in the present to the world already-taken-care-of. Heidegger notes that Dasein, although it may try, cannot “get behind” its thrownness which designates it as “that it is and has to be.”⁹¹ In other words, the call which lies in the very being of Dasein constituted by *concern* “forces” Dasein to face its “there” which it is *guilty* of “not-facing” due to its lost-ness in the they. It must be remembered, however, that being *guilty* is not an emotion or mood [*befindlichkeit*]. Rather, being *guilty* is an aspect of the very being who burdens itself with its being; that being is Dasein. At the same time (as long as we take temporality to be an ecstatic unity of three temporal moments), Dasein engages itself in self-projection upon its ownmost potentiality-of-being which brings it to its “there” in its *being-guilty*, attuned by anxiety as being thrown into *ex-istence* which, given its essence in temporality, is finite through and through. This is what Heidegger calls “resoluteness” [*Entschlossenheit*]. Heidegger considers resoluteness as the “authentic truth of Dasein.”⁹² As well, “*resoluteness is only the authenticity of care itself, cared for in care and possible as care,*”⁹³ which makes sense given that the being of Dasein is concern [care].

As resoluteness is authentic, Heidegger argues that it is also the “*primordial truth*” of Dasein seeing that it brings Dasein to itself in that it discloses Dasein in its “there.” In addition,

resoluteness is “anticipatory” [*Vorlaufen*] in that, when resoluteness brings Dasein to itself to be projected into certain possibilities, Dasein is in being towards these possibilities *as* possibilities—it *anticipates these possibilities*.⁹⁴ In its resoluteness, Dasein is in a mode of resolve [re-solve] which it takes itself in its disclosed “there” as the situation of simultaneous uncovering and covering up, or truth and “un-truth.” As Richardson aptly argues, Dasein as being in a mode of resolve is how it accepts itself as a finite transcendence where Dasein comes to awareness of its being truth or un-truth and “accepts the inescapable finite existence.”⁹⁵ While the concept of “finite transcendence” will be discussed more in depth in the second chapter, the theme of the finiteness of Dasein’s existence is where we see how the ownmost possibility of Dasein is *being-toward-death*; that is, the coming to an end of Dasein as what is finite cannot be infinite. From what we have gathered so far, as the being of Dasein, concern already is the unity of “past,” “future,” and “present” of *Dasein*, that being its thrownness (that it is and has to be), its already-being-ahead-of-itself as projecting into the future as *ex-istence*, and its being meaningfully present in the world already-taken-care-of with innerworldly beings and beings like Dasein itself. However, the question remains to be asked: what does this have to do with questionableness and the *Seinsfrage*?

As was stated in the beginning of this chapter, what Heidegger is attempting to accomplish, at least in SZ, is to work out the question of the meaning of Being. However, as it is evident from what we have hitherto covered, SZ does not merely set out to elucidate *the* question to ask. If we put some thought to it, *a* question, let alone *the* question, is not simply posed *as such*, as if it were thrown out without any regard to what was being asked about, what was to be gathered from the question, and who was asking the question. While we may be able to speak of the question *as such*, this talk is only preliminary. In order to ask such a question and to

encounter questionableness, one must be in a position to do so; we must hold ourselves a certain way.

Heidegger gives us a glimpse of what this “holding ourselves” entails, insofar as “entails” connotes “that which is the case.” He accomplishes this through the concept of “anticipatory resoluteness” coupled with a certain understanding of “indefiniteness,” and “authenticity” [*Eigentlichkeit*].⁹⁶ When Dasein is disclosed in its “there”-being-in-the-world, Dasein must remain “open” as a mode of being towards this disclosedness, as well as the closedness.⁹⁷ It is precisely this remaining open which constitutes Dasein’s being authentic, or its own-ness as being itself, or as Heidegger puts it more directly, “Dasein *is authentically itself* in the mode of the primordial individuation of reticent resoluteness that expects anxiety of itself.”⁹⁸ The key word here is “expects.” Insofar as Dasein is thrown into existence as being projected into the future which grounds itself as a disclosing of its “there,” and existence is ex-istence in the sense of being projected, then we think of Dasein as being a project⁹⁹ for itself. In this being a project for itself, Dasein takes itself as being a project and not merely as an object of a grasping-like investigation. Since its existence is a project in the double sense just demonstrated, Dasein in its mode of being remaining-open is expecting (as expecting is a “mode of the future”¹⁰⁰) itself in its being, that is its *being-there-in-the-world* where the “there” is *always-already there* disclosed¹⁰¹, as Heidegger writes of it, “*Existence can be questionable*. If it is to be possible for something ‘to be in question,’ a disclosedness is necessary.”¹⁰² Dasein cannot completely turn away from its questionableness since its questionableness is *always-already there*. Although it can shy away from it, Dasein cannot completely rid itself of its questionableness. We can say that questionableness arises (or possibly pervades) in the three moments of temporality, that being its “past” (attunement), “present” (being disclosed), and “future” (being projected). Therefore, questionableness strikes up against Dasein “from all sides.” The only other way of being that

Dasein can take up to shy away from this all-pervading questionableness is to turn away to things found in the world already taken care of and *completely give itself over to the they* where Dasein is dis-burdened of its being in that its being as *being-there* lies in questionableness. This completely giving oneself over is what Heidegger refers to as “inauthenticity” [*Uneigentlichkeit*] or what I would call, *remaining-unopen*. However, this remaining-unopen is not a complete negation or failure as the questionableness cannot be negated. Rather, “The ignorance [Nichtwissen] corresponding to this does not consist in a failure to understand, but must be taken as a deficient mode of the projectedness of one’s potentiality-of-being.”¹⁰³

In regards to the “temporality of understanding,” we have already elucidated this with Heidegger’s expression of “anticipation” [*Vorlaufen*] which is the authentic future, that being to remain-open towards the future in that we anticipate our possibilities-to-be in a resoluteness that we might consider as “awareness.” The inauthentic way of going about the future is what Heidegger calls “awaiting.” For awaiting (or we could say “indifference”), this is not remaining-open to Dasein’s being projected into the future as a project. While being inauthentic, Dasein simply awaits the future and is not “aware” of the *being-there* of Dasein. Simply awaiting, we are not in the position to ask the question of the meaning of Being and encounter the questionableness that lies in the very existence of Dasein; one cannot be in the position to ask the question of the meaning of Being and to confront questionableness if they are indifferent. Furthermore, it is the authentic future of anticipation that constitutes anxiety and not awaiting. What can one project themselves upon in anticipation, Heidegger notes, is not some-thing which can be taken care of, or at least what is already taken care of in the world,¹⁰⁴ but can only be projected upon Dasein’s ownmost potentiality-to-be, that being death, which anxiously “brings one back to the sheer That¹⁰⁵ of one’s ownmost, individuated thrownness.”¹⁰⁶ In terms of the present, the mode of the present is the *now* which inauthentically is what Heidegger calls the

“making present” [*Gegenwärtigen*] that is also “irresolute.” He also writes that it is also “lacking the Moment [*Augenblick*].”¹⁰⁷ This Moment that he writes of is the authentic present where “nothing can happen, but as an authentic present it lets us *encounter for the first time* what can be ‘in a time’ as something at hand or objectively present.”¹⁰⁸ It is here too in the present that anxiety occurs. Insofar as anxiety is the fundamental attunement,¹⁰⁹ it brings Dasein into the mood for a “*possible* resolution.” If we remember that Dasein is resolute when it comes back to itself, that is its “there” in *being-there*, anxiety occurs in the present (authentically) as it “holds the Moment *in readiness* [*auf dem Sprung*], as which it, and only it, is possible.”¹¹⁰ In terms of questionableness and being in the position to ask the question of the meaning of Being, it is the Moment which Dasein is brought to that in the present, while the things usually taken care of in the world fall into nullity, it is in the Moment which the world *as such* and Dasein *being-there-in-the-world* shine forth. It is then this shining forth in the Moment that questionableness arises and how we think with the Moment dictates our position to ask the question of the meaning of Being. Finally, in terms of the past, when in anticipation, Dasein is able as being-able [*Seinkönnen*] to “bring itself forth again [*holt sich...wieder...vor*] to its ownmost potentiality-of-being.”¹¹¹ This authentic way of having-been is what Heidegger calls “repetition” [*Wiederholung*], while the inauthentic having-been Heidegger designates as “forgetting,” where Dasein has “*forgotten* itself in its ownmost *thrown* potentiality-of-being.”¹¹² The idea of repetition as the authentic mode of having-been may appear as far removed from the topic of questionableness and being in the position to ask the question of the meaning of Being as the other two temporal moments. While at first glance this may be the case, we have to remember back to when we noted that the questionableness that lies at the very existence of Dasein cannot be ripped away from Dasein, but rather is *always-already there*. In the Moment when this always-already there shines forth *as*¹¹³ questionableness, this has the possibility of repetition, of

always “coming back,” which Dasein can never “shake off.”¹¹⁴ In the next chapter, Heidegger writes of repetition as that which “*responds* to the possibility of existence that has been-there. But responding [Erwiderung] to this possibility in a resolution is at the same time, *as a response belonging to the Moment*, the *renunciation* [Widerruf] of that which is working itself out in the today as ‘past’”.¹¹⁵ What Heidegger means by this is repetition as that responding to that which “has been-there” is what brings Dasein to the always-already there which has always-already-been-there; to what most concerns Dasein as Da-sein.

These ways of working out the different, yet equiprimordial temporal moments of Dasein is the way, on Heidegger’s part, to elucidate the position that Dasein *always-already is in*, but also how it can go about these different temporal moments in order to come about this position *towards* questionableness which then (and only then) can we be *in* the position to ask the question of the meaning of Being: “*Ecstatic temporality clears the there primordially*. It is the primary regulator of the possible unity of all the essential existential structures of Dasein.”¹¹⁶ This ecstatic temporal unity, brought to the fore (or we can say awareness) through anxiety is what Heidegger points out as being “powerful” where “Dasein is taken back fully to its naked uncanniness and stunned [benommen] by it. But this feeling of being stunned not only *takes* Dasein back from its ‘worldly’ possibilities, but at the same time *gives* it the possibility of an *authentic* potentiality-of-being.”¹¹⁷ This “naked uncanniness” of Dasein and being “stunned” by it should remind us of our earlier note regarding Heidegger’s remark in IM when he writes of the Greeks being stunned that the world was *as such* and was already meaningful. Furthermore, it is this being “stunned” that leads onward to the questioning of “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?” The analysis of temporality (in relation to questioning) is to bring about the awareness that one must be in to question as Heidegger sees it, or to encounter the *Sache*, and questionableness that lies in the very being of Dasein. In other words, as temporality being the

meaning of Being for Dasein, this is Dasein's finitude which comes into focus in questioning, however, we must encounter this; time is what allows for transcendence. Furthermore, transcendence is the awareness of coming to the one who questions; a going-towards and a return, however, we must keep in mind that this transcendence is not transcendence "away from," but a *moving-toward* (this will become clearer in the second chapter). Therefore, we can say that Heidegger's analysis up to this point in SZ not only works out this leading onward to such a questioning and indeed to encounter questionableness by the way of content, but this work is a work in both its content and the way of thought which it takes its reader. Put differently, SZ sets out the first steps towards demonstrating a certain method of investigation that (a phrase which Heidegger often uses both in his early and later writings and lectures) *leaps forward* and encounters the questionableness that arises from the questioning being itself as it interrogates itself so as to be in a position adequate and appropriate enough to ask the question of the meaning of Being. However, we are left asking ourselves: where do we go from here? Is Heidegger's project complete? The obvious answer to the second question is no. However, the first question is one worth asking since much has been accomplished hitherto. It is a well covered topic in Heideggerian scholarship that SZ is largely unfinished. We know that the last chapter of the second division focused on, as its title suggests, "Temporality and Historicity" and contains much of Heidegger's critique of historicism. The title of the fifth chapter is a bit misleading as much more is contained in these final pages of SZ than just a positing of the relation between temporality and historicity. It is in these final pages that Heidegger begins to write of a beginning that, if we are to take up this method which he has devised up to this point, we must "go back" to and "retrieve" this beginning along with the question of the meaning of being. It is with this quick look at what Heidegger means by "going back" to the beginning, as

well as the idea of “retrieval” which will serve as the starting point for the second chapter of the study.

1.7 “Back” to the Beginning

I would like to start this section with a quotation from Safranski in MH: “It should not be forgotten that coming into the world is not completed by being born. Several births are necessary during a human life, and it may well be that one never fully arrives in the world.”¹¹⁸ This interesting and thought-provoking quotation provides us with an appropriate way of thinking about what Heidegger means by beginning. When he writes of “going back” to this beginning, it is easy to assume that we are to go back and somehow revitalize a far-gone origin of a past world. Such thinking, while romantic, is nothing but a bit of nostalgia that seeks only the past and remains blind toward what is present; *it remains blind to what is there* and what is future; *what could be*. There is not just one origin or beginning point, but the potentiality of *multiple beginnings*. However, they just do not come about willy-nilly. The beginning that Heidegger seeks is a beginning with the *Sache* which we have encountered multiple times hitherto. The *Sache* is, for the most part (if it has not become clear already), *elusive*. While it discloses itself, it also closes itself off. This is why it is of most importance for Heidegger that before one can embark on investigating this *Sache* that presents itself in questionableness, one must learn to position themselves appropriately to encounter it, something which Heidegger makes most explicit in the beginning sections of chapter five of the second division.¹¹⁹ It is then with this learning of position that we can *begin* to seek out a *beginning* with this *Sache*. The beginning which Heidegger is after is therefore a beginning in the sense that it is new, however not new in the way that something is new which is taken as the newest thing out there that incites curiosity. There are two reasons for this: (1) this beginning is certainly not a thing like a thing-at-hand, and

(2) such an inciting of curiosity as the “next best and newest thing,” as it were, we know not to fall victim to, taking from Heidegger’s analysis of curiosity in the first division of SZ.¹²⁰ As well, what is new in a vulgar sense denotes something that someone awaits: “Awaiting the next new thing, it [*Dasein*] has already forgotten what is old.”¹²¹

The critique that Heidegger embarks on in the final portion of SZ is of a similar tone to what we have seen in his other critiques, namely that *Dasein* has been set-upon as an object of many grasping-like investigations which do not encounter *Dasein* for what *and* that it is. Heidegger argues that *Dasein* moves in its existence (from “birth” to “death”) and that in this movement *Dasein* is “*stretched out stretching itself along...*” which Heidegger refers to as the “*occurrence* [*Geschehen*] of *Dasein*.”¹²² Moreover, to understand this structure of occurrence means to understand *ontologically* this occurrence as “*historicity*” [*Geschichtlichkeit*]. Heidegger’s point here is to further demonstrate that *Dasein*’s being is rooted in temporality (hence the movement of its finite existence) and that a new understanding is still needed to properly look at the occurrence and historicity of *Dasein*. The common way of looking at the historicity of *Dasein* is the study of history itself, however as Heidegger will later show, this situation is actually the reverse. It is not that the study of history shines light on the historicity of *Dasein*. Rather, it is only from the historicity of *Dasein* as a being whose being is rooted in temporality that we can ever have a study of history. In other words, history is not appropriate for the study of *Dasein* in its finite existence as it presupposes that every existence which gives rise to itself, yet it remains ignorant (or might we say, *remains-unopen*) to this very fact.

There is also another reason that Heidegger gives as to why history, or at least a view to the being of *Dasein* as constituted by history or being-historical, is inadequate is that when we say something is historical, we really do mean that some-*thing* is historical. If we take that the study of history studies *things* which are deemed “past,” [*Vergangenheit*] Heidegger argues that

history then guides its gaze towards the past to view things which must still exist in the present as artifacts, however, they are no longer useful to us. These things *used to be* useful in “past” *worlds* as they were innerworldly beings at hand, and as Heidegger is quick to remind us, those worlds are no longer.¹²³ Therefore, history *is not* the study of *Dasein* in its being. Rather it is the study of innerworldly beings of a past world no longer and the engagement of “past” *Dasein* with such innerworldly beings. This should come as no surprise as to why Heidegger does not take history to be the adequate and appropriate study of the being of *Dasein*. As Heidegger makes it clear throughout *SZ*, the being of *Dasein* is not something which is objectively present in the world like a table or chair. Hence, any study that studies those beings which Heidegger refers to as innerworldly beings cannot study the being of *Dasein*. Heidegger even goes as far as to assert that *Dasein* can never be thought of as “past” or being in the “past” due to its never being objectively present; it is “*having-been-there* [*da-gewesen*].”¹²⁴ What gives the *having-been-there* its priority in the theme of what is historical and constitutes the historicity of *Dasein*, Heidegger argues, is that which we would not take initially as being involved in what is historical—*authentic being-toward-death*. Since *Dasein*’s being is rooted in temporality and is finite in its being, it constitutes *Dasein*’s own “fate” [*Schicksals*] as *Dasein* is “being free *for* death....”¹²⁵ When we see the word “free” here, this should remind us of our earlier analysis of Heidegger’s wanting to become “free from tradition” in his *destruktion* of the tradition of Western metaphysics.¹²⁶ To become free *from* the tradition, one should then become free *for* themselves in their existence—their being-there. If we take what is tradition or traditional as that which comes “before” us, we can include it in what is merely historical. Therefore, to become free *from* what is merely historical means to become free *for* oneself in one’s being as *being-toward-death* or what is properly the *ownness* of *Dasein* as its historicity as having-been-there which opens up the always-already there of *Dasein*. In other words, we have yet again an example that

demonstrates Heidegger's attempts to get at a certain position which allowed for Dasein to question itself in its questionableness. To further this point, Heidegger writes, "Dasein does not first become historical in repetition, but rather because as temporal it is historical, it can take itself over in its history, retrieving itself."¹²⁷ Dasein is retrieving *itself*; it itself can only take itself over or back over and it is only because of this that the possibility to have a history, to be historical, and to have the study of history is possible. This, however, is not to deter the possibility of having an authentic historicity, which Heidegger does account for. He posits that there can be an authentic historicity insofar as it "understands history as the 'return' [Wiederkehr] of what is possible and knows that a possibility returns only when existence is open for it fatefully, in the Moment, in resolute repetition."¹²⁸

History as "return"? Does this not appear to be an odd definition of history? At first, yes. However, if we think of this definition in terms of Heidegger's thought which we have covered, history as "return" is not out of place as it first seems. What we must first do is to not think of history in the common way. The study of history as we usually have it means a "going back" to the past to have a better understanding (or better, grasping) of certain events that have occurred. While this may be an interesting pursuit, it is when it moves towards an understanding of Dasein that it often falls short. As we have just demonstrated, the common way of doing the study of history is to always look towards the past, not the *having-been-there* without a return to the "there" that first gave rise to itself—it remains in the "past" as *remaining-unopen* towards its own "there." Therefore, if we are going to think about history and historicity in terms of Dasein then we must do so by keeping in mind the being of the very being who questions. We should remember (and this serves as a major point of the chapter), if we are going to think about or at least devise a study or investigation or method of viewing Dasein, it must not be objective in the sense that it is completely removed from the being who first gave rise to the questioning that

serves as the study, investigation, or method. Moreover, let us remind ourselves of Heidegger's initial frustrations regarding the philosophy of his day and the work of the scholastics that set the stage for the tradition of Western metaphysics that we covered in the beginning of this chapter. Something needed to change; it was calling out for change as something was coming to an end; *a new beginning was in order*.

This brings us back to the start of this section where we asked what it meant to go back to the beginning. As I pointed out earlier, the *Sache* that Heidegger was after from the genesis of this thought was something that was *always-already there*. It was not something that lay in wait in some long-forgotten time, for example, the world of the Greeks. We certainly can look towards those worlds and their thoughts as they have clues so to speak of what they were *responding* to, and Heidegger does this quite often. But while this gives us a clearer understanding of what was at work in the thoughts of these thinkers, it still leaves us stranded (to an extent) of our *own* beginning. Therefore, the beginning that Heidegger is after is not something that exists as an origin which is part of a past world. Rather, the beginning is something that is *always-already there*. It is what is *nearest*, yet *farthest* away from us (given our turning away of what is *always-already there*). Hence, there is no "going back" to the beginning; *it is right here*. The retrieve that Heidegger writes about is not to go back to retrieve something in the past; the retrieving is a retrieve of *Dasein itself as Da-sein*.¹²⁹ Nonetheless, as long as we keep devising methods of investigation which seek to objectify the being who questions and does turn towards the matter which calls to be encountered in its arising questionableness, *we simply remain unopen*. To end this chapter and to look forward to the next, let us think through a thought Heidegger writes of in an essay titled "Language": "But we do not want to get anywhere. We would like only, for once, to get to just where we are already."¹³⁰

Notes

¹ Thomas Sheehan in his book *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* marks out the distinction between the different divisions of *Being and Time*, including the projected divisions that were never published, as for example: SZ I.2 (*Sein und Zeit* Part one, Division Two). Henceforth, I will be referencing the different parts of SZ in a similar manner.

² See Edmund Husserl's lecture titled "The Crisis of the European Man" which hits on various themes contained in this section (and others in this chapter) that give context to Heidegger's engagement with them.

³ Rüdiger Safranski, *Martin Heidegger: Between Good and Evil*, trans. Ewald Osers (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998), 61. Hereafter cited as MH.

⁴ MH., 63.

⁵ MH., 65. Here, Safranski quotes from *Frühe Schriften* [Early Writings] (Hereafter: FS) (Frankfurt, 1972), 348.

⁶ MH., 67; FS, 141.

⁷ MH., 66.

⁸ Martin Heidegger, "Letter to Karl Löwith on His Philosophical Identity," in *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927*, ed. Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 101. Hereafter cited as LKL.

⁹ Although this letter was written two years prior to his first encounter with Heidegger, this way of thinking and questioning that Heidegger was working out where there is a radical form of getting at the "matters at hand" is parallel to Hans-Georg Gadamer's recollection of his first lecture with Heidegger in 1923 at the University of Freiburg that he writes about in *Heidegger's Ways*.

¹⁰ LKL., 101-102. Heidegger's emphasis. Editors' translation note.

¹¹ In an article titled "Phenomenological Research as *Destruktion*: The Early Heidegger's Reading of Dilthey," Charles R. Bambach notes of a similar sentiment that Heidegger had at around this time, which was also the time that Heidegger held his first lecture (1919). Bambach writes, "Heidegger made clear in his very first lecture of 1919 that what he sought was 'a genuine reform in the sphere of the university' which would shake philosophy from its dogmatic slumbers and *force it to confront the uncertainty at the heart of life*." Charles R. Bambach, "Phenomenological Research as *Destruktion*: The Early Heidegger's Reading of Dilthey," in *Philosophy Today* 37, no. 2, summer 1993. My emphasis.

¹² LKL., 97.

¹³ MH., 119-120.

¹⁴ Martin Heidegger, "Critical Comments on Karl Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews*," in *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927*, ed. Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 148. Hereafter cited as CKJ.

¹⁵ CKJ., 149.

¹⁶ Gadamer makes a similar note in his book *Heidegger's Ways* where he writes, "This was not simply a new art, an intuitive power used to prove once again the value of a conceptual craft. It was much more than that. Above all, a new impetus was taking hold in Heidegger's thought that effected a complete transformation. Here was a thinking that attempted to think *the very beginning and beginnings*—although certainly not in the style of Neo-Kantianism and Husserl's

phenomenology ‘as a rigorous science.’” Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Heidegger Ways*, trans. John W. Stanley (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 63. My emphasis. Hereafter cited HW.

¹⁷ “Whether pursued along the path of the sense, truth, or place of being, Heidegger’s topic arose out of the byways of deconstructing the entire western metaphysical tradition, which he viewed as a ‘first beginning’ initiated by the Greeks and working itself out in various constellations in the Middle Ages and modernity.” John van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumour of the Hidden King* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 29-30. Hereafter cited as TYH.

¹⁸ TYH., 30.

¹⁹ Scott M. Campbell, “Early Lecture Courses,” in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*, ed. François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 179. Hereafter cited as ELC.

²⁰ While the term “position” may appear as odd here, it will be crucial aspect of the second chapter.

²¹ MH., 149.

²² Martin Heidegger, “Phenomenology and Theology,” in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 41. Hereafter cited as PT.

²³ MH., 94.

²⁴ As it has been written various times elsewhere, Heidegger’s interaction with phenomenology largely consisted in his re-working of Husserl’s notion of the “natural attitude.”

²⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, trans. Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2005), 4. Hereafter cited as IP.

²⁶ IP., 9. Heidegger’s emphasis.

²⁷ IP., 9. One must take note here of the word “uncovered” and its meaning for the “later Heidegger,” especially in his discussions of truth (*alētheia*), which he takes as being un-covered (disclosed/unconcealed).

²⁸ IP., 81.

²⁹ IP., 85.

³⁰ IP., 85.

³¹ IP., 150.

³² IP., 183. Heidegger’s emphasis. Translator’s note.

³³ Take the section of SZI.1, chapter three, devoted to Descartes titled “The Contrast Between Our Analysis of Worldliness and Descartes’ Interpretation of the World” where Heidegger makes it clear that his project differs greatly from the Cartesian one.

³⁴ IP., 193.

³⁵ Sean J. McGrath, *The Early Heidegger and Medieval Philosophy: Phenomenology for the Godforsaken* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 210. Hereafter cited as TEH.

³⁶ Martin Heidegger, *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, trans. John van Buren (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1999), 4. Heidegger’s emphasis, except on “confrontation” which is mine. Hereafter cited as HF.

³⁷ HF., 13.

³⁸ Although it will necessarily include these “objects” in the traditional sense, which Heidegger will later call “innerworldly beings” or “things-at-hand,” insofar as we interact with them in our everyday dealings. Although he notes this in HF: “Dasein is not a ‘thing’ like a piece of wood

nor such a thing as a plant—nor does it consist of experiences, and still less is it a subject (an ego) standing over against objects (which are not the ego).” (37)

³⁹ HF., 13. My emphasis.

⁴⁰ This will serve a more important importance later on in the chapter, as well as a focal point in the second chapter.

⁴¹ The use of the word “view” here is purely intentional. There lies a crucial difference between “sight” and “viewing.” The difference lies in the *how*. While we can speak of the ability to see, things which we see often come into view for us which are, as Hans-Georg Gadamer points out, coloured by certain prejudices. The affinity between Gadamer’s hermeneutics and Heidegger’s take on the hermeneutical project are not to be discussed here. However, the point to be made is in viewing something or when something comes into view, it is meaningful to us.

⁴² The reader should keep in mind this “as is” for it will become an integral aspect of the second chapter’s discussion of “meditative thinking” [*Gelassenheit*].

⁴³ ELC., 180.

⁴⁴ TEH., 139. My translation note on “subject matter” as *Sache*.

⁴⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2010), xxix. Hereafter cited as SZ.

⁴⁶ SZ., 3.

⁴⁷ “While the controversies surrounding Heidegger and his work have continued, what seems to have been lost today that the first readers of this remarkable text recognized is the sense of disorientation that comes as soon as one engages this book.” Dennis J. Schmidt, “Being and Time,” in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*, ed. François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 192. Hereafter cited as BT.

⁴⁸ This way of thinking is what Heidegger will later argue more explicitly as “calculative thinking” (what has become the common notion of thinking) in, for example *Discourse on Thinking* which will be covered in detail in chapter 2.

⁴⁹ BT., 192.

⁵⁰ HW., 10.

⁵¹ SZ., 1. Heidegger’s emphasis.

⁵² SZ., 2. Heidegger quickly demonstrates three such prejudices which renders any investigation about being [*Sein*] and therefore the Being-question useless, that being (1) “Being” is the most “universal” concept, (2) “being” as a concept is undefinable, and (3) as a concept, “being” is entirely self-evident.

⁵³ Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1995), 39. Hereafter cited as FM.

⁵⁴ FM., 39.

⁵⁵ Heidegger’s relationship with the scholastics has been written about at length by various authors. Some include the two biographical sketches, *The Young Heidegger* (John Van Buren) and *Heidegger: Between Good and Evil* (Rüdiger Safranski) which tackle the early Heidegger’s take on Scholasticism up to his *habilitationsschrift* on Duns Scotus, and a book written by S.J. McGrath titled *The Early Heidegger and Medieval Philosophy* where it is argued that Heidegger never really broke all ties with scholasticism. Rather, it was the case that Medieval philosophy influenced his thought throughout his life. While these works write on Heidegger’s relationship with scholasticism for different reasons, they all demonstrate that the influence which Medieval philosophy had on Heidegger’s thought is more complex than a case where Heidegger *completely* left scholastic writings. For the purposes of this study, while I don’t doubt the

influence that Medieval philosophy had on Heidegger, which will be proven evident with Heidegger's meditation on the notion of "concern" [*Sorge*], I also take it that Heidegger regardless distanced himself to an extent from Scholasticism given its ties to the neglect of the Being-question.

⁵⁶ SZ., 10.

⁵⁷ SZ., 9. As is the case with the works of both Plato and Aristotle. Also, see Husserl's lecture "The Crisis of European Man" as Husserl makes note of "prescientific culture." Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, trans. Quentin Lauer (New York, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1965), 176.

⁵⁸ SZ., 10. Heidegger's emphasis.

⁵⁹ Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (London, England: Rowman & Littleman International Ltd., 2015), 134. Hereafter cited as MSH.

⁶⁰ SZ., 4.

⁶¹ SZ., 4.

⁶² SZ., 6. My emphasis.

⁶³ Martin Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics?", in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 82. My emphasis. Hereafter cited as WM.

⁶⁴ Hence in SZ the title for Division One reads "The Preparatory Fundamental Analysis of Dasein."

⁶⁵ These notions of "turning towards" and "grounding a position" will be of particular importance in forthcoming two chapters when Heidegger's later writings will be considered in the study. As it is prevalent in many of Heidegger's later lectures and essays as well as Heideggerian scholarship, talk of a (or *the*) "turn" serves as an important theme, not only in the development of Heidegger's thought, but also in understanding as to what Heidegger was attempting to direct our attention towards.

⁶⁶ Gadamer in his book *Heidegger's Ways* makes this crucial distinction of the difference of the Heideggerian project's relation to metaphysics (and the tradition of Western metaphysics in general) where he states "Yet, it remains undoubtedly true that Heidegger's overcoming of metaphysics was not intended to be a triumph over it. Later, he expressly called it *getting over* [*Verwindung*] metaphysics. That is to say, when one gets over an ache or an illness, the achiness and sick feeling remains there in its entirety—it is not so simply forgotten. Thus, he saw his own thinking as a continuing dialogue with metaphysics, which means that he was always speaking, to a greater or lesser extent, the language of metaphysics." (164)

⁶⁷ PT., 41. My emphasis.

⁶⁸ Thomas Sheehan, "The Turn: All Three of Them," in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*, ed. François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 32. Sheehan also points out that the *Kehre-1* was the original aim of Heidegger's project and that other subsequent *Kehres* were to serve as a way to highlight this "originary" aim.

⁶⁹ MSH, 244-245.

⁷⁰ I use this term purposely with its Heideggerian meaning attached. The full extent of this meaning will become much clearer in the coming chapter.

⁷¹ This too I use purposely which echoes Heidegger's remarks in the 1935 summer semester lecture *Introduction to Metaphysics* regarding the role of philosophy: "You can't do anything with philosophy. The only mistake is to believe that with this, the judgement concerning philosophy is at an end. For a little epilogue arises in the form of a counter-question: even if we can't do anything with it, may no philosophy in the end do something *with us*, provided that we engage ourselves with it?" (13-14)

⁷² A note about translation must be given here. In the latest translation of SZ (2010), “care” is translated as *Sorge*, while “care for” as *Fürsorgen*, and “concern” as *Besorgen*. William J. Richardson, on the other hand, in his book *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* translates *Sorge* as “concern” (Thomas Sheehan in MSH makes note of this difference in translation and agrees with Richardson’s translation of *Sorge*). While I do not intend to bring about any disputation regarding the exact translation of Heideggerian terminology, hereafter I will make use of Richardson’s translation of *Sorge* as “concern” as it carries the tone and meaning that I wish to elucidate in this chapter in regards to questioning and the idea of questionableness. Where I pull quotations from the latest translation of SZ where “care” is the word utilized, the word will still be included, however, I will place “concern” in round brackets to remind the reader of the main goal of the chapter.

⁷³ *There-being* is the literal translation of the word *Da-sein* which references to the disclosure of the “*Being-in* as such” in “*Being-in-the-world*.”

⁷⁴ SZ., 179.

⁷⁵ SZ., 180.

⁷⁶ Heidegger writes of this directly when addressing the issue of anxiety and its possible interpretation of a solipsistic take on *Dasein*: “Anxiety individualizes and thus discloses *Dasein* as ‘*solus ipse*.’ This existential ‘solipsism,’ however, is so far from transposing an isolated subject-thing into the harmless vacuum of a world-less occurrence that it brings *Dasein* in an extreme sense precisely before its world as world, and thus itself before itself as being-in-the-world.” SZ., 182.

⁷⁷ SZ., 180.

⁷⁸ SZ., 180.

⁷⁹ Quite literally “looking-around”. However, it should be noted that this “looking” is not sight *as such*. Rather it refers to more of a “view” that one has which are coloured, hence things-at-hand that are objectively present [*Vorhandensein*] are “viewed” in their “handiness.” [*Vorhandenheit*]. See SZ I.1 Ch.3, § 14. “The Idea of the Worldliness of the World in General”.

⁸⁰ SZ., 180.

⁸¹ SZ., 180.

⁸² SZ., 181. Heidegger’s emphasis.

⁸³ “The nothing of handiness is grounded in the primordial ‘something’ [‘*Etwas*’], in the *world*.” SZ., 181.

⁸⁴ Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics 2/e*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 1. Hereafter cited as IM.

⁸⁵ WM., 91.

⁸⁶ WM., 96.

⁸⁷ SZ., 186.

⁸⁸ SZ., 187.

⁸⁹ SZ., 267.

⁹⁰ *Ex-istence* denotes a “standing-out.” In Heidegger’s later writings, he writes this “standing-out” as *Ek-sistence*.

⁹¹ SZ., 272.

⁹² SZ., 290.

⁹³ SZ., 288. Heidegger’s emphasis.

⁹⁴ SZ., 251.

⁹⁵ William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (Martinus Nijhoff/The Hague., 1963), 96. Hereafter cited as HPT.

⁹⁶ The translation of *Eigentlichkeit* is often “authenticity” while its opposite, *Uneigentlichkeit* is translated as “inauthenticity,” while some translations take the words to mean “own-ness” and “not-own-ness” respectively. Again, while this study does not intend to bring about any arguments regarding translations, the difference and trouble of translating *Eigentlichkeit* and *Uneigentlichkeit* must be noted. There is *no* direct English translation of the German and, rather unfortunately, the terms “authenticity” and “inauthenticity” are pinned with a moral connotation, which couldn’t be further from what Heidegger wanted to get at using the terms *Eigentlichkeit* and *Uneigentlichkeit*. In what follows, I plan on offering my own translation of these terms as “remaining-open” and “un-remaining-open” respectively. What Heidegger means by using the words *Eigentlichkeit* and *Uneigentlichkeit* I hope can become clearer with this chapter.

⁹⁷ SZ., 294-295.

⁹⁸ SZ., 308.

⁹⁹ Note the play on words between one being a project for themselves and one who projects themselves into the future.

¹⁰⁰ SZ., 322.

¹⁰¹ That is being disclosed in both concealment and unconcealment. This will become clearer in the second chapter.

¹⁰² SZ., 321.

¹⁰³ SZ., 321.

¹⁰⁴ Recall that anxiety reveals the nullity that surrounds things in the world that have “nothing to say to us.”

¹⁰⁵ That is *Dasein*’s *being-there*.

¹⁰⁶ SZ., 328.

¹⁰⁷ SZ., 323.

¹⁰⁸ SZ., 323.

¹⁰⁹ We see a similar analysis in FM where Heidegger talks of fundamental attunement as “profound boredom” which affects *Dasein* in its metaphysical questioning. See chapters 4 and 5 of part one in FM (132-164) and chapter 1 of part two (169-174).

¹¹⁰ SZ., 328. Heidegger’s emphasis. Translator’s note.

¹¹¹ SZ., 324.

¹¹² SZ., 324.

¹¹³ This “*as*” is the hermeneutical “*as*,” that which is opposed to the apophantical “*as*.” It is in hermeneutical investigation or interpretation (and only in such an investigation or interpretation) which questionableness can first arise. See SZI.1, §32 “Understanding and Interpretation”.

¹¹⁴ It is also noteworthy to remember the first section of chapter one of the introduction: “The Necessity of an Explicit Repetition of the Question of Being”. It is evident from the first page of the treatise that Heidegger was writing of the same thing that he writes of in the final pages of SZ.

¹¹⁵ SZ., 367. Heidegger’s emphasis.

¹¹⁶ SZ., 334. Heidegger’s emphasis.

¹¹⁷ SZ., 328.

¹¹⁸ MH., 2.

¹¹⁹ “All our efforts in the existential analytic are geared to the one goal of finding a possibility of answering the question of the *meaning of being* in general. The development of this *question* requires a delineation of the phenomenon in which something like being itself becomes accessible—the phenomenon of the *understanding of being*. But this phenomenon belongs to the constitution of being of *Dasein*. Only when this being [*Seiende*] as been interpreted before hand

in a sufficiently primordial way, can the understanding of being contained in its constitution of being itself be grasped, and only on that basis can we formulate the question of being understood in this understanding and the question of what such understanding ‘presupposes’.” SZ., 355.

Heidegger’s emphasis.

¹²⁰ See SZI.1, Chapter 5, §36. “Curiosity” (64).

¹²¹ SZ., 372.

¹²² SZ., 358. Heidegger’s emphasis. Translator’s note.

¹²³ SZ., 362.

¹²⁴ SZ., 363.

¹²⁵ SZ., 365. Heidegger’s emphasis.

¹²⁶ It should be noted that to talk of *destruktion* of the tradition of Western metaphysics in the context of Heidegger’s thoughts on the historicity of *Dasein* is of some worth as Heidegger notes: “Nevertheless, we may venture an outline of the ontological genesis of historiography as a science in terms of the historicity of *Dasein*. It should serve as a preparation for the clarification of the task of a *historical destruction* of the history of philosophy to be carried out in what follows.” (372) My emphasis. This task that Heidegger writes of here is what was to become the unpublished third division of SZ.

¹²⁷ SZ., 367.

¹²⁸ SZ., 372.

¹²⁹ However, it should be noted that the point of Heidegger’s analysis was not to stop at *Dasein*. Rather, the analysis of *Dasein* was preliminary. While *Dasein* is important, it is not the whole picture.

¹³⁰ Martin Heidegger, “Language,” in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York, New York: Harper Perennial Modern Thought, 2013), 188.

Chapter 2

Thinking as the Struggle Against the Confrontation: The Re-turn to Being-There

2.1 Introduction

We will begin this chapter with a concluding remark Heidegger gave in his 1953 lecture titled “The Question Concerning Technology”: “The closer we come to the danger, the more brightly do the ways into the saving power begin to shine and the more questioning we become. *For questioning is the piety of thought.*”¹ In a later lecture titled “The Nature of Language,” Heidegger provides an explanation as to what he meant by the remark, “For questioning is the piety of thought”; he says, “At the close of a lecture called ‘The Question of Technology,’ given some time ago, I said: ‘Questioning is the piety of thinking.’ ‘Piety’ is meant here in the ancient sense: obedient, or submissive, and in this case submitting to what thinking has to think about.”² What of this distinction between questioning and thinking? If questioning is obedient or submissive to thinking, does this mean that questioning has fallen to the wayside? Finally, how does this distinction fit with what we have established in the first chapter? At first glance, this remark or explanation that Heidegger has given appears to have thrown the study off course. With much importance being placed on the *Seinsfrage*, the *question* of the meaning of Being and its relation to the being who questions themselves in the face of the questionableness that lies in their being, saying that questioning is obedient or submissive to thinking seems at odds with not only what we established in the first chapter but also what Heidegger writes of in his early writings. In his later writings, or if we are to be more specific, the latter half of his later writings Heidegger writes of and places emphasis on thinking rather than questioning.³ It would be a

mistake to assume that there exists some discord between the “early Heidegger” and the “later Heidegger,” although this particular mistake lies beyond assuming discord and already finds itself with such a distinction between an “early” and “later” Heidegger. Distinctions such as this should be kept for organizing purposes *and not* for purposes that seek to ground a fundamental difference between two so-called “phases” of his thought. But how are we to think of this difference between questioning and thinking? And where does the theme of beginning and the *always-already there* that served as the conclusion to the previous section fit in with this seeming change in direction? In addition, can we still talk of a possible “method” that Heidegger was working out?

2.2 A Conclusion to the Discussion of Questioning and Questionableness

In the period following the publication of SZ, Heidegger’s thought appears to take a different direction towards the *Sache* that he was after, for example, his thinking regarding the various poems and hymns of Friedrich Hölderlin rather than the typical philosophical matter that he often engaged with earlier. However, he still engaged in those typical philosophical themes that we are used to seeing in other philosophical endeavors, yet he does so in a way which forces⁴ these philosophical themes, thinkers, and works into the fore and highlights within them a certain “element” that demonstrates their relation to a “beginning.” This of course was Heidegger’s planned *destruktion* of the tradition of Western metaphysics that was to form most of the second part of SZ which included the likes of Kant, Descartes, and Aristotle.⁵ We know that others were included from Heidegger’s published lectures including those on Nietzsche, Hegel, Schelling, Plato, and the pre-Socratics, most notably Parmenides. For Heidegger, philosophy as traditionally conceived had or was coming to an end. The “first beginning” he located with the Greeks, more specifically with the pre-Socratics with medieval and modern

thought being largely a process of moving further away from this first beginning, while remaining in the same situation that was being thought of in Greek thought. This moving further away is what Heidegger conceived as the tradition of Western metaphysics which comes to an end with Nietzsche. Although Nietzsche was highly critical of metaphysics proper, Heidegger argues that Nietzsche nonetheless remained within metaphysical thought. As Nietzsche sought to work out a “revaluation of all values,” he remained concerned with value, that being what concerned primarily beings. When Nietzsche took what modernity had prized as its system of values and turned it onto its head, Heidegger saw this as a marker of a major milestone in the process of thought of Western metaphysics; metaphysics proper had exhausted itself. Therefore, the predominant way of thinking (or doing philosophy) was coming to an end, which called for a new beginning, the “other beginning” as Heidegger often wrote of it. Before we move on, it is necessary to make note of Heidegger’s “interpretations.” It is well documented in Heideggerian scholarship that Heidegger’s readings of certain figures in philosophy are skewed in that he reads the texts of these figures the way he does in order to bring to light his own way of thinking, for example, referring to Nietzsche as the “last metaphysician” in the history of Western thought (something which I myself am not convinced by). Regardless, the point of looking at some of these lectures that Heidegger has held where he is engaging with these thinkers is to bring to light what Heidegger was attempting to articulate *in his own way*. I will not debate issues surrounding interpretations as it lies beyond the scope of the present study. I simply would like to take Heidegger’s engagements as they are.

Moving on, to make a proper connection between this chapter and the first, we will have to jump to Heidegger’s 1935 lecture titled *Introduction to Metaphysics*. It is in this lecture that we see Heidegger begin to take a turn in his thinking, while still keeping with certain themes from his earlier writings. In IM Heidegger writes of the “fundamental question of metaphysics”

which reads “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?” However, what Heidegger makes evident in this lecture which he does not explicitly do in SZ is that what presupposes a question, even *the* question is the ability (being-able) to question. We know from the first chapter that this is what Heidegger was attempting to accomplish in the published parts of SZ. The question whether being the “guiding question” or the “grounding question”⁶ is dependent on our being able to question or the act of questioning itself. This much is evident in our everyday thinking. Although what is forgotten is what must be “done” in order to question—the position that one must be *in* to question and how this is carried out is subsequently forgotten as well. In other words, it is not sufficient to formulate questions out of thin air, nor to inquire into what makes us able to question. What approaches sufficiency is the working out of the positioning that one is *in* to “authentically” question. How one is to go from here⁷ is not a step among many in a step-by-step process, nor a mere relation as “after” any given “moment” in time as the “now-to-come,” yet how one is to go from here is still concerned with what is future, although not in the common sense. Where one goes from here is a “projecting forward” towards the *Sache*. From what we demonstrated in the first chapter, this projecting forward “comes back” to the there of Dasein as resoluteness. It is this resoluteness as anticipatory that is an “authentic” way of being for Dasein. It will be the point of the later parts of this chapter to demonstrate that Heidegger’s conception of thinking is precisely this projecting forward. For the time being, let us remain with the theme of questioning.

Questionableness arises with our questioning of a specific question which can only be posed when one is most proper to themselves, that is remaining-open or being authentic of the constitution of Dasein, that being the disclosing of its there (as both concealment and unconcealment). Insofar as disclosing opens up, the proper questioning “...pushes us into the open...” and in so doing it “...transforms itself (as does every genuine questioning), and casts a

new space over and through everything.”⁸ What of this “new space”? Heidegger notes that in questioning beings are not changed by such questioning; they remain as they are. What is new, then? We must not think of “new” in the common way as something which is created to be the “next best thing.”⁹ This new space that Heidegger writes of here is not merely new but something that is *open*.¹⁰ The open has a double sense for Heidegger, as he explains: “Our questioning just opens up the domain, so that beings can break open in such questionworthiness,” and “Yet it is *this* questioning that pushes us into the open. . . .”¹¹ Therefore, not only does questioning open up a domain that beings can shine forth, but it also pushes us into the open. It is this double sense of openness that Heidegger sees as the way, through questioning, to move “ahead” of beings. Asking the question of “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?” throws ourselves into this openness, as well as opening the domain for these beings to shine forth as, even though they are being (hence “beings at all”), they could also be non-being (hence “instead of nothing”). This situation pushes us into the openness as we are the questioning being—that beings can and cannot be throws ourselves onto ourselves in such questioning. This being thrown “back” onto ourselves is precisely this moving “ahead” that Heidegger writes of in IM. This should remind us of what we established in the first chapter regarding Heidegger’s reworking of the concept of metaphysics with the emphasis on “meta-“ as the not turning away, but rather turning towards a different matter or *Sache*. However, we do not leave the “domain” of questioning with this moving “ahead.” For Heidegger, this moving ahead brings about or “forces us” to another “prior” question: “How does it stand with Being?”¹² The difference between these two questions of “Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?” and “How does it stand with being?” (while both share an intimate relation) is that the former is the “guiding question” and the latter is the “grounding question.” While Heidegger does not explicitly express this in IM, in his *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)* he makes

such a distinction, albeit in different terms yet while keeping the general idea intact. In the *Contributions* he writes of the grounding question as "... the question of the essential swaying of be-ing, when asked in this way, is the *grounding-question*," where the guiding question is the question that from the Greeks to Nietzsche (the tradition of Western metaphysics) "... defines the same manner of the question of 'being'"¹³; it is the inquiry into the being of beings (ὅν ἤ ὅν).

We still remain within the realm of questioning, however, we move towards a more fundamental questioning that moves "ahead" as an overcoming of metaphysics proper as long as the question belonging to metaphysics is that which asks "Why are there beings at all instead of nothing?" and towards a more "authentic" stance or position towards questionableness. But remember, to overcome in Heidegger's sense is *not to forget* but rather to keep in view. Therefore, while the question "How does it stand with being?" is the "prior question" [*Vorfrage*], this in no way suggests that the being prior of the grounding question means that such a question is the first of many steps, nor that it lies in the past as the no-longer-now. Heidegger gives the example of a hearth fire which always glows and that the prior question is the hearth fire that is always glowing as the source in the asking of the fundamental question or the guiding question.¹⁴ The hearth fire is not before everything else (e.g. a dwelling in its construction) but it is at the center of the dwelling as that place which ones of the dwelling gather around for warmth and/or light. Another way we can understand this is that the prior question is *always-already there*. That is why, insofar as *Da-sein* is being-*there* and taking from Heidegger's early wanting of a method which sought to throw itself back onto the very existence that gave rise to it, the asking of the guiding question and moving ahead to the grounding question is the "taking up the decisive fundamental *position*" and "winning and securing the attitude that is essential here."¹⁵ If we remember from what we established earlier, Heidegger sought, for example in *SZ*, the working out of the *position* that one must be *in* to ask the question of the meaning of Being (or

by what he writes of in CP, the swaying of Be-ing).¹⁶ Hence the moving ahead to the grounding question from the guiding question is the coming to the position which is *open*—that being the being-there as Da-sein.

It is in this moment when that which was deemed no longer questionable or not open to questioning “proved to be *what is most worthy of questioning*,”¹⁷ and in its question-worthiness *it* becomes questionable; it is the *always-already there* that becomes questionable. In IM Heidegger still reminds us of this, however, he looks not only towards a more phenomenological explanation but to what certain Greek thinkers have written. This should not come as a surprise as we know that Heidegger held lectures on Aristotle and ancient philosophy in general prior to publishing SZ. But in IM, Heidegger, in addition to engaging with Aristotle, Heraclitus, and Parmenides, also looks at Sophocles’ *Antigone* where Sophocles writes of the *deinon* who is *to deinotaton*. Heidegger translates the former as “uncanny” and the latter as “that which is the uncanniest,” while also writing that *deinon* can also be translated as humanity. Possible translation aside, Heidegger sees that that which is uncanny names what is terrible, that which is uncanniest itself. Heidegger writes that the *deinon* is as it is insofar that it is “exposed to this overwhelming sway, because it essentially belongs to Being,”¹⁸ where this overwhelming sway is violent as its essential characteristic.¹⁹ What this violent overwhelming sway which the *deinon* is exposed to gives way for the *deinon*, Heidegger adds, is “[induced] panicked fear, true anxiety, as well as collected, inwardly reverberating, reticent awe.”²⁰ From our discussion of anxiety in chapter one, we know that anxiety (not fear) is the ontological-existential structure of Dasein that allows for the questioning of the existence that gives way to investigation; it is in the face of the very existence itself. This only comes through with questioning in the face of questionableness and what proves to be most worthy of questioning. But the violent aspect is in addition part of the *deinon* itself in that what the *deinon* can do in the face of the violent overwhelming sway is

do violence to it, as Heidegger notes, "...humanity is also *deinon* because it is violence-doing... [It gathers what holds sway and lets it enter into an openness]."²¹

While this double meaning of violence may sound odd, what Heidegger is offering here is an account that attempts to shine a light on the situation of the relationship between Being and beings,²² one that arises when that being questions themselves in their being where they are overwhelmed by the abiding sway of Being. Moreover, when this situation arises, what the questioning (and thinking) being does in response to the overwhelming abiding sway of Being is of particular interest. From what Heidegger writes in this section of IM, he simply refers to what this being (that is Dasein) does in the face of the sway of Being as doing violence since Dasein is primarily a "violence-doer." However, this should not lead us to believe that what we do in the face of Being that opens up in questioning can only be known as doing violence as if this doing violence was something of a negative outcome. Let us take, for example, a note from *The History of Beyng*, (a compilation of notes that Heidegger wrote spanning the years from 1938-1940) where Heidegger writes of questioning "as questioning opening onto the truth of being,"²³ or in the introductory remarks of the 1933-34 series of lectures that were published under the title *Being and Truth*, Heidegger argues that questioning has an intimate relation with a struggle that comes through philosophy, especially with "Greek philosophy" and "Greek questioning."²⁴ Therefore, from these two remarks, we can take questioning as a way to provide the possibility for a struggle. But what about thinking? What does this mean for the quotation and explanation that commenced this chapter? Is this not a contradiction within Heidegger's thought? To think of this as simply a contradiction would be too hasty. To answer these questions, we must for the time being forego the theme of questioning and questionableness and focus on Heidegger's thoughts on the theme of thinking and what this means for the "other beginning" that Heidegger mentions often, especially in his later writings.

2.3 The Theme of Thinking: Beginning Considerations

As we established in the first chapter, Heidegger urges us to not simply take thinking as something that is akin to a mere action carried out by a subject, let alone something narrowed down to a mental function. To begin, we will look towards a distinction that Heidegger often draws throughout various works that will set the stage to examine his notion of thinking, that being between a way of taking something *as it is*, *letting be as it is*, and a way which (if I could use my own terminology) *constricts* that something. The former is what Heidegger calls *inceptual thinking* and the latter *calculative thinking*. In some texts, for example *Discourse on Thinking*, particularly the speech titled “Memorial Address,” Heidegger uses the term *Gelassenheit* to name the way of thinking that is differentiated from the calculative way of thinking.²⁵ The word *Gelassenheit* is translated as “releasement,” given the word *lassen* in German denotes a “letting” as letting something be as it is and the corresponding “type” of thinking that Heidegger has in mind, *das besinnliche Nachdenken* is translated as “meditative thinking.” The term “meditative” [*besinnliche*] is a sufficient English equivalent to what Heidegger is after here, although it does run the risk of falling into a nihilistic attitude of removing oneself from the situation²⁶, something which Heidegger went to great lengths to avoid. This should bring us back to SZ where Heidegger differentiates awaiting and anticipation where awaiting is the inauthentic (or remaining-unopen) way of being towards the future and anticipation is the authentic (or remaining-open) way of being towards the future. When Dasein is resolute it is so only in remaining-open to its own possibility, that being death, or “being-whole.” This possible but hasty misunderstanding regarding a possible nihilistic tone to Heidegger’s thought is the reason why one should take care to understand what Heidegger means by his notion of thinking while ultimately considering his project as a whole. We have done exactly this thus far as we have already noted, as far back as the 1923-24 lecture *Hermeneutics of*

Facticity, that Heidegger was attempting to bring forth an awakening, or as he expresses it in the lecture, a “radical awakening.” This of course flowed through into SZ where I argued that Heidegger’s conception of authenticity and inauthenticity be rethought to mean a way of being unique to Dasein where Dasein either remains open or remains unopen respectively. In his introduction to *Discourse on Thinking*, translator John M. Anderson points out that Heidegger was indeed after some sort of re-awakening stemming from the project of SZ which carried over to IM, and according to Anderson, is expressed most explicitly in the memorial address,²⁷ however, we have located this in Heidegger’s thought predating SZ.

If questioning opens up and lets the confrontation come through, how do we proceed from this presencing of the confrontation? To give a quick answer, this proceeding through the confrontation as a struggle is what Heidegger has in mind when he writes of thinking. But to proceed to where? Is there a proceeding? Is there a definite where? To answer the last two questions: *no*, at least if we take the words “proceeding” and “where” to mean their common definitions. There is no proceeding to some-where in thinking as if one were to go and move to any place. Recall the quotation that concluded the first chapter: “But we do not want to get anywhere. We would like only, for once, to get to just where we are already.” “Where we are already” is *where* we want to get to, or to *proceed to*. Of course, this is being-there—*Da-sein*. When there is a struggle with the revealed confrontation, we have two options of going about this confrontation: (1) either we *turn away*, close ourselves off and remain-unopen and busy ourselves with things at hand, or (2) we *turn towards*, proceed into the openness that is disclosed through questioning, and remain-open to *it*. We are here reminded of the project of SZ as well as some of the other works around that time where Heidegger was working with similar themes. The turning away and turning towards is something that Heidegger distinguished between the traditional Western metaphysics and the metaphysics in the Greek sense as *meta-physika*.

Moreover, this option also plays into what Heidegger means by the *eigentlichkeit* and *uneigentlichkeit* or authenticity and inauthenticity differentiation. This option that arises and the necessity of such an option is close to what Heidegger means by anxiety [*Angst*] as it is in that moment when Dasein is thrown back onto itself as its being-there in disclosedness that this option and its necessity comes through.

It should be noted, however, that the word “option” is not simply an option, as thinking of it in the common sense of the word may lead to a misunderstanding of what Heidegger is attempting to account for. To say that there is an option does not mean that the options presented are those of a kind similar to something that one merely chooses as if one were choosing one thing out of a multiplicity of other things. An option like this does not have to be taken up if one does not want to, but an option of the kind that we are talking about here is a *necessity*, as Heidegger puts it in CP: “What *is* decision at all? Not *choice*. Choosing always involves only what is pregiven and can be taken or rejected. *De-cision* here means grounding and creating, disposing in advance and beyond oneself or giving up and losing.”²⁸ This is so as the option is not just an option, but what Heidegger refers to as the *decision*, a decision which sets forth the “happening” of Dasein as historical Dasein where Da-sein becomes *Da-sein*. In other words, the “decision belongs entirely in the essential prevailing of being itself,”²⁹ where what is at issue is “neither the human being, nor a particular being, nor beings at all, but rather whether being prevails in its essence.”³⁰ The situation is then: will we as *Da-sein* *turn away* from Being or *turn towards* it and let it “prevail in its essence”? In his notes (*The History of Being*), Heidegger further writes that “Not whether we pose or make the decision—that is impossible. But rather whether the human being can still be ready to prepare its arrival—or whether he must let it pass him by,”³¹ hence the decision which Heidegger writes of is something that is to come, however, we have the *option* to *position* ourselves towards it in preparation for its arrival. Therefore, it is

not the case that Dasein is entirely left out and all that matters is Being as just with what we covered in the first chapter regarding questioning, Heidegger sees that one must learn to position oneself, not just to stand by and be indifferent and this includes thinking as well. While this decision to come may sound odd at first, we must remember that for Heidegger, metaphysics as we have come to traditionally know it has reached its end. Recall what we said earlier in the chapter regarding Heidegger's thoughts on the work of Nietzsche.

With Nietzsche, the tradition of Western metaphysics was turned on its head and what it held true was completely reversed. For Heidegger, this was an indicator that the tradition of metaphysics had reached an end insofar as it was beginning to cease its meaningfulness. Therefore, it would be a mistake to take Heidegger's position as arguing for the *complete* end of Western metaphysics. The study itself will still go on (and it has), however, the meaning that it once held will be lost. One only has to think of Nietzsche's writings of the madman who proclaims to the towns folk that "God is dead!"³² Of course, Nietzsche never meant this to mean that God itself was dead. Rather, the plethora of values that were once held true by Western culture (or at least modernity) has come crashing down and its meaning has thus been lost. This then set the stage for Nietzsche's search for meaning in a world that had lost most of its meaning, hence the need for a reevaluation of all values.

This talk of the coming to the point of the loss of meaning of something which is (or was) meaningful is something that Heidegger was attempting to come to grips with from the beginning of his earlier lectures and writings, albeit in a more formal way, playing with more traditional philosophical themes. However, it is in his later lectures and writings where this point of the loss of meaning becomes most explicit, although we could say that the beginning remark in SZ was an explicit jab at the state that modernity found itself in, thinking that it somehow "knew" metaphysics (Being) while it could not have been further away from it.³³ It should also

be no surprise that when he writes of this loss, Heidegger will often mention Nietzsche as it was Nietzsche who, for Heidegger, saw the coming of meaninglessness. This point of the loss of meaning, which Heidegger argues is currently happening, he calls “machination” [*Machenschaft*]. As the “beingness of beings,” machination is a part of the history of being³⁴ and is not to be thought of as being something that lies completely outside of being. Machination indicates a mode of dominion over beings and Being itself as it still has a relation to *phusis* (the Greek word for what Heidegger calls the “sway of being”) as *poiēsis* or the “domain of making” which the Greeks already recognized.³⁵ Therefore, Heidegger urges us not to take machination as a negative phenomenon; it is a happening of the history of being. Nonetheless, instead of remaining a domain of making, it is to bring back a theme explored in the first chapter, *absolutized*. In its being absolutized, it leaves no room for anything else like, for example, different ways of thinking. It is what Heidegger calls overpowering as it “empowers power into its essence.”³⁶ Most importantly for Heidegger, machination annihilates as it brings forth devastation [*Verwüstung*] and the “wasteland” [*Wüste*].³⁷ The words “annihilates,” “devastation,” and “wasteland” can lead to a view which in its essence is nihilistic (*an-nihilates*), and this was why Nietzsche proved to be an influence on Heidegger’s thinking as it is evident from many of Nietzsche’s writings that nihilism as a response to the death of God (or loss of meaning) was a central issue for him. While the death of God would break us from the chains of Western values, it also carried with it the loss of what was once meaningful. Therefore, the death of God would also run the risk of reveling in meaninglessness without actually *creating* values and subsequently meaningfulness, and it was this which was demonstrated to be the core of nihilism.

While both Heidegger and Nietzsche realize and are moved by the “creation” of meaning,³⁸ as mentioned before, Heidegger ultimately takes Nietzsche to be working within

Western metaphysics as he was mostly concerned with values and how meaning could somehow come from that. At the same time words such as annihilation, devastation, and wasteland can also bring about a feeling of destruction³⁹ in the sense that things are broken and fragmented; this is not the case.⁴⁰ What the annihilation and devastation along with the impending wasteland do is *level down*: “nothing ‘grows’ anymore; beings no longer enter into the decision of being.”⁴¹ The decision is covered over and *forgotten* in its necessity and results in a sense of *decision-lessness* where everything is already taken care of⁴²; there is no option as being-open to the decision as it is decision-less. In other words, there is a “lack of distress”⁴³ or anxiety with machination. In other writings, for example, “The Question Concerning Technology,” Heidegger writes of a similar power, however, not in terms of machination. Rather, he writes of “challenging,” “setting-upon,” the “standing-reserve,” [*Bestand*], and “enframing” [*Gestell*]. The essence of technology as a way of revealing has a way of ordering that takes everything and forces or challenges it to stand by, thus becoming the standing-reserve where use value is of most importance. Moreover, it is this revealing which challenges that seeks to unlock, regulate, and secure whatever it comes in contact with.⁴⁴ This we also saw with Heidegger’s thoughts on science in its various modes of investigation which attempts to leave no corner untouched and whose goal is certainty or coming to secure definite answers.⁴⁵ From what we have gathered so far, machination and technology are a part of the history of Being and reveals beings in a certain way, that being as a resource to be used. It is this way of revealing which attempts to enframe everything as *calculable* which makes it easier to transform into a resource. Calculable—we are then brought back to the distinction that Heidegger makes between calculative thinking and a way of thinking that is a “releasement” and lets something be as it is. Therefore, if we take calculable thinking to be part of machination that sets-upon everything and challenges it into a resource *and* insofar as it challenges, we can say that such thinking disallows for growth and

brings with it a sense of decision-lessness (when it is absolutized). Thus inceptual thinking or thinking which remains open must be so as to struggle *and* think the decision which arises as a confrontation (this we already know ensues through questioning). However, does this mean that such inceptual thinking obtains or at least strives towards a pure view? Certainly not. Such thinking cannot get to *it* and have *it* in its hands, so to speak. Before we can move on, it is necessary to explore exactly why Heidegger thinks this is the case.

2.4 The Coming-to-Understand of Finiteness: The Davos Encounter

Despite the negative connotations that it has picked up in the social sciences, appropriation for Heidegger is a positive phenomenon and is a part of the happening of Dasein. In other words, there is always an appropriation. Interestingly, Heidegger's thinking about appropriation has its beginnings in SZ, however, it is not until two years later with his 1929 book *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* and the debate of the same year with Ernst Cassirer in Davos, Switzerland which the grounds for the idea of appropriation and the inability of Dasein to get at something pure are laid. Heidegger covers a plethora of themes in the work, and considerable ground is also covered in the Heidegger-Cassirer debate and to address them all would be outside of the scope of this study. I have therefore chosen to narrow the theme down to the debate regarding the finitude of Dasein and the problem of transcendence to highlight the concept of appropriation.

What makes up most of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* and the Davos debate is Heidegger's interpretations of Kant's various works, specifically the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Heidegger's interpretations are often violent to the original text, and his interpretation of Kant is no exception. Of this Heidegger was fully aware as he would begin some of his lectures noting that the interpretations that he was to embark on were "violent."⁴⁶ Cassirer knew this coming

from the tradition of neo-Kantians that saw Kant's work primarily as a theory of knowledge and pertaining mostly to the study of the natural sciences. However, it should be noted that Cassirer, by the time of the Davos debate, had moved beyond the neo-Kantianism of the Marburg school (where the theory of knowledge interpretation of Kant had its most adherents) and developed a neo-Kantian critique, not of reason, but of culture.⁴⁷ Heidegger, on the other hand, takes Kant's project as the "groundlaying for metaphysics" which outlines how the finite human being (Dasein) is the only being that can attempt an inquiry into ontological knowledge.⁴⁸ Despite Cassirer and the neo-Kantians being on the side of a more "traditional" interpretation of Kant and Heidegger's interpretation being involved with ontological knowledge, the two thinkers, while perhaps having a similar starting point, differ greatly in what they see highlighted in Kant's thought. For Cassirer, Kant was attempting to elucidate a theory that could serve as a critique of human culture, but it also served as the ground to work out an account of "mental spontaneity" regarding myth and science where Dasein has the ability to attain freedom *from* its finitude and through the fulfillment of its finitude, Dasein can achieve a sense of infinity⁴⁹, for example, the world of symbolic forms. For Heidegger, it was a matter of uncovering the finitude of Dasein through an understanding of the *a priori* temporal horizon⁵⁰ which in part gives rise to the concept of thrownness, insofar as thrownness is the being thrown-open as the There [Da] in There-being [Da-sein] as the particular finite "occurrence" of Being in time. Coming to an understanding of the situation of Dasein laid the grounds for metaphysics as an inquiry into not beings but the Being of those beings. Such an interpretation is indeed provocative. However, while Heidegger's interpretation of Kant is certainly questionable, I only intend to include it to emphasize certain aspects of his thought as although it is an interpretation of Kant, it is *Heidegger's* interpretation of Kant.

One issue between Heidegger and Cassirer (if it has not already been made obvious) was the problem of transcendence, but more specifically between the ideas of finitude and infinity. From what I have written above, while Cassirer was more interested in the idea of Dasein having the ability to achieve a state of infinity, or what he called “immanent infinity,”⁵¹ Heidegger was more concerned with coming to an understanding of and remaining within the finitude of Dasein. However, these interests and concerns were much more than just mere interests and concerns. Constituting a rift between the two thinkers, the debate surrounding the ideas of finitude and infinity were ways of accounting for the meaning of being human. What does it mean to be human or what is meaningful of being human? Was it that achieving fulfillment of the experience of human finitude where immanent infinity as objective form arose through our capacity for symbolization? Was it rather the achievement of understanding of the finitude of the very being whose existence is finite as the There [*Da*] of Being (or “occurrence”) where in thrownness, this being is being thrown-open as an “opening irruption”⁵² and it is only when this necessary situation is understood do we engage in metaphysics⁵³? While Cassirer was adamant that human beings had a capacity to achieve a kind of immanent infinity (this was clear for him seeing that we have in the course of human history established systems such as myth, religion, and science which were for Cassirer the result of symbolic formalization), he also agreed with Heidegger that something like an existential analysis was needed, hence the analysis of the finitude of Dasein. For example, in Cassirer’s *An Essay on Man*, he writes, “Man is declared to be that creature who is constantly in search of himself—a creature who in every moment of his existence must examine and scrutinize the conditions of his existence.”⁵⁴ Heidegger, on the other hand, was more hesitant towards Cassirer’s arguments, especially Cassirer’s view that Dasein could achieve a state of infinity. From the portion of the dialogue between Heidegger and

Cassirer which is transcribed as an appendix in KM, we can see that Heidegger was skeptical of Cassirer's argument:

Cassirer wants to show that finitude becomes transcendent in the ethical writings [of Kant]. In the Categorical Imperative we have something which goes beyond the finite creature. But precisely the concept of the imperative as such shows the inner reference to a finite creature. Also, this going-beyond to something higher is always just a going-beyond to the finite creature, to one which is created. This transcendence too still remains within the [sphere of] creatureliness [*Geschöpflichkeit*] and finitude. ... Questions for Cassirer: 1. What path does man have to infinitude? And what is the manner in which man can participate in infinity? 2. Is infinitude to be attained as privative determination of finitude, or is infinitude a region in its own right? 3. To what extent does philosophy have as its task to be allowed to become free from anxiety? Or does it not have as its task to surrender man, even radically to anxiety?⁵⁵

Some confusion may follow the above quotation. Heidegger is not opposed to the idea of infinity in his own thought, nor is he opposed to it in his interpretation of Kant, as he explains during the debate: "As a finite creature, the human being has a certain infinitude in the ontological. But the human being is never infinite and absolute in the creating of the being itself, rather, it is infinite in the sense of the understanding of Being."⁵⁶ If this is the case then why has Heidegger earlier said that even in transcendence, Dasein still remains "within the [sphere of] creatureliness [*Geschöpflichkeit*]⁵⁷ and finitude"? The key word here is "going beyond." There is no way (in Heidegger's view) that Dasein could somehow move past or go beyond its own finitude or its own existence, and as Frank Schalow correctly puts it, "Because this grasp of our finitude implies a further concern for charting the farthest reaches to which knowledge extends—even to the point where these boundaries are illegitimately transgressed."⁵⁸ Moreover, even if Dasein is "infinite in the sense of the understanding of Being" it cannot escape or rid itself of the finitude of its being. In other words, a return or *re-turn towards* the finitude of Dasein is needed, which is echoed by Schalow where he notes that "the understanding of being which arises with *Dasein*'s transcendence at the same time delivers back to it what is meaningful about its own existence,"⁵⁹

and not to remain in this plane of infinitude or “immanent infinity.” The reason for this is there must be an understanding of the finite nature of Dasein as Dasein is the only being who can come about to this understanding (and certainly the only one who questions and thinks into this finitude). Take, for example, what Heidegger says in response to Cassirer’s question regarding Heidegger’s renouncing of the objectivity and “form of absoluteness” that Kant writes of in the *Critique of Judgement*: “But as Kant says, provided that the ontological understanding of Being is only possible within the inner experience of beings, this infinitude of the ontological is bound essentially to ontic experience so that we must say the reverse: this infinitude which breaks out in the power of imagination is precisely the strongest argument for finitude, for ontology is the index of finitude.”⁶⁰ Here it is quite clear that Heidegger intends to demonstrate that the idea of infinitude should only serve to highlight and throw us back (as a re-turn) onto ourselves in the Moment of the There, that is the occurrence of Dasein in its finitude. As some foreshadowing for the coming sections of this chapter, what we can take away from this aspect of the Davos debate is that for both Cassirer and Heidegger, what was at stake was much more than interpretations of Kant and what to think of the human being; it was the search for that “something” which brings the human being into an understanding of itself.

Another interesting point of debate between Heidegger and Cassirer, which explains the importance that Heidegger placed on the coming-to-understand the finitude of Dasein and which also served as Heidegger’s third question to Cassirer, is the theme of anxiety. Much of what Heidegger says regarding anxiety in the debate follows the same line of thought as his work on anxiety in *SZ*, however the meaning behind his thoughts on anxiety are much more explicit here. This comes up with the discussion surrounding what both thinkers believe to be the role of philosophy. While both Heidegger and Cassirer agree that anxiety is an integral part of Dasein, the thinkers differ on what we do in the face of anxiety through philosophy. On one hand,

Cassirer argues that the task of philosophy is to free ourselves from anxiety through the creation of an ideal world and that freedom is a process which is entirely a way of emancipation.⁶¹ Heidegger, on the other hand, argues that the task of philosophy is to allow us to confront anxiety as a way to open oneself up to the finitude of their being. As Peter E. Gordon puts it, “To be exposed to anxiety there offers a kind of emancipation, because it is only in the anxious anticipation of being-towards-death that one can take on board the finitude at the core of one’s existence and resolve authentically to be who one truly is.”⁶² I would not posit that Heidegger is concerned with emancipation (it is quite the opposite, though Gordon is correct to talk of the relation of anxiety, finitude, and authentically resolving); according to Heidegger, the point is not to *turn away* from anxiety and finitude, but to *turn towards it*, and it is precisely this turning towards which is the task of philosophy. Gordon adds to this by stating: “for it is a cardinal principle of Heidegger’s philosophy that the human being cannot extricate itself from its temporal as thrown (*geworfen*) into the world.”⁶³ This inability to extricate oneself from one’s temporal condition, that is their finiteness, is what I set out to argue as an important point regarding Heidegger’s reconceptualization of thinking. Thus, thinking is that “part” of Dasein which *must* understand what Dasein *is*, and it is this understanding of Dasein as the occurrence of Being that we must accept⁶⁴ if we are to think not only about Being but *with Being*. It is then anxiety which sets the stage for thinking in the proper sense of thinking about and with Being.

What then of appropriation and its relation to inceptual thinking? In his 1957 lecture titled “Identity and Difference,” Heidegger notes that appropriation is mutual in that both Dasein and Being are appropriated.⁶⁵ He goes on to say that the definition of “experience of thinking” (which we can take to mean thinking in the sense of *not* calculative thinking) is entering into this “mutual appropriation.”⁶⁶ To provide a quick answer to the above question, it is then in part the role of inceptual thinking (which we will from now on refer to as “poetic thinking”) to enter into

the event of mutual appropriation of Dasein and Being. Or to put it differently, since Dasein and Being are appropriated, they share a certain relation which poetic thinking must think about and somehow bring it about in understanding. This “bring about in understanding” as well as the relation between Dasein and Being will form the later parts of this chapter and will be dealt with in more detail.

When writing of appropriation in relation to Heidegger, many scholars understand appropriation as *ap-proprietation* in order to bring out its underlying meaning. An example of this is in Sheehan’s work in MSH where he points out that appropriation ought to be understood as another way in which Heidegger thought of “the event” [*das Ereignis*] (the term “the event” can be used interchangeably with what has been written as the There-being or the occurrence of Being as finiteness). Sheehan argues that Heidegger’s usage of the term *event* was meant as a way to say the “event of appropriation,”⁶⁷ and that he saw in the German *Ereignis* two meanings which lent to his understanding of appropriation, that being “to see” and “to own” (in the sense of one’s own, not of property).⁶⁸ Providing the etymology of appropriation, Sheehan shows that the Latin *propus* and *proprietas* refer to a certain quality that one thing “has” or that belongs to it which makes it what it is. Thus, ap-proprietating for Heidegger is “bring[ing] something *ad proprium*, into its *own proper state* such that it comes into its own, into its *proprietas* as the essential ‘something’ that it is,”⁶⁹ or we can think of it as what is *appropriate* of something. If Dasein in its being as existence is finite then the “event of appropriation” as bringing something into what it is brings Dasein (or delivers it over) to its existence or finiteness. If we remember to when in IM Heidegger notes that the Greek thinkers understood that what they were after, while at moments presencing, had an elusive nature to it and what we have just accomplished with looking at some of the aspects of the debate between Heidegger and Cassirer, then the event as appropriation bringing Dasein to its finiteness makes sense. Beings in their relation to Being

cannot be brought into a “pure” or “whole” view since the being who questions and thinks this relation (and who must necessarily do so) is itself unable to reach a pure or whole “state”; they cannot be “one” with Being.⁷⁰ We could also look at it by way of a “need” on the part of Being, something which Joan Stambaugh writes of in her book *The Finitude of Being* where Being is in need of Dasein in order “to open itself” as Dasein, is the “place” or space (Da-sein—being-*there*) of “Being’s arrival.”⁷¹ In other words, Dasein cannot erase itself from Being, either by forgetting or distancing oneself from Being (what has been done through the history of Western metaphysics) or by attempting to forget Dasein. Either way, the relation between beings and Being or the “belonging together” as Heidegger puts it in ID, is ignored.

This inability to grasp something which lies in the very heart of the existence of Dasein is what Heidegger meant (going back to SZ) by Dasein’s “being-towards-death.” It is (to now bring in a theme from the first chapter) the awareness [*besinnung*] of Dasein as being-towards-death, the “end” of Dasein which shines a light on the finiteness of the existence of Dasein as the occurrence of Being. However, we can never experience death or the end of Dasein as it is “out of reach” or “out-standing”⁷² for Dasein; *we can never “have” it.*⁷³ Therefore, the death or end of Dasein must not be something which we seek to obtain through some means, nor should our investigation as questioning and thinking itself “end” (or “state” that lies “outside” Dasein). Instead, such a “state” must force us to re-*turn towards* (but not necessarily *turn away* from said “state”) that which is proper to Dasein—*its being-there.*⁷⁴ Furthermore, as being-towards-death is towards the future and what is considered future is a projecting-open as understanding for Dasein, it is then clear that the end of Dasein provides the understanding of the situation that Dasein finds itself in, that being its finitude, as Gadamer puts it, “Insofar as *Dasein* is continuously involved in its anticipation of death ... it is the experience of time as such that confronts us with the essential finiteness that governs us as a whole.”⁷⁵ Gadamer here also adds

that the anticipation of death is what “Heidegger really means” and that it was not about the anticipation of the “whole” of Dasein. I think that, on Gadamer’s part, to completely separate “death” and “whole” might lead to a misunderstanding. This is not to say that Gadamer has made this misunderstanding in wording, but this conflating of “death” and “whole” could be avoided if we were to think of death and whole within the theme of the “end” of Dasein. Take, for example, what Heidegger writes in the first chapter of SZI.2 titled “The Possible Being-a-Whole of Dasein and Being-toward-Death” where it is written that “In Dasein there is inevitably [undurchstreichbar] a constant ‘lack of wholeness’ which finds its end in death.”⁷⁶ This proves that Heidegger was indeed interested in the theme of the whole of Dasein that was tied with the death of Dasein. Hence when we speak of appropriation, it is done so as to demonstrate that Dasein, as long as it cannot reach that perfect or pure “thing,” is always already held down, so to speak, to that which it is and it cannot simply leave behind what it is.⁷⁷ This does not mean that we cannot or certainly have not tried to do this. For Heidegger, this attempt was what he called the *Seinsvergessenheit* or the forgetting of the forgetfulness of Being or the history of Western metaphysics. Moreover, we should not take this situation that Dasein finds itself in as a deficiency, for how could what Dasein *fundamentally is* be considered deficient? Therefore, we must come to terms with this situation and not shrink back from that which is disclosed as *truth* [*alētheia*].

2.5 The Struggle⁷⁸ of the Confrontation and Subsequent Following-Along: Setting-Forth the “Other Beginning”

We have now come to the point of the chapter where we are ready to discuss what Heidegger means when he writes of thinking. Simply put, questioning is what throws open the situation that Dasein then finds itself in, and thinking is that ability on behalf of Dasein where in seeing ahead,

its finiteness becomes clear as Dasein is being-toward-death and in not turning away from this, must re-turn to the constituted moment where in presence, meaning is disclosed. If questioning opens up the situation then thinking works to confront that openness and somehow “tell” it. This “telling,” however, must be done in a way that does not seek to put a firm grasp of certainty on its “object.” Rather, it must let the “object” *be*, that is *be in its simplicity*. Safranski makes note of this when discussing Heidegger’s conception of thinking. Referring back to Heidegger’s 1946 essay “Letter on Humanism,” Safranski pinpoints what served as Heidegger’s inspiration for what he called thinking, that being how Aristotle speaks of a story involving Heraclitus where a few sought to see what a thinker was. What they found was Heraclitus warming himself by sitting near a baking oven. It is then that Heraclitus tells the people, “The gods are present here too.”⁷⁹ The “here too” of the statement meant for Heidegger that something like the gods were not just confined to a special space but were also *there* in what was seemingly an everyday situation. Safranski then goes on to argue that the gods are present in the bakery “so long as Heraclitus brings them into discourse,”⁸⁰ and it is this bringing into discourse that Safranski takes to be what Heidegger means by thinking. Furthermore, the bringing into discourse has two aspects: (1) the invitation and (2) the communication. According to Safranski, the invitation begins when a situation is opened as something is led out of seclusion and brought into the open, to discourse as the communication is the sharing of that open space with others.⁸¹ While I agree with Safranski’s use of “bringing into discourse” to describe what Heidegger means by thinking and to characterize it with the two-fold invitation and communication, I remain skeptical whether Safranski has considered the concept of thinking in the true Heideggerian sense. First, in the particular section in MH devoted to covering this moment in Heidegger’s thought (titled “What Do We Do When We Think?”), Safranski makes only one mention of questioning and what is most questionable, yet no mention is made of the *Seinsfrage*. When questioning is talked of, it is

not done so in relation to thinking, with Safranski instead insisting that, although Heidegger never meant it, talk of questioning and what is most questionable lent a contribution to scientific anthropology.⁸² He further notes that “With so much *Dasein*, Being had been lost sight of.”⁸³ This may be true, however, we cannot simply do away with questioning, questionability, and the *Seinsfrage*, especially with its relation to thinking and relegate it to a mistake or a deficiency in Heidegger’s thought. While it may be the case that questioning has its eye towards *Dasein*, it is something that is completely necessary as it is that which throws open. Furthermore, it would be a mistake to think that Heidegger was in any way leaving behind, so to speak, *Dasein* or more specifically its relation to Being as this would simply be a way of forgetting *Dasein* in light of giving full, undivided attention to Being. The point is not to side this way or that way in questioning and thinking, but to *dwell on the difference between beings and Being* or in other words, the relation that lies between beings and Being and bring it into discourse, which shines forth in the event of (mutual) appropriation (of *Dasein* and Being). In TFB, Stambaugh makes a similar case, albeit not exactly in terms of questioning *and* thinking where she notes that in the thinking of *Ereignis* (which she translates as appropriation), there no longer is the “clear-cut distinction” between *Dasein* and Being.⁸⁴ What we now must turn our attention towards is the relation between *Dasein* and Being that proves to be the most primordial, allowing for the origination of both *Dasein* and Being.⁸⁵

In any case, *Dasein* is and remains finite and (most) ways of thinking, in Heidegger’s terms, that seek to somehow un-do this forget what is most essential to the being who questions and thinks. In addition, Safranski does not mention the themes of confrontation and struggle, and its relation to thinking, besides mentioning anxiety in earlier sections of MH, he misses the inclusion of a discussion on thinking as the struggle in the face of confrontation which irrupts from anxiety. His conceptualization of Heidegger’s notion of thinking follows a more “kind”

interpretation with using such words as “invitation” and “communication.” As I noted above, I am in agreement with Safranski with using such terms. With that being said, I also argue that they must be brought into context, namely to what we have hitherto established.

Thinking as this invitation and communication is the “telling” of the struggle and confrontation with that difference and relation that Dasein and its world has with Being; it sets a certain “tone” by which Dasein may interpret itself. For Heidegger, this “tone” was best demonstrated through poetic verse, hence the intimate closeness that he places thinking and poetry within, as he notes in IM: “This struggle is then sustained by the creators, by the poets, the thinkers, and statesmen.”⁸⁷ Heidegger is not equating thinking with poetry, rather *thinking is poetic*. The way that the thinker (in Heidegger’s terms) and the poet “position” themselves towards the relation between beings and Being is similar. Let us look into this further. A reoccurring theme in Heidegger’s later writings (which also makes an appearance in SZ, although under a different name) was the theme of “saying,” [*sage*]⁸⁸ “response,” and in order to respond one must “hear” the saying. In SZ, we know this as “the call,” [*das Ruf*] and even though Heidegger still plays on the word and theme of the call, it is in a slightly different sense. For now, let us consider a fragment from a letter that Heidegger wrote in response to the letter of a young student of his. That student asks, “whence does thinking about Being receive (to speak concisely) its directive?” Heidegger bluntly writes as an answer, “To think ‘Being’ means: to respond to the appeal of its presencing. The response stems from the appeal and releases itself toward that appeal.”⁸⁹ We can see here with clarity that thinking, which is always related to Being, is a *response*. Of course, this response is not just any response that one gives. The type of response that Heidegger has in mind here is the result of hearing, but hearing of what? We could give a quick and easy answer and say “Being.” The simplicity of such an answer leaves much to be desired. The saying of Being is not Being itself but what Heidegger, for example in TNL,

calls “silence.” Being does not resound a definitive sound, one which we may know out of certainty. On the contrary, Being says something, but this something says what we may call indefinite. Take, for example, a situation where one hears a sound that, let us say, catches them off guard or catches their interest. To their disappointment, the sound that they heard was distant and there is present a good amount of noise that mostly buries it, but that individual wants to know what the sound either is or is coming from. As a *response* to the sound and the situation that they find themselves in, the individual attempts to follow the sound and its direction, especially if the sound rings again. They follow the sound and its path as if that sound had authority in the situation; it *demand*s to be heard and followed. The individual is now listening in for the sound. Their hearing is no longer that of an indifferent kind that is simply aware of noise; the hearing is now *attuned*.⁹⁰ Unfortunately, the individual may never find the source of the sound. What is left is its silence and “trace.” It is exactly this “trace” that plays into the situation of Dasein being unable to grasp Being, for how could one grasp something in its wholeness when all that they have is its “trace”? However cynical this view may seem, it should not lead us to a nihilistic attitude. While such a nihilistic attitude is certainly a possible (and attractive) attitude to take up, it does nothing (quite literally) in the way of thinking of and with Being. In other words, it does not tell of the relation between Dasein and Being, nor does it name or set forth what Heidegger calls a “historical Dasein,” or historical time; it does not provide a position so as to interpret itself within this relation. This inability to grasp is something that the poetic thinker must be aware [*besinn*] of; they may only come into the “proximity” of Being, something which Heidegger believes is thought of in the poem of Stefan George titled “The Word.” In the stanza that proves of interest to us here, George proclaims “No like of this these depths enfold. And straight it vanished from my hand, The treasure never graced my land...” In TNL Heidegger sees this particular utterance as an indication that what the poet names cannot be fully named in that

there could never be a “pure” or “whole” naming where the thing itself is grasped in a sense of certainty. One might say that there is a “refusal”⁹¹ of what is attempted to be named, something which L.M. Vail in *Heidegger and the Ontological Difference* sums up by writing, “Thus the ontological difference is not an object of thought that can be conceptually grasped and categorized in any adequate manner.”⁹² Of course we here are not speaking about the ontological difference as by this time in Heidegger’s writings, he had dropped the term “ontological difference” and instead opted for speaking about a “relation” between Dasein and Being that, although it brings about a confrontation, it is also unifying as Dasein and Being “belong together.” In any case, he takes George to be indicating that what the poetic thinker is after is the “frail rich prize,” that in all of its richness “does not reach being as a thing, it does not come to be a treasure, that is, a poetically *secured* possession of the land”⁹³; we could say that it remains *questionable*.

This theme of “call and response” constitutes much of Heidegger’s work regarding language, or more specifically, λόγος [*logos*] and λέγειν [*legein*]. It is no surprise that the poetic thinker thinks in language and this is how the poetic thinker invites and communicates to others. Much like other concepts, Heidegger urges us not to take language at face value or by its common understanding. Language is not just a group of words with certain sounds with which we construct sentences. Of course, we do this, and while much of it is talking about everyday “events” (what Heidegger in SZ called *Gerede* or “idle talk”), therein also lies a more meaningful connection which we can come near within the language of poetic thinking. Heidegger interprets the Greek word λέγειν as the responding (and hearing) of the “saying,” something which Dasein can only do while λόγος is that “saying” itself, hence Dasein has language insofar as it is hearing and responding to the “saying” of Being. We can see a similar and more explicit view expressed in ID where he states, “But man’s distinctive feature lies in

this, that he, as the being who thinks, is open to Being and so answers to it. Man *is* essentially this relationship of responding to Being, and he is only this.”⁹⁴ This is most clear when Heidegger provides his interpretation of a section of Parmenides’ poem in the series of lectures collected under the title *What is Called Thinking?* The section reads as thus: “χρή: τό λέγειν τε νοεῖν τ’ ἐὸν ἔμμεναι,” which Heidegger translates differently throughout the lectures depending on the progress in understanding he makes regarding the section. One translation that he settles on reads, “Needful: the saying also thinking too: being: to be.”⁹⁵ Heidegger speaks of the translation of λέγειν as not simply words, nor “activating the organs of speech,” rather λέγειν means “to lay out” in the sense of “When someone tells of an event, he lays it out for us,”⁹⁶ or the poetic thinker *tells* of something. The poetic thinker (to use Safranski’s phrase) “brings into discourse” (or what Heidegger calls *rede* discourse in SZ) the saying of Being; λόγος, on the other hand, is the “gathering ‘gatheredness’”⁹⁷ that provides the possibility (as the ground) for Dasein to lay out or tell, or in other words, λόγος is language. Λόγος is then a gathering that gathers beings together as the “saying” of Being which are then to be told and laid out by Dasein as λέγειν insofar as Dasein is ζῶον λόγον ἔχον [*zōon logon echon*]: “For to be human means to be a sayer.”⁹⁸ Heidegger’s usage of Aristotle’s notion of ζῶον λόγον ἔχον in various of his later writings is a way to demonstrate that nearness or proximity that Dasein has with Being⁹⁹ (or the “saying” of Being), which we have known previous to this when we established that Dasein’s existence is as it is in that it is the finite “occurrence” of Being.

Returning to the theme of the “trace,” we are at once reminded again of Heidegger’s remark in IM where he argues that the Greek thinkers understood the double movement of appearing and disappearing. Moreover, in the first lecture of WCT Heidegger discusses not so much appearance but withdrawal. Being is always withdrawing from Dasein,¹⁰⁰ hence its trace that it leaves behind and which we are called to follow. While Being may appear in a moment, or

what Joseph Kockelmans in *On the Truth of Being: Reflections on Heidegger's Later Philosophy* refers to as a “flash of lightning,”¹⁰¹ it also has an elusive nature. If these are the “characteristics” of Being and the thinking of Being is a response then thinking must be aware of this double movement of Being. We can think of it this way: in *SZ*, Heidegger writes of the forgetting of Being, however, it is not only the forgetting of Being but also the forgetting of the forgetting of Being. While when we forget, we have the possibility to come to an awareness of this forgetting and attempt to remember, when we forget that we have forgotten, that possibility of remembrance is no longer open to us.

Heidegger wants to show that (1) the silence of the saying of Being is “unsettling,” it moves us asunder and despite this, we must follow the trace that is left behind—we must struggle along—and (2) we must somehow tell of this trace along with the forth-coming moment when that “flash of lightning” will occur. It is, then, the latter point that explains Heidegger’s talk of “preparation” for the de-cision, and as David Halliburton correctly puts it, “Through such openness—which is synonymous with Open—a people achieves truth, which is not to say eternal verity but a struggle between concealment and *Lichtung* [clearing] that persists in time.”¹⁰² However, there is a bit of an issue here in Halliburton’s wording, particularly between the difference of concealment and *Lichtung*. It is not unusual at all for Heideggerian scholarship to discuss concealment and *Lichtung* at the same time, especially when writing about Heidegger’s later works. With that being said, it is unusual to contrast concealment and *Lichtung*. As I have added in the above quotation, *Lichtung* can be translated as “clearing” (although it should be noted that there does not exist an *exact* English translation) and while at first glance concealment [*Verborgenheit*] and clearing may sound like a difference lies between them, this is not the case. The “opposite” of concealment is *unconcealment* [*Unverborgenheit*] and the clearing has a different place in Heidegger’s writings altogether, albeit one that is related to the double

movement of concealment and unconcealment. For example, when looking at some instances where Heidegger writes of clearing in CP, he writes of it as “Clearing for concealing as originary-onefold essential sway is the abground of ground, as which the t/here [*Da*] holds sway.”¹⁰³ Also, in THB: “It [concealing] is beyng itself, which in clearing veils and cloaks itself, as clearing, precisely through those (beings) that come to presence. Everything thus depends on the clearing.”¹⁰⁴

We can see from these two notes that clearing is indeed not the “opposite” of concealment, not in terms of the German language nor in Heidegger’s thought. On the contrary, the clearing is that which is *for* the double movement of concealing and unconcealing of Being. Furthermore, the clearing is part of Dasein as Da-sein itself (as the event): “The clearing is on each occasion configured in the manner of the event, and unfolded into projective realms and paths by the Da-sein that has been appropriated and steadfastly insists within it.”¹⁰⁵ Moreover, we can see the important relation between the clearing and poetry when we look at the words in German for we already know that *Lichtung* is clearing, while poetry is *Dichtung*. Insofar as Dasein dwells within and on the in-between “space” of Being and beings, and given that Dasein as Da-sein is the appropriated event that is the clearing, poetic thinking is that which not only emerges from out of the clearing but also names the clearing. Two points can be said about this: (1) this emerging and naming is what Heidegger considers *truth* in the Greek sense of *alethēia* where a “historical Dasein” is set-forth (this is what constitutes the “other beginning” for Heidegger, however, more on this in the coming paragraphs); and (2) this interpretation of emerging and naming offers a possible explanation of why Heidegger in his later writings often would talk of Being as something that had a “mind of its own” so to speak. Again, it does not appear to be Heidegger’s intention as to speak of Being *as such*. Rather, I believe Heidegger’s point is to demonstrate the intimacy shared between Dasein and Being as Being provides the

ground upon which Dasein is able to engage in poetic thinking and naming, something that Dasein must be aware of when poetically thinking. It is with all this in mind that we can take thinking not only as the struggle but the following-along of the trace or withdrawal. We should take caution, then, not to conceive of thinking as made up of two separate parts. On the contrary, the struggle and following-along of the trace or withdrawal are one and the same characteristic of thinking; where there is a struggle, there too do we find a following-along. We can also find this notion of following-along in WCT where Heidegger talks of a “drawing towards” in that when one thinks genuinely, one is drawn towards what withdraws so as to “point towards it.”¹⁰⁶

A similar view of Heidegger’s conception of poetizing and thinking is shared by George Seidel in his book *Martin Heidegger and the Pre-Socratics*, where he writes: “For what does man do when he poetizes in an original manner (*ursprünglich dichtet*) except *go into a struggle*, a ‘set-to’ (*Auseinandersetzung*) with things in which he tries to bring them to their being? Thus, when man poetizes in this original manner, he pro-jects something new.”¹⁰⁷ However, “new” does not quite get at what Heidegger is attempting to elucidate (something which Seidel makes note of¹⁰⁸). Saying that when one poetizes there is a pro-jection of “something new” is not the whole story of what Heidegger takes poetizing and thinking to be and “what it can do.” What thinking and poetizing bring about is not just something “new” as many things are brought about which are new, yet we certainly would not consider them to be in the realm of thinking, poetizing, or philosophy. Instead, turning to “The Origin of the Work of Art,” we see Heidegger talking of “founding...in a triple sense: founding as bestowing, founding as grounding, and founding as beginning. ... Thus to each mode of founding there corresponds a mode of preserving.”¹⁰⁹ What should be of particular interest to us here are the words “a mode of preserving.” Preserving what? How can there be a preserving and yet at the same time be a “pro-jecting new” as founding? This is another reason to avoid accounting for what thinking and

poetizing accomplish as something merely “new” for what is new (in the Heideggerian sense) is always tied to what is *there*, therefore it is never truly new in the common sense of the word. Unfortunately, Seidel does not provide this clarification, and what needs to be understood is that what thinking and poetizing bring about is the *getting to what is always-already there*. To further the confusion, in various essays and lectures that make up Heidegger’s later writings, he appears to be skeptical of the account of what sets the “tone” for a “historical Dasein” as something creative.¹¹⁰ Yet Seidel still writes (regarding language and its relation to poetizing), “Language in its ontological roots is Logos, original *creative* poetizing.”¹¹¹ We could use various words to describe what Heidegger is after, however, to call it “creative” must be followed by a certain understanding of it to distance what Heidegger means by creative and the everyday understanding of creative as the everyday understanding runs the risk of missing the weight and nuance of his thought regarding poetic thinking. Heidegger uses the term “creative” himself in CP (quoted above in § 2), however, he mentions it in tandem with “grounding.” This is so because, for Heidegger, creativity is not the *creatio ex nihilo* nor the creation of just anything. Creativity must be as it is insofar as it serves as a grounding, founding, or bestowal at the same time. What is created in poetic thinking honours Being by accounting for the difference between beings and Being and sets it forth so as to gather beings (like and unlike Dasein) in the always-already there. Take, for example, his thoughts in OWA where he writes, “All creation, because it is such a drawing-up, is a drawing, as of water from a spring. Modern subjectivism, to be sure, immediately misinterprets creation, taking it as the sovereign subject’s performance of genius.”¹¹² This is where we find Heidegger’s thoughts regarding the “other beginning” that he so often spoke of in his later life. It was not the “first beginning” (*that* belonged to the Greeks), but the “other beginning” which Heidegger felt was at stake for us in our “thought-provoking time,”¹¹³ and it is also here that we can better understand the term “retrieval.” The retrieval that

he speaks of is not going back to some far-gone origin or beginning. Rather, the retrieval retrieves what is always-already there and sets-forth a new beginning from that always-already there as a source; in a way, thinking is also a retrieval. Again, while it is a “new beginning,” it is still tied to the always already there. It is, then, poetic thinking which takes the “original leap” [*Ursprung*] towards this new beginning. What exactly this new beginning is can be accounted for using various words which Heidegger himself did throughout his later writings. For this study, I have chosen the term “naming” to account for what poetic thinking does.

But why choose the term “naming”?¹¹⁴ Poetic thinking in its essence names what is always already there and we as Dasein who engage in poetic thinking are the being-there. For example, returning to WCT, Heidegger notes regarding the understanding of λέγειν, “Laying, λέγειν, concerns what *lies there*.... What must be laid lies there, and henceforth belongs to what *already* lies before us. And what lies before us is primary, especially when it lies there *before* all the laying and setting that are *man’s* work, when it lies there prior to all that and lays out, lays down, or lays in ruin.”¹¹⁵ We hear the address or call of Being that lies in questionability, which throws us back and open onto ourselves and when our finiteness is revealed, we are faced with an irruption, an aporia, a difference between beings and Being and with our being-out-of-reach of Being as an inability to be whole, we are confronted and forced to come to an understanding not only of our finiteness but of the difference that ultimately proves to be an intimate relation. It is not only Being that holds sway but also the intimate relation, and it is then the task of poetic thinking to name and tell of the intimate relation from listening to the saying of Being. In letting it and beings be as they are (*Gelassenheit*), poetic thinking brings forth the intimate relation and Being’s presence shines forth in its meaningfulness. To further cement the closeness shared between the meaning that shines forth from the intimate relation with Being and the poetic thinker we can look at the terms that Heidegger uses to describe what exactly the poetic thinker

does. For example, in the lecture *Introduction to Philosophy—Thinking and Poetizing*, Heidegger uses such words as “reflectiveness,” [*Besinnlichkeit*] “meditation,” [*Sinnen*] and “awareness” [*Besinnung*]. What we can see from these three words is the common word of *sinn* or meaning. If we take that the poetic thinker is aware or must be aware then it makes sense that in their awareness, the poetic thinker is connected to meaning, or the meaning of Being. We could also argue that it is this awareness or reflectiveness that brings about a “burden” onto the poetic thinker to set-forth the “other beginning.” Or we could put it this way: the awareness positions the poetic thinker up to respond to the call of Being and in the coming-to-understand of the finiteness of the existence of Dasein (what the poetic thinker *is*) and thus their inability to fully grasp Being, it flees or withdraws from the poetic thinker and the difference, yet intimate relation shared by Dasein and Being is what comes through. The poetic thinker is then left to tell of this event that sets forth a new beginning to which a historical time or Dasein is able to interpret itself¹¹⁶ and ultimately allow meaningfulness to appear, not in the extra-ordinary, but the ordinary.¹¹⁷

Therefore, we can say that, insofar that we poetically think, we dwell upon the intimate relation of the difference between beings and Being in both senses of the word. We dwell upon it in that it is the “space” within which we occupy and we dwell by way of the expression when one is in “deep thought”; one dwells on something. Hence Heidegger’s interest in a fragment from Hölderlin’s poem titled “In Lovely Blue” where he states, “...poetically man dwells...”¹¹⁸ Richardson in HPT makes note of this understanding of dwelling, although not in the way as I have done above. Instead, Richardson pulls from Heidegger’s other interpretations of Hölderlin’s poems, namely, that “if man dwells ‘on the earth,’ he also looks up toward ‘heaven.’ Hence effectively he dwells ‘between’ heaven and earth...”¹¹⁹ Moreover, Richardson writes of a “between” which he believes Heidegger was working out in his thought regarding dwelling, and

on this too I concur seeing that this concept of “between” is similar to the theme of dwelling on the relation *between* Dasein and Being. Regarding thinking in this section of his book, surprisingly Richardson writes that in the essay “Building, Dwelling, Thinking” Heidegger’s treatment of thinking was only an “incidental treatment.” Not at all! While it may be the case that Heidegger only explicitly *mentions* thinking near the end of the essay, this in no way should lead to the conclusion that thinking receives “incidental treatment.” So long as we dwell within the openness, that space of the intimate (difference) relation, *we are thinking and thinking about and by it*, and so long as we let the difference be as it is by remaining-open (“authentic”), we name and preserve it—something which is proper to who we are as Dasein. Heidegger demonstrates this relation in meanings between “preserving” and dwelling when in “Building, Dwelling, Thinking” he writes, “The old word *bauen*, which says that man *is* insofar as he *dwells*, this word *bauen* however *also* means at the same time to cherish and protect, to preserve and care for....”¹²⁰ We already know that where we dwell and thus preserve and set-forth the “other beginning” from that which is always already there. This is why in the letter to the young student Heidegger writes of “guardianship” in that we are the guardians of Being, not that we protect Being as if it were “a treasure stored in a building,” but that we keep a watchful or vigilant eye (or attuned hearing) “for the has-been [attunement] and coming destiny [pro-jection] of Being.”¹²¹ If we remember back to SZ, the has-been and will-be are what constitute the moment or there of what is, hence the term “ecstatic unity.” We can say from this that a “Heideggerian method” exists insofar as such a method synthesizes radical questioning and the thinking in the face of such questioning in order that Dasein or “historical Dasein” is able to navigate its being-there. Therefore, such a method is the navigation for Dasein so as to call Dasein forth to build and set itself within a relation with Being and thus to name (and create) for itself something which allows meaning to come through once again.

Notes

¹ Martin Heidegger, “The Question Concerning Technology,” in *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*, trans. and ed. David Farrell Krell (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 341. My emphasis. Hereafter cited as QCT.

² Martin Heidegger, “The Nature of Language,” in *On the Way to Language*, trans. and ed. Peter D. Hertz (New York, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1971), 72. Hereafter cited as TNL.

³ I write of the “latter half” of Heidegger’s “later writings” as in the writings and lectures after SZ. Heidegger still writes of questioning (although questionableness seems to disappear), however, as time goes on, Heidegger begins to write more about thinking rather than questioning.

⁴ Heideggerian scholarship including Heidegger himself have noted that his thinking with these various philosophical themes, thinkers, and works is indeed forceful in that it is *violent*. More of this to come later on in the chapter.

⁵ MSH., 135.

⁶ More about this distinction to come.

⁷ Or better, *there*.

⁸ IM., 33.

⁹ Refer to SZ1.1 where Heidegger writes of “idle talk,” “curiosity,” and “ambiguity.” (See §35, §36, and §37 of Chapter 5, part B).

¹⁰ This understanding of “new” will become much clearer in the coming pages of this chapter when the discussion of Heidegger’s conception of thinking takes place.

¹¹ IM., 33.

¹² IM., 36.

¹³ Martin Heidegger, *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1999), 53. Hereafter cited as CP.

¹⁴ IM., 46.

¹⁵ IM., 46. My emphasis.

¹⁶ In MSH, Sheehan points out that what Heidegger was after in the course of his thought was never expressed the same and that he often used different words and terms (See pg. 5-8). While it is obvious that the meaning of Being and the swaying of be-ing are different terms, it should be noted that both were Heidegger’s attempts to express the same thing.

¹⁷ IM., 224. Heidegger’s emphasis.

¹⁸ IM., 167.

¹⁹ IM., 166.

²⁰ IM., 166.

²¹ IM., 167.

²² What Heidegger in SZ calls the “ontological difference.”

²³ Martin Heidegger, *The History of Beyng*, trans. William McNeill and Jeffery Powell (Indiana and Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015), 146. Hereafter cited as THB.

²⁴ Martin Heidegger, *Being and Truth*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010), 5-7.

²⁵ *Gelassenheit* was also the German title for *Discourse on Thinking*.

-
- ²⁶ There can never be a full removal of oneself from the situation Dasein as this situation is unique to Dasein. One can only remove oneself by way of turning away from the situation.
- ²⁷ Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1966), 19-20.
- ²⁸ CP., 69.
- ²⁹ THB., 51.
- ³⁰ THB., 50.
- ³¹ THB., 52.
- ³² See *The Gay Science*, p.181 (trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, Inc., 1974)).
- ³³ “Do we in our time have an answer to the question of what we really mean by the word ‘being’ [‘seiend’]? Not at all. So it is fitting that we should raise anew *the question of the meaning of being* [*Sein*]. But are nowadays even perplexed at our inability to understand the expression ‘being’ [‘Sein’]? Not at all ... This question has today been forgotten—although our time considers itself progressive in again affirming ‘metaphysics.’” SZ., xxix-1. Heidegger’s emphasis.
- ³⁴ Beyng [*Seyn*] was Heidegger’s attempt to get at a more “primordial” notion or word for Being [*Sein*].
- ³⁵ THB., 42.
- ³⁶ THB., 43.
- ³⁷ THB., 43.
- ³⁸ As Sheehan reminds the reader throughout MSH, what Heidegger was mostly concerned with in his thought spanning the earlier and later writings was meaning [*Sinn*]. While Heidegger used many terms to account for this meaning, he nonetheless wanted to get at meaning.
- ³⁹ But not *destruktion!* (cf. ch.1).
- ⁴⁰ “Annihilation here does not mean elimination or merely doing away with something on the basis of whatever is present at hand and holds validity; yet nor does it refer to a destruction or demolition in the sense of smashing into pieces what is at hand in the manner of a fragmentation.” THB., 43.
- ⁴¹ THB., 43.
- ⁴² This echoes back to SZI.1 where Heidegger analyses what he calls the “they self” (See §27. *Everyday Being a Self and the They*).
- ⁴³ CP., 91.
- ⁴⁴ QCT., 322.
- ⁴⁵ This is something too that Heidegger expresses in QCT (See p. 326).
- ⁴⁶ Take for example: “Certainly, in order to wring from what the words say, what it is they want to say, every interpretation [*interpretation*] must necessarily use violence. Such violence, however, cannot be roving arbitrariness.” Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics 5/e*, trans. Richard Taft (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1997), 141. (Also see Richardson’s thoughts on Heidegger’s violent interpretation of Kant where he ties it in with Heidegger’s notion of re-trieve, HPT., 158.) Or, take Heidegger’s preface to the second edition of KM, “Readers have taken constant offense at the violence of my interpretations. Their allegation of violence can indeed be supported by this text. Philosophicohistorical research is always correctly subject to this charge whenever it is directed against attempts to set in motion a thoughtful dialogue between thinkers” (KM., XX).

⁴⁷ Peter E. Gordon, “Heidegger, Neo-Kantianism, and Cassirer,” in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*, ed. François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013), 146.

⁴⁸ Peter E. Gordon, *Continental Divide: Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010), 211. Hereafter cited as CD.

⁴⁹ Upon questioning from Heidegger regarding the exact relation between finitude and infinity, Cassirer remarks that finitude and infinitude are separate worlds or things. Rather, infinitude is a fulfillment of finitude and that this conception of infinity is an “immanent infinitude.” KM., 201.

⁵⁰ “(2) Time is a necessary representation that underlies all intuitions. We cannot remove time itself from appearances in general, though we can quite well take away appearances from time. Time, therefore, is given *a priori*. In time alone is the actuality of appearances possible. All appearances may vanish, but time itself (as the universal condition of their possibility) cannot be removed.” Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Marcus Weigelt (London, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007), 67.

⁵¹ CD., 182.

⁵² KM., 160.

⁵³ “Every question concerning the Being of being, however, and even the question concerning the Being of that being to the constitution of whose Being finitude as the understanding of Being belongs, is metaphysics.” KM., 161.

⁵⁴ Ernst Cassirer, *An Essay on Man* (Yale University Press, 1944), 5-6. My emphasis.

⁵⁵ KM., 196 and 200.

⁵⁶ KM., 197.

⁵⁷ Note the similarity between the word *Geschöpflichkeit* [“creatureliness”] and *Geschichtlichkeit* [historicity], *Geschichte* [history], *Schicksal* [fate], and *Geschick* [destiny].

⁵⁸ Frank Schalow, *The Renewal of the Heidegger-Kant Dialogue: Action, Thought, and Responsibility* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 252. Hereafter cited as RHKD.

⁵⁹ RHKD., 255.

⁶⁰ KM., 197.

⁶¹ “Cassirer instead believed that whatever else freedom might entail, it surely must involve a liberation *from* anxiety.” CD., 187. Gordon’s emphasis.

⁶² CD., 186.

⁶³ CD., 188. While Gordon uses the term “temporal condition,” we can easily say that this term is synonymous with finiteness or finitude insofar as finitude is wholly dependent on a temporal nature or a temporal condition.

⁶⁴ “Dasein’s freedom is conditioned by thrownness in such a way that authentic Being-a-self cannot mean a release from this thrownness but instead means *a deepened understanding and acceptance of the thrown being one is*.” CD., 188. Gordon’s emphasis.

⁶⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Identity and Difference*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Evanston, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1969), 31. Hereafter cited as ID.

⁶⁶ ID., 33.

⁶⁷ MSH., 232.

⁶⁸ Here is Sheehan’s brilliant note on Heidegger’s take on *Ereignis*: “Instead, Heidegger understands *Ereignis* in terms of its etymological roots, which go back to the German word for ‘eye.’ The brothers Grimm had demonstrated that the original etymon of *Ereignis* is the Old High German *ouga*, ‘eye’ (see modern German *Auge*). *Ouga* underlies the Old High German verb *ir-ougen* and the Middle High German *er-ougen* and *er-äugen*, as well as the obsolete High

German verb *er-eigen*, all of which mean ‘to place before the eyes, to show,’ parallel to the Latin verbs *monstrare* and *ostendere*. Over the centuries, however, the etymology shifted significantly as the entirely unrelated adjective *eigen* (‘one’s own’) and its cognate verb *an-eigen* (‘to appropriate’) came to be associated with *sich er-eigen*. Eventually the two meanings—on the one hand, ‘to eye something,’ and on the other, ‘to own it’—got commingled. Furthermore, by the early 1600s the letter *n* crept in (as in *sich er-eignen*)” (MSH., 232). Something that Sheehan here misses is the connection between this etymological look at *Ereignis*, especially with the German word *eigen* and Heidegger’s use of the word *eigentlichkeit* in SZ. Therefore, the translation of *eigentlichkeit* as “ownness” now makes more sense than the traditional translation of “authenticity.” I still argue, however, that such word as *eigentlichkeit* must not only be translated directly but be translated with regards to Heidegger’s project in view, specifically SZ, hence “remaining-open.” Of course, the translation of “ownness” still factors in with understanding *eigentlichkeit* as remaining-open insofar as the remaining-open is that “position” towards what is “own” to Dasein. I would also argue that remaining-open still encompasses what Sheehan has demonstrated above with etymological roots of *Ereignis* as “eye,” “to show,” and “to see” as remaining-open entails a kind of “seeing” not in the literal sense of sight, but in the way of *viewing* or seeing in appearance. In other words, to remain-open, we must direct our gaze towards the event that is Dasein, or we can remain-unopen and divert our gaze away from the event.

⁶⁹ MSH., 234.

⁷⁰ Safranski in MH notices something similar regarding Heidegger’s notion of thinking where instead of conceptualizing it as the inability to grasp something “pure” or “whole” as I have done, he rather notes thinking, while expected to achieve a sense of “immediacy,” ultimately cannot. While Safranski does not put it in terms of the situation of the poetic thinker, he does mention a “distancing tendency” which he attributes to thinking. I would argue that yes, this is a characteristic of thinking, however, it finds its ground in the situation of the being who thinks. “If original Being-in is the closest, if in that proximity the things of life can unfold in their whole profusion, then a paradoxical constellation arises. Since thinking causes us to lose immediacy, any thinking that strives for proximity is, in consequence, expected to think against its own distancing tendency. Thinking that is at home in mediation is expected to get close to the immediate. But, in doing so, will it not then be like the fish out of water?” MH., 366.

⁷¹ Joan Stambaugh, *The Finitude of Being* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 55. Hereafter cited as TFB.

⁷² The reasoning for hyphenating “outstanding” is to emphasize, not only the being “out” as being in the future and the “standing” in that Dasein as Da-sein is standing There as There-being, but to bring understanding to Heidegger’s later writing of existence as “ek-sistence” (particularly in *Letter on Humanism*) which was to highlight the essence of the being of Dasein as being towards the future.

⁷³ Another instance of this point (in different terms) can be found in the first volume of Heidegger’s lectures on Nietzsche. When addressing the so-called discordance between truth and art in Nietzsche’s thought, as well as Nietzsche’s claim that his thought was “reversed Platonism,” Heidegger turns to the Platonic dialogue *Phaedrus* (where discussions of beauty and truth take place). Heidegger states, “But now we must catch a glimpse of man’s other essential determination. Because the view upon Being is exiled in the body, Being can never be behold purely in its unclouded brilliance; it can be seen only under the circumstance of our encountering this or that particular being.” Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche: Volumes One and Two*, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1979), 193.

⁷⁴ While all of this talk of inability might sound negative or tragic, the point is to elucidate another possibility that one could become aware of. It is not the case that in the face of this inability to grasp something, one must turn away from this something. On the contrary, it is to be thought that this acts as a call to follow-along; to turn towards it and somehow (as this chapter will later show) struggle against this.

⁷⁵ HW., 129.

⁷⁶ SZ., 233.

⁷⁷ Again, we see a similarity here between Heidegger's thought and Nietzsche's criticisms regarding the tendency that various thinkers through the history of philosophy and most notably in what Nietzsche called "European nihilism" had to attempt and move away from *this* world and towards another "*other-worldly*" world. While Heidegger does not put his concerns in terms of "worlds" (although the world has an important role in Heidegger's thought), it is the meaning behind the concerns and criticisms that are important. For both thinkers, there is an issue of *turning away* from what is most worthy of question and thought and therefore there must be a *turning towards* or return to what is most worthy. From what has been written on the relationship between the works of Heidegger and Nietzsche, none have said this explicitly, with the (somewhat) exception of Richardson in HPT. Richardson does not express this connection between Heidegger and Nietzsche exactly how I have done above, he does however write that what is at issue for both thinkers is "metaphysical nihilism" (362), metaphysical in that what is traditionally metaphysical (not *meta-physika*) that is, as Heidegger writes, a process of "making-present."

⁷⁸ "Strife among thinkers is the 'lovers' quarrel' concerning the matter itself." Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," in *Basic Writings*, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 239. Hereafter cited LH.

⁷⁹ MH., 354 [The anecdote appears in LH., 256].

⁸⁰ MH., 354.

⁸¹ MH., 354.

⁸² MH., 367. This was so as talk of questioning, questionability, and the *Seinsfrage* was mostly concerned with *Dasein* and "In point of fact, Heidegger had performed his *Dasein* analysis with an eye to Being..." (367).

⁸³ MH., 367.

⁸⁴ While Stambaugh is not fully clear on what she means by this, I take her to be arguing that *Dasein* and Being are no longer separated in that there now exists a relation which *Dasein* has become aware of, not that *Dasein* and Being are now one single entity; *Dasein* is still *Dasein* and Being is still Being.

⁸⁵ TFB., 62.

⁸⁷ IM., 68.

⁸⁸ In some Heideggerian scholarship, this written as "address."

⁸⁹ Martin Heidegger, "A Letter to a Young Student," in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2013), 181-182. Hereafter cited as LYS.

⁹⁰ To my knowledge, Heidegger has never written of hearing as being attuned, however, I have written it here so as to demonstrate the similarities that lie between talking of hearing like this and the translation of *Befindlichkeit* as "attunement."

⁹¹ One only has to think to "The Origin of the Work of Art" where we find Heidegger noting that "In the earth, however, as essentially self-secluding, the openness of the open region finds that which most intensely *resists* it..." While it is not my intention to equate what is being argued in

the current chapter is similar to a conception of the earth, I rather would like to demonstrate the similarities in thinking and/or language that he is using here and how we are talking of the “trace” of Being and how we are unable to grasp in, even in poetic thinking. Martin Heidegger, “The Origin of the Work of Art,” in *Basic Writings*, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 194. My emphasis. Hereafter cited as OWA.

⁹² L.M. Vail, *Heidegger and the Ontological Difference* (The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1972), 188.

⁹³ TNL., 69. My emphasis.

⁹⁴ ID., 31. Heidegger’s emphasis.

⁹⁵ Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, trans. J. Glenn Gray (New York, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1968), 186. Hereafter cited as WCT.

⁹⁶ WCT., 198.

⁹⁷ IM., 141.

⁹⁸ IM., 90.

⁹⁹ “In his essential unfolding within the history of Being, man is the being whose Being as ek-sistence consists in his dwelling in the nearness of Being. *Man is the neighbor of Being.*” LH., 245. My emphasis.

¹⁰⁰ WCT., 8-9.

¹⁰¹ “Being addresses itself to humans; the lightning flash of its address can in principle be seen by everybody who has come to authenticity and, thus, has not yet fallen, or no longer is the victim of the dominating scientific, technological, and thus nihilistic view of the world.” Joseph J. Kockelmans, *On the Truth of Being: Reflections on Heidegger’s Later Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 207.

¹⁰² David Halliburton, *Poetic Thinking: An Approach to Heidegger* (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press., 1981), 44. My translation. As a note, Halliburton’s use of the term “a people” might appear problematic, especially given Heidegger’s involvement in Nazism. The use of this quotation only seeks to revolve around the terms of “openness,” “concealment,” “struggle,” and “clearing” [*Lichtung*].

¹⁰³ CP., 245.

¹⁰⁴ THB., 124.

¹⁰⁵ THB., 123.

¹⁰⁶ WCT., 9.

¹⁰⁷ George Joseph Seidel, *Martin Heidegger and the Pre-Socratics: An Introduction to His Thought* (University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 147. Author’s translations, my emphasis. Hereafter cited as MHPS.

¹⁰⁸ MHPS., 147, fn. 96 “*Stiftung* would be the word in German used for the endowing of a university, the foundation of a monastery, etc.”

¹⁰⁹ OWA., 199.

¹¹⁰ In fact, we see this skepticism as early as the Davos debate where unlike Heidegger, Cassirer argues that it is Dasein’s ability to achieve a state of “immanent infinity” that is a demonstration of the creative capacities of Dasein.

¹¹¹ MHPS., 149. My emphasis.

¹¹² OWA., 200.

¹¹³ Heidegger mentions this phrase numerous times throughout the lectures of WCT. Of course it was not simply “thought-provoking times,” but a time where we did not think that proved to be most thought-provoking.

¹¹⁴ It should be noted that I have nothing against using the term “creativity” in terms of what poetic thinking does. My only issue is that to use such a term is in need of clarification to be put into context of Heidegger’s thought. In addition, we should not take creativity to then mean something “happy” or of that particular sort. Rather, creativity carries a great deal of weight with it; we may even say that this “Heideggerian creativity” is *burdensome*. This notion of creativity is not warm and fuzzy as it were. Instead, it is anxiety ridden; it is the result of something unsettling.

¹¹⁵ WCT., 202-205. My emphasis on “lies there.”

¹¹⁶ In an article titled “The Continually Expanding Limits of Hermeneutics: Heidegger on Poetic Expression, Nature, and the Holy,” Niall Keane comments on Heidegger’s thinking of poetry, especially the poetry of Hölderlin, as being a force which can gather people together and marks them as they are, thus leaving a trace. I take this to be an interesting use of the word “trace” as I have used it to mark the withdrawal of Being. One could certainly interpret Heidegger’s “trace” as “leaving a trace,” however, given how I have used the word, I have opted to account for this power of poetry as “setting-forth a new beginning” where a historical Dasein is able to interpret itself. Niall Keane, “The Continually Expanding Limits of Hermeneutics: Heidegger on Poetic Expression, Nature, and the Holy,” in *Research in Phenomenology* 46 (2016), 353.

¹¹⁷ Refer back to the Heraclitus story where a thinker was not involved in the extra-ordinary, but the ordinary (a baker’s oven). The gods are present, even in the most ordinary places and it is on behalf of the poetic thinker to establish this.

¹¹⁸ This served as the inspiration for Heidegger in the essay titled the same quoted phrase, which is translated in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2013), 211-227.

¹¹⁹ HPT., 589.

¹²⁰ Martin Heidegger, “Building, Dwelling, Thinking,” in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2013), 145.

¹²¹ LYS., 182. My notes.

Conclusion

The Relation Between Questioning and Thinking: A Synthesis

We now return to the quotation that commenced the second chapter, the so-called piety of thinking and the subservience of questioning to thinking. It should be obvious that to say questioning is submissive or obedient to thinking is slightly misleading given what we have demonstrated hitherto. This may be the result of either one (or both) of two reasons, that being either Heidegger meant for us to think about what it means to be subservient or pious in the “ancient sense,” or the translation of TNL ought to have offered some clarification. While it would not be surprising for Heidegger to use such language so as to lead us on to think about the relation between questioning and thinking, I do certainly believe that some clarification should have been given. To clear up any confusion, my reading of the statement is that questioning is not submissive or obedient to thinking in that questioning waits on hand and foot in the name of thinking, as if questioning were to be relegated to a lower class. Rather, I take submissiveness or obedience to be religious through and through (hence “pious”). On the contrary, questioning *serves* thinking. If we conceptualize thinking as a path that we follow along which also struggles against the confrontation of the clearing and follows the withdrawal of Being, it is questioning which *opens up* or *throws-open* that clearing for thinking, which would then make sense of Heidegger’s statement in the essay “The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking,” where he writes, “It is only such openness [of the clearing] that grants to giving and receiving and to any evidence at all the free space in which they can remain and must move.... All philosophical thinking that explicitly or inexplicitly follows the call ‘to the matter itself’ is in its movement and with its method already admitted to the free space of the clearing.”¹ In other words, questioning *provides* for thinking, or as Heidegger puts it in lecture VII of WCT, “The term [‘attempt at

thinking’] makes the claim that we are here taking a way of *questioning*, on which the problematic alone is accepted as the unique habitat and *locus* of thinking.”²

To drive home the connection between questioning and thinking, we can look at the German for both “submissive” and “obedience” which is the same for both words: *Gehorsam*. Other words in German that are close to *Gehorsam* are words such as *Gehör* [‘sense of hearing’], *gehören* [‘belonging to’], and *gehörig* [‘proper’]. We immediately get the sense that to even call the relation between questioning and thinking as “serving” misses the mark on the meaning that Heidegger is attempting to show with his comments. Questioning “belongs to” thinking, questioning is “proper” to thinking, or questioning has a “sense of hearing” for/towards thinking. The synthesis of questioning and thinking can then be expressed in the phrase “confrontational struggle” as questioning brings about a confrontation and it is then the role of thinking to struggle against that confrontation and what is thrown-open from questioning. Ultimately, the two cannot be separated and constitute a structural aspect of Dasein that are inextricably a part of Dasein’s (what I would like to call) “navigation” of its being-there. In general, the relation between Heidegger’s conceptions of questioning and thinking has received little to no attention with most scholars opting to treat both individually without much relating to one or the other. Not only is this surprising given that Heidegger still wrote of questioning in some of his later writings, but to think about the relation between questioning and thinking is one way in which we can study the transition or the so-called “turn.”³ The reason why I offer this interpretation in part is to come to an understanding of why there is a disconnect when speaking about questioning and thinking in Heidegger’s thought. It is understandable as to why this disconnect exists as questioning is a theme Heidegger mostly deals with in his early writings and lectures, while thinking gets the most treatment in the later writings and lectures (this is also why I have split the study into two chapters, one dealing with questioning and the early works, while the

second chapter deals with thinking and the later works). However, I maintain that throughout both chapters (and thus both questioning and thinking) there exists a theme of navigation or making sense of the being-there of Dasein, or a certain “Heideggerian method.” If I have illustrated in the two chapters of this study that questioning forms the major theme of the “early Heidegger” and thinking forms the major theme of the “later Heidegger,” what better way to elucidate the connection between the two than by uncovering the dual place that questioning and thinking have in Dasein’s navigation or its attempts at “making sense” of its situation. Another reason for focusing on questioning and thinking was an attempt to present Heidegger’s thought regarding them so as to re-think and (hopefully) to uncover the meaning that lies within questioning and thinking. For two “activities” which are so important in philosophy in general, they often go unnoticed, not only in their meaningfulness, but in their relevancy to what is possible and what we can bring about through them. This of course was to bring questioning and thinking into a domain (or *back into* a domain) other than the realm of abstract ideas. It should be noted that this in no way suggests that questioning and thinking need to be completely removed from this area. Rather, this is to demonstrate other possibilities for questioning and thinking in how we can come to understand them, as well as to explore what can come about (as possibilities) from them. Moreover, this serves to shine a light on a theme that, while Heidegger does not explicitly express this and what Heideggerian scholarship has left largely untouched, is surrounding the making of certain forms of questioning and thinking absolute, thus seizing upon the navigation of Dasein and its possibilities of how it can come to understand itself. Heidegger never set out to demonize technology, abstract thought, calculative thinking, and/or the sciences. His goal was to show how these forms of understanding and “knowledge” were not the only ways of understanding nor was it the be all end all of such understanding. What is most important to take away here is that Heidegger’s work was largely based around an “other

beginning” that he saw was inevitable. Therefore, there was a need in place to better understand the situation that we as Dasein find ourselves in so that we could learn how to position ourselves and be open to this other beginning. What I intended to demonstrate in the study was how to understand Heidegger’s need to position himself towards this other beginning, which I have done by way of an analysis of his themes of questioning and thinking. Tracing his thought throughout his early and later periods shows that Heidegger was always aware of what he was after and this never changed, even though the style of his work did. While Heidegger did express at times a dissatisfaction with his earlier work, it should not be taken that this dissatisfaction is with the work in its entirety. What was at issue was *how* he was going about getting at what he was after. It is interesting to see that what Heidegger was working out in his later period was not just confined to a thinker establishing a “system” on how to think or position oneself towards a certain matter. It appears that Heidegger himself was taking on his learning to position; he was enacting his own method and not distancing himself from his own investigation. Even though this is most evident in his later lectures and essays, it rings loudly of his earliest thought of attempting to revitalize what it means to question and that an investigation or method was needed that turned on the very being that gave rise to it. It is then through a radical conceptualization of questioning (the *Seinsfrage*) and thinking (poetic thinking) that set the stage for this other beginning. Through questioning, Dasein opens *itself* up and opens itself up *to* its situation which then, in facing its existence, is called to think *in spite* of this uniqueness of its existence and situation as being-there to then bestow a beginning from out of this questioning and thinking that brings Dasein into a proper relation to itself.

Notes

¹ Martin Heidegger, “The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking,” in *Basic Writings*, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 443.

² WCT., 185. My note, Heidegger’s emphasis.

³ For Sheehan, the second out of three turns.

Bibliography

- Bambach, Charles R. "Phenomenological Research as *Destruktion*: The Early Heidegger's Reading of Dilthey." In *Philosophy Today* 37, no. 2, summer 1993.
- Buren, John van. *The Young Heidegger: Rumour of the Hidden King*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Campbell, Scott M. "Early Lecture Courses." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*. Edited by François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013.
- Cassirer, Ernst. *An Essay on Man*. Yale University Press, 1944.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Heidegger Ways*. Translated by John W. Stanley. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Gordon, Peter E. *Continental Divide: Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- . "Heidegger, Neo-Kantianism, and Cassirer." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*. Edited by François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013.
- Halliburton, David. *Poetic Thinking: An Approach to Heidegger*. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press., 1981.
- Heidegger, Martin. "A Letter to a Young Student." In *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2013.
- . *Being and Time*. Translated Joan Stambaugh. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2010.
- . *Being and Truth*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2010.
- . "Building, Dwelling, Thinking." In *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2013.
- . *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- . "Critical Comments on Karl Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews*." In *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927*. Edited by Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

- . *Discourse on Thinking*. Translated by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1966.
- . *Identity and Difference*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Evanston, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1969.
- . *Introduction to Metaphysics 2/e*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- . *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*. Translated by Daniel O. Dahlstrom. Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- . *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics 5/e*. Translated by Richard Taft. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- . “Language.” In *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York, New York: Harper Perennial Modern Thought, 2013.
- . “Letter on Humanism.” In *Basic Writings*. Translated by David Farrell Krell. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.
- . “Letter to Karl Löwith on His Philosophical Identity.” In *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927*. Edited by Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007.
- . *Nietzsche: Volumes One and Two*. Translated by David Farrell Krell. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1979.
- . *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- . “Phenomenology and Theology.” In *Pathmarks*. Edited by William McNeill. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . “The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking.” In *Basic Writings*. Translated by David Farrell Krell. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.
- . *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- . *The History of Beyng*. Translated by William McNeill and Jeffery Powell. Indiana and Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015.
- . “The Nature of Language.” In *On the Way to Language*. Edited and translated by Peter D. Hertz. New York, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1971.

- . “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In *Basic Writings*. Translated by David Farrell Krell. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.
- . “The Question Concerning Technology.” In *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*. Edited and translated by David Farrell Krell. New York, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.
- . *What is Called Thinking*. Translated by J. Glenn Gray. New York, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1968.
- . “What is Metaphysics?” In *Pathmarks*. Edited by William McNeill. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*. Translated by Quentin Lauer. New York, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1965.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Marcus Weigelt. London, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 2007.
- Keane, Niall. “The Continually Expanding Limits of Hermeneutics: Heidegger on Poetic Expression, Nature, and the Holy.” In *Research in Phenomenology* 46, 2016.
- Kockelmans, Joseph J. *On the Truth of Being: Reflections on Heidegger’s Later Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- McGrath, Sean J. *The Early Heidegger and Medieval Philosophy: Phenomenology for the Godforsaken*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, Inc., 1974.
- Richardson, William J. *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*. Martinus Nijhoff/ The Hague., 1963.
- Safranski, Rüdiger. *Martin Heidegger: Between Good and Evil*. Translated by Ewald Osers. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Schalow, Frank. *The Renewal of the Heidegger-Kant Dialogue: Action, Thought, and Responsibility*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Schmidt, Dennis J. “Being and Time.” In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*. Edited by François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013.
- Sheehan, Thomas. *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*. London, England: Rowman & Littleman International Ltd., 2015.

—. “The Turn: All Three of Them.” In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*. Edited by François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson. London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., 2013.

Seidel, George Joseph. *Martin Heidegger and the Pre-Socratics: An Introduction to His Thought*. University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Stambaugh, Joan. *The Finitude of Being*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Vail, L.M. *Heidegger and the Ontological Difference*. The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1972.