

TIME AND THE SHARED WORLD

Northwestern University  
Studies in Phenomenology  
and  
Existential Philosophy

---

Founding Editor †James M. Edie

General Editor Anthony J. Steinbock

Associate Editor John McCumber

---



# TIME AND THE SHARED WORLD

Heidegger on Social Relations

Irene McMullin

---

Northwestern University Press  
Evanston, Illinois

Northwestern University Press  
www.nupress.northwestern.edu

Copyright © 2013 by Northwestern University Press. Published 2013. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McMullin, Irene.

Time and the shared world : Heidegger on social relations /  
Irene McMullin.

p. cm. — (Northwestern University studies in phenomenology and  
existential philosophy)

Originally presented as the author's thesis (doctoral)—Rice University.  
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8101-2903-0 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-8101-2902-3  
(pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Heidegger, Martin, 1889–1976. 2. Time—Philosophy. 3. Intersubjectivity.  
I. Title. II. Series: Northwestern University studies in phenomenology &  
existential philosophy.

B3279.H49M3758 2013

193—dc23

2012046386

Except where otherwise noted, this book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

In all cases attribution should include the following information:

McMullin, Irene. *Time and the Shared World: Heidegger on Social Relations*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2013.

For permissions beyond the scope of this license, visit <http://www.nupress.northwestern.edu/>.

### Knowledge Unlatched

An electronic version of this book is freely available, thanks to the support of libraries working with Knowledge Unlatched. KU is a collaborative initiative designed to make high-quality books open access for the public good. More information about the initiative and links to the open-access version can be found at [www.knowledgetunlatched.org](http://www.knowledgetunlatched.org).

To Matthew, Lucy, and Mary:  
the shared world is full of joy because of you.

*—time is a tree (this life one leaf)  
but love is the sky and i am for you  
just so long and long enough*





---

# Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction: Time and the Shared World	3
1 The “Subject” of Inquiry	15
2 Mineness and the Practical First-Person	39
3 Being and Otherness: Sartre’s Critique	58
4 Heideggerian Apriority and the Categories of Being	77
5 The Temporality of Care	105
6 <i>Fürsorge</i> : Acknowledging the Other Dasein	141
7 Authenticity, Inauthenticity, and the Extremes of <i>Fürsorge</i>	184
Conclusion	231
Notes	235
Bibliography	269
Index	293



---

## Acknowledgments

None of this would be possible without the love and support of my family—especially my mother’s unflagging faith in me. Thank you, Mom, for being the bedrock of my life. Jim, Heather, and Neil: you have been a tremendous inspiration—the many times you have made me laugh in the face of despair are too numerous to count.

This book began as my dissertation work at Rice University under the wise and wonderful direction of Steven Crowell, a man whose incisive critiques and disciplined writing will always serve as the philosophical model I strive to emulate. Steve’s extraordinary work on normativity and the space of meaning, on the relationship between Husserl and Heidegger, on the question of authenticity—among many other topics—is an exemplar of philosophical excellence. Thank you, Steve—it has been an honor and a privilege to work with you. The hours spent in your seminars will always number among my happiest.

I am grateful for the support provided by Rice University—including the Vaughn Dissertation Fellowship, the Mellon Foundation Fellowship, and the Dunlevie Teaching Fellowship. Rice was a marvelous place to attend graduate school, not only because of the exceptional faculty—especially George Sher, Rachel Zuckert, and Tristram Engelhardt—but also because of the wonderful graduate students with whom I shared many a beer and philosophical discussion at Valhalla. This book is about sharing the world with others, and what better people to teach me this than the following treasured souls: Will Smith, Matt Schunke, Philip Robichaud, Garret Merriam, Christine Ogilvie Hendren, Leslie McNolty, Dave Snyder, Michelle Calabretta, and Janet Malek. These pages are filled with your bright philosophical spirits.

In 2006 I received a research fellowship from the *Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst*, for which I am extremely grateful. My year studying in Germany with the wonderful László Tengelyi at Bergische Universität played a tremendous role in developing my thinking on these issues. I am thankful to him and to the brilliant Inga Römer for their friendship.

Over the years I have had the privilege of working with several philosophers whose impact on my career cannot be overstated. Bill Blattner’s

extraordinary work on Heidegger and temporality in many ways served as the spark that ignited the argument of this book. Though I adopt a critical stance toward his brilliant work, this should be taken as the highest compliment that one philosopher can pay another. Iain Thomson's outstanding work and his support for my own philosophical pursuits are also deeply appreciated. I am grateful to Dermot Moran, whose visiting professorship at Rice came at the perfect time for helping me in the formative years of my dissertation writing. Dermot's irrepressible spirit and unflagging enthusiasm for my work were a highlight of my time there.

Over the past six years I have been fortunate to work with marvelous colleagues in the philosophy department at the University of Arkansas. I am particularly grateful for the extraordinary support of Tom Senor—the world's best department chair—and for the hours of philosophical debate with Jack Lyons. I will miss the friendly halls of Old Main.

Finally, I would like to thank Matthew Burch, my best friend, my wisest critic, and my most inspiring partner in all things. Nothing is more fun than discussing ideas with you. I am grateful beyond measure for the unbelievable support that you have always given me. I knew I liked you from the minute we met.

---

## Abbreviations

### *Heidegger*

“AS”	“Anaximander Saying”
BPP	<i>Basic Problems of Phenomenology</i>
BT	<i>Being and Time</i>
EHF	<i>The Essence of Human Freedom</i>
FCM	<i>The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics</i>
HCT	<i>History of the Concept of Time</i>
IPR	<i>Introduction to Phenomenological Research</i>
KPM	<i>Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics</i>
MFL	<i>Metaphysical Foundations of Logic</i>
“OEG”	“On the Essence of Ground”
OHF	<i>Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity</i>
PIA	<i>Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle</i>
WCT	<i>What Is Called Thinking?</i>
ZS	<i>The Zollikon Seminars</i>

### *Husserl*

<i>Crisis</i>	<i>The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy</i>
<i>Ideas I</i>	<i>Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book</i>
<i>Ideas II</i>	<i>Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: Second Book</i>

*Other Authors*

- BN*      *Being and Nothingness*, Jean-Paul Sartre
- HLWD*    *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*, Cristina Lafont
- HTI*      *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism*, William Blattner
- "DR"      "Diachrony and Representation," Emmanuel Levinas

TIME AND THE SHARED WORLD





# Time and the Shared World

This book analyzes the implications of Heidegger's critique of traditional theories of subjectivity for any conception of "intersubjectivity," demonstrating that one can benefit from Heidegger's radically new characterization of human selfhood without being committed to the distorted and solipsistic social ontology that is often deemed to be its direct consequence. Dominant interpretations tend to misunderstand Heidegger's work in this regard by characterizing the Heideggerian self—*Dasein*<sup>1</sup>—as either too solipsistic or too selfless. In response I develop an account of *Dasein*'s social nature that is grounded in Heidegger's notion that *Dasein*'s originary temporality expresses itself in a heedful accommodation of the temporalizing presence of the other *Dasein*. In doing so I am able to provide an account of *Dasein*-to-*Dasein* relationships as a type of mutual recognition of individuated personhood within everydayness. Such an "interdasein" relationship is neither suffocated under *das Man* anonymity nor dependent on a previously accomplished authenticity.

Despite the many interpretations to the contrary, I argue that Heidegger's work on the social nature of the self must be located within a philosophical continuum that not only builds on Kant and Husserl's work regarding the nature of the a priori and the fundamental structures of human temporality, but also points forward to the ways in which these themes will be further developed both in his own later work and by such thinkers as Sartre and Levinas. By demonstrating the manner in which *Dasein*'s fundamental being-with-others is first and foremost a responsive acknowledgment of the other's particularity, I am able to provide a Heidegger-inspired account of respect and the intersubjective origins of normativity. I thereby show how Heidegger may serve as a valuable resource for developing an appropriately complex understanding of the relationship between persons—a novel contribution not only to contemporary Heidegger scholarship but also to the philosophical tradition as a whole.

Unlike the common interpretive tendency to view Heidegger's scattered commentary on ethical and intersubjective themes as disinterested asides, then—a view that reads their unsystematic and incomplete nature as betraying moral and philosophical flaws in both Heidegger and his work—this book takes these comments to offer more extensive resources

than is generally recognized. Focusing not only on Heidegger's *Being and Time* but also on his *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, *History of the Concept of Time*, and *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, as well as a wide variety of recently published lecture courses ranging from his 1921 *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* through to the *Zollikon Seminars* of the 1960s, this discussion demonstrates that Heidegger's corpus displays a consistent concern with the problem of intersubjectivity.

It is important to note, however, that an enormous amount of interpretive and reconstructive work is necessary in order to produce a feasible "Heideggerian intersubjectivity." Heidegger himself only provided fragments—which means that this book is not so much an interpretation as a creative restructuring of his work aimed at building from it a coherent, unified position that explicitly addresses this issue. *Why* Heidegger failed fully to develop his own position—whether out of a tendency to take Husserl's extensive work on this topic for granted, because he was primarily interested in examining the conditions for the possibility of the solitary task of philosophizing, or simply out of moral bankruptcy—will not be considered. The issue of Heidegger's reprehensible personal orientations will be bracketed in the interest of fleshing out the undeveloped social implications that are undeniably present in his work.

To understand what Heidegger has to offer to debates on intersubjectivity requires one to first recognize the novel way in which he transforms the notion of subjectivity. Heidegger rejects traditional characterizations of selfhood largely because they present the self as an isolated, independent substance required to "bridge the gap" to reach or recognize the world and others like itself. This stance is evident, for example, in the traditional "problem of other minds," which takes as its starting point the independent subject and then seeks to provide an epistemological account of how it is possible to know that others have an inner life analogous to one's own, despite the fact that one only ever has access to one's own inner life. Taking such an epistemological orientation means that the problem of other minds is derivative of the "problem of the external world"; an investigation into the reliability of knowledge that purports to be about anything other than the thinking self. Rooted in modern skepticism, both the problem of the external world and the problem of other minds thus rely on a conception of the self as a type of autonomous subject that can be radically isolated and distinguished from the world, the others who share the world, and even the thinker's own body. Unsurprisingly, Heidegger typically refers to such a picture of selfhood as "Cartesian," since it finds its most profound expression in the self-enclosed independence of Descartes's *cogito sum*.<sup>2</sup> Having assumed at the outset that there is a gulf between self and world, the philosophical game since Descartes has been to "prove" that the gulf is not unbridge-

able. Even in cases where an explicit proof of the external world or of other minds is not the primary purpose of the philosophical analysis, the tendency has not been to dismiss the demand for such a proof as illegitimate and misguided, but to assume that it has been or will be achieved. In doing so, such stances simply assume the isolated subject and its “inner” life as the philosophical starting point.

This starting point has infected all accounts of intersubjectivity, which tend to derive an understanding of social/political relationships on the basis of the nature of the individuals that are taken to be the basic units comprising them. This stance is evident, for example, in social contract theory’s attempt to characterize the nation-state on the basis of a particular understanding of “state of nature” individuals. By beginning with the notion of a rational individual struggling for survival, one produces a characterization of the nation-state as an institution designed to maximize the effectiveness of that struggle. The social arena is merely a reflection of the inner life of the self-enclosed subject. Theories of empathy also demonstrate this orientation toward characterizing the sociality of the self in terms of the individual’s “pre”-social qualities or capacities—qualities that are then simply mapped onto other persons and social contexts after the fact. According to such approaches, empathy does not mean a particular way of existing in terms of some other specific person—as in “Neil was empathizing with her sorrow”—it also refers to the condition for understanding other humans *qua* humans at all.<sup>3</sup> As a result, empathy is supposed to “provide the first ontological bridge from one’s own subject, initially given by itself, to the other subject, which is initially quite inaccessible” (*BT* 124/117).

In contrast, Heidegger refuses to adopt the starting point from which such problematics arise. Rather than seeking an ontological bridge from self to other, Heidegger rejects the philosophical commitments underpinning the traditional problem of other minds according to which such a bridge is needed. We can no longer begin with an isolated self who must then “reach” the others through explicit acts of knowledge or inferences from analogy.<sup>4</sup> Heidegger argues, rather, that there *is* no human self in the absence of the other. Beginning with a particular characterization of an “a”- or “pre”-social form of human existing is a seriously misleading approach, then, because it means that the capacities by virtue of which we might recognize and interact with others are assumed in advance, thereby ignoring the role that encounters with others play in structuring and developing these very capacities. For Heidegger, we need others to become knowers at all. As Frederick Olafson notes: “In such an approach, the philosophical inquirer is assumed to be already situated in and familiar with a world that lends itself to the kind of comprehension that eventually finds full expression in the sciences of

nature. At the same time, however, he is supposed to be in a position that enables him to raise doubts as to whether there is any other being that is like him in this respect.<sup>75</sup> These two demands are contradictory, however, insofar as the situated familiarity with the world characteristic of the first assumption is dependent on the very others who are brought into question in the second. For Heidegger, engaging in an inquiry regarding the problem of other minds implies the capacity to treat this question as just another “fact” to be ascertained in the absence of any recognition that the endeavor itself—with its public, inherited language of inquiry and its collaboratively determined conceptions of proof—presupposes this very existence.

The problem is not the failure to produce a compelling account of how one bridges the gulf between two isolated self-enclosed subjects. Contrary to Kant’s claim, Heidegger argues that “the ‘scandal of philosophy’ does not consist in the fact that this proof [of the external world] is still lacking up to now, but *in the fact that such proofs are expected and attempted again and again*” (*BT* 205/190). The existence of the external world and of other minds is only problematic insofar as we engage in a highly theoretical characterization of subjectivity that is modeled on the existence of things; a characterization in which one subject is trapped in its cabinet-like self with no key to the “cabinet doors” of others. Theories that begin with such an autonomous self cannot hope to overcome the solipsism with which they have begun.

In contrast with these problematic approaches, Heidegger engages in a radical break with the tradition by refusing to engage in a characterization of human existence that allows these topics to appear as problems at all. The self does not need to “find” a way to the world and the others who share it since it is always already defined by its worldly commitments, activities, and relationships. As we will see, to be *Dasein* is to always already be “in” the world: defined in terms of its structures, skillfully coping with its tasks, responsive to its claims. For Heidegger, any philosophical position that demands an account of how the self “reaches” the world has already failed to recognize the phenomenon to be explained. Rather than accounting for how one isolated subject encounters another, then, Heidegger argues that the whole endeavor must be dismissed as a dramatic misrepresentation of human experience: “a mere subject ‘is’ not initially and is also never given. And, thus, an isolated I without the others is in the end just as far from being given initially” (*BT* 116/109).

In contrast to traditional starting points, then, the Heideggerian account of the self is an attempt to transform this Cartesian picture of the isolated or monolithic subject. In doing so, Heidegger introduces a notion of social subjectivity that accommodates the other-directed nature

of selfhood such that it becomes ontologically defined by its “being-with-othersness.” Unlike other theories that emphasize the fundamental sociality of human existing, however, Heidegger does not characterize this essential “being-with” (or *Mitsein*) in terms of a primal struggle for recognition or participation in a language community. Others are encountered, rather, in terms of a shared immersion in the public roles, orientations, and norms through which Dasein understands itself. Others play a necessary role in the very constitution of one’s being because each self is dependent on the others to institute and maintain the shared world in terms of which it understands who it can be.

Despite this attempt to accommodate the necessary role that others play in Dasein’s very being, however, Heidegger’s approach has been subject to significant criticism. Since the Heideggerian self is immersed in the world and understands itself and others through the world’s public meanings and general categories, one such self does not seem able to directly encounter this or that other person in her concrete individuality. Indeed, the actual presence of the individual other appears to be completely *irrelevant* in Heidegger’s view, since this co-being with others constitutes a necessary structural characteristic of human existence itself and is not “something which occurs at times on the basis of the existence of others” (*BT* 120/113). By simply stipulating that human being is a “being-with” others—a “being-with” that is not accomplished or created through direct encounters—Heidegger appears to move the generality, anonymity, and mediation that may characterize *particular* social roles to the level of an a priori category that characterizes one’s very way of being. In defining human selfhood as fundamentally characterized by with-others-ness, Heidegger seems to be guilty of advocating a position that cannot accommodate the immediate experiences of others in their concrete particularity. Rather, one can only ever encounter other persons as representative types able to trigger particular preexisting categories—be they ontic social categories or the overarching ontological category *Mitsein*. Individual persons do not play a role in constituting or developing these categories, but are interchangeable instances whose uniqueness is subsumed to the category by which one knows them. By simply stipulating that a self is always with others, then, Heidegger cannot do justice to the social encounter in all its particularity—the role that being with this or that other person plays in the very constitution of the self. Variations on this criticism have haunted Heidegger’s position since Jean-Paul Sartre made it famous in *Being and Nothingness*. Emmanuel Levinas’s elaboration on its implications has only served to entrench this reading such that this interpretation of the social dimension of Heidegger’s work has by now come to have the status of established

fact. The verdict appears to be in: Heidegger's very efforts to accommodate the self's fundamental other-directedness seem to have the ironic consequence of preventing it.

In attempting to avoid such a conclusion about Heidegger's position, commentators have traditionally focused on the individuating role that *Angst*<sup>6</sup> and authenticity play in *Being and Time*, arguing that Heidegger makes room for the possibility of direct encounters between individuals because of the individuating nature of the conditions picked out with these concepts. But characterizing the possibility of any concrete encounter between individuals in terms of a prerequisite authenticating individuation will condemn social encounters to an extremely rarefied status, since Heidegger is clear that these conditions are not the norm. Though authenticity and the capacity for authenticity will be important aspects of the social encounter, my purpose in this book is to show that concrete encounters between individuals are possible from within the confines of everyday existing. In doing so, I demonstrate that such encounters are not contingent on a prior, rare authenticity—indeed, it becomes evident that direct encounters between individual selves can be conducive to authentic existing in one or both participants. In contrast, the many *Angst* and authenticity-focused attempts to escape this critique are particularly problematic insofar as they encourage the view that Heidegger is advocating a type of existential solipsism—thereby undermining whatever he may claim elsewhere about the self's fundamentally social nature.

The task of the book will be to articulate the manner in which a self can be both dependent on others to be what it is and yet display an individuation that prevents it from being merely an interchangeable token of the type "Dasein." This book's agenda, then, is to navigate the Scylla and Charybdis of a self that is too dependent on others and one that is too independent. Heidegger's account of selfhood, I will argue, provides such a middle ground. In order to make this case, however, I must do a great deal of philosophical construction. The majority of this text is an articulation of what I believe Heidegger *ought* to have said—or was "*trying*" to say—based both on his other philosophical commitments and the nature of the "things themselves." Since this type of constructive interpretation was characteristic of Heidegger's own approach to the history of philosophy, it seems only fitting that his own work should be subject to the same treatment. Though it will be impossible to avoid importing aspects of my own interpretive agenda, I hope to avoid doing violence to Heidegger's work and to provide, instead, a realization of the strengths of his account of subjectivity by working out its necessary implications for any account of intersubjectivity.

Though Heidegger supplied the foundation, then, the house must still be built, and in this text I do so by developing the above argument in the following steps:

### Chapter 1: "The 'Subject' of Inquiry"

This chapter outlines the reasons for Heidegger's reformulation of human subjectivity and explains the terms and concepts necessary for understanding his account of the structures that define Dasein. According to Heidegger, Dasein's way of being is a transcending immersion in the world that is grounded in its care for who it is to be. This care structure is defined by the fact that (1) Dasein finds itself in a situation in which things matter to it, (2) Dasein must address itself practically to different possibilities of response in the face of the world's mattering, and (3) Dasein is never alone, but always finds itself with others and understands itself—and them—in terms of the public norms and practices that they share.

### Chapter 2: "Mineness and the Practical First-Person"

Here I show that, despite the anonymity and averageness that this worldly conception of the self seems to entail, Heidegger has room for an everyday understanding of the first-personal, individuated nature of the self without having to restrict this individuated selfhood to the condition of authenticity. Though the *capacity* to experience authenticity involves existential structures that are essential conditions for Dasein's everyday way of being "mine," they need not be authentically grasped or appropriated as such for them to manifest themselves in Dasein's everyday way of being. Since my primary concern here is our *everyday* existence as social selves, the extremes of authenticity and inauthenticity are not addressed in detail until chapter 7. This everyday way of being mine is instead analyzed in terms of Heidegger's characterization of the self as defined by intentionality. This chapter demonstrates that Heidegger's account of the type of first-person self-presence characterizing intentionality offers an attractive middle way between the extreme positions put forth in the debate on this issue between Hubert Dreyfus and John Searle.

### Chapter 3: "Being and Otherness: Sartre's Critique"

This chapter illustrates how, based on Heidegger's reformulation of traditional concepts of subjectivity, a Heideggerian account of intersubjectivity faces the objection outlined above. I provide the details of this objection through the lens of Sartre's criticism as it is articulated in *Being and Nothingness*. There Sartre argues that Heidegger's characterization of the fundamentally social nature of human existing fails because it simply stipulates an a priori category specific to others without explaining how the individual selfhood of these others could be directly encountered as such. For Sartre, Heidegger cannot move from the ontological to the ontic. As I will show, however, Sartre's account itself falls victim to a difficulty that Heidegger's does not: namely, Sartre's emphasis on the facticity and contingency of the intersubjective encounter will not allow him to account for the fact that such encounters leave a trace—that the public nature of the world and the structures of subjectivity itself continue to speak of the presence of others even when they are not concretely present. In his failure to accommodate this, Sartre essentially cannot move from the ontic to the ontological. In light of the difficulties that the Sartre discussion raises, it becomes clear that Heidegger's existential category "being-with" must not only preserve its ability to explain this residue of social presence which remains despite the absence of concrete others—but it must do so while avoiding the danger of losing the individual other to the anonymity of an a priori category.

### Chapter 4: "Heideggerian Apriority and the Categories of Being"

Chapter 4 addresses this issue by turning to an analysis of the manner in which Dasein's structures can be understood as a priori categories. I argue in this section that Heidegger's existential analytic is essentially a reformulation of traditional transcendental apriority aimed at both maintaining the categorial nature of human experience—the view that our way of being contributes to what and how something is experienced—and preserving a type of realism whereby what is encountered shapes the categories of experience. In following this path, I argue that Heidegger's reconception of the a priori both follows Husserl in its recognition of the fundamental *responsiveness* of the categories to the concrete existences in which they are operative, and follows Kant in charac-



terizing the existences to which these categories are responsive in terms of *temporality*. The authority of the categories—how they permit us to immediately encounter things other than the self—will therefore lie in their ability to allow things encountered to be experienced in their particular temporal mode of existing. On this basis, I show that Heideggerian being-with must allow one self to directly encounter another because it is a category responsive to the other in her temporal particularity.

### Chapter 5: “The Temporality of Care”

This chapter explains the structure of the responsive, temporally particular intersubjective encounter. According to Heidegger, understanding our way of being in the world demands that we recognize the unique temporality on which it is based. This temporalizing existing is characterized by an ecstatic relationality to otherness which accounts for the fact that (1) time has a duration relating the present to past and future, (2) Dasein’s temporalizing can be indexically tied to worldly events and meanings, and (3) time’s relational structure involves the direct encounter of one temporalizing self with another. In this chapter I demonstrate how the mutual accommodation that occurs in this shared temporal presence constitutes the public measures and meanings of the world. In doing so, I provide an original interpretation of Heidegger’s account of Dasein’s temporality—emphasizing the role that others must play on the most basic levels of Dasein’s being-in-the-world. Because these encounters occur on a level prior to anonymous public categories and involve the direct acknowledgment of the other in the particularity of her temporalizing care, they cannot be understood as simple subsumptions of the other’s particularity to a preexisting general category. This reading thereby undermines Sartre’s claim that Heidegger’s position does not allow for such immediate, particular encounters.

### Chapter 6: “*Fürsorge*: Acknowledging the Other Dasein”

On the basis of the analysis in chapter 5, chapter 6 turns to an elaboration of this temporal recognition of the other, articulating how all modes of human social encounter fall within a continuum characterized by this recognition—which Heidegger calls “solicitude” (*Fürsorge*). Though it is

possible to act in ways that subsequently contradict the immediacy of the acknowledgment that occurs when I recognize others as persons, I show in this chapter that we cannot *but* first recognize them as such. I compare Heidegger's position in this regard to Kant's person/thing distinction and examine the manner in which this type of acknowledgment can be considered a type of respect. This chapter concludes with an analysis of discourse and other modes of being-with in which this minimal acknowledgment of the other's personhood discloses itself in an everyday way. I demonstrate that Heidegger's account of discourse is irreducible to language or to understanding, but instead explains the shared orientation to the world that is the essence of communication. In doing so, I show how Heideggerian discourse is the foundation for language—though irreducible to it—because it makes possible the co-appropriation of meaning necessary for the publicity of linguistic intelligibility.

#### Chapter 7: "Authenticity, Inauthenticity, and the Extremes of *Fürsorge*"

Having considered the everyday modes of interaction, the final chapter turns to the extremes of the solicitude continuum. I demonstrate first why even the most reifying and abusive ways of being toward others can still be deemed modes of temporalizing accommodation and recognition, despite their deficient character. In doing so, it will be necessary to examine why Heidegger dubs such modes of being-with inauthentic. The answer lies in their tendency to treat the others in terms of temporal categories appropriate to things, thereby covering over the role that these others play as temporalizing co-constitutors of the shared space of world time. The opposite pole of the social continuum designates those attitudes and behaviors in which recognition of the other in all his temporalizing complexity is taken as one's guiding principle. Because such a mode of being toward the other demands an explicit awareness of this temporalizing way of being—an awareness resistant, therefore, to the inauthentic tendency to interpret persons using temporal categories appropriate for things—Heidegger characterizes such relationships as authentic. This chapter considers objections to the view that relationships between persons can be genuinely understood as authentic in Heidegger's view, considering the tendency to interpret Heideggerian authenticity as a form of solipsism. The discussion will conclude by examining some of the moral implications of this type of relationship, focusing particularly on the call of conscience—the way in which authen-

ticity manifests itself qua discourse—and the manner in which another person can thereby summon me to a greater fullness and responsibility in being.

### Notes on Method

Contemporary Heidegger scholarship is a field dominated by a number of mutually exclusive interpretative tendencies. This book endorses a primarily philosophical rather than historical treatment of Heidegger's work. Unlike many Heidegger scholars, I take his contributions to be another moment in the history of philosophy and not such a radical break with it that one must henceforth speak only in Heidegger's idiom. As a result, this book reads Heidegger as a transcendental phenomenologist deeply indebted to the innovations of Edmund Husserl. Though Heidegger's contributions to enriching phenomenology were extraordinary—providing, above all, an existential grounding for Husserl's analyses of meaning—these contributions cannot be fully understood or appreciated without recognizing the manner in which they were a development of, and not a simple break with, Husserl's work. Understood as such, this discussion presents Heidegger as a phenomenologist concerned with the first-person experience of meaning—despite the fact that his project was aimed at transforming the way in which the first-person is to be understood. Similarly, I read Heidegger as a transcendental philosopher insofar as he was (a) concerned with the philosophical articulation of the conditions for the possibility of such first-person meaning, and (b) committed to a rigorous understanding of the norms that must govern such a philosophical endeavor.

This is not an uncontroversial stance. Heidegger's critique of the tradition and reformulation of the notion of subjectivity have prompted some readers to view Heidegger's project not as a *development of* but as a fundamental *break with* the philosophical tradition and its struggle to analyze the nature of the self. On this interpretation, Heidegger's notion of Dasein is taken to be radically other than what philosophers historically (or presently) designate by concepts such as "subjectivity," "subject," or "self." Dasein has nothing to do with these concepts because it is a notion differing so fundamentally that we cannot speak as if these terms all designate roughly the same thing.

In contrast to such interpretive tendencies, I take Heidegger's transformation of these notions as an effort to more accurately characterize what these terms are all attempting to designate. Dasein *is* the "sub-

ject” or the “self” insofar as each of these terms is attempting to pick out the I who exists, who cares about its own existence, and who is capable of philosophical inquiry into the nature of that existence. Though it is true that the later Heidegger was interested primarily in the responsivity of a self who simply lets the “event of Being” be, we cannot interpret this shift to mean that Heidegger did away with subjectivity. Rather, he asks his readers to think of the subject in terms other than the willful autonomy championed by modernity. Thus he continued to speak of the responsivity of the *thinking* self until the end of his life. For Heidegger, there is no philosophy or “thinking” without the self. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine what that would even mean.<sup>7</sup>

No doubt there will be many who argue with this reading. It is not my purpose in this text to convince them of its wisdom, however, and as a result those who are not amenable to this view may find much to quibble with in the following pages. One such quibble might focus on my choice to continue to use words like “subjectivity” and “intersubjectivity” interchangeably with *Dasein* and *Mitsein*—despite Heidegger’s attempts to overcome the conceptual baggage of the former terms through his introduction of the latter. My purpose in this book is to explain and examine these terminological transformations, however; a project that requires me to analyze the parameters of the general condition or mode of being that the term “*Dasein*” is meant to designate, rather than simply taking the meaning of this term to be both straightforwardly obvious and yet entirely unrelated to conceptual analogues such as “subjectivity.” As Heidegger himself said, his interest is in articulating the “subjectivity of the subject” (*BT* 24/21). By reading the concept of *Dasein* as the true definition of subjectivity, so to speak, it becomes possible to recognize both the problems afflicting the Cartesian position and the manner in which Heidegger succeeds in solving them.<sup>8</sup> If “*Dasein*” in no way designates the same self picked out by terms like “subject” then he is not transforming the tradition—he is simply changing the subject (no pun intended). Since the work of escaping the negative aspects of the modern self mostly occurs in Heidegger’s pre-1930 works—and since it is there, I believe, that he stays most true to the existential developments of transcendental phenomenology that I take to be his greatest achievement—this book’s focus lies there. Though I will reference some of his late works, *Being and Time*—along with the texts immediately before and after it—will be of primary interest.<sup>9</sup>

# The “Subject” of Inquiry

According to Heidegger, the traditional problem of other minds is in fact a false problematic because “the very being which serves as its theme repudiates such a line of questioning” (BT 206/191). In other words, Heidegger answers the problem of other minds by rejecting the modern conception of selfhood that gave rise to it and by insisting that any account of human existence in which it appears as a problem is misguided from the outset.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Heidegger’s use of the term “Dasein” is itself a protest against such accounts and their tendency to characterize the self as an atomic substance that is “initially *worldless*, or not certain of its world, and which basically must first make certain of a world” (BT 206/191). With the notion of Dasein Heidegger instead names a self that only *is* insofar as it is social and worldly. He repudiates demands for proofs of external reality because Dasein is not a self-contained substance independent of the world but is instead “being-in-the-world.” To be a self is to occupy a way of being characterized by relationality and responsiveness to the world and others.<sup>2</sup> Though the notion of being-in-the-world may conjure images of distinct inside and outside realms, Heidegger uses this expression to characterize the way in which we do not live “outside” the world, only to find our way “into” it or “prove” that it’s really there. Rather, we exist embedded in its social, practical, and axiological meanings and we understand ourselves in terms of them. Indeed, this context of meaning is just what Heidegger means by “world”—which is not merely the totality of objects but is instead the network of meaningful references in terms of which we understand ourselves. Heidegger presents his account as an alternative to the modern philosophical tradition, which has tended to use the observation of physical objects as the paradigm for understanding all things. In contrast, Heidegger asks us to recognize the inappropriateness of this ontology for understanding the self. The self is not an object comparable to hunks of matter located at some particular point in space-time. Naturalistic presuppositions about the fundamental thing-status of all beings therefore preclude an adequate thematization of selfhood. Selfhood is a way of being characterized by directedness toward and dependence on the worldly context of meaning—not by a self-enclosed worldless independence. To be-in-the-world, then, means that we orient our lives according to the meaning frameworks that it

provides, *not* that we are just one more object positioned within a larger collection of things—the traditional notion of the “world.”

On this picture, Dasein’s relation to the world is not a contingent feature of its selfhood but is its very way of being: “In the customary, psychological representation of the ‘I,’ the relationship to the world is absent. Therefore, the representation of the *ego cogito* is abstract, whereas the ‘I-am-in-the-world’ lets the ‘I’ be conjoined with the world, that is, as something primordially concrete [*ur-konkret*]” (ZS 175). Being-in-the-world is relationality, dependence, and directedness—in Heidegger’s terms, transcendence.<sup>3</sup> By “transcendence” Heidegger does not intend the popular philosophical meaning according to which “to transcend” means for something to exist outside or beyond the immanent sphere of subjectivity. Such characterizations simply return us to the isolation of the Cartesian subject. The original meaning of *transcendere*, Heidegger claims, “signifies literally to step over, pass over, go through, and occasionally to surpass.”<sup>4</sup> Transcendence is the stepping over or beyond the “borders” of one’s internal life to be with or at the thing toward which it is directed: “The transcendens, the transcendent, is *that which oversteps as such* and not that toward which I step over” (BPP 299). It is a fundamental *openness* to that which lies outside or beyond the immanent sphere of subjectivity—an openness that is not some kind of occasional activity of the self, but its very essence: “Dasein does not exist at first in some mysterious way so as then to accomplish the step beyond itself to others or to extant things. Existence, instead, always already means to step beyond or, better, having stepped beyond . . . The transcendence, the over-and-out-beyond of the Dasein makes it possible for the Dasein to comport itself to beings, whether to extant things, to others, or to itself, as beings” (BPP 300).<sup>5</sup> Thus one might say that the confines of one’s inner life are porous; to be a self is to be fundamentally shaped by and directed toward the web of significance that is the world. “To relate itself is implicit in the concept of the subject. In its own self the subject is a being that relates-itself-to” (BPP 157). We *are* only selves insofar as we are engaged in the world’s meaning framework and understand ourselves in terms of it. Indeed, our capacity to comport ourselves to things—to choose, to love, to organize, to regret—relies on precisely this openness to the world. To be a self is to always already be “at” the world—transfixed and engaged and dependent on its network of meanings and significances. Thus Heidegger claims that transcending “does not only and not primarily mean a self-relating of a subject to an object; rather, transcendence means *to understand oneself from a world*” (BPP 300).

But what does it mean to “understand oneself from a world”? According to Heidegger, Dasein is worldly not simply because it exists in

relation to worldly things, but because through its activities and relationships it can understand *itself* as meeting the standards and filling the roles that give these practices their meaning. Though we will be discussing the nature of Dasein's selfhood further in chapter 2, it is enough to note here that unlike many traditional accounts, Heidegger argues that to be a self is to be committed to the deeply personal project of understanding who one is to be. Thus Dasein does not have its possibilities arrayed before it as indifferent objects of choice; rather, to be a self is to be caught up in the fact that certain possibilities *matter*. Indeed, "care" is the term that Heidegger uses to designate this specifically human way of existing as a being that understands itself from the context of activities and meanings through which it plays out the possibilities that matter to it.<sup>6</sup> We *care* about certain possibilities because they define who we will be. Our encounters with things are not "a rigid staring at something merely objectively present. Being-in-the-world, as taking care of things, is *taken in by* the world which it takes care of" (BT 61/57). To be a self is to be defined by care-laden openness to the world.

The problem, however, is that the philosophical tradition has tended to reify selfhood as a result of its failure to decouple itself from substance-oriented thinking. In contrast, Heidegger argues that the self *cannot* be understood as a type of substance—whether it be an object banging up against other things located in the world *or* a closed private arena of beliefs and representations. Such characterizations fail by portraying the self as either too "close" or too "far" from the world. The consequence is that such theories are then required to compensate—either by accounting for how a worldly object can be conscious and care-driven *or* by solving skeptical problems regarding the existence of world and others "outside" the sphere of my mental representations.<sup>7</sup> Both responses are rooted in another misguided aspect of the philosophical tradition: its tendency to take the detached observation of physical objects as the basic model for understanding the self-world relationship. This characterization both obscures the fact that such observation is founded on our practical engagements with the world and encourages the view that the self is self-contained. Though our capacity to achieve the detached stance of a disinterested observer is an important human ability, it is a refinement of our basic oriented, directed, care-based ways of being and cannot be taken as primary. For Heidegger, practical immersion in one's way of being in the world takes precedence in human existing; detached, contemplative, scientific modes of being are derivative attitudes that must be *accomplished*, despite philosophy's fondness for pretending that they are the norm.

According to Heidegger, it is their commitment to this "scientific"

model of knowing that ultimately causes him to break with Husserl and with Kant. Heidegger takes his stance in opposition not only to the traditional Cartesian picture of the self-enclosed cogito, then, but also to Husserl and Kant, whom he took to be Descartes's intellectual children in this regard.<sup>8</sup> This inheritance is evident, he thinks, insofar as they explain the indubitability of the I by attempting to "abstract from everything else that is 'given,' not only from an existing 'world' but also from the being of other 'I's'" (BT 115/109). But such an approach, Heidegger claims, will only lead the existential analytic into a "trap" (BT 116/109) because it assumes that such an abstraction is possible and conducive to uncovering the meaning of the I. To do so is to interpret the self as a type of self-enclosed unit—much as things are. Avoiding such a trap-like project, then, means accounting for the self in terms of the world and the others who share it. Thus Heidegger will reject the Kantian I "because it exists only as 'I think' and not as 'I think something.'"<sup>9</sup>

Of course, Heidegger's interpretation of Kant and Husserl's shortcomings can and should be questioned—especially insofar as the "I think something" is the essence of *Husserl's* characterization of intentionality. Thus even if we were to grant Heidegger the legitimacy of this criticism of Kant (which is also questionable), it is difficult to see how Heidegger can claim the distance that he does from Husserl's position. After all, it is a distortion of Husserl's work to suggest that his account of the transcendental subject simply reiterated the Cartesian view of subjectivity as monolithic, solitary, epistemic I. The theory of intentionality was Husserl's *resistance* to the isolation of the traditional subject; an impulse that he only continued to develop with his analyses of the lived body<sup>10</sup> and the Lifeworld.<sup>11</sup> Thus characterizing Husserlian intentionality as worldless is a misunderstanding at best, insofar as intentionality is Husserl's attempt to designate the way in which the self *always* exists immersed in its relation to the world.<sup>12</sup>

Despite interpretive claims to the contrary, then—including, in some cases, Heidegger's own—Heidegger was deeply indebted to Husserl's insights. Heidegger's contributions to enriching phenomenology cannot be fully understood or appreciated without recognizing the manner in which they were a development of, and not a simple break with, Husserl's work. Heidegger himself admits as much insofar as he too addresses the problem of what it means to be an I in terms of intentionality. Thus in *Being and Time* he asserts that "essentially the person exists only in carrying out intentional acts, and is thus essentially *not* an object" (BT 48/44–45).<sup>13</sup> As Heidegger's Marburg lectures of 1923 to 1928 reveal, Heidegger did not reject Husserl's notion of intentionality so much as call for a more thorough elaboration of it in light of ontological con-



cerns regarding the being of the intentional subject and its object.<sup>14</sup> This becomes clearer once we acknowledge that the kind of transcending toward the world dubbed being-in-the-world is already present in proto-form in Husserl's notion of intentionality (since all "I thinks" are "I think something") as well as in his account of the horizontal nature of experience—the recognition that objects are always given in terms of their unfolding relationships both to other objects and to the experiencing self.

Heidegger did not so much *reject* Husserl's intentional I, then, as object to the tendency to characterize the intentional relationship as primarily *cognitive*. For Heidegger, the being of Husserl's intentional object is simply presupposed as equivalent to the being of the *scientific* object. Understood as such, the object is characterized without reference to the social, affective and practical context that gives it meaning, relying, instead, on an account of knowing that tends to abstract from these dimensions. Thus Heidegger believes that Husserl's approach inappropriately prioritizes the epistemic relation to the world; a misunderstanding most clearly evident in Husserl's tendency to locate the source of intentionality in consciousness rather than in the rich contours of affective, practical, social life.<sup>15</sup> The result of this approach, Heidegger claims, is that Husserl's phenomenological descriptions of how meaning must be constituted in terms of the transcendental ego tend to sound too much like empiricist proofs for the existence of the world and other minds. Of course, the very essence of phenomenology is a *rejection* of the legitimacy of such metaphysical existence disputes in favor of analyses of how existence claims show up as meaningful within experience. Nevertheless, Husserl's focus on the "sphere of ownness" and the "solipsistic" perceptual horizon lead Heidegger to conclude that Husserl did not recognize the import of his own discovery. Namely, how intentionality means that the self *is* only in terms of its interrelation with the world and those who share it. Because Heidegger believes that Husserl's characterization of intentionality maintains this scientific stance, he rejects its viability for accounting for the worldly nature of selfhood. The notion of intentionality will have to be transformed if it is to accommodate the insight that Husserl was attempting to articulate—a transformation that will be examined in further detail in the following chapter.

Thus Husserl's emphasis on phenomenology as "science" is a position that many Heideggerians view as fundamentally incompatible with Heidegger's project. As one commentator puts it: "Whereas Heidegger aims at separating philosophical thinking from science, Husserl's intention is the reverse. He wants to confirm scientific *theoria* as the highest form of human *praxis*."<sup>16</sup> However, though Heidegger rejects Husserl's epistemological orientation and its implicit commitment to the tradi-

tional conception of the self, there is another sense in which Heidegger adopts the same scientific stance that Husserl does. This becomes clear once we recognize that Husserl takes “science” to mean all endeavors founded on self-responsibility—meaning that “nothing held to be obvious, either predicatively or pre-predicatively, can pass, unquestioned, as a basis for knowledge.”<sup>17</sup> Such a stance does *not* mean that phenomenology confirms theory as primary or that it is a foundationalist project in the original Cartesian sense. Husserl is not trying to deduce an error-free view of the world on the basis of some indubitable truth, nor does he aim to replace praxis with theory (despite the problematic formulations that may promote this conclusion).<sup>18</sup> Rather, Husserl’s call for a rigorous science means that philosophy must take responsibility for its claims. This commitment manifests itself in phenomenology’s methodological constraints, which prevent one from taking any claims for granted—most especially the natural attitude’s tendency to simply take given objects as straightforwardly there. In other words, striving to make phenomenology scientific means distinguishing between naive, thing-focused modes of thought—characterized primarily by psychologism and naturalism for Husserl—and the philosophizing that attends to the primordial lived experiences from out of which such modes of thought arise. Such an approach is the same one adopted in Heidegger’s “destruction” of the history of ontology, however, according to which the primordial lived experiences that gave rise to certain (distorting) philosophical concepts are uncovered once again. Thus Husserl’s fundamental methodological insight—the “to the things themselves” that lies at the heart of phenomenology—is adopted by Heidegger himself (*BT* section 7, 27–39/23–34). Phenomenology—Heidegger’s chosen method—is “to let what shows itself be seen from itself, just as it shows itself from itself” (*BT* 34/30).<sup>19</sup>

Indeed, Husserl’s phenomenological demand that one ground one’s transcendental claims regarding conditions for the possibility of experience in one’s *own* concrete first-person experience was already a break with abstract Kantian-style transcendental philosophy insofar as it refused to deduce these conditions from some prior architectonic, but insisted that they could only arise in response to concrete existence itself.<sup>20</sup> It is this impulse that Heidegger carries further by providing an existential grounding for Husserl’s analyses of meaning.<sup>21</sup> Heidegger was concerned with the first-person experience of meaning despite the fact that his project aimed at transforming the way in which the meaning and the method of this “first-person” is to be understood—a point to be examined further in chapter 2. Allowing the nature of human existence to show itself from itself therefore involves both a commitment to the Husserlian phenomenological approach and a refusal to accept the

Cartesian baggage that prevented this approach from being as radical as it needed to be. Though Heidegger undeniably changed the focus of phenomenology, then, he is fundamentally a phenomenologist in the same scientific way that Husserl himself was.

This interpretation of Heidegger goes against the grain of much contemporary Heidegger scholarship, which takes Heidegger's relationship with Husserl to be a radical break rather than an enrichment and development (though one often characterized by bad feeling on both sides). According to the former account, Husserl was trapped in a traditional characterization of subjectivity that resulted in the solipsism and idealism characteristic of Husserlian transcendental phenomenology. Heidegger's genius, so the story goes, lies in his radical rejection of the Husserlian subject in order to produce the notion of *Dasein*—in which no trace of the traditional subject is to be found. This transformation only continued throughout Heidegger's career, according to this interpretation, and ultimately culminated in an understanding of *Dasein*-analysis as a dead-end on the road to the real philosophical matter: the happening of Being.<sup>22</sup>

The primary difficulty with such approaches, however, is their methodological commitment to the belief that Being or "*Seyn*" is open to philosophical examination without the first-person evidence requirement of Husserl-style phenomenology. This commitment is evident in the many claims one encounters in the literature about Being's "swaying," "jointure," "sonority," or "en-owning eventuation"—claims often put forward with little effort to unpack how these terms designate something that shows up as meaningful in first-person experience.<sup>23</sup> But if one interprets Heidegger's work as proceeding without the methodological grounding of Husserlian phenomenology, it is difficult to see how his claims are anything more than metaphysical speculation. For a philosopher who appreciated Kant as much as Heidegger did, such speculation is incompatible with the meaning of philosophical thought. And it is clear that Heidegger was a philosopher deeply concerned with the legitimacy of philosophical method: his corpus was dedicated to both the philosophical articulation of the conditions for the possibility of meaning and developing a rigorous understanding of the norms governing such a philosophical endeavor. Thus Heidegger's stance as a phenomenologist is expressed most succinctly in the claim that "*ontology is possible only as phenomenology*" (*BT* 35/31)—a claim revealing his commitment to the idea that any study of the meaning of being cannot be considered in isolation from the existence of the being who is engaged in the study or the first-person *Evidenz* that is made available thereby. This is a commitment he maintains regardless of changes to how he thinks about the

Dasein/Being relationship—evident, for example, in his later analyses of how Dasein engages in a genuine “thinking” of Being.<sup>24</sup> As Heidegger recognized, phenomenology must be existential if it is to succeed in understanding how philosophy itself is possible—but existentialism must be phenomenological if its claims are to be grounded in anything other than speculation and construction.

It is for this reason that Husserl has little patience when Heidegger appears to wander into speculative waters with his talk of “Being” in the absence of any reference to how such Being is experienced as such. This type of account cannot possibly be justified, Husserl thinks, since philosophical self-responsibility demands that we refrain from making ontological claims about things that transcend the bounds of possible experience. If it does not show up within the field of possible experience, how do we even know to speak of it—let alone have any standard for assessing the legitimacy of what we say? Indeed, to read Heidegger’s work as lacking in such phenomenological commitments is to do him a disservice, since it presents his work in the absence of the methodological principles that give it legitimacy as philosophical inquiry.<sup>25</sup>

Thus Husserl insists on the first-person nature of phenomenology—all ontological claims must be traced back to an analysis of how they show up *as* making the claim that they do in the lived experience of transcendental subjectivity. This does not mean that transcendental subjectivity creates all meaning or that in Husserl’s search for the ground of beings he “interprets this ground as itself a being.”<sup>26</sup> The concept of transcendental subjectivity is introduced precisely to *avoid* presuppositions regarding entities and to speak only of the field of experience within which meaning comes to manifestation. To speak of the metaphysical status of this field of experience, then—to claim that Husserl understands transcendental subjectivity as a type of “entity”—contradicts the entire phenomenological project as Husserl knows it. The purpose of the *Epoché* is to bracket any presuppositions or assumptions regarding the metaphysical status of who or what is doing the lived experiencing. The focus, instead, is on the experiencing itself as it is lived.<sup>27</sup>

Despite Husserl’s methodological worries about Heidegger’s approach, however, it must be recognized that Husserl himself was not entirely consistent in the application of his own method. As Steven Crowell makes clear in “Does the Husserl/Heidegger Feud Rest on a Mistake?”<sup>28</sup> Husserl’s rejection of Heidegger’s so-called anthropology fails to recognize the implicit naturalism of Husserl’s own view that subjectivity is still part of the world in a psychological sense. This unrecognized commitment is what necessitates Husserl’s second reduction—a commitment that Heidegger realized had already been overcome in the original phe-

nomenological bracketing of ontological presuppositions, which necessarily included those applying to the subject doing the bracketing. This misunderstanding is a consequence of the fact that Husserl

believes that even if one brackets everything worldly with which the subject being reflected on—oneself!—is concerned, the reflecting philosopher still posits that subject as a worldly entity. Even when one brackets its objects, one takes the field of consciousness as a “real” worldly psychic stream. Why does he hold this view? It has nothing to do with the phenomenological reduction, for on this matter everything is quite clear: the phenomenological reduction brackets *all* worldly commitments, *every* worldly positing. Rather, it is because Husserl imagines that the reduction is carried out not by a philosopher but by a *scientist* in the *naturalistic attitude*—namely, by the putative pure psychologist.<sup>29</sup>

In this case, however, Heidegger understood Husserl’s method better than he himself did, and *Dasein* is the name for the self and its field of experience understood in the absence of any such presuppositions or commitments. As we will see in the remainder of this chapter, Heidegger’s understanding of this point manifested itself in his greater focus on the preconceptual and non-theoretical dimensions of lived experience. Heidegger moves Husserl’s phenomenological project forward by recognizing the practical and affective modes whereby preconceptual dimensions of lived experience manifest themselves first-personally, thereby expanding and enriching the Husserlian analysis of subjectivity to include those dimensions excluded by the third-person naturalistic stance implicit in some of Husserl’s commitments. Heidegger’s understanding of intentionality as transcendence is not so much a *rejection* of Husserl as a call for Husserl’s position to be fully consistent with the method he endorsed. Heidegger’s development of phenomenology, then, involves re-conceptualizing intentionality to prioritize the pre-cognitive and practical engagements with the world from out of which any theoretical knowledge of scientific objects can arise.

As we will see below, the affective, practical, and social dimensions of lived experience in terms of which the person carries out intentional acts are what Heidegger calls the *existentials* in *Being and Time*—dimensions of the self that are made pre-theoretically but first-personally manifest through their corresponding “modes of disclosure”: mood, understanding, and discourse. Heidegger’s contributions in this regard cannot be overstated. His re-characterization of transcendental subjectivity as *Dasein* succeeds in highlighting the manner in which care—the lived experience of attuned practical commitment to an existence that funda-

mentally matters—takes Husserl’s notion of transcendental subjectivity in a direction that it was required to go. And this is true regardless of whether Husserl recognized the profound import of Heidegger’s contributions *or* whether Heidegger acknowledged that he was making a contribution to the existing phenomenological project—and not simply overcoming it.

### Thrown Project

To clarify the manner in which Dasein understands itself from the world, we must turn to Heidegger’s existentials and the modes of disclosure that reveal them. In terms of the former, Heidegger makes particular use of the concepts “projection” and “thrownness.” Thrownness refers to the sheer “thatness” of existence, to the fact that one aspect of the way we exist is to be always already cast into the world, burdened with the fact that we simply find ourselves in possibilities not of our own choosing. Dasein cannot simply define itself, then, because it is always already defined by the worldly situation in which it simply discovers itself to be.

This dimension of Dasein’s being is revealed to it in the mode of disclosure that Heidegger terms *Befindlichkeit*—a term he coins to suggest *how* this thrownness is disclosed to us as such. Various translations as “attunement,” “mood,” “affectedness,” “state of mind,” “situatedness,” and “disposition,” what one needs in translating this term is “an English word that conveys *being found in a situation where things and options already matter*.”<sup>30</sup> This mode of disclosure reveals the whole of being-in-the-world insofar as it “assails Dasein in the unreflected falling prey to the ‘world’ of its heedfulness” (BT 136/129). In other words, attunement reveals that the world I’ve been thrown into always has a particular *orientation*; I find myself in a situation where things and options already matter. I do not choose to be drawn to or repulsed by things; rather, the way I exist in the world is one in which I am “solicited and summoned” by it.<sup>31</sup> A consequence of this disclosure of self and world through attunement, for Heidegger, is that it “*first makes possible directing oneself toward something*” (BT 137/129). Attuned existing means that things in the world are encountered primarily in a “circumspective” way: as useful, attractive, frightening, and so on. These “subjective” colorings are not somehow added on afterwards to raw data accumulated by an indifferent observer, but define Dasein’s very experience of things *as* meaningful. Circumspective encountering is not just “a sensation or staring out at something.

Letting things be encountered in a circumspect, heedful way has—we can see this now more precisely in terms of attunement—the character of being affected or moved” (*BT* 137/129). To be Dasein is to be moved by the world.

But Dasein is not merely a passive observer of the way the world matters to it. “Project” or “projectedness” refers to Dasein’s capacity to live into given possibilities of its worldly situation; to take over and own them as its own, regardless of the fact that it simply finds itself in them. Project is the appropriation of this thrown ground from and as which one *must* be, in light of that towards which one *might* be. It designates Dasein’s ability to commit itself to different possible ways to be itself. While attunement reveals Dasein’s being-in-the-world qua thrown, *understanding* discloses being-in-the-world in terms of projectedness; the fact that Dasein’s existence is suspended among possibilities into which it has been thrown and among which it must choose. As with attunement, the mode of disclosure Heidegger refers to as understanding must also be understood existentially—it is not a specific cognitive activity such as judging or explaining, but a way of being that makes such cognitive activities possible. By “understanding” Heidegger means a competence or skill—a “know-how” by which we *act into* the attuned mattering of the world.

Through understanding Dasein’s existence is revealed qua *potentiality*—as balanced amidst possible activities of existing—thereby enabling it to address itself practically to the options that attunement has revealed as mattering. Understanding discloses the fact that I exist among possible ways to be me and that I can choose to pursue or neglect these different possibilities. Understanding does not disclose Dasein’s being-possible in terms of definite options, however—“what is *not yet* real and *not always* necessary” (*BT* 143/135)—in other words, purely logical possibility or the contingency of some objectively present thing. Understanding does not simply observe a menu of possible selves; it is, rather, a skillful living into my possibilities that *makes* these possibilities possible for me.

Projecting has nothing to do with being related to a plan thought out, according to which Da-sein arranges its being, but, as Da-sein, it has always already projected itself and is, as long as it is, projecting. As long as it is, Da-sein always has understood itself and will understand itself in terms of possibilities . . . in projecting project throws possibility before itself as possibility, and as such lets it *be*. As projecting, understanding is the mode of being of Da-sein in which it *is* its possibilities as possibilities. (*BT* 145/136)

Understanding thereby discloses Dasein's existence as one in which its being is always still open and incomplete; as "a potentiality of being which is never still outstanding as something *not yet* objectively present, but as something essentially *never* objectively present" (BT 144/135, emphasis mine). Dasein's very "excessiveness" to definition, its projection into possibility is, in a strange sense, what defines it. We are not simply passive observers in the face of our own possibilities; we *are* our possibilities and how with live them.

If the Dasein is free for definite possibilities of itself, for its ability to be, then the Dasein is in this *being-free-for*; it is these possibilities themselves . . . It is the possibility it is only if the Dasein becomes existent in it. To be one's ownmost ability to be, to take it over and keep oneself in the possibility, to understand oneself in one's own factual freedom, that is, to understand oneself in the being of one's own most peculiar ability-to-be, is the original existential concept of understanding. (BPP 276)

Because Dasein has no fixed "essence" it is an entity "*whose what is precisely to be and nothing but to be*" (HCT 110). As a result, Heidegger insists that we must be careful in our language; we cannot speak thoughtlessly of Dasein as an entity with the mode of being of Dasein, for example, because this implies a thing on hand in the world to which this mode of being has simply been attributed like a property. Avoiding such characterizations is, as we have seen, not only necessary for an accurate understanding of what the self is—it is also essential if we are to achieve a more accurate understanding of social relations between such selves. In other words, we must speak of Dasein not as a "what" but as a *who*; "the authentic entity of Dasein, the who, is not a thing and nothing worldly, but is itself only a way to be" (HCT 237). Who the self is, is fundamentally a matter of *how* I am to be—not *what* I am to be.

Because Dasein's own mode of existing is itself a condition for the possibility of it experiencing entities as meaningful and accessible, disclosing the being of entities involves a co-disclosure of this being-in-the-world itself—the way of being that allows the world to show up as being the way it is. Like attunement, then, understanding also discloses or *appresents* (HCT 211) the worldliness of Dasein's being-in-the-world—it reveals not only Dasein's ability to pursue different abilities to be, but the world itself as arena in which this projectedness finds its significance. The world is disclosed in understanding as a totality of meaningful references grounded in Dasein's care for its possible ways to be its self. In understandingly pursuing one or another of the options that matter to



me, I act in specific ways that serve to differentiate the world into articulated contexts of relevance.<sup>32</sup>

This meaningful context of things functions, for the most part, as an unthematized background; I do not explicitly attribute the function "driver of screws" to the screwdriver; simply using the screwdriver to drive screws as part of my project helps constitute it as such. When I am absorbed in the projects of my existing, understanding self and world, this context of referentiality is merely a "*pale and inconspicuous presence*" (HCT 189). It is in terms of the absence or breakdown of tools useful to my projects that these tools become prominent or conspicuous, a "distinctive disturbance" or "specific absence" that in turn "points to what underlies it as its possibility, that is, the *always-already-there* of a familiar continuity of references which is disturbed because something is missing, and which stands out through this specific absence" (HCT 189). For Heidegger, our everyday encountering of the world is in terms of this implicit context of reference that relies on—but does not make explicit—the fact that my being suspended among ways to be a self gives this context its shape and meaning. Understanding thus discloses the situation in which my existence finds expression and significance, revealing both the worldly constellation of meaningful roles, things, and activities, *and* Dasein's status as the ultimate "for-the-sake-of-which" grounding the meaning of these referential structures.

## Meaning

It is this structure of the world as background referential totality that is the essence of meaningfulness for Heidegger. Meaning is defined as "that in which the intelligibility of something keeps itself, without coming into view explicitly and thematically. Meaning signifies that upon which the primary project is projected, that in terms of which something can be conceived in its possibility as what it is. Projecting discloses possibilities, that is, it discloses what makes something possible" (BT 324/298). Understanding therefore reveals not only Dasein's nature as entrusted with its own ways to be in the world, but reveals it as being so in a context of references in terms of which particular things reveal *their* possibilities. In understanding, "the world, qua world, [is] disclosed in its possible significance" (BT 144/135) and so too "innerworldly beings themselves are freed, . . . freed for *their own* possibilities. What is at hand is discovered as such in its service *ability*, *usability*, *detrimentality*. The totality of relevance

reveals itself as the categorial whole of a *possibility* of the connection of things at hand” (BT 144–45/135–36). Meaningfulness, then, is this condition of there being specific connection possibilities, and does not refer to particular connections themselves.

It is important to note here that Heidegger describes understanding as freeing innerworldly beings for *their own* possibilities. Though the condition of meaningfulness is grounded in Dasein’s openness to possibility, Dasein does not simply project meanings onto things arbitrarily. Rather, Dasein’s ways to be in the world discover or reveal—disclose—potential connections among the things at hand. The potentiality of these connections means that they are characterized not only by openness to change and interpretation but also by a certain limit or resistance to my activities. This concept of resistance, however,

can only be understood in terms of meaningfulness. The authentic correlation of world and Dasein (if we can speak here of correlation at all, which is not my opinion) is not that of impulse and resistance or, as in Scheler, will and resistance, but rather *care and meaningfulness*. This correlation is the basic structure of life, a structure which I also call *facticity*. For something can be encountered in its resistivity as a resistance only as something which I do not succeed in getting through when I live in a wanting-to-get-through, which means in being out toward something. (HCT 221)

Dasein’s way of being gives rise to meaning through its interpretive encounter with that which it is not—and it succeeds in cultivating the inherent possible connections of meaning depending on the degree to which it attempts to impose an interpretive agenda resisted by the world itself. Dasein’s interpretive engagement with the possibilities it encounters can vary considerably; “draw[ing] the conceptuality belonging to the beings to be interpreted from these themselves or else force them into concepts to which beings are opposed in accordance with their kind of being” (BT 150/141).

Heidegger’s concern here is not simply the flexibility of meaning-possibilities, however, but the implicit condition of this flexibility: Dasein as the ultimate-for-the-sake-of-which, as the entity for whom possibility is its very way of existing. The meaning of meaning is, in a certain sense, *Dasein*—the being whose openness to possibilities makes their disclosure itself possible.<sup>33</sup> It is for this reason that Heidegger ultimately defines the meaningful in terms of “Dasein itself, which has meaning in the primary sense” (HCT 211) and discusses a “secondary” sense of meaning: the significance of innerworldly things based on their location in the refer-

ential totality and which only have meaning insofar as they occupy the "place" of meaning. This place of meaning is Dasein itself, understood in the *primary* sense of meaning: the "formal, existential framework of the disclosedness belonging to understanding" (BT 151/142). This primary sense of meaningfulness thus designates Dasein's way of being: its existing *as* the site of disclosedness: "Only Da-sein 'has' meaning in that the disclosedness of being-in-the-world can be 'fulfilled' through the things discoverable in it. *Thus only Da-sein can be meaningful or meaningless . . .* all beings whose mode of being is unlike Da-sein must be understood as *unmeaningful*, as essentially bare of meaning as such" (BT 151/142). As we will come to see in the following sections, this way of existing qua primary meaning seeks to establish worldly or "secondarily" meaningful ways in which its being-in-the-world can be fulfilled: "Factual life develops ever new possibilities of meaningfulness in which it can bestir itself and can in that way be assured of its own 'meaning.'"<sup>34</sup> This distinction between Dasein's inherent meaningfulness and the innerworldly things that are unmeaningful—but are encountered *as* meaningful in terms of Dasein—will be crucial for this discussion, particularly in terms of understanding how we encounter the *other* primarily meaningful beings with whom we share the world. In what way do such encounters differ from encountering secondarily meaningful things in the world? The answer, we will see in later chapters, lies in the fundamentally different relationship to time. Before we can reach such a conclusion, however, we must first lay the groundwork by turning to Heidegger's account of how Dasein is always already with the others with whom it shares the world.

### Being-With

In addition to Thrownness and Projectedness, Being-with (*Mitsein*) is the third fundamental dimension of care and designates Dasein's essentially social nature. For Heidegger, every possibility that human existence offers must be understood in terms of the presence of other people. Even when we are alone or solitary the others are present *as* an absence. Being-with does not mean that there are always others physically there with me but characterizes the way in which being in the world is always already permeated with the presence of others; it is an "existential attribute that belongs to Da-sein of itself on the basis of its kind of being" (BT 120/113). Heidegger's emphasis is therefore not on a spatial notion of "with" but on an existential one: we exist in such a way that we are never alone but are always being implicitly referred to those who make our

clothes, write the books we read, act as role models, and so on. And like the other existentials—thrownness and projection—being-with must be understood not as a form of *understanding* human life but as a dimension of *existing* it.

As we have seen, Dasein exists immersed in the world; all encounters with particular others must therefore be understood in terms of this worldly way of being—not in terms of the inner confines of some self-enclosed subject. Dasein's encounters with others are an existing along with other Dasein *in the shared world*. All varieties of being-with-one-another, then, are “understandable only if being-with-one-another means *being-with-one-another in a world*” (HCT 241). Being-in-the-world means that “Dasein initially finds ‘itself’ in what it does, needs, expects, has charge of, in the things at hand which it initially takes care of in the surrounding world” (BT 119/112). Similarly, Dasein “finds” other Dasein in what they do and have in the world; like the self, others are encountered primarily *from* the world. Because I exist immersed in a “referential totality of significance” through which I pursue my projects of existing (BT 123/115)—all encounters with others occur in and through this referential totality. Encountering other people, even in “the most everyday of activities, passing by and avoiding one another on the street, already involves this environmental encounter, based on this street common to us” (HCT 240). I do not encounter others in the total absence of a shared background context of meaningful things and activities; they are always driving a car, eating some food, lounging on the couch. When we encounter this or that other human being, argues Heidegger, “this being of the others is not that of the ‘subject’ or the ‘person’ in the sense in which this is taken conceptually in philosophy. Rather, I meet the other in the field, at work, on the street while on the way to work or strolling along with nothing to do” (HCT 240).

Like the self, then, experiencing others requires no “espionage on the ego” to take them as its object qua subject. Though we may treat them as such, others are never *experienced* as objects but only ever as other selves engaged in particular practices, tasks, and activities—the projects in which they pursue their possibilities. As William Schroeder notes: “One does not primarily see the Other’s body which hides his mind; one apprehends ‘what he is about,’ ‘what he is up to.’ For Heidegger, this is a direct and lucid experience of the Other’s existence since his existence *is* his being-in-the-world”—his being engaged in projects and practices similar to my own.<sup>35</sup> The physical actions of the other’s smiling and waving aren’t experienced as the mere “appearance” of her inner desire to greet me—the smile and wave *are* a greeting. To see the greeting as “behavior” is to be engaged in a highly theoretical level of remove from our ordinary ex-

perience: typically, we do *not* see "bodies" to which we attribute "minds." Rather, I understand the others with whom I share the world just as I understand myself: as pursuing projects within a shared world.

Though we typically encounter others from worldly things and activities, this does not mean that I first encounter "stuff" and then infer that there are others who could also be using it. On the contrary, Heidegger's point is that there is never simply "stuff"; I only ever encounter anything against the background of meaningful contexts of relevance that are always already heavy with the presence of others: "The others who are 'encountered' in the context of useful things in the surrounding world at hand are not somehow added on in thought to an initially merely objectively present thing, but these 'things' are encountered from the world in which they are at hand for the others" (BT 118/111). The publicity and commonality of things in the world is definitive of them *as* the things that they are. This is particularly evident in the case of things like traffic regulations, whose very meaning demands that there be others. But Heidegger's claim is that even solitary experiences—standing alone before a wilderness landscape, for example—involve the presence of others. Others are "there" as potential tourists, or as friends for whom you take a picture, or in the poem of which the scene reminds you—the presence of others is a feature of the experience, argues Heidegger, even insofar as I am delighted that there are no others there to ruin it. "The others, the fellow humans, are also there with the Dasein even when they are not to be found there in immediately tangible proximity" (BPP 289). The others are present *as* absent. For Heidegger, then, coexistence with others is not simply a *contingent* feature of the world. Being-with does not refer to the fact that I am rarely alone in places with no traces of other humans; rather, "being-with existentially determines Da-sein even when another is not factually present and perceived. The being-alone of Da-sein, too, is being-with in the world. The other can be lacking only *in* and *for* a being-with" (BT 120/113).

Based on such a characterization of Dasein, then, it seems evident how the "problem" of intersubjectivity can be dismissed as a false problematic. Human co-being with others constitutes a structural characteristic of human existence itself and is not "something which occurs at times on the basis of the existence of others" (BT 120/113). The with-one-another implied in being-with is a way of being constitutive of selfhood—it is not a type of spatiotemporal proximity or a contingent fact about particular encounters with this or that other. It is an ontological, rather than ontic or factual feature of my way of existing: "We ourselves are determined through a Being-with the other."<sup>36</sup>

Indeed, Heidegger claims that the presence of other Dasein in the

world helps to determine the possible ways that *I* can be. Thus this “having to do with one another in the one world” can also be described as a “*being dependent on one another*” (HCT 240). The publicity, commonality, and social interdependence of the world in which I exist are themselves essential features of my existing.

### *Das Man*

In what way is this interdependence and publicity of the world definitive for my way of existing? How am I affected by the fact that the background of referential totalities against which I play out my projects is shaped not only by my own meaningful practices, but by the presence and projects of other purposive selves?

According to Heidegger, the everyday way that I exist in terms of the publicity of the world is fundamentally in terms of *averageness*. I understand myself and others in light of a context of social roles and meanings in which we are all, for the most part, engaged in behavior that is interchangeable and anonymous. “In utilizing public transportation, in the use of information services such as the newspaper, every other is like the next” (BT 126/119). This everyday form of existence—in which *my* way of being is simply the *average* way of being—Heidegger refers to as *das Man*. Various translations as “the they,” “the crowd,” or “one,” these terms are designed to illustrate the way in which we understand ourselves in terms of anonymous social roles and practices infused with the interchangeability of those participating in them. Distinguishable and explicit individuals do not, primarily and for the most part, differentiate themselves or others from these general social categories, meanings, and standards through which they are encountered in the surrounding world. Thus Heidegger asserts that

“the others” does not mean everybody else but me—those from whom the I distinguishes itself. They are, rather, those from whom one mostly does *not* distinguish oneself, those among whom one is, too. This being-there-too with them does not have the ontological character of being objectively present “with” them within a world. The “with” is of the character of *Da-sein*, the “also” means the sameness of being as circumspect, heedful being-in-the-world. “With” and “also” are to be understood existentially, not categorially. On the basis of this *like-with* being-in-the-world, the world is always already the one that I share with the others. (BT 118/111–12)

As we have noted, the with of being-with must be distinguished from objective co-presence, from mere spatial contiguity. Thus my indistinguishability from the others does not mean that it is impossible to determine where I end and you begin; the sameness and indistinguishability of human beings existing in terms of *das Man* must be understood existentially: as a *way* of existing, as patterns of interpreting and behaving in the world that we all share. Because we all participate in, and understand ourselves from, these average and public understandings, Heidegger is designating a way of being in which the self is initially and for the most part *not* differentiated from the others. Self, others, and world are experienced through the lens of shared meanings and practices that are unquestioningly taken up. The existential nature of the way we are with others in terms of *das Man* refers not to some type of group subject, but to the way in which communal standards determine our engagement in particular activities and how these activities are carried out. Since selfhood is understood as a *way* of existing, not as a kind of substance, it becomes clear how I can become a seemingly indistinct and anonymous one among many: because the activities that define my existence are determined by shared public norms. Thus "the they" "are not *definite* others. On the contrary, any other can represent them" (BT 126/118). Insofar as I live out the standards of teacher, daughter, sailor, I too am "the they." Everyday Dasein's being-in-the-world takes the form of an engagement in the activities of its taking care, but these activities and the tools made use of are defined by the communal standards of what things are and how "one" does things: "We enjoy ourselves and have fun the way *they* enjoy themselves. We read, see, and judge literature and art the way *they* see and judge. But we also withdraw from the 'great mass' the way *they* withdraw, we find 'shocking' what they find shocking. The they, which is nothing definite and which all are, though not as a sum, prescribes the kind of being of everydayness" (BT 127/119). Anyone who has noted the profound conformity even within groups of those who are "rebellious" against society—Goths, punks, hippies—will recognize the acuity of Heidegger's characterization.

The creation and maintenance of averageness involves our tendency to adapt ourselves to the others. Dasein is caught up not only in taking care of the different things and projects in which it is immersed, but also in taking care of *how* this taking care compares to that of others. We recognize the unspoken standard of how one does things and constantly, unthinkingly modify our behavior to meet this standard, to control this distance between others and ourselves. This tendency to manage our distance from others is what Heidegger refers to as *distantiality*. While I pursue my projects in the world that I share with the others,

there is “constant care as to the way one differs from them, whether this difference is to be equalized, whether one’s own *Da-sein* has lagged behind others and wants to catch up in relation to them. Being-with-one-another is, unknown to itself, disquieted by the care about this distance. Existentially expressed, being-with-one-another has the character of *distantiality*” (BT 126/118). Though this urge to conform to the “normal” and the “average” can be quite explicit, it generally operates on an unthematized level that infuses all of our activities: we immediately lower our voice if someone whispers to us, we wait in line if others are doing so. The implicit nature of this constant adjusting to the public standards and understandings in which we are immersed is in keeping with Heidegger’s claim that we do not adapt to *das Man* standards only after we have become full-fledged independent subjects—that we in some sense autonomously *choose* to adapt to these standards. Rather, “in terms of the they, and as the they, I am initially ‘given’ to ‘myself.’ Initially, *Dasein* is the they and for the most part it remains so” (BT 129/121). The they is a normative construction that determines the way in which one’s taking care *can* manifest itself; it “prescribes the kind of being of everydayness” (BT 127/119).

The manner in which *das Man* dominates my everyday way of being, then, involves its tendency to delimit and control the possible interpretations of self, world, and others that are available. Though the characteristic of distantiality indicates a tendency to minimize and manage the difference between self and others in terms of the socially defined meanings and interpretations available, *das Man* itself determines their availability. “Thus, the they maintains itself factically in the averageness of what is proper, what is allowed, and what is not. Of what is granted success and what is not” (BT 127/119). *I* do not decide what makes for a successful woman, philosopher, citizen; the social context that defines these roles and interpretations does. My everyday way of existing is determined on the basis of the easy and familiar patterns provided and encouraged by the public meanings and standards in which I find myself. This tendency for all possibilities to become average and general is what Heidegger refers to as *leveling down*.

Attendant on this feature of our everyday way of being is the tendency to conceal the *possibleness*—the possible nature—of these average possibilities. The greater the extent to which leveling-down characterizes *das Man*’s prescription of the range of acceptable meanings and self-understandings—what counts as *normal*—the greater the sense that these possible ways to be and the norms governing them seem to have the determinate force of laws of nature. Under such an influence, we can lose our awareness of ourselves as entrusted with our own possible



ways of being. Indeed, the structures of averageness, distanciality, and leveling down—all of which together constitute what Heidegger terms *publicness*—implicitly encourage the loss of this self-responsibility. The always already being-interpreted of the average and the normal—the everyday way I understand even myself—is “characterized by the fact that it is in fact not explicitly experienced, not explicitly present, it is a how of Dasein from out of which and on the basis of which the Dasein of each is lived.”<sup>37</sup> Thus the averageness of the everyday is conducive to what Heidegger refers to as an inauthentic or “*fallen*” way of existing—when averageness inhibits and conceals the particularity and responsibility of Dasein’s being. As Frederick Elliston notes: “By prescribing in advance the way Dasein is to understand itself and its world, the public removes the burden each person has of deciding for himself.”<sup>38</sup> Everyday Dasein is not only *unaware* that it is responsible for choosing its way of being, but the way of being of *das Man* actively discourages, punishes, or covers over Dasein’s attempt to act on this responsibility: “This averageness, which prescribes what can and may be ventured, watches over every exception which thrusts itself to the fore. Every priority is noiselessly squashed. Overnight, everything primordial is flattened down as something long since known. Everything gained by struggle becomes something to be manipulated” (*BT* 127/119). Such a reduction to the common, the determined in advance, the average, results in a phasing out of the possible as such. We are generally blind to this lack of possibility when immersed in our social context since social roles, meanings, and norms tend to conceal their own contingent nature. According to Heidegger, our tendency to inauthentic being-in-the-world involves just this type of blindness to possibility and a tranquilization with what is “real”; possibilities lose their possibleness by being socially interpreted as given in advance, as settled and prearranged.

Following Hubert Dreyfus’s classic account in *Being-in-the-World*, we can note, then, that there seem to be two senses in which Heidegger understands the role of *das Man*. There is the first, somewhat unproblematic understanding in which the they provides us with the possibilities of taking care from which we must choose our ways of being. How we understand ourselves is shaped by the fact that any possible self-understanding is acquired from public meanings and practices. However, there is also the sense of *das Man* as something that *prevents* us from being able to make choices about who we are to be. Thus Dreyfus claims that “Heidegger takes up and extends the Diltheyan insight that intelligibility and truth arise only in the context of public, historical practices, but he is also deeply influenced by the Kierkegaardian view that ‘the truth is never in the crowd.’”<sup>39</sup>

It is this latter view that Heidegger often seems to prioritize in his descriptions: “Because the they presents every judgment and decision as its own, it takes the responsibility of Dasein away from it. The they can, as it were, manage to have ‘them’ constantly invoking it. It can most easily be responsible for everything because no one has to vouch for anything. The they always ‘did it,’ and yet it can be said that ‘no one’ did it. In the everydayness of Dasein, most things happen in such a way that we must say ‘no one did it’” (BT 127/120). Though this has chilling reverberations considering Heidegger’s Nazi involvement, its accuracy is attested by that very involvement. The most frightening dimension of Nazi Germany is precisely the *average* person’s involvement in a monstrosity that had come to be the norm. Putting aside the already well-hashed out discussion of Heidegger’s Nazi involvement, however,<sup>40</sup> we can notice everywhere—not only in Nazi Germany—this tendency toward loss of individual responsibility in the face of the overwhelming inertia of socially accepted norms. It’s not *I* who am these things—it’s just “the way it is.” “Thus, the they *disburdens* Dasein in its everydayness. Not only that; by disburdening it of its being, the they accommodates Dasein in its tendency to take things easily and make them easy” (BT 128/120).

Characterized as such, *das Man* is seen as responsible not only for providing us with possible interpretations of self, world, and others but also for encouraging us in our tendency to fall prey to the temptation of simply being immersed in the world and passively accepting the socially accepted public understandings and interpretations, rather than actively making them one’s own. It is tempting to fall into this inauthentic mode of being, argues Heidegger, because of the tendency of publicity to present itself as “having-seen everything and having-understood-everything,” which encourages “the supposition that the disclosedness of Dasein thus available and prevalent could guarantee to Dasein the certainty, genuineness, and fullness of all the possibilities of its being. In the self-certainty and decisiveness of the they, it gets spread abroad increasingly that there is no need of authentic, attuned understanding. The supposition of the they that one is leading and sustaining a full and genuine ‘life’ brings a *tranquillization* to Dasein” (BT 177/166). The certainty of rightness characteristic of *das Man*—that its ways of being are the *only* ways of being, or the only ones that matter—promotes our desire to have our existence determined for us from without such that our own responsibility for this existence can be forgotten. “When Dasein, tranquilized and ‘understanding’ everything, thus compares itself with everything, it drifts toward an alienation in which its ownmost potentiality for being-in-the-world is concealed” (BT 178/166).

According to Heidegger, this irresponsible drift or fall into such

a condition of inauthenticity or fallenness is ultimately rooted in the failure to distinguish different senses of being; to interpret all entities, instead, according to an understanding relevant only to "occurrent," or "thingly" entities. The insidiousness of fallenness is that it takes its interpretive cues not simply from the public modes of interpretation, but that these public modes of interpretation take their cues only from the mode of being of things. "Absorbed in taking care of things, Dasein understands itself in terms of what it encounters within the world . . . the understanding of being in general initially understands all beings as something objectively present" (*BT* 225/207). Falling is Dasein's tendency to live in this interpretative stance, the "tendency to understand itself primarily by way of things and to derive the concept of being from the extant" (*BPP* 272), rather than deriving the concept of being from Dasein itself. The phasing out of the possible—Dasein's tendency to fall into thinking of itself as a settled, thing-like substance—conceals from Dasein its own way of being as finite, contingent, and entrusted with its own having to be. The temptation to misunderstand itself in this manner derives from the fact that understanding itself as a type of thing allows Dasein to avoid recognizing the responsibility for being with which it is always entrusted. It is for this reason, Heidegger claims, that the fallen mode of Dasein's self-interpretation is "only a *mask* which it holds up before itself in order not to be frightened by itself" (*OHF* 26).

When characterized as such, it is difficult to see how our everyday being with others is anything other than destructive. This is hardly an appealing conclusion, and if it is indeed what Heidegger advocates, any account of intersubjectivity that he might provide only succeeds in avoiding worries about the problem of other minds by articulating a necessarily social dimension of being that is nevertheless profoundly negative. In order to avoid this conclusion, I will argue that though the two senses of *das Man* are intimately linked, fallen inauthenticity and average everydayness must be distinguished. While the latter is an immersion in the worldly, average, publicly defined tasks that reflect me back to myself, the former is a self-misunderstanding rooted in the failure to differentiate between the various modes of being. In this regard, the ambiguity of the term *das Man*—an ambiguity expressed in Dreyfus's distinction above—will encourage us to avoid it for the most part, emphasizing, instead, (1) Everydayness—in which Dasein is neither inauthentic nor authentic, but is immersed in average worldly activities with the others, (2) Falling—the tendency conducive to misunderstanding or cultivating this averageness in such a way that Dasein becomes (3) Inauthentic/fallen—a condition in which Dasein can avoid awareness of the contingency and responsibility of its being by using interpretive categories appropriate for things.

These distinctions will be examined in much greater detail in chapter 6, where I will explicitly argue against the many interpreters who argue that Heidegger simply *equates* average everydayness with inauthenticity. At this point, it is enough to familiarize ourselves with the necessity of maintaining the distinction.

Even if we do maintain this distinction, however, Heidegger's account of Dasein's fundamentally being-with nature still faces a number of serious problems. First, if we are always immersed in the world—if we always understand ourselves in terms of average, anonymous roles and standards—what kind of self remains in the face of such anonymity? How can we accommodate our intuitions about the privacy of our first-personal, “inner,” lives? In what way can we account for the individuated first-person self-presence that we take to be definitive of selfhood? Second, if other Dasein are always encountered in terms of the publicity and averageness of the shared world, in what sense can we understand the *other* as such an individuated self? How do we experience the particularity and immediacy of the other if *being-with* only refers to this condition of being in a shared world—not to concrete encounters with this or that other person?

Chapter 2 takes up the first issue. There I will argue that though Heidegger is indeed claiming that my everyday self-understandings are in a certain sense *not* my own—since they are provided by the general inherited public meanings and norms according to which we *all* understand ourselves—he nevertheless leaves room for the fact that our everyday self-understandings are in some sense *always* our own. Chapter 3 examines the second problem—the fact that Heidegger must face a version of the traditional problem of other minds. In other words, though there can be no question that there are always already others shaping and sharing the worldly meanings in terms of which we understand ourselves, Heidegger must still account for the manner in which we experience the *particularity* of individual others, despite the averageness and anonymity that characterizes our everyday encounters with them. Chapter 3 addresses this problem by examining its formulation in the work of Jean-Paul Sartre, and the remainder of the book is dedicated to answering how the other is *always* encountered as a particular self—despite the fact that I always understand her in terms of the shared world.

## Mineness and the Practical First-Person

Heidegger's non-substantive account of subjectivity—coupled with his characterization of our everyday way of being as a lostness in the anonymity and averageness of the public realm—leads us to wonder whether there really is a Heideggerian “self” at all. Despite the tendency to read Heidegger—especially his later writings—as advocating some version of such a position, Heidegger recognizes that there is a sense in which there is nothing “less dubious than the givenness of the I” (*BT* 115/109). His deep concern is not to show that there is no I but to show that its very obviousness promotes its misunderstanding. The primary form that such a misunderstanding takes, as we have seen, is the view that the self can be understood in isolation from the worldly context of meaning in which it is immersed. In contrast, Heidegger argues that to be a self is to be open to the world and dependent on its meaning frameworks. Despite the importance of this reorientation, however, we cannot allow it to obscure the fundamental individuation and self-presence that also characterizes Dasein. As Heidegger notes, the very notion of the I contains an indication of the solitude of the self; it suggests that “an I is always this being, and not others” (*BT* 114/108).

The purpose of this chapter is to examine what the individuated, first-personal quality of Dasein looks like; in other words, how we can capture the traditional sense of selfhood as a kind of singular condition characterized by self-awareness. What can such first-personal selfhood look like on Heidegger's account, considering his insistence that our everyday way of being does not consist of a distinct subjective “inner” realm that exists in isolation from an objective “outer” realm, but is defined, rather, by an intentional directedness that transcends sharp subject/object boundaries and finds shape for this intentionality in the world? The question of import, then, is what differentiates my first-personal way of being from yours, if this being is not to be understood as isolated in some self-enclosed substantive subjectivity à la Descartes? What makes it *mine* and how do I have “access” to such a unique being?

Though Dasein's individuation will not be fully explicable prior to a discussion of authenticity, here our purpose is to demonstrate the

manner in which Dasein is given to itself in an everyday way through the first-personal *mineness* that characterizes all of its lived experiences. In what follows below, I will argue that this basic self-givenness cannot be characterized as a conceptual self-grasping but only as a kind of pre-reflective practical self-presence. On Heidegger's account, the manner in which the self is present to itself is not primarily in terms of explicit self-knowledge or deliberate self-representation. Rather, the self is always and most fundamentally present to itself as *care* for its own being. It is this committed, caring "mineness" that constitutes first-person presence to self; a self-presence that is inherent in every intentional act that one undertakes, regardless of how steeped in averageness. Understanding this mode of self-presence will allow us to recognize how Heidegger can accommodate our sense that something like a self must remain—despite Dasein's worldly averageness and its tendency to fall into inauthenticity. As we will see, a practical notion of the first-person differs from much of the current literature on this issue, which tends to champion some variety of a representational model of self-awareness—in which the first-person is a type of "I think" or "I reflect" that accompanies all of one's actions.

### Epistemic Self-Awareness

Sydney Shoemaker—a philosopher who has done a great deal of work on the problem of the first-person—argues in "First-Person Access" and elsewhere that in asking about the nature of the first-person, we are investigating "the mind's *epistemic* access to itself . . . the view that each of us has a logically 'privileged access' to his or her mental states, and that it is of the essence of the mind that this should be so."<sup>1</sup> On this approach, self-awareness is taken to be a type of higher-order attitude or comportment that each of us takes toward our own thoughts or activities. Though Shoemaker recognizes that the notion of privileged access has been undermined not only by the Freudian subconscious but also by research showing how much of the mind's activity is inaccessible to conscious inspection, he argues, nevertheless, that a weaker privileged access thesis can be supported, requiring that one need only claim (1) that such states are "necessarily 'self-intimating': that it belongs to their very nature that having them leads to the belief, and knowledge, that one has them," and (2) that a person has a "'special authority' about what such states he or she has."<sup>2</sup>

Though the first claim regarding privileged access taps into the sense that the first-person involves the self's immediacy to itself, this for-

mulation is nevertheless problematic: my everyday experience of self certainly does not seem to involve any “belief” or “knowledge” that I am experiencing my own thoughts; their nature is precisely one whereby such descriptions are ridiculous—there is never any *doubt* that my thoughts are my own<sup>3</sup> and thus do not “lead to the belief” that they are my own. The second point—that the first-person involves a particular type of authority—was taken by Descartes to champion a conception of the mind as completely transparent to itself, as well as a corresponding infallibility of the self-knowledge that this transparency would allow. According to Shoemaker, however, complete transparency and infallibility are not necessarily claims that such a position must advocate. Viewing first-person access as involving a particular type of authority is at a minimum “the claim that it is in some sense necessary that our beliefs about our mental states of these kinds be for the most part correct, and that a person’s belief that she has such a state creates a presumption that she has it, in a sense in which it is not true that someone’s having a belief that some *other* person has such a state creates a presumption that the other person does indeed have the state.”<sup>4</sup> Such a claim nevertheless seems to commit one to the view that self-awareness involves *true beliefs* about having particular mental states, beliefs that one does not *know* to be true when applied to the mental states of others. On this picture, then, first-person self-awareness is a condition in which I *know* more about what is true of me than others do.

Such an epistemological orientation is representative of “higher-order” theories in general, which tend to characterize self-awareness as a type of upper level of representation that takes a non-self-aware experience as its object and thereby grants it its first-personal feel.<sup>5</sup> Thus Peter Carruthers claims in *Phenomenal Consciousness: A Naturalistic Theory* that “it is just such a manner of focusing which confers on our experiences the dimension of subjectivity, and so which renders them for the first time fully phenomenally conscious.”<sup>6</sup> Like Shoemaker’s claims above, then, the debate is cast in terms of the self’s epistemic access to itself, an access that is itself supposed to bring with it the “what it is like” quality of first-person self-givenness. One’s mental states are conscious, such views hold, only insofar as they are represented in the correct way by other mental states or attitudes that take them as their object. Thus one can notice the tendency—inspired by Locke—to hold that self-awareness is essentially a kind of object-awareness simply turned “inward” toward the states, beliefs, or propositions bearing the relevant internal content.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, self-awareness is characterized as a particular kind of epistemic privilege; one is granted access by one’s “internal perception” to objects (propositions, mentalese, etc.) that are in principle no different than the

way I perceive external objects. I am aware of my “self” insofar as I am aware of the mental contents that are available for grasping in roughly the same manner that other objects are grasped. Insofar as one is aware of these mental-objects, one is self-aware.<sup>8</sup>

In response to such approaches, phenomenologists have argued that basing first-personal self-givenness on object awareness fails to recognize the distinctive quality of the first-person. The problem, they argue, is that such approaches do not start at a sufficiently basic level—namely, at the condition of being present to oneself prior to the explicit grasping of distinct ideas or mental states. Starting at too high a level of representational thought creates the false sense that self-awareness is just object awareness turned inward—thereby obscuring the fact that object awareness itself contains the difficult problem of how I am present to myself *as aware while* I am engaged in any act of object-awareness (whether “internal” or “external”). The problem with such approaches, in other words, is the fact that they result in an infinite regress. If experience A is first-personally available because it is represented in a particular way by experience B, from whence does experience B obtain its ability to grant A its first-personal quality? Must it too be the object of some type of higher-order monitoring? If not, how can we account for the higher-order “I” that is itself doing the reflecting or perceiving?

Indeed, even if regress were not an issue, speaking this way seems to misrepresent the immediacy or transparency that is the essence of self-awareness. After all, explicit self-representations are quite rare and seem to be founded upon a more primordial self-presence. In recognition of this difference, Lynne Rudder Baker distinguishes between what she calls “weak” and “strong” first-person phenomena. The former refers to the condition of being a subject of perspectival experience at all, while the latter demands that one possess a concept of self and the ability to self-designate using “I.”<sup>9</sup> Thus Baker’s account seems to acknowledge what many others do not: namely, that explicit self-grasping or self-designation requires a more basic self-givenness according to which all of my experiences are given as mine. As Zahavi puts it: “The very mastery of the first-person pronoun presupposes possession of self-conscious thoughts . . . linguistic self-reference articulates self-awareness, it doesn’t bring it about.”<sup>10</sup> Even in the face of such a realization, however, Baker continues to count only the strong first-person phenomena as genuine self-awareness, a philosophical tendency that Heidegger rightly criticizes:

We must first of all see this one thing clearly: the Dasein, as existing, is there for itself, even when the ego does not expressly direct itself to itself in the manner of its own peculiar turning around and turning



back, which in phenomenology is called inner perception as contrasted with outer. The self is there for the Dasein itself without reflection and without inner perception, *before* all reflection. Reflection, in the sense of turning back, is only a mode of self-*apprehension*, but not the mode of primary self-disclosure. (*BPP* 159)

Self-awareness is not primarily self-representation—some kind of Locke-inspired self-as-object experience. Rather, primordial first-person self-presence is intrinsic to the “mineness” of *all* of my experiences. I am typically aware of myself *through* the mode of givenness of my experiences, not because of an explicit awareness *of* my experiences.<sup>11</sup> Thus Heidegger argues that *all* of our experiences are self-disclosive and the possibility of explicit self-representation arises out of a more basic self-presence characteristic of Dasein’s transcendence itself. Despite the fact that it is *possible* to engage in explicit self-reflection or self-representation, then, such objectifying modes of consciousness must be recognized as derivative of a more immediate presence to self: “The Dasein does not need a special kind of observation, nor does it need to conduct a sort of espionage on the ego in order to have the self; rather, as the Dasein gives itself over immediately and passionately to the world itself, its own self is reflected to it from things” (*BPP* 159). For Heidegger such thematizing knowing is always secondary to the way in which we generally live—in an unthematic tacit self-understanding present in the first-personal mode of givenness of all our experiences. Thus we cannot take our cues for understanding self-presence from a theoretical stance in which an autonomous epistemic subject observes an object (such as a belief or a proposition) laid out for its inspection. Though such stances are possible for Dasein, they are derivative of our everyday way of being in the world. Rather than modeling our understanding of first-personal self-presence to self on some type of abstract reflection, then, we must *start* with this primary self-disclosure and base any analyses of abstract reflection upon it.

By looking to Heidegger’s account of intentionality, we will find that Dasein’s basic self-givenness cannot be understood as something *other* than Dasein’s intentional transcendence toward the world. Rather, Dasein is present to itself in and through its intentional compartments toward that which it is not. This will become evident once we have examined the three features of intentionality that account for Dasein’s base-level selfhood. It is in terms of these features that we can understand how the self is characterized by first-person self-presence despite its intentional immersion in the world and its fundamentally social self-understandings. These features can be termed (1) directedness, (2) normativity, and (3) mattering.

## Intentional Directedness

In *The Zollikon Seminars* Heidegger makes the Husserl-style claim that “intentionality means: Each consciousness is consciousness of something. It is directed toward something” (ZS 226). Elsewhere he exhorts us to recognize that “Dasein’s comportments have an *intentional character* and . . . on the basis of this intentionality the subject already stands in relation to things that it itself is not” (BPP 155). Though many contemporary discussions of intentionality speak of it in terms of discrete *instances* of directedness toward this or that thing, for Heidegger what is of primary concern is not the particular intentional act or thought, but the underlying relationality or transcendence that makes this directedness toward things possible.<sup>12</sup> As we have seen in chapter 1, the directedness of specific intentional acts is, for Heidegger, rooted in Dasein’s way of being as an openness to or transcending toward the world. Dasein exists in such a way that it is never confined to some inner sphere, but is in its very essence directed toward things, engaged in particular relations with them, intentionally oriented to them. Understood as such, we are reminded how this first feature of intentionality undermines sharp divides between self and world: human beings exist as a relationality, not as some subjective thing-self occasionally bumping up against some objective thing-world.

But how does this “relating itself to” also include a kind of *self-givenness*? As we have already noted in chapter 1, Dasein’s transcending, intentional being is defined not only by immersion in the world, but also by a particular kind of *self-disclosure*. In *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* he will examine this notion further:

To intentionality belongs, not only a self-directing-toward and not only an understanding of the being of the being toward which it is directed, but also *the associated unveiling of the self* which is comporting itself here. Intentional self-direction-toward is not simply an act-ray issuing from an ego-center, which would have to be related back to the ego only afterward, in such a way that in a second act this ego would turn back to the first one (the first self-directing-toward). Rather, the co-disclosure of the self belongs to intentionality. (BPP 158)

It is clear from such statements that Heidegger is rejecting characterizations of the self-relation as a type of self-as-object for self-as-subject approach—which, as we saw, was a difficulty with higher-order theories of self-awareness. Rather, “the self which the Dasein is, is there somehow in and along with all intentional comportments” (BPP 158), and is not

“added on” through another intentional comportment. Dasein is fundamentally characterized by an intentional orientation to the world and this orientation itself involves a kind of presence to self—a co-disclosure of self—underlying all of its comportments.

### Intentional Normativity

But in what way am I “there along with” all of my immersed engagements, if this cannot be understood as higher-order observation? Accounting for the nature of this kind of intentional self-presence requires us to consider the second feature of Heideggerian intentionality: the fact that Dasein’s world-directedness involves some type of responsiveness to the norms determining the success or failure of its comportments. It is this norm-responsiveness, I will argue, that characterizes Dasein’s non-epistemic self-givenness. Clarifying this inherently normative nature of first-personal intentionality will bring us into dialogue with thinkers such as John Searle and Hubert Dreyfus, whose exchange on this point will provide us with an important context for understanding what Heidegger can contribute to this issue.

The normative dimension of intentionality is clearly articulated in Galen Strawson’s article “Real Intentionality,” where he argues that intentionality entails an “aboutness” or “taking as” that introduces the possibility of mis-recognition.<sup>13</sup> In Heidegger, the normativity of intentional actions is evident in the fact that they are subjected to the social categories of meaning and use that determine whether these actions succeed in the activities toward which they are directed. Thus in *Being and Time* Heidegger claims that “when we take care of things, we are subordinate to the in-order-to constitutive for the actual useful thing in our association with it” (BT 69/65). We are *subordinate* to it insofar as worldly things have a specific “for which”: their meanings *as* the type of things that they involve established conditions for successfully “taking them as” what they are—conditions to which our intentional activities are responsive.<sup>14</sup>

As we discussed in chapter 1, this responsiveness is evident in the condition that Heidegger termed distantiality—wherein Dasein seeks to meet the norms of averageness by submitting its behavior to the accepted standards of normalcy. Recall that Dasein’s way of being qua “primary meaning” promotes the establishment and maintenance of worldly or “secondarily” meaningful ways in which its being-in-the-world can be fulfilled: “Factual life develops ever new possibilities of meaningfulness in which it can bestir itself and can in that way be assured of its own ‘mean-

ing’” (*PIA* 80). Such assurance comes in the form of normative constraints on its worldly self-understandings; Dasein subordinates itself to the norms of success and failure embedded in worldly practices, thereby providing a means for understanding how well it is succeeding in living up to the burden of having itself to be. As we can see, this second feature of intentionality—its subordination and responsiveness to conditions of success and failure—reinforces the worldliness of Heidegger’s view of intentionality insofar as these conditions are primarily public and shared.

What remains to be determined, however, is the manner in which the self is co-disclosed in and through this worldly norm-responsiveness. In order to answer this, we will turn first to John Searle and Hubert Dreyfus’s efforts to determine what type of self-presence defines intentionality. As we will come to see, though both accounts describe important characteristics of intentionality, their disagreement is ultimately rooted in the need for a more basic existential account of intentional agency. By first pointing up the weaknesses in their accounts, we will be better able to recognize just what Heidegger’s view can provide in this regard.

In Jerome Wakefield and Hubert Dreyfus’s article entitled “Intentionality and the Phenomenality of Action,” the authors demand an account of human action that can accommodate the first-person phenomenological features of acting—what it *feels like* to be acting—that allow us to differentiate bodily movements caused by reasons<sup>15</sup> into those that are actions and those that are not. According to Wakefield and Dreyfus, John Searle’s notion of an “intention in action”—which they take to be “a representation of the goal of one’s action that both causes the action and is directly experienced as causing the action”<sup>16</sup>—is meant to account for these features. However, since there appear to be bodily movements that *should* count as actions but are nevertheless without “the constant accompaniment of representational states which specify what the action is aimed at accomplishing,” they argue that Searle’s account fails.<sup>17</sup>

According to Wakefield and Dreyfus, activities of “mindless coping,” such as brushing one’s teeth or driving to work, are actions in which *no* representation of the goal of the action shapes the action or persists throughout the acting. During such activities one is nevertheless responsive in some way to the situation in which one finds oneself, and one’s response “may be ‘aimed’ in a functional sense at achieving some larger purpose.”<sup>18</sup> This non-representational “bodily” awareness accounts for the phenomenological distinction between voluntary and non-voluntary action, they argue, without requiring that all voluntary, self-aware action involve an “ongoing representation” of its purpose in order to regulate that activity.<sup>19</sup> The authors thus distinguish between actions guided by representations of intentions and actions guided by

the non-representational “tendency to return to a *gestalt* equilibrium”—a tendency that does not require that we are “explicitly aware of what we are trying to do.”<sup>20</sup>

In response to such criticisms, Searle has argued that Wakefield and Dreyfus’s descriptions of what is supposed to be the *absence* of intention-in-action is precisely an example of what intention-in-action *is* for him. In other words, because they speak of “a sense of *deformation* from and return to an *optimal form* or *gestalt* of the body-world relationship,”<sup>21</sup> they are already invoking intentionality insofar as “deformation” and “optimality” imply conditions of satisfaction that these actions have failed or succeeded at meeting. On Searle’s account, both “are forms of Intentionality in the sense that they can succeed or fail. They have conditions of satisfaction.”<sup>22</sup> According to Searle, then, a conscious experience of acting is an experience of action that “involves a consciousness of the conditions of satisfaction of that experience.”<sup>23</sup> Wakefield and Dreyfus seem to agree with this account insofar as the optimality of one’s response to the situation demands *some* type of awareness of one’s success or failure—or at least improvement and its lack—in responding to the situation in which one finds oneself. As Dreyfus claims, however, “in absorbed coping, the agent’s body is led to move so as to reduce a sense of deviation from a satisfactory *gestalt* without the agent knowing what that satisfactory *gestalt* will be like in advance of achieving it.”<sup>24</sup>

The difficulty, then, becomes one of articulating the sense in which these conditions of satisfaction—and the experience of one’s own efforts to meet them—are present to the actor while she is acting. How am I present to myself *as* striving to be a certain way? Searle has already been forced to admit that certain types of action are intentional—responsive to conditions of satisfaction—without having to be *explicitly* before the mind *as* a representation of what that satisfaction would be like. He has granted, Dreyfus claims, “that in absorbed coping the agent need not have a representation of the end-state in order to be drawn toward it, and that the agent may find out what the final equilibrium feels like only when he gets there.”<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, Searle argues that activities of absorbed coping—while non-representationally intentional—only *receive* their intentionality—their directedness and their conditions of satisfaction—from an overarching representational intentionality. The “mindless” activities that fall under this umbrella intentionality are rooted in background capacities that do not themselves rely on the specific representation of satisfaction conditions. Such actions are instead “governed by the Intentionality of the flow, even though there is not, and need not be, any explicit representation of the intentional movement.”<sup>26</sup>

But why does Searle feel compelled to insist upon this umbrella

representational intentionality, faced with what Dreyfus takes to be a perfectly adequate account of “body-intentionality” style responsiveness to conditions of improvement or deterioration? In contrast to Dreyfus’s emphasis on such mindless coping, Searle is motivated to argue that background capacities only function when they are “activated by genuine Intentional contents” out of the necessity of designating what would *count* as an “improvement” or “easing” of tension.<sup>27</sup> For Searle, what counts as improvement must be determined on some level by an explicit articulation of what something is meant to be improving in terms of. The difficulty with Dreyfus’s account is precisely his failure to elaborate on the basis of the normativity inherent in any talk of the improvement or appropriateness of one’s actions. He thereby makes his account of “mindless” intentional action equally applicable to amoeba and to plants—or, for that matter, to those tightrope balancing toys that respond to changes in the environment “in order” to return to a certain gestalt equilibrium.<sup>28</sup> In other words, stripped of all sense of purposive self-presence, Dreyfus’s account no longer strikes us as being about *intentionality*.

Dreyfus himself seems to recognize this danger at points, insofar as he fluctuates in his opinion about the relationship between absorbed coping and explicitly intentional action. On the one hand he claims that absorbed coping requires that “the bodily movements that make up an action must, indeed, be initiated by an intention in action with success conditions,”<sup>29</sup> but on the other he claims that generally *no* representational intentionality is required: “Normally, absorbed coping does not need to be initiated by an intention in action, and so is more basic than intentional action.”<sup>30</sup> Despite such conflicting claims, however, it seems that ultimately Dreyfus is committed to the latter claim, that “in general, when intentional action occurs, it is only possible on the background of ongoing absorbed coping . . . [which] is the background condition of the possibility of all forms of comportment.”<sup>31</sup> For Dreyfus, then, an unthematic, mindless/bodily basic sense of appropriateness underlies all explicit articulations of success conditions—including those of representational consciousness and social institutions. We need not have any explicit awareness of what will count as appropriateness in order for our activities to be intentional.

If this is the case, however, it becomes very difficult to retain any meaningful sense of the word “intentionality” when it encompasses both human action and the equilibrium movements of inanimate objects. Unless we want to say that even the balancing statue’s movements are intentional actions—since its “body” is seeking equilibrium despite not having this equilibrium representationally present as a goal—there must be some middle path between Searle’s overly cognitive and Dreyfus’s overly “mindless” account of the manner in which the directedness and normativity of intentional acts are present to the actor while she acts.

This middle way is what Heidegger's account provides. Like Dreyfus, Heidegger does not believe an explicit representation of one's goal is necessary for one's actions to be intentional, but like Searle, Heidegger will attempt to offer a more thorough account of the intentional directedness underlying all human action and the manner in which we seek to express this directedness than Dreyfus's claim that the body seeks equilibrium. To fill this role, Heidegger's position must be seen as a fundamental shift from an *epistemic* to a *pragmatic* sense of first-personal self-presence. What counts as success or "appropriateness equilibrium" is present to the agent not as a type of *knowledge* or *lack* of knowledge. Rather, the first-person presence of these success conditions must instead be understood in terms of the manner in which they *matter* to the agent's very existence.

### Intentional Mattering

This point brings us to the third feature of Heideggerian intentionality. In *The Zollikon Seminars* Heidegger claims that "one does not have representations, but one represents" (ZS 226)—a statement that is definitive for his understanding of selfhood as a particular manner of intentional *agency*, not as an inner arena with a privileged type of self-viewing. So too must such a shift be applied to the intentionality debate: seeking equilibrium and striving to meet represented success conditions both *presuppose* a manner of practical self-presence rooted in the fact that I *care* about their fulfillment; I am never indifferent to my intentional actions but am deeply invested in their success. Thus even when I am "mindlessly" driving home, such an action is infused with an intentional directedness—not because my body is seeking equilibrium or because I am consciously representing the successful goal of reaching home—but because I *care* about safely reaching home. My "mindlessness" thus nevertheless includes a type of pre-thematic awareness of the *import* of this success for my existence, an awareness that is expressed in my failure to run red lights or pull into oncoming traffic. It is in *this* sense that Heidegger can claim that all intentionality is experiential, not as a *knowing* of success conditions, but as a *living* them in terms of what they will mean for my life if I meet them.<sup>32</sup>

If the Dasein projects itself upon a possibility and understands itself in that possibility, this understanding, this becoming manifest of the self, is not a self-contemplation in the sense that the ego would become the object of some cognition or other; rather, the projection is the way in

which I *am* the possibility; it is the way in which I exist freely. The essential core of understanding as projection is the Dasein's understanding itself existentially in it. Since projection unveils without making what is unveiled as such into an object of contemplation, there is present in all understanding an *insight* of the Dasein into itself. (*BPP* 277)

Heidegger recognizes that intentionality is not simply the directedness toward the world and the standards by which this directionality is measured—rather, on the most basic level, it is a *caring* about succeeding in measuring up that is present in every intentional act that one undertakes. Intentionality demands that meeting those conditions *matters* to the agent and thereby gives Dasein a way of “understanding itself existentially in it.” Dasein is co-disclosed in its striving to be something—a successful driver, teacher, parent, washer of dishes—because it has committed itself; because it understands the striving *as* a reflection of who it will be. Thus Heidegger's characterization of intentionality avoids both the overly conceptual Searlean reading—in which acting intentionally must involve an *explicit* awareness of the goal or the satisfaction conditions that it establishes—and Dreyfus's overly self-less understanding of intentionality, which lacks any sense of agency's *mineness*. Rather, on the most basic level Dasein's sustained caring for who it will be—its commitment to the way in which its various activities reflect it back to itself—is basic to self-awareness. All of my actions are grounded in the implicit awareness that whether I succeed or fail matters to me and reveals something about who I am.<sup>33</sup>

For Heidegger, this investment in all of my actions and understandings is rooted in the fact that everything I do falls under my overarching responsibility for who I am. Each specific intentional action is encompassed by my intention to succeed at my own existence: “It is not the case that this being just simply is; instead, so far as it is, it is occupied with its own capacity to be . . . The Dasein exists; that is to say, it is for the sake of its own capacity to be” (*BPP* 170). All explicit representational intentions to succeed and all implicit bodily intentions to improve are rooted in this fundamental directedness or purposiveness. As Heidegger notes in a lecture course from 1921 to 1922, “caring always exists in a determinate or indeterminate, secure or wavering, *direction*. Life finds direction, takes up a direction, grows into a direction, gives to itself or lives in a direction, and even if the direction is lost to sight, it nevertheless remains present” (*PIA* 70–71). Indeed, for Heidegger this overarching intentional investment in the things that I do just *is* the self that is present in all of my compartments. There is no “self-object” to be grasped in introspection because the self is not a thing but a mode of existing that



can only be experienced in and through the existing itself. Thus Heidegger's emphasis is on the responsibility of self-having—the fact that my way of being is normatively structured in terms of maintaining or losing, succeeding or failing at being this self that I have to be.

And furthermore, this being that we ourselves are and that exists for the sake of its own self is, as this being, *in each case mine*. The Dasein is not only, like every being in general, identical with itself in a formal-ontological sense—every thing is identical with itself—and it is also not merely, in distinction from a natural thing, conscious of this selfsameness. Instead, the Dasein has a peculiar selfsameness with itself in the sense of selfhood. It *is* in such a way that it is in a certain way *its own*, it *has itself*, and only on that account can it *lose* itself. (*BPP* 170)

For Heidegger, to exist as a self—as an I or a you—is to exist in light of a concern for what it *means* to be this self, a concern rooted in the fact that I am not guaranteed success and must therefore strive to achieve it. I care about this being who I am because I may fail at being it, and it is in terms of this concern that the normative conditions constraining my specific intentional acts are present to me as such.

## Mineness

Heidegger recognizes that such a reconception of selfhood is contrary to our everyday understandings of the self, however, when he notes that “if the self is conceived ‘only’ as a way of being of this being, then it seems tantamount to volatilizing the true ‘core’ of Dasein” (*BT* 117/110). In other words, reconceiving the self not as an inner arena or substance that “knows” the norms that constrain it but as a directedness that *lives* them in a self-aware yet non-representational way is foreign to the philosophical tradition. Nevertheless, he argues that “such fears are nourished by the incorrect preconception that the being in question really has, after all, the kind of being of something objectively present, even if one avoids attributing to it the massive element of a corporeal thing” (*BT* 117/110). On the contrary, the “substance” of human existing is one's way of being as a “having to be”—as a commitment to one's existence and the standards that allow one to judge one's success in meeting this responsibility. This mattering that makes all my experiences be experienced *as mine* is what Heidegger designates *Jemeinigkeit*, or “mineness”:

The being which this being is concerned about in its being is always my own. Thus, Da-sein is never to be understood ontologically as a case and instance of a genus of beings as objectively present. To something objectively present its being is a matter of “indifference,” more precisely, it “is” in such a way that its being can neither be indifferent nor non-indifferent to it. In accordance with the character of *always-being-my-own-being* [*Jemeinigkeit*], when we speak of Da-sein, we must always use the *personal* pronoun along with whatever we say: “I am,” “You are.” (BT 42/40)

To characterize the caring self as simply “accompanying” all of its actions and understandings imports a substantive account of the self and thereby distorts its nature. Actions and understandings only have the structure that they do insofar as they are always already infused with the normative weight that is the essence of selfhood.<sup>34</sup>

This understanding of the first-person—as being initially and for the most part not an indifferent self-observation but a care for the self that manifests itself in the things that matter to it and in its struggle to meet the standards to which it is committed—finds resonance in Richard Moran’s *Authority and Estrangement*, in which he launches a sustained attack on attempts to model “self-consciousness on the theoretical awareness of objects.”<sup>35</sup> For Moran the first-personal nature of a belief or intention does not reside in the relation that I have to this intention, but to a quality or character of the intention itself. This quality is the role that it plays in my life as a whole: “The special features of first-person awareness cannot be understood by thinking of it purely in terms of epistemic access (whether quasi-perceptual or not) to a special realm to which only one person has entry. Rather, we must think of it in terms of the special responsibilities the person has in virtue of the mental life in question being *his own*.”<sup>36</sup> The fact that my beliefs and actions are invested with the weight of their role in determining who I am to be is what gives them their particularly first-personal feel, thereby accounting for the “authority” of the first person to which Shoemaker alluded. This authority is not an epistemic one, however, but an *existential* one. I am not only in a position to avow that they are mine, but I experience them as being a statement—in the eyes of self and world—of what kind of person I am. As Moran puts it, “If it were simply a special immediate theoretical relation I have to this belief, then there would be no reason in principle why another person could not bear this same relation to my belief.”<sup>37</sup> Because my beliefs and intentions express who *I* am, however, they are fundamentally characterized by mineness. For Heidegger, then, self-awareness must be understood as a way of *living*—not knowing or observing—one’s self-

ness. Indeed, as Kisiel notes, Heidegger was inspired by Dilthey in this regard, since he believed that “every psychic experience bears within itself a knowledge of its own worth for the whole of the psychic individual.”<sup>38</sup>

It is important to note, however, that such responsibility for who one is to be is generally not *explicitly* acknowledged by the actor while she acts—the self-responsibility of existing comes *explicitly* to light only in the condition that Heidegger calls authenticity. Because Heidegger distinguishes between authentic and inauthentic selfhood in this manner—whereby the latter is understood as a fallen forgetfulness of self in the anonymity and averageness of *das Man*, and the former is a radical individuation accomplished through *Angst*, being-toward-death, and conscience—most Heidegger interpreters tend to focus solely on the *explicit* self-presence that characterizes authenticity. I am in agreement insofar as the mineness of existence—the fact that each of us is entrusted with the responsibility of her existing—rests upon the same existential structures underlying the possibility of authenticity. If we are to provide an account of our *everyday* sense of first-personal selfhood, however, we cannot turn to limit cases such as *Angst*—which reveals this existential care structure to us but thereby makes it impossible to simply live through it. Though this everyday, first-personal self-presence *depends* on the structures uncovered in Division Two of *Being and Time*, then—structures to which we will be returning in chapter 7—their authentic, explicit self-grasping is not a necessary prerequisite for an individuated self-presence within everydayness. Rather, these existential structures and their affiliated self-presence simply manifest themselves in an unthematized way in my everyday intentional orientation to the things that matter to me. The manner in which this existential care structure is present *in* and *through* everydayness lies in Dasein’s commitment and responsiveness to norms—in the fact that meeting them matters to it. “‘I’ means the being that is concerned *about* the being of the being which it is” (BT 322/296)—and this concern accompanies and shapes even Dasein’s inauthentic modes of being-in-the-world. Though it is *possible* to achieve a heightened form of explicit self-grasping in which these structures are recognized and owned as such, their activity in Dasein’s everyday way of being is no less prevalent for the absence of such explicitness.

### The Worldliness of the Self

It is for these reasons that Heidegger claims that the everyday self understands itself *from* the world; it “initially finds ‘itself’ in *what* it does,

needs, expects, has charge of, in the things at hand which it initially *takes care of* in the surrounding world” (BT 119/112). But Heidegger does not mean that I understand myself from just anything that happens to be lying around—I understand myself, rather, from those things with which I am concerned. “When we take care of things, we are subordinate to the in-order-to constitutive for the actual useful thing in our association with it” (BT 69/65). I understand myself from the world by successfully subordinating myself to the norms of success inherent in the meaning of things and practices. Thus “the self that is reflected to us from things is not ‘in’ the things in the sense that it would be extant among them as a portion of them or in them as an appendage or a layer deposited on them” (BPP 161). Such an interpretation belies a false, substantive understanding of how we encounter things—we encounter things not as meaningless “stuff” but as part of our projects, as an “equipmental contexture” that need not be explicitly recognized or thought as such in order for it to orient us: “‘Unthought’ means that it is not thematically apprehended for deliberate thinking about things; instead, in circumspection, we find our bearings in regard to them” (BPP 163). To find one’s bearings is to have access to the markers and measures by which to orient oneself. It is to have one’s “directedness” find signs that one is heading in the right direction. In this case, the directedness under consideration is the intentionality that characterizes our way of being. We understand ourselves from the world because the world grants us standards by which to judge whether we are succeeding or failing at existing—whether we’ve gotten our bearings straight, so to speak.

The same reference to the world’s normativity is inherent in the language Heidegger uses to characterize encounters with the other *Dasein* who reflect me back to myself: I measure my success against them in terms of social standards of success. As we already noted in chapter 1, this is what Heidegger terms *distanciality*: “There is constant care as to the way one differs from them” (BT 126/118). What characterizes this arena of social normativity is that it maintains itself in this typicality of “what is proper, what is allowed and what is not. Of what is granted success and what is not” (BT 127/119). This common project of subsuming ourselves to the measures of what counts as success is what led Heidegger to claim that in my everyday way of being I am in a sense *not* myself. As the above discussion has shown, however, this must not be read as a sort of *absence* of self; it must rather be understood in terms of a distinction between the *care* for self that motivates putting oneself up for measure and committing oneself to the norms that our activities embody, versus the *source* of the measures that allow us to understand ourselves. Though the latter is always public, worldly and “self-less”—the former is what makes one a

self present to itself as such. Though there is clearly an important difference between an everydayness in which I simply use the ready-made standards and interpretations that I find in the public sphere and an authentic conscience in which I seek norms rooted only in my own self-responsibility, the *care* operating in and through these modes of being is the same. The mineness of care differentiates me from the anonymity of public meaning, despite the fact that in our everyday way of being the norms of behavior through which this care is expressed are the same for all of us.

It is this necessary feature of intentionality that both Dreyfus and Searle miss: that regardless of whether I am responsive to standards of appropriateness or explicitly trying to meet standards of success, I must be present in the striving as a *care for or commitment to* being appropriate or successful. Dreyfus's resistance to Searle's attempt to abstract from indexical feelings of appropriateness in a particular context to formal social rules is likely rooted in this sense that intentionality is profoundly *personal* in this regard. Where Dreyfus's account fails, however, is in neglecting to account for what type of normative responsiveness is operative such that absorbed coping can be differentiated from the intentionless equilibrium-seeking that defines even certain types of objects. Though we do, in a sense, move to reduce bodily senses of deviation without knowing what a satisfactory condition will be like in advance, it is an essential feature of our intentional way of being that we seek and establish worldly standards that will *answer* what a satisfactory condition will be like and submit ourselves to them. Though these "right answers" may not be codifiable in propositional form, they nevertheless fall under the overarching intentionality of a creature whose care for its own being drives it to seek equilibrium and measure the success of this seeking against public standards of success. Unlike Searle's account, then—in which the directionality of the particular "mindless" activities must come from a propositional representation of some specific goal—Heidegger's account allows us to recognize that normative conditions of satisfaction may be present to human action as an unthematic manifestation of care. And unlike Dreyfus's account—in which this mindless coping is given no directionality other than a vague sense of "appropriateness"—Heidegger articulates a clear sense of what grounds all manner of satisfaction conditions; Dasein's overarching need to orient itself in the world according to clear norms of what will count as successful existing. It is in light of this overriding intentional directedness that Heidegger can make room for our sense of the self as first-personal: as being radically and always present to self as one's own, while nevertheless claiming that this selfhood is fundamentally worldly.

## The Existential Roots of Philosophy

Heidegger's account of first-personal self-presence as a normative intentional directedness grounded in care has a further advantage over other accounts of self-awareness: it can better account for the transition from everyday modes of experience to the standpoint of philosophical reflection. Accounting for this possibility is necessary if one wishes to claim that preconceptual, pre-linguistic experience is the fundamental mode of self-consciousness. As Dan Zahavi puts it, "the task is not simply to find examples of nonconceptual forms of self-awareness, but also to explain how these forms can give rise to fully fledged conceptual types of self-awareness, thereby making the latter comprehensible."<sup>39</sup> Heidegger's shift of focus to the care-laden life of the self has implications not only for how we theorize selfhood but for the origins of the method by which we can engage in this kind of thinking at all.

As we have already seen, the early Heidegger was committed to phenomenological methodology—a method focused on first-person lived experience rooted in the recognition that any talk of appearing—that is, of *phenomena*—includes an essential reference to the lived experience of the one for whom things appear. By rethinking the being of the experiencer, however, Heidegger can account for methodological requirements overlooked by Husserl himself. While Husserl tended to equate first-personally grounded self-responsibility with *apodicticity*, Heidegger recognized this to be an inappropriate standard of assessment considering the nature of Dasein's factual existence. By examining the nature of Dasein's existing—and not simply assuming an *epistemic* model, as Husserl did—Heidegger can show not only that Dasein's finitude and temporal dispersion make apodicticity virtually impossible to achieve, he can also show how Dasein's fundamental self-responsibility grounds the possibility of first-person *Evidenz*.<sup>40</sup> Husserl's focus on the epistemic self prevented him from recognizing the existential motivation for Dasein's move from everyday self-grasping to the explicit self-understanding necessary for philosophy itself. Despite the fact that Heidegger's ontic/ontological distinction mirrors Husserl's account of the transition from the naturalistic attitude to the transcendental standpoint, then, Heidegger develops Husserl's account by examining the nature of the being capable of this kind of move.<sup>41</sup> Heidegger's existential reformulation of the self is essential for understanding the possibility and the necessity of engaging in philosophy at all, since it reveals that thematizing self-questioning can only arise as the result of a kind of breakdown within the smooth engagement of everyday life—a break that prompts one to adopt the transcendental perspective through which philosophy is possible. Thus Hei-

degger develops Husserl's account by emphasizing (1) how the meaning of Dasein's existence *matters* to it, (2) the fact that Dasein is responsive to norms capable of being made explicit, and (3) the manner in which failures or breakdowns in Dasein's smooth coping provoke a shift to a reflective stance in which the meaning of its undertakings is explicitly considered.<sup>42</sup> As Crowell puts it, phenomenology is "a radicalization of a tendency inherent in a truthful life";<sup>43</sup> its purpose is not to say something new, but to bring to light the structures that are always already operative on a pre-theoretical level. This is the meaning of Heidegger's claim that "the ontic distinction of Da-sein lies in the fact that it *is* ontological" (*BT* 12/10). Namely, the fact that our being is at issue for us means that we are not simply responsive to normatively structured contexts but are capable of standing back from them to consider them for what they are.<sup>44</sup> Philosophical self-grasping is only possible because we are always already intentionally oriented toward the normatively governed world and we *care* about how well we are measuring up to it. This existence matters to me, and it is for this reason that I can be present to myself both pre-theoretically and philosophically.

## Being and Otherness: Sartre's Critique

Given his account of Dasein as a care-driven intentionally directed immersion in the shared world, Heidegger seems to avoid the difficulties associated with other accounts of social relations. For Heidegger, there *is* no private cabinet of consciousness to which others have no access—on the contrary, Dasein's selfhood is defined by an existential self-responsibility that expresses itself in publicly articulated satisfaction conditions. Insofar as the Heideggerian self is rooted in this *mineness* of self-responsibility, however, it may be argued that his account suffers from a type of existential solipsism.<sup>1</sup> Though this mineness only finds expression in the public arena of shared meaning, Heidegger defines this arena in terms of anonymity and averageness, undermining the sense that his reformulation of the Cartesian subject offers much in the way of resources for adequately characterizing the interpersonal encounter.

The question remains, then, as to the nature of intersubjectivity given such a view of selfhood: If Dasein exists as mine, in what sense can one genuinely or directly encounter others who are similarly defined by such a way of being? Is such a being-in-relation-with-others always secondary to Dasein's mineness? If such relations always occur through the mediation of average and anonymous public roles and meanings, in what sense have I experienced the other in all *her* mineness? The problem, as we will see, is that Heidegger's account seems to fall into the danger of viewing other Dasein merely as interchangeable representatives of the public norms and meanings through which we all pursue our particular abilities to be. Heidegger claims, for example, that the concrete meeting with the other on the street *already* involves an environmental encounter based on the commonality of the street. This "already" seems to indicate that the world's commonality and publicity exist *prior* to any and every encounter with particular others. As we saw in chapter 1, Heidegger seems to explicitly endorse this view when he asserts that being-with belongs to Dasein *regardless* of whether others are actually present:

The phenomenological statement, "Dasein as being-in-the-world is a being-with with others," has an existential ontological sense and does



not intend to establish that I in fact do not turn out to be alone and that still other entities of my kind are on hand. If this were the intention of the stipulation, then I would be speaking of my Dasein as if it were an environmental thing on hand. And being would not be a determination which would belong to Dasein of itself by way of its kind of being. Being-with would rather be something which Dasein would have at the time just because others happen to be on hand. Dasein would be being-with only because others do in fact turn up. (*HCT* 238)

If it is indeed the case that, for Heidegger, others are experienced merely as ontic instances triggering an ontological determination of Dasein's being that "belongs to Dasein of itself by way of its kind of being," how can he explain our sense that this fundamentally social mode of existence *depends* on concrete encounters with others in all their unexpectedness, uniqueness, and particularity? Could we still say that someone is "with" others if she had never directly encountered another?

Many thinkers have argued that Heidegger's focus on the existential ontological sense at the expense of the concrete encounter means that he *cannot* account for the ability to encounter the other in all her particularity, and that this is, in fact, a—if not *the*—major flaw in his work. Indeed, this criticism is so widespread that it has come to be accepted as a kind of truism. In order to combat this view, it will be necessary to first formulate the details of the criticism, however, and this chapter will do so by considering the version of it presented in Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*. Others have also analyzed and attempted to overcome this weakness in Heidegger's work—Emmanuel Levinas being an obvious example:

Beginning with Plato, the social ideal will be sought for in an ideal of fusion. It will be thought that, in its relationship with the other, the subject tends to be identified with the other, by being swallowed up in a collective representation, a common ideal . . . This collectivity necessarily establishes itself around a third term, which serves as an intermediary. [Heidegger's] *Miteinandersein* [being with another], too, remains the collectivity of the "with," and is revealed in its authentic form around the truth. It is a collectivity around something common. Just as in all the philosophies of communion, sociality in Heidegger is found in the subject alone; and it is in terms of solitude that the analysis of *Dasein* in its authentic form is pursued.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the relevance of such later critiques, I will focus on Sartre's formulation of the difficulty not only because it was one of the first such

criticisms, but because it is one that has yet to be adequately answered. Thus this chapter will outline Sartre's critique by analyzing his interpretation of being-with and the conclusions that he draws from it. I will then consider the alternate account that Sartre submits in its stead. As we will see, Sartre raises significant concerns that—if correct—would seriously undermine Heidegger's position. His own account faces equally severe difficulties, however—difficulties that Heidegger's own position can avoid. By articulating how Sartre interprets—and misconstrues—Heidegger's concept of being-with, it will become clear that Heidegger has better resources with which to account for concrete encounters between individual selves. Though the details will only be examined in the following chapters once the temporal implications of Heidegger's position are taken into consideration, it will become evident here that the nature of the Dasein-to-Dasein encounter is in fact much more complex than is typically acknowledged.

## Sartre

Sartre's assessment of Heidegger's view is not entirely negative; indeed, he thinks that Heidegger made huge advances over Husserl and others insofar as Heidegger recognized that "my relation to the Other is first and fundamentally a relation of being to being, not of knowledge to knowledge."<sup>3</sup> As we saw in the previous chapter, Heidegger's approach represents a step forward because he does not characterize the intentional relationship in subject/object theoretical knowledge terms, but emphasizes the deep pre-theoretical commitments and entanglements in terms of which we encounter the world and those who share it with us. Sartre, like Heidegger, rejects the tendency to "measure being by knowledge" (*BN* 329)—a tendency associated with figures like Husserl and Hegel. Instead, Sartre endorses Heidegger's approach insofar as it avoids characterizing the other as an object of knowledge. Heidegger's position represents progress, Sartre believes, because it recognizes that an adequate account of the experience of the Other must meet the following requirements: "(1) the relation between 'human-realities' must be a relation of being [and] (2) this relation must cause 'human-realities' to depend on one another in their essential being" (*BN* 330). In other words, the very nature of my being in the world must *depend* on other Dasein—it cannot be a mere theoretical knowing tacked on to a fundamentally solitary mode of being. Thus the ontological dependence of Dasein on the shared world appears to overcome all of the difficulties associated with

the Husserlian approach—not to mention the analytic analogues with the “problem” of other minds.

Despite its promise, however, Sartre ultimately rejects Heidegger's approach to intersubjectivity for two reasons—one substantive, one methodological. The methodological concern relates to the fact that Heidegger merely stipulates being-with as a kind of existential given. In other words, Sartre argues that Heidegger simply *claims* being-with as an ontological determination that belongs to Dasein qua Dasein; he does not show *how* this way of being is supposed to depend on the other Dasein who actually share the world with me. Thus Sartre claims that “in his abrupt, rather barbaric fashion of cutting Gordian knots rather than trying to untie them, [Heidegger] gives in answer to the question posed a pure and simple *definition*” (BN 330). He *defines* Dasein as being-with without examining the relationship to the specific others with whom Dasein must be.

Treating Dasein's being as fundamentally social in this way means that the presence or absence of other Dasein appears to be completely irrelevant to whether or not my being-in-the-world is defined by being-with. Thus concrete instances of encounter that fall under such an ontological determination do not affect the nature of the ontological determination itself—but only the details of its factual fulfillment: “Even Dasein's being-alone is a being-with in the world. Being-alone is only a deficiency of being-with—the other is absent—which points directly to the positive character of being-with. The other is absent: this means that the constitution of the being of Dasein as being-with does not come to its factual fulfillment” (HCT 238). On Heidegger's account, then, being-with will *always* be one of Dasein's ontological structures—regardless of whether other Dasein are ever directly encountered such that this structure comes to its realization. As Heidegger explicitly claims: “Being-with existentially determines Dasein even when another is not factually present and perceived” (BT 120/113). The experience of the commonality of the street does not require there to actually *be* others experiencing this street in common with me; the self's relatedness to others applies regardless of whether other concrete persons are ever encountered.

But for Sartre, this type of account can only reach the abstract other and cannot give us others in their concrete presence: “Even if this affirmation [that the existential structure being-with belonged to Dasein] were proved, it would not enable us to explain any concrete being-with. In other words, the ontological co-existence which appears as the structure of being-in-the-world can in no way serve as a foundation to an ontic being-with, such as, for example, the co-existence which appears in my friendship with Pierre” (BN 334). Because being-with is merely an on-

tological structure belonging to Dasein's way of being, Sartre argues, it provides a type of a priori condition for the possibility of ontic encounters, thereby reducing the social dimension of being-in-the-world to a structure of the self. Individual others are secondary to the dimension of sociality that precedes them—the consequence being that Heidegger “never draws attention to the actual transcendence and alterity of the other, for once being-with is introduced as a structural element of Dasein's being-in-the-world, the radical otherness of the other is ignored.”<sup>4</sup> Though Heidegger initially appears to overcome the ontological solipsism of the Cartesian subject, then, this is ultimately an illusion. Because Heidegger characterizes sociality as such an abstract, universal, and essential quality, he ultimately reduces the social dimension of being-in-the-world to an a priori structure of the self. Heidegger's account is essentially “metaphysical solipsism in disguise”<sup>5</sup> because possible modes of encounter are established in advance on the basis of the preexisting structures of self that permit the encounter to occur: “Because the Dasein is essentially being-in-the-world, projection unveils in every instance a possibility of being-in-the-world . . . This entails that along with understanding there is always already projected a *particular possible being with the others*” (BPP 278). The consequence of this shift to understanding the social as an a priori feature of Dasein's being is profound, argues Sartre; the other is no longer experienced in terms of a direct face-to-face encounter with otherness but is experienced in terms of a mute and anonymous coexisting in worldly activities: “The original relation of the Other and my consciousness is not the *you* and the *me*; it is the *we*. Heidegger's being-with is not the clear and distinct position of an individual confronting another individual; it is not *knowledge*. It is the mute existence in common of one member of the crew with his fellows . . . which will be made manifest to them by the common goal to be attained” (BN 332). Interestingly, Sartre here uses “knowledge” to characterize the direct encounter between individuals and to distinguish it from the anonymity of the Heideggerian mode of encounter. It was, however, precisely the use of *knowledge* as the model for intersubjective encounter that led Sartre to criticize Husserl's account. This is extremely instructive, as we will see below, for it reveals the fact that despite his criticisms, Sartre continues to rely on the subject/object model on which such philosophies of knowledge are based. He thereby undermines his own ability to meet the intersubjective criteria that he himself established: namely, that “(1) the relation between ‘human-realities’ must be a relation of being [and] (2) this relation must cause ‘human-realities’ to depend on one another in their essential being” (BN 330).

It is clear from his criticisms of Heidegger, however, that Sartre

takes direct confrontation between individuals to be an essential feature of such a dependence-inducing relation of being. Heidegger fails this requirement by allowing the relation of being to be a type of a priori stipulation that can only establish anonymous modes of encounter and dependence in which others are not directly encountered but are only ever experienced through a type of “ontological solidarity” expressed in shared public norms and activities (BN 331). Thus my relationship with this or that other person is not “a *frontal* opposition but rather an *oblique* interdependence” (BN 331). As a result, Sartre argues, it is not my relationship with this particular other person that my being depends on in its being, but the anonymous *das Man* presence of there being others at all. Because Heidegger’s account characterizes the relation to the other in terms of an anonymous “we” rather than a “you,” it “can be of absolutely no use to us in resolving the psychological, concrete problem of the recognition of the Other” (BN 334). Heidegger only provides an account of the conditions for the *possibility* of sociality—immersion in a shared world through which we understand self and others—he does not account for its *reality*. By defining being-with as an *ontological* structure of my being, Heidegger cannot account for the *ontic* encounter with another Dasein in all the particularity of his mineness.

### Possibilities of Heideggerian Response

Rather than denying this criticism regarding the essentially social nature of Dasein, Jean-Luc Nancy’s *Being Singular Plural* attempts to develop Heidegger’s account of being-with further in this direction, arguing that this commitment to essential plurality is not a weakness but a strength. For Nancy it is not merely Dasein that is fundamentally characterized by plurality, but reality itself. Thus he argues that the Heideggerian notion of being-with is an articulation of the fact that Being *itself* is fundamentally plural or “with.” It is, he claims, “indissociably individual and collective.”<sup>6</sup> Heidegger’s notion of being-with, properly understood, must be recognized as a deep challenge to traditional monist ontologies, since it forces us to recognize that “existence exists in the plural, singularly plural” (56). As a result of Heidegger’s notion of the fundamentally plural nature of Being, he claims, we can sidestep philosophical pseudo-problems by starting with a more compelling ontological picture. For Nancy, a feature of this reorientation is the fact that we must speak of the ontological condition of singular plurality as being prior to and independent of any sense of “individuated” Dasein. This conclusion is evident in Nancy’s

claim, for example, that “we” precedes and conditions the possibility of “I”: saying “we” presents “a stage [*scene*] on which several [people] can say ‘I.’ No ‘I’ can designate itself without there being a space-time of ‘self-referentiality’ in general” (65). Though Nancy appears to recognize that the self-referentiality of the “stage” requires a type of symbolization or representation that depends on Dasein’s “staging,” he is ultimately attempting to articulate a general ontology that is not tied to the disclosive possibilities of self-referential Dasein. He wants to speak, instead, of the “plural singular essence of Being” itself (55). Thus throughout the book he notes the priority of this “with” ontology: “Being-with-one-another . . . must support both the sphere of ‘nature’ and the sphere of ‘history,’ as well as both ‘human’ and the ‘nonhuman’; it must be an ontology for the world, for everyone” (53). By shifting to a position in which plurality belongs to Being itself, Nancy can thereby avoid the idealist or “subjectivist” tenor of the claim that it is Dasein that is fundamentally “with”—i.e., that all of Dasein’s particular encounters with others are shaped by its own ontological structure.

Nevertheless, Nancy’s development of Heideggerian themes fails in precisely the same methodological way that Sartre thinks Heidegger’s own position does. In other words, despite Nancy’s claims regarding the possibility of formulating such a sweeping ontology, he fails to offer any justification for the conclusion that he endorses. He does not explain the relationship between his claims about a “general ontology” and the manner in which it is nevertheless human being that is responsible for “saying we for the totality of all being” (3). His account presupposes that humans have a special status as those beings who “say we” for everything—but he does not account for *how* our “staging” and our language use enable being-with *as* a being-with. Indeed, he seems to blur the distinction between Being and the human tendency to bring Being to explicit presentation as what it is, arguing at various points that meaning is equivalent to one or the other or both. What is the difference between the we who expresses and represents this being-with and the world that is this being-with—and how do we access the latter if not by way of the former? As we noted above, Sartre’s methodological complaint about Heidegger’s work is its failure to offer any *account* of how Dasein’s being is dependent on its being-with others. Heidegger seems to simply assume it as an essential structure of Dasein itself: “To say that human reality (even if it is *my* human reality) ‘is-with’ by means of its ontological structure is to say that it is-with by nature—that is, in an essential and universal capacity” (BN 333–34). In Nancy’s case, this assumption expands to attribute the “with” to Being itself as its essential and universal structure. In either case, however, the claim needs to be justified. Though Sartre commends

Heidegger's attempt to provide "a being which in its own being implies the Other's being" (BN333), then, he condemns him for simply *asserting* that "the characteristic of being of human-reality is its being *with others*" (BN330). Though this approach certainly has the benefit of avoiding traditional monism and other-minds skepticism, the cost is high: claiming that it is not really a problem is hardly compelling for those who are not already committed to Heidegger's view.<sup>7</sup>

Nancy speaks of the necessarily plural nature of all reality—while the early Heidegger speaks of the necessarily plural nature of Dasein's being insofar as it is always already with others<sup>8</sup>—but the consequence is the same: both approaches will be subject to Sartre's criticism. In the early Heidegger's case, however, a chance for refuting it remains insofar as he avoids the metaphysical speculation of which Nancy's account is guilty. He does so by tying our access to any "plural being" to the philosophical *Evidenz* available in Dasein's first-person experience. Unlike Heidegger, Nancy does not examine the conditions for the possibility of such philosophical claims—namely, the nature of Dasein qua *questioner*—and therefore presupposes the legitimacy of the ontological claims that he makes and the methodology by which he reaches them. As a result, Nancy cannot overcome the difficulty brought to light by Sartre; rather, he expands on it by decoupling the conclusion from the phenomenological method that can be the only hope of its philosophical justification. Because Nancy's appropriation of Heidegger only makes these difficulties more pressing, then, Nancy's "development" of Heidegger's work must be recognized as a misstep.

In contrast to Nancy's assumptions, the meaning event can only be understood from the first-person perspective of phenomenological philosophy—even if the meaning to be uncovered *is* the singular plurality of Being itself. To speak of it otherwise is to slide into exactly the kind of metaphysical speculation in which phenomenologists are loathe to participate. Heidegger's phenomenology is a testament to the fact that one can uncover the manner in which meaning arises in first-person experience without this meaning-event being reduced to idealist creation or realist causation. Though the Heideggerian formulation of the first-person experience of plurality will be profoundly different than that based on the science-oriented subject/object model, Heidegger's respect for both Kant's and Husserl's insights into the structure of meaning leads him to reformulate—but not abandon—the methodological limits on metaphysical speculation that both thinkers took to be essential to philosophy. Thus if we are to reach the conclusion that Dasein is essentially "with others," this conclusion must be legitimated through an appeal to phenomenological evidence. Though Sartre is right to argue that "the

relation between ‘human-realities’ must be a relation of being,” this relation must be available to first-person experience *as such*. As we will see, this is precisely the approach that Sartre takes in his analyses of Being-for-others. It is also characteristic of Heidegger’s own approach, correctly understood.

### Sartre’s Response

In contrast to Heidegger’s position, Sartre argues that it must be the very contingency of the encounter that testifies to the otherness and transcendence of the other self in all her particularity and immediacy. Though it is tempting to claim that we are always already defined by a social way of being in the world, Sartre resists this conclusion in an effort to remain true to the fact that it is the existence of other Dasein in their concrete particularity that grounds this social way of being in the world: “We *encounter* the Other; we do not constitute him. And if this fact still appears to us in the form of a necessity, yet it does not belong with those ‘conditions of the possibility of experience’ or—if you prefer—with ontological necessity. If the Other’s existence is a necessity, it is a ‘contingent necessity’ . . . If the Other is to be capable of being given to us, it is by means of a direct apprehension which leaves to the encounter its character as facticity” (BN 336–37). The direct apprehension of the subjectivity of the other cannot rely on some prior ontological necessity and, true to his phenomenological commitments, Sartre shows this by turning to an analysis of the mode of experience that is capable of revealing the other’s subjectivity as such. As we have seen, such an experience cannot take the form of a relationship between a subject and its epistemic object, for this kind of object-orientation would preclude the other appearing in experience as a *subject*—which is precisely our aim here. The other’s subjectivity cannot be experienced *as subjectivity* if it only appears as an *object* of knowledge. This was precisely the difficulty with previous approaches:

The problem of Others has generally been treated as if the primary relation by which the Other is discovered is object-ness; that is, as if the Other were first revealed—directly or indirectly—to our perception. But since this perception by its very nature *refers* to something other than to itself and since it can refer neither to an infinite series of appearances of the same type—as in idealism the perception of the table or of the chair does—nor to an isolated entity located on principle outside my reach, its essence must be to refer to a primary



relation between my consciousness and the Other's. This relation, in which the Other must be given to me directly as a subject although in connection with me, is the fundamental relation, the very type of my being-for-others. (BN 340–41)

For Sartre, the other's subjectivity is encountered through a perception that does not objectify but *refers*. This referral is not simply an empty reference to that which is fundamentally beyond the possibility of encounter, however, some inaccessible "back-side" of the other's person, as Husserl's account in the *Cartesian Meditations* seems to imply. Rather, the other's subjectivity is *directly* encountered insofar as the perception of the other refers to the *relationship* that springs up between self and other because of the encounter: "The appearance must be capable of revealing to us . . . the relation to which it refers" (BN 341). In other words, Sartre is arguing that my concrete encounter with the other subjectivity involves a referral to the relation in which this encounter places me; the perception of the other refers by its very nature to a primary mode of connection between me and the other qua subject.

This being-placed-in-relation occurs, Sartre claims, through an experience of the other as a "centering" of the world; the world seen by the other person presents a face that exists only from that person's perspective. This fact is brought home to me not because both self and other look to some external object—the street seen from different perspectives, for example—as Heidegger's position seemed to imply. There must be a more primordial experience in terms of which I could first come to conceive of the other *as* a being capable of such perspective-taking. As Sartre famously concludes, this more primordial experience occurs when the object on which the other takes a foreign perspective is *me*. Sartre's phenomenological descriptions reveal that experiencing the other's subjectivity involves an encounter in which I am placed in a relation such that I experience myself as an object seen in the world. I experience *myself* as having dimensions that are seen only by the other from her perspective. Thus the primary experiences that reveal the other's subjectivity to me are, according to Sartre, ones in which I experience myself as vulnerable, embodied, limited, and exposed—experiences in which my easy mastery of the situation has been called into question.<sup>9</sup>

Sartre's famous description of shame is a poignant illustration of exactly the kind of transformation experienced in the presence of the other's look. When I am simply absorbed in my project of spying on people through the keyhole, he argues, I am not aware of myself as object in the world—I am instead immersed in the task at hand and the events revealed by it (BN 347). With the appearance of another, however, I am

exposed to a perspective that “confers upon my acts the character of a *given* on which a judgment can be brought to bear” (BN 348). Being “caught in the act” means I am ensnared in the other’s objectifying appraisal and defined by it. The point of particular interest here is that this self that is object only for the other is nevertheless still *me*; the immediate, overwhelming experience of shame is, Sartre argues, a type of *confession* to this: “I do not reject it as a strange image, but it is present to me as a self which I *am* without *knowing* it . . . It is the shame or pride which makes me *live*, not *know* the situation of being looked at” (BN 350). By engaging in this type of phenomenological analysis of the direct encounter with others, Sartre hopes to reveal the fact that through such encounters my identity is no longer mine alone: I am thrust into a type of ontological dependence on the other who gives me the dimensions of myself that are accessible only from her perspective. Thus Sartre notes that the encounter with another subject induces “essential modifications . . . in my structure” (BN 349) that I cannot predict or control. Such an account clearly fulfills Sartre’s criteria for genuinely intersubjective encounters: namely, that “(1) the relation between ‘human-realities’ must be a relation of being [and] (2) this relation must cause ‘human-realities’ to depend on one another in their essential being” (BN 330). For Sartre, this dependence is evident insofar as I cannot be who I am without the perspective of the other; the other’s look gives me dimensions of myself that I cannot otherwise access. And this dependence is not a *cognitive* one, Sartre contends, since it appears primarily on the level of pre-reflective consciousness in the form of other-oriented emotions like shame (BN 349). As a result, the mode that I am this self cannot be characterized as a type of preexisting a priori structure of self that I must face up to and lay hold of in its mineness. This is no ontological determination merely waiting to be brought to factual fulfillment through the appearance of this or that other. Rather, such experiences reveal a dimension of myself that I cannot determine in advance or completely appropriate as my own. Because of such immediate unwanted experiences of self—experiences that can *only* arise in the presence of another subject—I come to realize that “I am this being . . . [but] I do not find it in its being; I can not produce it directly” (BN 351). Not only does this type of encounter involve a direct referral to the primal relationship between myself qua object and other self qua subject, then; it is a relationship—and corresponding dimension of selfhood—that I must *rely* on the other’s presence to produce. Indeed, Sartre argues that it is the very contingency and facticity of such encounters—the fact that they are conditional and dependent—that can account both for the freedom of the other’s subjectivity, and for the fact that the encounter with this freedom *creates* a particular dimension of my

being—it does not merely trigger an existing one. In this sense Sartre believes he can account for “a being which in its own being implies the Other’s being” (BN 333) without falling into the difficulties that afflicted Heidegger’s position. Namely, Heidegger’s conclusion that I could experience the world as a with-world without having to directly encounter the particular others whose very contingency and resistance to my appropriation *reveal* that I am not the only centering perspective. Instead, argues Sartre, the fact that I am not alone is evident in the passivity and contingency of the intersubjective encounter—in the uncontrolled and involuntary nature of the self that I become in the eyes of the other whose arrival is beyond my choice or expectation.<sup>10</sup>

Living in a shared world means that I am always open to a determination of self by another. For Sartre, the other’s free subjectivity manifests itself primarily as a limiting of *my* freedom, as the “solidification and alienation of my own possibilities” (BN 352) such that the possible ways for me to be are “infected” with the presence of the other’s possibilities:

For example, the potentiality of the dark corner becomes a given possibility of hiding in the corner by the sole fact that the Other can pass beyond it toward his possibility of illuminating the corner with his flashlight. This possibility is there, and I apprehend it but as absent, as *in the Other*; I apprehend it through my anguish and through my decision to give up that hiding place which is “*too risky*.” Thus my possibilities are present to my unreflective consciousness insofar as the Other *is watching me*. (BN 353)

This emphasis on transformation in the relationship to one’s possibilities is important for our discussion, since the experience of “objectification” that Sartre discusses is not a type of reduction to thing-status. Rather, he is here attempting to express the manner in which one self—a being that is suspended among possible ways to be—encounters others as such. With the presence of another being that is defined by possibility I am not only given aspects of my identity that cannot be chosen or appropriated, I am also forced to live my relationship to the world differently. I no longer own the situation but am forced to live “all my possibilities as ambivalent” (BN 354). Unlike Heidegger’s emphasis on the averageness of the intersubjective arena, then—the *das Man* tendency to engage in the predictable and the settled in advance—Sartre highlights the other’s *un*predictability, her being engaged in projects that I cannot always foresee or control. Such freedom to deviate from the average and expected alters my own projects and transforms my relationship to possibility: in the presence of the other my possibilities become mere

probabilities (BN 354). I cannot naively rely on my different abilities to be, but must take the other's possibilities into consideration because his presence both opens up and closes down different ways for *me* to be: "I perceive that these possibilities which I *am* and which are the condition of my transcendence are given also to another" (BN 352). Without these others the world would be present to me simply as a malleable arena in which to play out my projects—all possibilities would be mine alone. Because of the other person's presence, however, my possibilities are called into question—they are illuminated *as possible* because they are experienced as "only mine." For Sartre, then, it is the contingent, factic presence of other beings defined by possibility—able to transcend the situation toward another situation undetermined by the present one—that evokes a profound change in how I experience both myself and the world. This change occurs not on the level of knowledge but on the level of my very being, and it is precisely this change, Sartre argues, that testifies to the fact that I share the world with others.

### Sartrean Difficulties

Despite the effectiveness of Sartre's phenomenological descriptions, there are nevertheless serious problems with his characterization of the intersubjective encounter. The fundamental difficulty with Sartre's approach is, unsurprisingly, the exact opposite of the problem that supposedly afflicts Heidegger's position: namely, Sartre's approach suffers from the inability to move from the *ontic* to the *ontological*. As we noted above, Sartre believes that it is the inability to move from the ontological category to the ontic particular that undermines the validity of Heidegger's position. The problem, however, is that Sartre fails to recognize that a view of intersubjectivity in which the contingency of the ontic is so heavily emphasized will face extreme difficulties if it attempts to claim—as Sartre does—that there is an essential "relation of being" possible between the subjects of such an encounter. Sartre's account cannot justify the claim that these concrete, contingent encounters *essentially* shape and define one's very mode of being. Indeed, as we will see below, his effort to establish such an essential relation of dependence between subjects very quickly leads him to make conclusions with a decidedly Heideggerian ring.

A major source of difficulty is the fact that, on Sartre's account, the relationship between self and other can only ever be that of objectifying and objectified. Because of his adherence to the Cartesian legacy

and its endorsement of the subject/object model for understanding the subject's modes of encounter, Sartre only leaves room for an either/or picture of intersubjectivity: one is either transcending the other or suffering the other's transcendence. In light of this, Theunissen claims that "on the whole, the alternative of action and passion is subjected to the domination of the subject-object split, from which, according to Sartre—this is the upshot of his observation—there is for me and the Others no escape: 'It is therefore useless for human reality to seek to get out of this dilemma: either to transcend the Other or to allow oneself to be transcended by him. The essence of relations between consciousnesses is not *Mitsein*, it is conflict.'"<sup>11</sup>

The consequence of such a view, however, is that in order to overcome my object status I must effectively strip the other of his subject status. Insofar as I refuse the other's objectification of me and transcend him toward my own projects, the other qua free subject is lost to me—he becomes merely object. As Theunissen puts it, the price "I have to pay for the recovery of my self is the loss of the original presence of the Other."<sup>12</sup> But this leaves us with a highly unappealing account of the intersubjective domain, since it will essentially rule out the ability to simultaneously experience self and other as subjects. Such a view negates the possibility of any human relationship untainted by objectification—a conclusion Sartre himself seems to endorse with his cynical characterization of love as an interplay between sadism and masochism. Sartre claims, for instance, that "my being-as-object is the only possible relation between me and the Other" (*BN* 476) and that "we can never hold a consistent attitude toward the Other unless he is simultaneously revealed as subject and as object, as transcendence-transcending and as transcendence-transcended—which is on principle impossible" (*BN* 529).

But if it were indeed the case that the presence of the other qua subject is stripped from the world the moment that I transcend my own objectification, it seems unlikely that Sartre could explain the possibility of a *shared* world in which objects and activities are imbued with references to other subjects. The residue of a multitude of subjectivities is necessary for explaining the *publicity* of certain meanings, artifacts, and activities—a sense of publicity that obtains even when I am engaged in my subjective projects, free of the objectifying gaze of the other. Though Sartre criticizes Heidegger for characterizing the relationship among *Dasein* as simply "oblique interdependence" then, it seems to be precisely this type of interdependence that explains our everyday communal immersion in shared worldly things and projects.

Sartre himself seems to acknowledge the possibility of some kind of trace or residue of subjectivity remaining within the objectification

experience. For example, he implies that one retains one's awareness of the capacity to reverse the objectification by turning the transcending look back upon the other. But I am never purely an object if I sense that I am able to recover my position of subjectivity by reversing the objectifying/objectified dynamic. Such a blurring of the subject/object divide demands a more complex characterization of the intersubjective encounter, however, than Sartre's mutually exclusive oscillation between subject and object status allows. Indeed, later in *Being and Nothingness* Sartre will come to characterize such either/or modes of understanding as bad faith—a stance in which one attempts to avoid coming to terms with an acceptance of both aspects of one's existence by fleeing from one to the other. The person in bad faith remains in “perpetual disintegration” so that she may “slide at any time from naturalistic present to transcendence and *vice versa*” (BN 99). By conceiving of herself as either all object or all subject, the person in bad faith facilitates the all or nothing game of the objectifying/objectified look.<sup>13</sup>

To address the possibility of another style of intersubjective encounter, Sartre considers the notion of a “we-subject.” Here he argues that despite the fact that it is possible to accomplish something like a community of subjects, Sartre argues that this communal being is still ultimately the accomplishment of a single consciousness and does not bring about a change in its mode of being itself: “The experience of the We-subject is a pure psychological, subjective event in a single consciousness; it corresponds to an inner modification of the structure of this consciousness but does not appear on the foundation of a concrete ontological relation with others and does not realize any *Mitsein*” (BN 550). In other words, anything like we-being is secondary and derivative of the more fundamental “being-for” that serves as the foundation of our consciousness of the Other: “It is necessary that the other consciousnesses which enter into a community with it should be first given in some other way” (BN 536). The derivative status of the “we” is evident, he thinks, in the fact that group dynamics fall into the exact same subject/object patterns he has already examined. Thus there can be an “us-object”—the community qua alienated and objectified—but this can only occur with the appearance of a Third whose gaze transcends self, Other, and the relationship between them—objectifying all of them in a single look. Even when speaking of such group consciousness, then, the complex dynamics of objectification and transcendence apply.<sup>14</sup>

Nevertheless, the later Sartre increasingly sought to understand the possibility of a community of co-subjects—not merely co-objects. Despite his claims that encountering the other necessarily involves a radical bifurcation of the self into either subject-seeing or object-seen,

his account nevertheless retains the possibility of an encounter that is in “good faith”—one that accommodates the simultaneity of our passivity and activity, our seeing and being seen. He makes this clear in *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, where he argues that the praxis of a shared political project enables the development of a class consciousness displaying a kind of good faith and mutual recognition. This occurs when an oppressed group comes to unify itself through committed political action aimed at overthrowing its oppression. In doing so it becomes a genuine “us-subject.”<sup>15</sup>

Based on the sharp dualism of his ontology, however, Sartre himself recognizes that the possibility of escape from the objectifying/objectified dichotomy requires a transformation of the individual on a deeper level than mere shared politics. As he notes in the famous footnote from *Being and Nothingness*: “These considerations do not exclude the possibility of an ethics of deliverance and salvation. But this can be achieved only after a radical conversion which we cannot discuss here” (BN 412). Such “conversion” is also hinted at when he claims that “grace reveals freedom as a property of the Other-as-object and refers obscurely . . . to a transcendent beyond of which we preserve only a confused memory and which we can reach only by a radical modification of our being; that is, by resolutely assuming our being-for-others” (BN 521). Such a radical modification or conversion of our being is discussed in *Notebook for an Ethics*, where Sartre argues that conversion involves rescinding the fundamental pre-reflective project in which one attempts to be simultaneously fully being-in-itself and fully being-for-itself.<sup>16</sup> To undergo conversion is to forego this doomed project in favor of an “authentic” stance toward the type of being that I am.<sup>17</sup> The problem with making use of such notions as authenticity and conversion, however, is that it forfeits the possibility of genuine subject-to-subject encounters in everyday experience. Recall that dependence on first accomplishing authenticity was a problem with most accounts of Heideggerian intersubjectivity. Insofar as our purpose is to account for the recognition of the other that must occur in *everydayness*—and not merely those relationships enabled by the rarefied condition of conversion or authenticity—we cannot make use of such dimensions of Sartre’s approach. Instead, we are left with the subject/object conflict of the pre-conversion self.<sup>18</sup>

But as we can now see, there are problems facing such an account. First, we must consider how the world itself comes to be experienced as a genuinely shared arena such that it speaks to me of the presence of others—even when those others are not present to grant me the experience of objectification that is the condition for my experiencing another subject as such. One can hardly claim that the boat on the shore or the

farmer's field produces a feeling of shame in me. How, then, can there be a residue of subjectivity clinging to public objects such that these communal spaces and things—the marketplace, the train, the painting—speak to me of the presence of other subjects who are nevertheless absent? If the presence of the other qua subject is torn from me the minute I transcend it toward my own free subjectivity, then so too is all trace of the other's subjectivity lost to me in transcending the very objectification that was necessary to experience any dimension of foreign subjectivity. Thus the contingency and particularity of the Sartrean encounter makes the establishment and maintenance of such intersubjective arenas and artifacts impossible.

A related difficulty arises when Sartre attempts to account for the possibility of being *mistaken* about whether another person is present. In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre examines the case in which someone suddenly hears a sound behind him while spying through a keyhole. He is frozen in an experience of shameful objectification, assuming that he has been caught in the act by the gaze of the other. In reality however, this "other" who has "seen" him is simply the wind. In such a case, is one in fact undergoing "the Look"? Considering his emphasis on the radically a posteriori and contingent nature of the intersubjective encounter, one would assume that Sartre must dismiss this feeling of being objectified before another subject as not really such an experience after all because there is *in fact* no other subject present. Though this would be a counterintuitive conclusion—that despite all of the phenomenological evidence indicating it *is* the same type of experience, it *cannot* be an experience of objectification because the concrete other actually looking at me is absent—it would be the conclusion most consistent with his position. Rather than dismissing the experience evoked by the sound of the wind as a false sense of being-seen, however, Sartre concludes that the experience is in fact one of objectification before another subject—but in this case the other subject *just happens to be physically absent*. Indeed, in the case of such mistaken experiences of being looked at, he claims:

Far from disappearing with my first alarm, the Other is present everywhere, below me, above me, in the neighboring rooms, and I continue to feel profoundly my being-for-others . . . if each creak announces to me a look, it is because I am already in the state of being-looked-at. What then is it which falsely appeared and which was self-destructive when I discovered the false-alarm? It is not the Other-as-subject, nor is it his presence to me. It is the Other's *facticity*; that is, the contingent connection between the Other and an object-being in *my* world. Thus what is doubtful is not the Other himself, it is the Other's *being-there*; i.e., that



concrete, historical event which we can express by the words, "There is someone in this room." (BN 370)

But recall that it was only the concretely objectifying gaze of others that could give me a dimension of self *unavailable in their absence*—a dimension of self whose very contingency attests to the dependence of my being on the presence of the other. Sartre's reference to the "presence" of an Other despite her absence in concrete facticity, then, is not a solution that is available to him—at least if he is to continue to account for the ontological dependence that was the key to his improvement on the epistemological model of intersubjectivity.

If the experience of another subjectivity does not require the concrete encounter with another factic subject, then in what way has Sartre moved beyond Heidegger's account? Has Sartre escaped the critiques he has leveled against Heideggerian being-with? It is far from clear that he has. Indeed, Sartre himself seems to fall into a kind of a priori account of the experience of the other: "My certainty of the Other's existence is independent of these experiences and is, on the contrary, that which makes them possible" (BN 280).<sup>19</sup> Thus in attempting to provide an answer to the "absent other" issue, he illicitly imports what he took to be insufficient Heideggerian solutions. As Theunissen queries, "How can the indubitability of the 'Other itself' be saved when the 'historical and concrete event' of being looked at sinks into mere probability?"<sup>20</sup> The very contingency and facticity that differentiated Sartre's position from Heidegger's has been abandoned; "now, on the contrary, Sartre defends the indubitability of the subject-Other at the expense of its facticity."<sup>21</sup>

The possibility of denying that his position falls into a type of Heideggerian social apriority may still be open to Sartre, however, if he characterizes such instances of the residual or mistaken presence of other subjects as somehow remnants of a primal concrete encounter that inaugurates the experience of oneself as seen object in the world. The very *first* encounter with the factually present other's look may grant me a dimension of the self that was unavailable to me without it, but this encounter changes me such that this dimension is henceforth always present in some manner, regardless of whether there is a concrete other looking at me right now. In other words, the original ontic encounter does have ontological implications. In order to adopt such a position, however, Sartre's approach would be required to change rather significantly—he would have to renounce his characterization of the intersubjective encounter as a type of complete and constant oscillation between objectifying and objectified and introduce the possibility of another type of encounter. As it stands, Sartre's characterization of intersubjectivity

along sharp subject/object lines means that the encounter with another subject *cannot* change one essentially: the ontic encounter has no ontological implications unless Sartre reformulates the encounter such that the experience of being objectified brings with it a transformation in what it means for me to be a subject.

What, then, can we conclude on the basis of our Sartre discussion? It seems clear that the role of the freedom and contingency of the other person must be an essential dimension of the intersubjective encounter, if, like Sartre, we agree that “we *encounter* the Other; we do not constitute him” (BN 336). With notions such as shame, Sartre powerfully expresses this idea—that the presence of the other grants me a dimension of my being that is unavailable through my own constituting powers. But if such encounters are to involve a type of dependence of being between subjects—such that my very way of being in the world is fundamentally altered by these encounters—their effect must have greater staying power than Sartre’s position can accommodate. In its fleetingness and its lack of necessary connection to the concrete presence of the other, Sartre is ultimately unable to support his own claims.

By taking our cue from the above notion of ontic events of encounter that have ontological implications, however, we may be able to navigate a way between the extremes of Sartre’s pure contingent facticity—an account that cannot do justice to the residue of social presence that remains despite the absence of concrete others—and the danger of losing the individual other in the anonymity of a priori categories. As I will argue extensively in the chapters to come, it is, in fact, just *this* position that is the correct interpretation of what Heidegger means by *Mitsein*—an ontological dimension that is ultimately dependent on ontic encounters. In order to demonstrate how a proper understanding of Heidegger’s ontological category being-with will allow us to avoid these extremes, however, we must discover the sense in which this dimension of Dasein’s way of being is to be understood as an a priori category at all. As I will show in the following chapter, Heidegger’s existential analytic must be understood as a type of reformulation of the traditional concept of the a priori—a reformulation that more adequately characterizes the other’s presence as what Sartre calls a “contingent necessity” (BN 336). As Kisiel points out: “Fundamental ontology is not to be developed from generic universals which indifferently subsume their instances, but rather from the distributive universals of ‘in each case mine’ according to the circumstances. It requires universals which maintain an essential reference to their differentiation into ontic instances (SZ 42).”<sup>22</sup> Examining the nature of such an “essential reference” will be the project of chapter 4.

## Heideggerian Apriority and the Categories of Being

We have seen that Sartre's account of intersubjective encounters bases the recognition of the other's selfhood on one's own experience of objectification, thereby leading him to fall into the same difficulty that he accuses Heidegger's account of endorsing: namely, that I may have the experience that is supposedly unique to encountering another person in the *absence* of anyone's concrete presence. Sartre accounts for the fact that my experience of the world is heavy with the presence of others by assuming a Heidegger-style position that takes a social dimension of experience to be a necessary condition of my very way of being in the world. Not only does Sartre fail to go beyond Heidegger's position in this regard, but in the following sections I will demonstrate that the primary motivation for Sartre's critique of Heidegger's position—the fact that it seems to preclude the concrete immediacy of another person from being experienced as such—does not apply. In order to do so, I will show that the existential category through which I recognize others is itself responsive to and dependent on particular concrete encounter experiences. This will entail showing how Dasein's categories do not simply impose an interpretive framework on things but are responsive to the things themselves. This account will take some cues from Heidegger's distinction between *Zuhanden* (available, "handy" things) and *Vorhanden* (objectively present or "occurrent" things), but ultimately it will argue that responsiveness to other Dasein must be formulated in another way—a way that leads through a discussion of Kant and his notion that temporality is the form of all intuition. Despite Heidegger's claim that Dasein's way of being grounds the frameworks of understanding through which the world has meaning, then, we will show that these frameworks nevertheless adapt in light of the way things are.

By grounding the meaning of particular entities in referential totalities that are themselves grounded in human categories of understanding and projects of existing, claiming categorical responsiveness to the thing's kind of being seems problematic at best. Such a worry is evident in Ernst Tugendhat's powerful critique of Heidegger's theory of truth in *Der Wahrheitsbegriff bei Husserl und Heidegger*.<sup>1</sup> Tugendhat accuses Hei-

degger of being unable to account for how the thing known can act as a standard according to which the way of knowing it—the mode of “unconcealing”—can be assessed for accuracy. According to Tugendhat, Heidegger simply equates truth with unconcealing, thereby dropping truth’s normative dimension, which demands that the latter—in order for it to be *true*—must reveal the thing *as it is in itself*, and not simply in whatever way one’s preexisting horizons of understanding happen to reveal it: “It is here a question not of bringing the subject-matter to givenness but of validating the givenness with reference to the subject-matter. Only through this second direction does the first acquire a validity, so that the revealing, which would otherwise be arbitrary, is directed toward the entity as it is itself.”<sup>2</sup> By defining truth as simple disclosure, argues Tugendhat, Heidegger is guilty of “giving up the regulative idea of certainty and the postulate of a critical foundation.”<sup>3</sup>

The relationship between Tugendhat’s position and Sartre’s critique is evident: the latter claims that Dasein’s way of being may conceal or distort the person as she is in herself by subsuming her to established frameworks of understanding that are themselves not open to critique or revision in terms of their accuracy in revealing her. Though Tugendhat aims his critique at what he sees as the arbitrariness and relativism of Heidegger’s historically and culturally determined horizons of meaning—and Sartre’s emphasis is on being-with as a priori structure—Tugendhat merely expands on Sartre’s fundamental point: that on Heidegger’s account of experience, the way things are encountered—whether persons or otherwise—is not held to any standard whereby Dasein’s categories and interpretive frameworks can and should get the things right *as they are in themselves*.<sup>4</sup>

If we are to account for how Dasein can disclose the world in such a way that “innerworldly beings themselves are freed, . . . freed for *their own possibilities*” (BT 144/135)—the Sartrean/Tugendhatian critique must be answered. Though Dasein encounters the world as meaningful through its projects, it does not simply “project” meaning onto things arbitrarily; it can “draw the conceptuality belonging to the beings to be interpreted from these themselves or else force them into concepts to which beings are opposed in accordance with their kind of being” (BT 150/141)—a distinction indicating Heidegger’s belief, at least, that his position does not commit him to the latter alone. Indeed, as Henry Pietersma notes, drawing one’s conceptuality from the beings themselves is what Heidegger means by his notion of “letting be” (*Seinlassen*): “An agent lets something be if he allows his actions to be determined by the nature of the things in the environment or world, rather than imposing his own preconceived ideas.”<sup>5</sup> Investigating the responsiveness and sensitivity of one’s interpretations to the beings to be interpreted comprised a significant part of Heidegger’s philosophical inquiry—particularly his early work, which is largely ori-

ented toward finding a theory of categories that both accounts for the objective validity of knowledge—its binding character—as well as its conceptual, “subjective” status. Despite Heidegger’s own claims regarding the dependence of truth on Dasein, then, such as: “*All truth is relative to the being of Da-sein*” (BT 227/208), this subjective element does not compromise truth’s objectivity.<sup>6</sup> For Heidegger, Dasein’s unconcealing of particular beings through a priori structures and historical frameworks of meaning is exempted from “the province of ‘subjective’ arbitrariness and brings discovering Da-sein before beings themselves . . . The ‘universal validity’ of truth, too, is rooted solely in the fact that Da-sein can discover and free beings in themselves. Only thus can this being in itself be binding for every possible statement, that is, for every possible way of pointing them out” (BT 227/208–9). The problem, as Heidegger saw it, was one of navigating between a Kantian idealism and an Aristotelian realism; both of which failed to adequately account for one or the other feature of knowledge.<sup>7</sup>

Every experience is in itself an encounter and indeed an encounter in and for an act of caring. The basic character of the object is therefore always this: it stands, and is met with, on the path of care; it is experienced as meaningful. To interpret what is meant by saying that the world “is there” (i.e., to interpret the character of the actuality of the world of factual life) is neither as easy as transcendental theory of knowledge imagines nor so self-evident and unproblematic as realism believes. (PIA 68–69)

Heidegger thus clearly recognized both the need for—and the extreme difficulties involved in providing—a theory of Dasein’s categories in which they are *constrained* by the particular things known such that both subjective and objective dimensions of knowing are accommodated. In demonstrating that Dasein is responsive or “beholden”<sup>8</sup> to the concrete particularity of the things known, the claim that Dasein cannot encounter or learn from individual others is called into question. Though he did not analyze the nature of being-with in this regard, I will show both that Heidegger’s work develops a theory of responsive categories, and that it can be successfully applied to the case of being-with, though Heidegger himself failed to do so in detail.

## Encountering Things

Before examining the social encounter, we will turn first to the way in which Heidegger most recognizably distinguishes between subject-dependent

and subject-independent reality—between Dasein’s arbitrary subsumption of things to its categories, and the constrained responsiveness of the categories to the things themselves. This occurs in his distinction between *Zuhanden* (handy, available) things and *Vorhanden* (objectively present, occurrent) things. The obvious emphasis on Dasein’s *Zuhanden* way of being throughout *Being and Time* is largely responsible for the tendency to interpret Heidegger as claiming that all meaning is simply imposed on things in terms of their practical usability for Dasein’s projects, whether these projects are understood in terms of an individual constituting ego (idealism) or socially determined roles and norms (pragmatism).

Despite Heidegger’s emphasis on our primarily *Zuhanden* mode of encountering things, however, thingly encounters can nevertheless provide a resistance to Dasein’s interpretive categories and frameworks against which the truth of these practical frameworks may be measured. In other words, the distinction between available and occurrent things allows Heidegger to acknowledge the reality of entities independent of human practice and therefore to recognize that what motivates the realist/idealist distinction cannot simply be done away with. Further, these ontological categories of occurrentness and availability do not stand in any metaphysical order of primacy.<sup>9</sup> Though Heidegger stresses the *Zuhanden* throughout *Being and Time*, this is due to (1) a priority in the order of discovery, and (2) the fact that “our familiarity with available things . . . is a condition of our interpretation of entities *as* having some definite, specifiable character, for example, as cognizable objects with determinate properties standing in objective relations.”<sup>10</sup> Heidegger’s point is not that things cannot or do not exist independently of human meanings and practices; rather, his point is that recognizing or experiencing such independent existence will require an unnatural, distanced, “apragmatic” attitude toward these things—an attitude fostered, for example, in philosophy and the sciences: “Not free from prejudice but free for the possibility of giving up a prejudice at the decisive moment on the basis of a critical encounter with the subject matter. That is the form of existence of a scientific human.”<sup>11</sup> Such an attitude is secondary to the ordinary mode of practical engagement with the world and must be recognized as a type of *achievement*.<sup>12</sup> Heidegger acknowledges the possibility of a stance toward the world characterized by a “critical encounter with the subject matter,” but argues that such “ideally objective” world interpretations only arise through the bracketing or loss of the practices that ordinarily give things their meaning. Though experiencing things in abstraction from our ordinary contexts of relevance is not our ordinary way of encountering them, then, it is not impossible. Indeed, as Charles Taylor notes in “Engaged Agency and Background,” the legacy of modern

philosophy has been to “ontologize” this ability: “The disengaged perspective, which might better have been conceived as a rare and regional achievement of a knowing agent whose normal stance was engaged, was read into the very nature of mind.”<sup>13</sup>

Heidegger’s distinction between available and occurrent modes of experience is similar to John Searle’s distinction between “institutional” and “brute” facts; the former being characterized as facts that “require human institutions for their existence,” while the latter “require no human institutions for their existence.”<sup>14</sup> Unlike Searle, however, who takes “brute facts” to be primary because institutional facts must have some physical realization, Heidegger argues that understanding brute facts as such is the consequence of a particular type of practical breakdown that allows one to *recognize* the radical independence of things from how one understands them—in other words, it provokes a shift from *Zuhanden* to *Vorhanden* modes of being. Heidegger’s well-worn example of such breakdown is of the damaged hammer that interrupts and resists the practical activity of hammering, requiring one to stop and assess the hammer in terms of its occurrent qualities. Such breakdown need not always result in a shift from *Zuhanden* to *Vorhanden*, however—one may simply adapt to what is broken or missing or getting in the way and continue with the project. According to Heidegger, however,

the more urgently we need what is missing and the more truly it is encountered in its unhandiness, all the more obtrusive does what is at hand become, such that it seems to lose the character of handiness. It reveals itself as something merely objectively present, which cannot be budged without the missing element. As a deficient mode of taking care of things, the helpless way in which we stand before it discovers the mere objective presence of what is at hand. (*BT* 73/69)

In every case, however, this deficient, helpless mode is *derivative* of my everyday practical coping. Depending on what is normally at hand as a thing available for my projects—be it “brute” physical things such as rocks, or social things such as money—there are various ways in which these modes of caring engagement can become deficient. In the case of physical reality, this type of practical distance and its corresponding recognition of occurrent independence is precisely the mode of comportment that is nurtured in the physical sciences.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, because of the primary role that the physical sciences play in our social self-understandings, the derivative nature of the objectively present from the ready to hand—of the theoretical from the practical—is often obscured. The role that our own body plays in the practical context of knowledge, for example, is

generally masked by a scientific understanding that takes our physical size, orientation, and makeup as foundational for knowledge—but without acknowledging it as such. The physical world is experienced as being composed of a certain set of brute facts taken to be independent of us because we have already dealt with the brute fact of being endowed with particular types of bodies. We encounter “medium-sized” objects *as* objects—but we have a much harder time experiencing quarks or planets as such. Experiencing things like mountains and snow only makes sense “against the background of this kind of embodiment . . . the nature of this experience is formed by this constitution, and how the terms in which this experience is described are thus given their sense only in relation to this form of embodiment.”<sup>16</sup> Though experiences of resistance and breakdown may be more difficult to achieve for such foundational and generally unrecognized practical interpretive frameworks as those of embodiment, they too are possible. This is evident, for example, not only in quantum and Einsteinian physics, but in types of abnormal experiences accomplished in meditation, illness, or substance abuse. For Heidegger, the most extreme form of such loss of handiness in engaging with the world arises through *Angst*, being-toward-death, and the call of conscience—the modes of disclosure whereby worldly significance itself falls away.<sup>17</sup>

Though the primary way that one understands things on Heidegger’s account is in terms of their practical usability, then, this practical priority does not commit him to anti-realism. Underlying all of my practical engagements is the threat of a resistance ranging from broken hammers to broken worlds.<sup>18</sup> Despite this eternal threat of failure, however, the groundedness of cognition in human practical care for its own existence indicates that ways of understanding things other than as available for projects will be secondary or derivative modes of understanding. As chapter 2’s discussion of mineness and Dasein’s worldly self-understandings indicated, however, it is precisely the possibility of failure that gives success its meaning. It is just this point—that Dasein cares for its own existence and measures its success in expressing this care through worldly engagements—that will allow us to recognize the normative dimension of the world’s resistance to Dasein’s practical modes of comportment.

Though the mere resistance of things to certain practical interpretive frameworks will demonstrate that Dasein’s frameworks are not all-powerful or unquestionable in terms of meaning-constitution, then, the question remains as to whether there is some standard according to which one interpretive framework can be deemed more accurate than others in the face of practical breakdown. Recall that to overcome Tu-



gendhat's critique it is not enough for there to be mere resistance to arbitrary "unconcealments"; the resistance must be normatively determined by the nature of the thing as it is in itself. Though the appropriateness of a mode of concealing will *generally* depend on the practical context for Heidegger, in the case of breakdown there will invariably be cases in which the appropriateness and truth of the entire practical framework of interpretation are called into question.

As John Haugeland argues in his article "Truth and Finitude: Heidegger's Transcendental Existentialism," the issue is such that

if there is to be a significant distinction between "getting an entity right" and failing to do so, there must be some way—some feasible and nonarbitrary way—of telling it in particular cases . . . Compartments in themselves, however, do not wear their ontical truth on their sleeves. Therefore, something else, some further compartment or compartments, must be involved in telling whether they are true or not. So the question at this point resolves into these: how can some compartments impugn the ontical truth of others? And, supposing they can, how can the choice among them be nonarbitrary?<sup>19</sup>

Haugeland addresses himself to this problem by arguing that Dasein's self-disclosing is "inseparable from a disclosing of the being of *other* entities," because "in knowing how to be me, I must know how to deal with the entities amidst which I work and live—indeed, these are often just two ways of looking at the same know-how."<sup>20</sup> This claim recalls us to the discussion of mineness, where Dasein's care for its own being pushes it to seek standards of self-assessment within its practical engagements with worldly things. Though Dasein tends to take it easy by simply accepting the truth of these worldly standards, the close relationship between self and world-disclosure brings with it a requirement that those who dismiss Heidegger as an idealist or a relativist tend to overlook; namely, because I assess myself in terms of the entities with which I am engaged, I need to know if I am getting them *right* in some sense. And if it is possible for me to "get them right" then there must be a difference between those modes of understanding through which I do or do not get them right—a difference that is itself a function of the things themselves. The consequence of this is that my modes of understanding will be in some sense in the service of the things that they disclose.<sup>21</sup>

Assessing the accuracy of one's interpretive frameworks will depend on their mutual compatibility; my stances are called into question by the kind of breakdown that results when the entities themselves would be *impossible* if both compartments have gotten it right.<sup>22</sup> Being a good Satanist

and being a good sister cannot both be true, since sisterhood involves norms of kindness, generosity, forgiveness, and so on that are directly antithetical to Satan worshippers (or so I understand). An important aspect of the ability of one comportment to impugn the truth of another, however, is that the person involved is immersed in an orientation bent on truth-finding; an orientation in which conflicts and impossibilities are *unacceptable*. Such unacceptability encourages one to make a choice between the incompatible interpretations and to engage in procedures of confirmation and clarification such that this choice is not—or not completely—arbitrary.

But why are such ostensible impossibilities unacceptable? As we noted above, since my ability to be depends on the possibilities specified by social norms governing the way I comport myself in the world, how I deal with entities—the truth of my comportments toward them—directly relates to my ability to be me. The consequence of understanding the relationship between the disclosure of world and the disclosure of self in this way—their mutual implication, so to speak—allows us to recognize some important (and often misunderstood) aspects of Heidegger's position:

My *self* understanding, therefore *presupposes* that I understand the being of the entities amid which I live . . . But, if my self-understanding depends on my understanding of the being of other entities, then I must *be able to* project those entities onto their possibilities. *This* ability, therefore, belongs essentially to my ability-to-be *me*. My ability to project those entities onto their possibilities is not merely another possibility onto which I project myself, but is rather *part of* my ability to project myself onto my own possibilities at all. In other words, my *self* understanding literally *incorporates* an understanding of the being of other entities.<sup>23</sup>

Our engagements with things are definitive of who we are, and we care about who we are; the result being that we care about the consistency and appropriateness of our engagements with things. Getting *things* right is one of the most fundamental ways of ascertaining whether, loosely speaking, we have gotten ourselves right. Though the achievement of a disinterested knowing whereby we can explicitly test the consistency of our practical, interested knowing is a *derivative* mode of being, it is nevertheless a permanent possibility based on the world's resistance to our practical frameworks and the fact that we care about what this resistance says about who we are. One's care about getting something right—care for truth and consistency—is rooted in the fact that one is entrusted

with the mineness of one's own existence. The possibility of the disinterested knowing that this self-responsibility allows undermines the dictatorship of *Zuhandenheit*'s subsumption of worldly things to the category of usability.

### Encountering Others: The A Priori Nature of Being-With

Though resistance to Dasein's interpretive categories is evident in the possibility of the *Vorhanden* interrupting the *Zuhanden*, and the reengagement with the practical seems to be constrained by Dasein's desire to reach an accurate world and self-understanding, it is not yet clear how this will help us solve Sartre's difficulty, since Heidegger explicitly claims that the occurrent and the available are not modes of being that can apply to encountering *other Dasein*.<sup>24</sup> Being-with is essentially different than the worldly categories of practical interpretation; indeed, its nature *qua existential* grants it a radically different categorial status—the consequence being that the above discussion will not solve our problem regarding the possibility of recognizing other Dasein as such (as opposed to mere instances of the category *Mitsein*). The fundamental distinction between being-*among* things and being-*with* others is evident in his claim that “being-in-the-world is with equal originality both being-with and being-among” (*BPP* 278). Heidegger elaborates further by articulating how encounters with others are worldly but nevertheless not *thingly*—that is, occurrent or available—because others are themselves Dasein: “Taking care of things is a character of being which being-with cannot have as its own, although this kind of being is a *being-toward* beings encountered in the world, as is taking care of things. The being to which Dasein is related as being-with does not, however, have the kind of being of useful things at hand; it is itself Dasein” (*BT* 121/114). Note the unequivocal claim that Dasein *cannot* encounter others as it does things. Not only is the mode of being of the others different from that of things, then, but so too is the manner in which I encounter and interact with them. Because of this radical distinction, we cannot understand the social encounter through the categories of the *Zuhanden* and the *Vorhanden*.

However, commentators have argued that though such a distinction is present in Heidegger it is nevertheless undermined by the priority that his work consistently gives to *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden*—*thingly*—existence. As Michael Theunissen notes, “Regardless of the declared fact that *Dasein-with* cannot be traced back to the ready-to-hand [*Zuhanden*],”<sup>25</sup>

Heidegger's emphasis is nevertheless on the experience of the other as *mediated* by the ready-to-hand. The point, argues Theunissen, is not "the dependence of one kind of being upon another but of the inner order of the *event of encountering*. However, for Heidegger, in this order (and this must be firmly grasped) equipment is the first to be encountered."<sup>26</sup> Heidegger's claim that we encounter others through the world indicates, for Theunissen, that despite all claims to the contrary, being-with others has a derivative and secondary status to being-among things—and so, presumably, that the former can be understood in terms of the latter.

It is far from clear that this is the case for Heidegger, however. Though equipment may be the first to be encountered in *Being and Time*'s analyses, this does not mean that Dasein's existence is fraught with this priority—that I first encounter stuff and then infer the presence of others. Heidegger explicitly denies this: "The others who are 'encountered' in the context of useful things in the surrounding world at hand are not somehow added on in thought to an initially merely objectively present thing, but these 'things' are encountered from the world in which they are at hand for the others" (BT 118/111). Though Heidegger begins his discussion of being-in-the-world with an analysis of the way that *things* exist, he indicates that he does not address the being of other persons at this point not only because he wants to simplify the initial discussion, but

above all, because the kind of being of the existence of the others encountered within the surrounding world is distinct from handiness and objective presence [*Zuhandenheit* and *Vorhandenheit*]. The world of Da-sein thus frees beings which are not only completely different from tools and things, but which themselves in accordance with their kind of being as *Da-sein* are themselves "in" the world as being-in-the-world in which they are at the same time encountered. These beings are neither objectively present nor at hand, but they *are like* the very Da-sein which frees them—*they are there, too, and there with it*. (BT 118/111)

Encountering others "in" the world does not mean that there is some sort of equipmental screen thrown up between me and others—the other is not simply "*mediated* by equipment," as Theunissen claims;<sup>27</sup> rather, equipment is "*mediated*" by the other. Though I may experience the presence of others in terms of equipment despite their absence—in the cultivated field, for example—the encounter is experienced as personal insofar as particular dimensions of the equipment are salient. I do not recognize the other merely through this or that expanse of dirt—I recognize her in terms of its *relevance* (BT 118/111): in the trace of her purposive activity, in the fact that this expanse of dirt is *cultivated*: "These others

do not stand in the referential context of the environing world, but are encountered in that with which they have to do, in the 'with which' of their preoccupation as the ones who are preoccupied with it. They are encountered as they are in their being-in-the-world, not as chance occurrences but as the ones who till the field" (*HCT* 240).

This is a point to which we will be returning below. It is important to be clear, however, that worldly encounters with others do not preclude directly encountering these others—their worldliness cannot be taken to grant priority to Dasein's thingly modes of encounter. For Heidegger, the thingly does not have priority over the social dimension of worldly encounter. Indeed, it will become clear that the priority is precisely the opposite in the "inner order of the event of encountering"—despite the fact that this priority is forgotten and concealed in our everyday way of being. As we will come to see, without encountering the others with whom this world is co-constituted, the innerworldly things that Dasein encounters in *Zuhandenheit* or *Vorhandenheit* modes would be inaccessible.

Despite the tendency of ontological interpretations to equate our equipmental, *Zuhanden* mode of thingly encounter with the indifference of our everyday modes of being-with, Heidegger is clear that "ontologically there is an essential distinction between the 'indifferent' being together of arbitrary things and the not-mattering-to-one-another of beings who are with one another" (*BT* 121–22/114). For Heidegger, the way in which the being of other Dasein is disclosed differs fundamentally and categorially from the way in which things are disclosed, despite the tendency of ontological theorizing to reduce all to the same: "Being-toward-others is ontologically different from being toward objectively present things. The 'other' being itself has the kind of being of Da-sein. Thus, in being with and toward others, there is a relation of being from Da-sein to Da-sein" (*BT* 124/117). If the encounter with other Dasein is fundamentally different than the *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden* modes of engagement with worldly things, then the above discussion regarding the thingly resistance that evokes the shift from the former to the latter will not allow us to meet Sartre's criticism, though it will become clear that in both cases—the thingly and the social encounter—Dasein's self-responsible way of being qua mineness plays an essential role. To refute Sartre's critique, then, we must demonstrate that individual others themselves offer some principled resistance to the a priori category being-with. But in order to do so, we must first determine how Heidegger's existential analytic characterizes the a priori categories of experience in general. By showing how the categories are responsive to "the things themselves" we can demonstrate how *Mitsein* is not an arbitrary imposition upon other

Dasein but a responsive disclosing of them in all their particularity and specificity.

### The Heideggerian A Priori

In contrast to traditional characterizations of the a priori as an unchanging, complete set of categories, Heidegger's aim in *Being and Time* is to *ground* the apriority of the I in its particular existence, emphasizing the fact that the *existence* character of the I is precisely what cannot be bracketed. The existential analytic's shift away from traditional accounts lies in its insistence on recognizing that the a priori categories are only ever found within this or that Dasein's particular, finite existing. Thus Heidegger asserts in the first pages of *Being and Time* that questioning the meaning of being cannot simply be assumed as an abstract ability belonging universally to all things of the type "human," because the attitudes and activities of inquiry are "themselves modes of being of a particular being, of *the* being we inquirers ourselves in each case are" (BT 7/6). In other words, such abilities cannot be understood in abstraction from the concrete context of the particular life in which they come to be, but must be responsive to it in its concrete particularity: "These investigations have the peculiar character of leading out from the discipline [of phenomenology] to a peculiar connection of phenomena: existence. Becoming free from the discipline for existence itself. This 'becoming free' means seizing the possibilities of making this existence itself the theme of a research determined by existence itself" (IPR 81). So too, then, must questioning the meaning of social encounter be grounded in the modes of Dasein's concrete existing. If we are to fully understand the implications of Heidegger's shift to the existential analytic, we must examine the manner in which the ontological categories determining Dasein's way of being—including being-with—are themselves shaped by the ontic existence in which they play their interpretive role. To take seriously the fact that the mode of being of Dasein is always this or that finite, factual existence involves recognizing that the categories are themselves *dependent* on the particular beings encountered in that existence. For Heidegger, ontic encounters reveal and evoke the ontological categories operating within my existence; they initiate and enrich them. Heidegger's claim that "ontology has an ontical foundation" (BPP 19) means not only that the question of the meaning of being arises in the ontic existence of concrete Dasein; it also points to concrete encounters as the necessary condition for the possibility of an ontological category's meaning *hold-*

*ing* for what it does. This does not mean that there must always be concrete particulars present if the category is to be operating—since this would return us to Sartre’s difficulty in explaining residual traces or false alarm experiences—but they must have been present at some point if this category is to be at work in a particular Dasein’s existence. Dasein’s categories of being cannot easily be defined as “ontic” or “ontological,” then, insofar as they designate a constitutive ontological dimension of being-in-the-world that nevertheless stipulates an ontic condition—a type of “contingent necessity.” To exist as a finite being is to always already exist in certain determinate possibilities that involve encountering concrete particulars.<sup>28</sup> The implication of this claim is that if I had never encountered another Dasein then the category of understanding specific to others would be unavailable—since it is dependent on the intuited beings that exist in their own right. In other words, in the complete absence of particular instances of concrete encounter, there could be no genuine being-with.

This is a somewhat controversial claim, considering traditional notions of the a priori and the fact that Heidegger’s views seem to be ambiguous at points—he claims, for example, that despite ontology’s ontic foundation, “being and its attributes in a certain way underlie beings and precede them and so are a proteron, an earlier” (*BPP* 20). This appears to be a clear statement of the ontic’s ontological foundation, and those who interpret Heidegger as advocating a type of uncomplicated transcendental idealism understand such statements as making just such an assertion. But like Husserl, Heidegger was intent on reformulating the categories by rejecting the Kantian assumption that a complete, preestablished set of categories could simply be deduced from a logical architectonic or taken over from the philosophical tradition. As László Tengelyi notes, “Husserl’s main contention, on the contrary, is that the categories, far from arising through *reflection* upon certain intentional acts, have their origin in the *fulfillment* of some intentional acts.”<sup>29</sup> Heidegger continues this Husserlian notion of the a priori as originating in particular modes of encounter. He expands on it, however, by emphasizing the manner in which such modes of encounter are not mere epistemological categories but are deeply implicated in who it is to be me.<sup>30</sup> Heidegger further differs from Husserl by maintaining a crucial aspect of the Kantian approach—the view that these modes of encounter are all types of responsiveness to *temporal intuition*, which provides the horizon within which all category-initiating and enriching encounters may occur. The section below entitled “Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics” will examine this further. In the course of that discussion it will become evident why the relationship between the ontic encounter and the a priori

ontological structure of being-with cannot be characterized as a simple priority of the latter over the former. Though the ontological cannot be reduced to the ontic, the pitfalls of a reduction in the other direction must also be avoided:

No understanding of being is possible that would not root in a comportment toward beings. Understanding of being and comportment toward beings do not come together only afterward and by chance; always already latently present in the Dasein's existence, they unfold as summoned from the ecstatic-horizonal constitution of temporality and as made possible by it in their belonging together. As long as this original belonging together of comportment toward beings and understanding of being is not conceived by means of temporality, philosophical inquiry remains exposed to a double danger, to which it has succumbed over and over again in its history until now. Either everything ontical is dissolved into the ontological (Hegel), without insight into the ground of possibility of ontology itself; or else the ontological is denied altogether and explained away ontically, without an understanding of the ontological presuppositions which every ontical explanation harbors as such within itself. (*BPP* 327)

As we saw in the previous chapter, it is precisely this failure to understand his own ontological presuppositions that afflicted Sartre's ontical explanations. So too does Heidegger reject the very position that Sartre accuses him of accepting, however, for Heidegger recognizes that without concrete encounters with other Dasein, the ontological category "being-with" could not "unfold as summoned from the ecstatic-horizonal constitution of temporality." The ontic encounter is what "summons" the ontological structure to "unfold" or come into concrete existence. Or, to speak more plainly, if one were born and raised in complete isolation, the social dimension of selfhood would be an ontological structure of my way of being that could not find enactment or expression in my ontic existence. Heidegger's shift to the *existential* analytic allows him to claim that the categories of meaning only ever arise in this or that existence and are responsive to its concrete texture.<sup>31</sup> Heidegger does not want to claim that Dasein's essential structure qua being-in-the-world means that Dasein necessarily exists—rather, he says that "if Dasein in fact exists, then its existence has the structure of being-in-the-world" (*MFL* 169). My related claim is that *if* Dasein in fact exists, then other Dasein also in fact exist or once existed and it is only in inaugural encounters with them that the existential category "being-with" comes into being.

One might read such an approach to the a priori as a direct inheri-



tance from Husserl—though it is unlikely Heidegger would be willing to recognize it as such. Though the Husserlian *epoché* is often taken to distance Husserl's account from the concreteness and contingency of being-in-the-world, Husserl's reformulation of the Kantian a priori was itself an attempt to accommodate it. Tugendhat makes this point when he describes Husserl's a priori as "hypothetical" and "relative" in character—as opposed to the absolute universality that characterized its traditional understanding. This does not undermine the necessity of its nature, but it becomes, so to speak, a *conditional* necessity, a necessity dependent on the contingent presence of things at a particular time: "während Husserls Apriori an sich zwar absolut gilt, aber nur relativ auf die jeweilige Sachhaltigkeit, die selbst nicht notwendig ist."<sup>32</sup> Thus Husserl characterizes the relationship between the intuition of individual and essence as follows: "Intuition of essence has as its basis a principal part of intuition of something individual, namely an appearing, a sightedness of something individual, though not indeed a seizing upon this nor any sort of positing as an actuality; certainly, in consequence of that, no intuition of essence is possible without the free possibility of turning one's regard to a 'corresponding' individual and forming a consciousness of an example" (*Ideas I*, 12).

Husserl addresses this issue in the sixth of his *Logical Investigations* with his notion of categorial intuition, which he characterizes as a type of *perception* of meaning objectivities—not simply of sensory data—which, qua perception, depends on concrete fulfillment experiences.<sup>33</sup> It is as a result of this discovery of categorial intuition, Heidegger claims, that the "original sense of the *a priori*" becomes intelligible, which, along with intentionality and categorial intuition, together comprise what Heidegger dubs the three "decisive discoveries" of Husserl's phenomenology (*HCT* 27). This is instructive for our account, since Heidegger acknowledges that "everything categorial ultimately rests upon sense intuition," as long as we understand that "*sensuousness is a formal phenomenological concept* and refers to all material content as it is already given by the subject matters themselves. This is to be contrasted with the proper concept of the categorial, that is, of the formal and objectively empty. *Sensuousness is therefore the title for the total constellation of entities which are given beforehand in their material content*" (*HCT* 70). Heidegger goes on to clarify that the categories are ways in which to "bring out" the "content of a subject matter" (*HCT* 71) and are "not something made by the subject and even less something added to the real objects, such that the real entity is itself modified by this forming. Rather, they actually present the entity more truly in its 'being-in-itself'" (*HCT* 70).

Though such a category/entity or Being/beings distinction may

appear to maintain the traditional Platonic and Aristotelian “two world” theories of Idea/reality and Form/matter, for Heidegger this distinction is meant to maintain their insights while overcoming the deep divide that such theories establish; it resists the tendency to “ontologize” meaning—to pass on as “fact” what is really a matter of validity. As Heidegger clarifies in *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*: “Kant tries to understand the essence of categories in such a way that categories can be real determinations of objects (of appearances) without having to be empirical properties (of appearances). If determinations of being are not ontic properties of the things that are, in what way do they still belong to *re- alitas*, to the what-content of objects? Their reality, their belonging to essential content, is a transcendental reality, a finite, horizontal-ecstatic reality.”<sup>34</sup> As Steven Crowell makes clear in *Husserl, Heidegger and the Space of Meaning*, Heidegger followed Emil Lask in arguing that we “grasp the category *as* form—not as itself an existent, but as a moment of validity.”<sup>35</sup> Like Lask, Heidegger understood category or form not as mental entity imposed from without but that which “holds” for the material of which it is the form; as Crowell notes, “If there is a plurality of forms (a ‘table’ of categories), the principle of differentiation must lie in the material itself.”<sup>36</sup> From this—“Lask’s principle of the ‘material determination of form’—it follows that the discovery of categories will be, as Heidegger demanded, an empirical phenomenological affair.”<sup>37</sup> This “empirical phenomenological affair” is precisely the analysis of the a priori in full awareness of its synthetic, contingent nature. As Tengelyi and Tugendhat note, the breakthrough of the phenomenological approach to the a priori—a breakthrough that Heidegger clearly followed—has to do with the origin of the categories; they cannot be deduced from a prior metaphysics but must be attentive to the manner in which they operate in and through particular encounters in concrete existence. For Husserl—and, I would argue, for Heidegger—even “the categories of pure logical grammar are rooted in the things present to consciousness. They are not purely formal; nor are they innate principles of mind . . . that are imposed upon a formless material.”<sup>38</sup>

Thus Heidegger’s elaboration of the notion of categorial intuition confirms his indebtedness to Husserl in recognizing the responsiveness of the categories to intuition. As Kisiel notes, it is through such influences that Heidegger develops “a sense of intentionality and categorial intuition which allows him to move toward a new sense of the apriori, that of the facticity of historical meaning, which finds its norms in experienceability instead of knowability.”<sup>39</sup> It is not only the case that the ontological is dependent on the ontic insofar as the latter provides an opportunity for the former’s application, then, but the a priori is itself

rooted in a type of *beholdenness* to ontic encounters in their experience-ability. As Tugendhat notes of this Husserlian—and, I believe, Heideggerian—understanding of the “synthetic *a priori*”: “bei Husserl gilt das Apriori überhaupt nicht mehr direkt von Seienden oder den Gegenständen unserer Erfahrung, und so ergibt sich die Möglichkeit einer offenen Pluralität der Erfahrungsweisen, jede mit ihrem eigenen Apriori.”<sup>40</sup> This is not to imply that the transcendental conditions of meaning and possibility can be reduced to or are entirely subservient to the ontic realm of entities. But the interrelatedness of these “realms” indicates that whether a category holds of something is deeply dependent on the particular things through which this meaning is initiated and enriched, and recognizing the interrelatedness of the two is part of Husserl’s legacy to Heidegger.

Even if we are to speak of concrete ontic encounters as evoking, enriching, and inaugurating the categories through which they are understood, however, one may argue that such an interpretation must account for the fact that one must have the *potential* to exist in the mode of orientation particular to other Dasein. In other words, one must have some innate category “being-with” that is simply triggered by this or that other—otherwise those others could never be recognized as such. Though concrete others may be necessary as triggers, then, the innate idea or ability is already there, waiting for the inaugural instance of concrete otherness to “summon” it into “unfolding.” What type of priority must operate here? Does the presence of such “potential” categories ensure that Heidegger falls victim to Sartre’s claim that his position cannot account for direct, unmediated encounters with others?

The difficulty with such an objection is its illicit use of the notion of subjectivity that Heidegger has rejected. Thus it substitutes a *substantial* self—with an established set of attributes—for the relational self that is constituted through its activities of existing. Dasein does not exist in such a way that it can have a possibility simply waiting to be triggered, a “free-floating potentiality of being” (*BT* 144/135). On the contrary, “it is the possibility it is only if the Dasein becomes existent in it” (*BPP* 276). In other words, the possibility of understanding in terms of this or that category is only a possibility insofar as the category is “actualized” through a concrete encounter with the particular that inaugurates it. Thus in Division One, section 5 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger’s further elaboration of Dasein’s way of being acknowledges—but rejects—the temptation to view the features of being-in-the-world as an unyielding grid we impose upon it: “It must have seemed that being-in-the-world functions as a rigid framework within which the possible relations of Dasein to its world occur” (*BT* 176/165). Heidegger distances himself from such interpreta-

tions, however, which make use of this notion “without the ‘framework’ itself being touched upon in its kind of being. But this supposed ‘framework’ itself belongs to the kind of being of Da-sein” (*BT* 176/165). The framework in which the possible relations of being-in-the-world occur is *itself* relational, changing, and incomplete. In light of this, Sartre’s characterization of being-with as a mere abstract structure of my own being fails to recognize that the existential analytic has rejected the notion of abstract structures in favor of a picture of human being as immersed and responsive to its concrete worldly situation.

As Heidegger notes in the Aristotle lecture course of 1921 to 1922, interpretive categories “can be understood only insofar as factual life itself is compelled to interpretation” (*PIA* 66). Factual life is *compelled* to interpretation by my being thrown into a situation in which I must respond to it—I am condemned to existence and my categories of interpretation must be understood as *responses* to this condition: “The categories are not inventions or a group of logical schemata as such, ‘lattices’; on the contrary, they are *alive in life itself* in an original way: alive in order to ‘form’ life on themselves. They have their own modes of access, which are not foreign to life itself, as if they pounced down upon life from the outside, but instead are precisely the preeminent way in which *life comes to itself*” (*PIA* 66). The categories through which we understand the world are not dead things imposed from without—they are living orientations and responses evoked by the world-immersed living of the beings that we are. Heidegger makes explicit the vehemence with which he refuses to separate the ontological from the ontic in this regard: “These categorial nexuses are *alive in genuinely concrete life* and are not merely trivial and arbitrary observations . . . Furthermore, it must be understood that they are *alive in facticity*; i.e., they include factual possibilities, from which they are (thank God) never to be freed.”<sup>41</sup> Heidegger elaborates on this notion of “living categories” in his discussion of “The Task of Definition,” where he argues that for philosophy to understand a “principle”—“that on the basis of which something ‘is’ in its own proper way” (*PIA* 18)—it cannot be characterized as an established universal that encompasses all of the particular objects known. Rather, *every* object of knowledge “is always in some sense a principle, something which is at issue and which, with respect to and for something, has ‘something to say’” (*PIA* 19).

Anything that I can encounter exists in a regulating and enriching relationship to the categories through which it is encountered. Analyzing the relationship of the understanding to the thing known—such that the object of knowledge is recognized as both speaking its “something to say,” and as speaking it to *me*—is the heart of Heidegger’s enduring effort to find a middle way between a naive realism and a simplistic

idealism. It is this aim that must be kept in mind as we explore more fully Heidegger's account of the relationship between spontaneity and receptivity, understanding and intuition, a priori and particular. We can do so by recognizing that for Heidegger, the three decisive discoveries of phenomenology can ultimately be understood as determinations of the first discovery—intentionality—and thus that understanding the nature of the a priori depends on a correct understanding of Dasein's intentionality. This point is instructive, for it reminds us that the a priori categories and the categorial intuition on which they are based are rooted in the fundamental structure of Dasein's way of being as transcending toward the world. It is for this reason that Heidegger will claim that the clarification of the sense of the a priori "presupposes the understanding of what we are seeking: *time*" (*HCT* 27); a claim—as we will see—that is only made good in his discussion of the relationship between the a priori and Dasein's fundamental temporality in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. It is there that he explicitly addresses the claim that "finite intuition sees that it is dependent upon the intuitable as a being which exists in its own right."<sup>42</sup> By turning to this text we will be able to achieve a more nuanced reading of how Heidegger thinks different types of beings become available to the understanding in such a way that Dasein does not simply impose established a priori categories on the raw data it encounters in the world.

### Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics

The transcendental project in both Kant and Heidegger lies in articulating the ontological knowledge that makes comporting oneself toward particular ontic beings possible; the quest for the synthetic a priori is a quest for the preexisting conditions of finite knowing that are nevertheless responsive to the being itself. "Because our Dasein is finite—existing in the midst of beings that already are, beings to which it has been delivered over—therefore it must necessarily take this already-existing being in stride, that is to say, it must offer it the possibility of announcing itself" (*KPM* 19). This invitation to self-announcing—the immediate presence of the being we intuit or "take in stride"—is limited by the finitude of the one who opens herself to its arrival. Nevertheless, this limiting must be understood as a restricting, not a simple failure, of accessibility.<sup>43</sup> "The being 'in the appearance' is the same being as the being in itself, and this alone. As a being, it alone can become an object, although only for a finite [act of] knowledge. Nevertheless, it reveals itself in accordance

with the manner and scope of the ability that finite knowledge has at its disposal to take things in stride and to determine them" (*KPM* 22).

The manner in which we know things will only ever be finite and partial. This does not preclude accuracy in the way the thing is revealed in finite knowing, but this accuracy will never be "complete"—there is no god's-eye view from which such completion could be accomplished. Pining for the thing-in-itself is a consequence of humanity's failure to accept our radical finitude; we yearn for an infinite knowing that allows all aspects of the thing to be unconcealed simultaneously and forever, but this knowledge is necessarily unavailable to us and cannot even be proved as such from within the confines of our own finitude:

It is therefore a misunderstanding of what the thing in itself means if we believe that the impossibility of a knowledge of the thing in itself must be proven through a positivistic critique. Such attempts at proof presuppose the thing in itself to be something which is presumed to be an object within finite knowledge in general, but whose tactical inaccessibility can and must be proven. Accordingly, the "mere" in the phrase "mere appearance" is not a restricting and diminishing of the actuality of the thing, but is rather only the negation of the [assumption] that the being can be infinitely known in human knowledge. (*KPM* 23–24)

It is in light of this that we can recognize how Heidegger is not advocating a simple idealism, he is not claiming that the things known just *are* the way in which they are known; rather, his claim is simply that the things known cannot be known in the absence of the way in which they are known—as our discussion regarding *Vorhanden* and *Zuhanden* ways of being has already indicated. Conflating the two will only obscure the complexity of the interaction.

For Heidegger, the concealed inner passion of Kant's work can be found in the recognition that the categories must be differentiated from "notions." The former are applied by the understanding to content received through sensible intuition, while the latter are "concepts which are also given their content [*Inhalt*] a priori" (*KPM* 37–38). In other words, notions are not directly answerable to intuitions, but are "pure" of any such connection; as such, however, they are unable to account for the essential *relatedness* of thought and sensibility. Only when we recognize that "thinking is merely in the service of intuition" (*KPM* 15) can we understand the *responsiveness* of the categories—and derivatively, the notions that are based on them—to sensible intuition.

The relatedness of thought and intuition—this responsiveness of the former to the latter—springs from the nature of human subjectivity

as fundamentally temporal. *Temporality* is the form that all Dasein's intuition must take and it is thus to *temporality* that the categories are in service. The authority of the categories—"the proof for the possibility of the a priori ability of pure concepts to refer to objects" (KPM 60)—will therefore lie in their ability to allow things encountered to show themselves in their particular temporal mode of existing. Insofar as they are grounded in temporality, the categories are both responsive to intuition *and* "given their content a priori": "[They] are not notions, but rather pure concepts which, by means of the pure power of imagination, refer essentially to time. To the extent that they are this essence, however, they constitute transcendence. They are formed with the letting-stand-against-of . . . For this reason they are, in advance, determinations of the objects, i.e., of the being insofar as it is encountered by a finite creature" (KPM 61). The categories originate in the finite creature's responsiveness to concrete encounters with objects; they are *formed* with the "letting-stand-against-of." But the manner in which this "standing-against" nature of objects can be understood—their independence—depends on the function of receptivity and its relationship to the a priori "advance determinations of the objects" attributable to the knower; a relationship, Heidegger argues, that is rooted in the original unity of the faculty of imagination and its essentially temporal nature.<sup>44</sup> By examining the imagination we will show how temporality unifies the spontaneous and receptive dimensions of Dasein's encounter with that which "stands against" it. In doing so, we can recognize how Dasein's way of being is an "invitation to self-announcing" in which Dasein's encounters are both defined by a priori structures *and* responsive to the things themselves.

## The Imagination

Heidegger (and Kant via Heidegger) is interested in the essential possibility of ontological synthesis—whereby "pure intuition and pure thinking should be able to meet one another a priori" (KPM 49). Such a synthesis is what grounds the possibility of any transcending toward particular beings: "The problem of the transcendental, i.e., of the synthesis which constitutes transcendence, thus can also be put this way: How must the finite being that we call 'human being' be according to its innermost essence so that in general it can be open to a being that it itself is not and that therefore must be able to show itself from itself?" (KPM 30). The answer, Heidegger thinks, lies in the temporalizing synthesis of the imagination, in which spontaneity and receptivity can be recognized not

as separate capacities but as facets of the fundamental unity characteristic of Dasein's mode of being. In other words, the synthesizing unity of the imagination must itself be understood in terms of the essential unity of "the subjectivity of the human subject" (*KPM* 144) and its fundamentally temporal nature. By making use of Kant's insights into the temporal structure of imagination, Heidegger hopes to capitalize on the claim that the unity of the self—a unity that guarantees the responsiveness of Dasein's a priori categories to the things themselves—is fundamentally the unity of time. "If a-priority is a basic characteristic of being, and if a-priority is a time designation, and if being is connected with time in such a way that the understanding of being is rooted in the temporality of Dasein, then there is an intrinsic connection between the a priori and temporality, the being-constitution of Dasein, the subjectivity of the subject" (*MFL* 149–50). While Kant did not explicitly trace out the existential structure of the finite knowers that we are, he nevertheless recognized the unity of thinking and intuiting—a unity necessary for a finite being to "be open to a being that it itself is not" (*KPM* 30)—to lie in the prior unity of temporality-determined subjectivity. For Kant, this prior unity is accomplished in the pure faculty of the imagination. As Stephan Käufer notes in "Schemata, Hammers, and Time: Heidegger's Two Derivations of Judgment,"

Time is the form of inner sense, for Kant, i.e. all representations occur in time. Hence categories, which condition the original synthetic unity of consciousness, must unify consciousness in such a way that it can synthesize the representations it has in time. The original unity provided by the categories, then, must in some way bear on the unity of time. Kant traces this connection in the schematism chapter, but he is notoriously unclear about the connection this chapter has to the deduction. But precisely this connection is key to Heidegger's interpretation of Kant, which focuses on the underlying role of time in synthesis all along.<sup>45</sup>

A schema is described in Kant's "Transcendental Doctrine of Judgment" as a "third thing" that lies between the sensible and the intelligible<sup>46</sup>—through the schema, seemingly heterogeneous elements enter into relation by way of this mediating "third thing" that is itself homogenous with both elements.<sup>47</sup>

To illustrate this original unity of intuition and understanding, Heidegger argues that Kant engages in two ways of analyzing the relationship between them; the first way starts with the understanding and demonstrates its dependence on intuition; the second way reverses this



approach. In both instances, however, “what is essential here is perhaps not a connection of two faculties thought of in a linear fashion, but rather the structural elucidation of their essential unity” (KPM 54). Early on in the text, Heidegger argues that this essential unity lies in the fact that both intuition and thinking share the same “species”: that of “*representation in general*,” which “has the broad, formal sense according to which one thing indicates, announces, presents another” (KPM 16). Both intuition and understanding announce or present an object: “The former relates immediately to the object and is single; the latter refers to it mediately by means of a feature which several things can have in common.”<sup>48</sup> Both announce that which they allow us to encounter—the former directly and the other by means of some shared feature. What unifies these two varieties of representation—intuition and understanding—is their mutual representing *of* unity: each contains an inner reference to the other that is characterized in its pure form in terms of a representation of unity. This unifying is fairly obvious in the case of the conceptual representations of the faculty of understanding, which “gives in advance that which is contrary to the haphazard. Representing unity originally, namely, as unifying, it represents to itself a connectedness which in advance rules all possible gathering together” (KPM 52). As Heidegger points out, however, characterizing this faculty of rules as that which “regulate[s] in advance all that ‘intuition’ brings forth” seems to imply that it is being expounded “as the supreme faculty” (KPM 53).

In order to make good on the claim that intuition and thinking are interdependent, then—and that “all thinking is merely in the service of intuition” (KPM 15)—this *conceptual* representation of unity must be shown to be dependent on the representation of unity found in *intuition*: the unity presented or announced must be recognized as ultimately being that of the temporal immediacy of intuition. The receptive capacity of intuition must therefore be structured such that it may announce or present a unity—a presented unity that cannot be understood as a function of spontaneity but is itself given *as* intuition: “The represented unity first awaits the encountered being; and as such awaiting, it makes possible the encountering of objects which show themselves with one another” (KPM 56). The intuition’s representation of unity is a type of passive awaiting or primed receptiveness for a possible encounter with that which is capable of being experienced in intuition: “If what comes along is to be capable of being encountered as something which stands within connectedness, the sense of something like ‘connection’ must be understood in advance. To pre-present connection in advance, however, means; first of all to form something like relation in general by representing it” (KPM 58).

Prior to any particular intuitions, then, is an intuition of connection—an a priori relatedness in general that nevertheless does not undermine the character of the encounter as an immediate receptivity of the object in its singularity (*KPM* 16). This a priori horizon against which particular intuitions can be received—the “pre-presentation” of unity in general—is itself received in the manner of an intuition, not spontaneously formed—a point that is essential for refuting Sartre’s interpretation of Heidegger insofar as it demonstrates the deep responsivity present in Dasein’s encounters with otherness. For Heidegger, Dasein’s primordial openness to relation itself has the character of a passive *offering* of a site at which encounters can be given to intuition: “Taking-in-stride, however, if it is to be possible, requires something on the order of a turning-toward, and indeed not a random one, but one which makes possible in a preliminary way the encountering of the being. In order for the being to be able to offer itself as such, however, the horizon of its possible encountering must itself have the character of an offering. The turning-toward must in itself be a preparatory being-in-mind of what is offerable in general” (*KPM* 63). The priority of intuition to thought lies in its offering of this “horizon of possible encountering”—a horizon of intuitability that initially makes possible both the empirical receptivity at work in particular intuitions of things as “standing against” (*KPM* 63) and the concepts that arise in response to them.

The receptivity of the pure horizon of intuition also requires, however, that “the finite creature which turns-toward must itself be able to make the horizon intuitable, i.e., it must be able to ‘form’ the look of the offering from out of itself” (*KPM* 63–64), and we can see here the interdependence of pure intuition and pure understanding mediated through the imagination. Simple ontic intuiting “means the taking-in-stride of what gives itself,” while “pure intuition, in the taking-in-stride, gives itself that which is capable of being taken in stride” (*KPM* 122): in other words, the pure power of the imagination lies in its simultaneous forming and being offered of the general horizon of intuition that makes specific empirical intuitions possible.<sup>49</sup> For imagination to be the root of Dasein’s very being, then, is for this complex interplay of spontaneity and intuition to allow Dasein to serve as the site at which a being may “announce itself.” The synthesizing of this interplay is Dasein’s transcendence—the primal unity of the subject that guarantees a relationship in which thought can be said to hold of the representations received in intuition.

What the Kant book ultimately shows us, then—revealing, in this regard, the manner in which it is a development of *Being and Time*—is the fact that such structures can only be understood in terms of Dasein’s primordial temporality. For Heidegger—and for Heidegger’s Kant—this

prior horizon of possible encountering given in intuition is *time*. Such a formal intuition accounts for both the passive and active dimensions of encounter since it encompasses Dasein's turn toward the thing encountered in such a way that it enables it to come to appearance as what it is. This same role is played by the Kantian forms of intuition: "Space and time are not merely the *means* of receiving intuitions, but also they can themselves be *intuited*, and consequently they are *intuitions*, namely *formal intuitions*, which have their own character. Space and time are not merely featureless receptacles, but on the contrary have a characteristic way of receiving impressions."<sup>50</sup> Thus Dasein's intuition announces or presents an object by representing a unified horizon in terms of which all possible particular intuitions may be received. Depending on the type of intuited concrete particular being given to/through intuition—be it numbers, rocks, persons, and so on—a corresponding horizon will be given in terms of which this concrete particular may be "taken in stride." And for Heidegger, as for Kant, what unifies these particular horizons of intuition is the form of *all* of Dasein's intuition—temporality. The unified horizon in terms of which all things can announce themselves to Dasein's experience is not a function of the conceptualizing work of spontaneity, then, but is rooted in the passivity and particularity of Dasein's finite temporality. As Robert Dostal notes: "Each of the categories, initially presented independent of time, is in the end nothing other than a form or configuration of time."<sup>51</sup> Temporality itself accounts for Dasein's structure as the active passivity or passive activity which Heidegger here refers to as a "pure self-affection" (*KPM* 132) that "lets-(something)-stand-in-opposition" and "allows a space for play" in the "letting-stand-against-of" the object (*KPM* 50–51). Temporality is the underlying unity operating at the root of both receptivity and spontaneity—that "ambivalent middle voice at the heart of experience."<sup>52</sup>

The concept of the "middle voice" is particularly relevant here, since it refers to those verbs in which one cannot distinguish between the active and passive elements of a particular happening or event: "The middle is distinguished from the passive in that the subject participates in this enactment, or is implicated in it, rather than being wholly at the mercy of another agent. There is neither a clearly demarcated agent, nor a receptive object."<sup>53</sup> One can find this structure throughout Heidegger's work: in formal indication, authenticity, conscience, hearing, and the impersonal grammatical structures familiar from *es gibt* ("it gives) and *es wellet* ("it" worlds). Such an actively passive structure is also what Heidegger is attempting to articulate with the notion of *Seinlassen*—in which Dasein enables that which it encounters to present itself from itself. This notion is often translated as "letting be" in order to capture

this middle-voice structure, since, as Olafson notes, “The prefix verb ‘to let’ still asserts an element of agency even in this passivity.”<sup>54</sup>

Although the middle voice appears throughout Heidegger’s work, it is only in the work on temporality that we can see this structure operating on the most fundamental levels of Dasein’s being-in-the-world. Dasein itself is essentially “middle-voiced” because its very being is a unifying horizon of givenness in terms of which it opens itself to receiving encounters with otherness. The imagination’s interplay between spontaneity and receptivity produces a mode of encounter which is “less that of causing than *enabling*”<sup>55</sup>—and this is possible because active-passive temporality is the essential structure not only of all of Dasein’s encounters, but of Dasein’s very existence as finite transcendence:

The interpretation of the transcendental power of imagination as root, i.e., the elucidation of how the pure synthesis allows both stems to grow from out of it and how it maintains them, leads back from itself to that in which this root is rooted: to original time. As the original, threefold unifying forming of future, past, and present in general, this is what first makes possible the “faculty” of pure synthesis, i.e., that which it is able to produce, namely, the unification of the three elements of ontological knowledge, in the unity of which transcendence is formed. (*KPM* 137)

Dasein’s way of being qua transcendence is nothing more than the synthesis of activity and passivity, intuition and understanding found in original time. The primal unity of the subject in time thereby guarantees “the possibility of the a priori ability of pure concepts to refer to objects” (*KPM* 60). As Frank Schalow puts it, the imagination’s “schema stands as the intermediary between the content of intuition and its determination by the signifying act of the category. Insofar as time is essential to the formation of this intermediating bridge, and the category’s applicability to objects hinges on its ‘translation’ into temporal terms (i.e. schematism), Heidegger argues that schematism charts the trajectory of finite transcendence.”<sup>56</sup>

The combination of categorial subsumption and passive receptivity that allows for transcendence—for finite beings to encounter the thing as it shows itself from itself—is rooted in the synthesizing unity of Dasein’s temporal mode of being. By turning to an account of Dasein’s ordinary temporality, then—an account we will consider in detail in chapter 5—Heidegger can show how “the finite being that we call ‘human being’ . . . is according to its innermost essence so that in general it can be open to a being that it itself is not” (*KPM* 30).

## The Temporal in the Concrete

In *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, Heidegger is engaged in a discussion of knowing as a particular kind of comportment, claiming that “this ‘typifying’ comportment at the point of departure . . . takes up what has already been made available (in a ready-made characterization) in the comportment of that curiosity which is pulled along by its objects” (OHF 47). Heidegger does say that this “point of departure” for classifying grasps what is known “in advance in terms of its types, its essential generalities. Only when the concrete has been defined in advance in *such* a manner does it have the conceptual makeup as an object which is necessary for it to be able to enter in any manner into a context of classification” (OHF 47). As Heidegger points out, however, “The work of classifying does not tarry here, but only begins there, i.e., it moves on” (OHF 47). This later work of knowing is then taken to be the true essence of knowing, and the transitional stage whereby the concrete becomes available to classification is quickly passed over and “remains conspicuously undefined in philosophy” (OHF 47).

In keeping with his interpretation of Kant, Heidegger argues that this transitional stage at the “point of departure”—the stage in which the concrete is grasped such that it is made available for conceptualization—must be understood in terms of temporal articulation. In other words, it is the temporal horizon against which particulars are encountered. What is defined in advance, he argues, is “the temporal itself, within the concrete” (OHF 46). Though today’s philosophers may recognize the departure point as the temporal, Heidegger argues, they nevertheless miss the point insofar as “their point of departure is characterized as an object” (OHF 47)—they assume its objectivity without analyzing how it becomes so from out of the concrete. What is of interest in this type of “knowing” attitude becomes simply the filing away itself—not the basis on which such filing is itself possible: “Something concrete is considered to be known when one has defined *where* it belongs, the place within the totality of the classificatory order *whereinto* it is to be inserted—something is seen to be defined when it has been put away” (OHF 48).

In contrast to this short-sightedness of knowledge, argues Heidegger, we must recognize the temporal in the concrete without assuming its status as object but recognizing it instead as *horizon* for all knowledge: “Time must be brought to light and genuinely grasped as the horizon of every understanding and interpretation of being” (BT 17/15). As our analysis of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* has illustrated, this temporal horizon is the self-given openness or orientation to receptivity that makes possible the transcendence of Dasein’s way of being. Dasein’s primordial

temporality is the condition for the possibility of the encounter with that which it is not, a transcendence characteristic of its way of being: "*Temporality is the primordial 'outside of itself' "*" (BT 329/302). Thus as we can now see, Heidegger makes use of the Kantian orientation to time in order to further the Husserlian notion of the responsive, conditional a priori: "General logic presumes that the common ancestry each of the categories has in thought provides the basis for its grammar. The procedure of schematism, however, demonstrates this commonality by uncovering time as the one source from which the categorial determinations of objects spring."<sup>57</sup>

Following Kant's understanding of time as an original single intuited unity—of which particular temporal experiences and horizons are simply limiting domains—Heidegger can characterize the unity of Dasein as temporality, but as a temporality that is fundamentally open to articulation. And following Husserl's understanding of the a priori, Heidegger can characterize this articulation as a *responsiveness* to that which is given within the temporal horizon that defines the very subjectivity of the subject. Understood as such, Sartre's understanding of the categorial status of the Heideggerian *existentials* is off the mark. Though Heidegger is, as Kisiel notes, interested in "the interpretation of life's sense of being in terms of its fundamental categorial structures," this *means* the conditions under which "factic life temporalizes itself and so speaks with itself . . . These conditions, understood categorically, are not 'logical forms' but rather the genuinely accessible possibilities drawn from the actual temporalization of existence."<sup>58</sup> Thus, contrary to traditional accounts of the a priori categories as organizing principles imposed from above, here they are understood as responsive to the givenness of intuition. The categories are not some type of established interpretive framework—rather, they articulate possibilities of experience that are dependent on the fundamentally temporal dimensions of Dasein's intuition. To respond to Sartre's critique, then—to understand how Dasein can encounter particular others as such—will be a matter of determining the mode of intuition (i.e., of *temporal givenness*) through which concrete encounters with other Dasein are experienced. In doing so, it will become clearer how the category *being-with* is a mode of openness to the specific temporality of other Dasein. This point brings us to Division Two of *Being and Time*, where Heidegger clarifies and deepens his analysis of Dasein's care structure by demonstrating the way in which it must be understood most primordially in terms of temporality. To this analysis—and the role that others play in it—we will now turn.

## The Temporality of Care

*Being and Time*'s Division Two engages in a temporal reformulation of its initial characterization of Dasein's care structure, demonstrating that interpreting Dasein's being in terms of temporality will offer a deeper understanding of what grounds and unifies care: "*The primordial unity of the structure of care lies in temporality*" (BT 327/301); it "makes possible the constitution of the structures of care" (BT 331/304). And as we saw in chapter 4, such a temporal analysis will also account for how time serves as the horizon of every understanding—a horizon in terms of which both things and other Dasein are able to show themselves as themselves. Thus William Blattner notes in *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism* that "Heidegger is not introducing an independent, unifying scheme to explain care; he is showing how care's internal structure is inherently unified because originarily temporal."<sup>1</sup>

Thus Heidegger claims in *History of the Concept of Time* that "*Dasein itself*—as we shall later see—is *time*" (HCT 197). It is important to uncover what Heidegger means by this, however, since he emphasizes that such claims cannot be understood in terms of our ordinary conception of time—a sequence of undifferentiated and anonymous "nows, without beginning and without end" (BT 329/302). Rather, the ordinary conception of time is itself based on "originary" or "primordial" time—on the essence of Dasein's subjectivity as temporal. Instead of occupying particular regions of the linear sequence of undifferentiated moments, past, present, and future must be understood as lived dimensions of Dasein's being-in-the-world. Thus Dasein's projectedness—and the understanding that discloses it—is rooted in a fundamentally *futural way of being*, from which we then derive our everyday concepts of futurity as the "not yet now": "'Future' does not mean a now that has *not yet* become 'actual' and that sometime *will be* for the first time, but the coming in which Dasein comes toward itself in its ownmost potentiality-of-being . . . Dasein, *as existing*, always already comes toward itself, that is, is futural in its being in general" (BT 325/299). The fact that it is futural in its being in general is captured in the for-the-sake-of-itself that characterizes Dasein's projecting—the purposiveness of its pressing into possible ways for it to be: "The 'before' and the 'ahead of' indicate the future that first makes possible in general the fact that Dasein can be in such a way that is concerned

about its potentiality-of-being. The self-project grounded in the ‘for the sake of itself’ in the future is an essential quality of *existentiality*. Its *primary meaning is the future*” (BT 327/301). Thus the primordial meaning of the future is not some moment that is simply waiting to be actualized—rather, it is the manner in which Dasein is always moving toward being the self that it has the potential to be.

Similarly, the originary meaning of the past is not some “now” that was once objectively present but is present no longer, but refers in its most fundamental sense to Dasein’s thrownness or facticity and the attunement that discloses it. As we will recall, thrownness relates to the sheer “that it is” of existing that permeates every moment of this existence—the fact that Dasein is always already defined by the situation in which it simply discovers itself to be. This dimension of existence is the primordial meaning of the past since it refers to the conditions from out of which one’s understanding must always arise: “In *attunement* Da-sein is invaded by itself as the being that it still is and already was, that is, that it constantly *is* as having been. The primary existential meaning of facticity lies in having-been. The formulation of the structure of care indicates the temporal meaning of existentiality or facticity with the expressions ‘before’ and ‘already’” (BT 328/301).<sup>2</sup>

Thus Dasein’s futurity and having-beenness cannot be understood in terms of ordinary time designations without distorting the always-on-the-way nature of Dasein’s existence:

If the expressions “ahead of” and “already” had *this* temporal meaning, which they can also have, then we would be saying about the temporality of care that it is something that is “earlier” and “later,” “not yet” and “no longer” at the same time. Then care would be conceived as a being that occurs and elapses “in time.” The being of a being of the nature of Dasein would then turn into *something objectively present*. If this is impossible, the temporal significance of these expressions must be a different one. (BT 327/301)

In this originary sense of time, then—temporality as that which constitutes the very subjectivity of the subject—Heidegger must distinguish the past and the future from the everyday way in which they are understood—no longer can they be understood simply as occupying particular regions of some linear sequence of undifferentiated “nows.” Dasein’s ability to experience the future or past is not referring to the fact that it once lived in a present now that is over or will live in a present now that is not yet—it refers to the fact that *every* present now is always weighted with a past and directed toward a future. To be constituted by originary



temporality means to project forward into potentialities that only arise on the basis of what Dasein has been.

A difficulty arises for Heidegger's account when we consider the following issue: how exactly can the shift to temporality clarify the care structure if the meaning of time with which Heidegger is working in his discussions of originary temporality does not seem to bear any real resemblance to what we ordinarily mean by time—namely, a sequence of undifferentiated nows? By grounding care in such an unfamiliar conception of time, what is being gained? Why should originary time be considered “time” at all, since it's missing a—if not *the*—main quality we associate with the word “time”—namely, sequentiality? What justifies Heidegger's claim that he's talking about time at all? As Blattner notes in regard to this issue, “It is possible, after all, to violate the terms of a concept so egregiously that we are justified in claiming that one is using the wrong word or concept. The notion of nonsuccessive time might seem to be such a violation, for we do ordinarily think of time as essentially sequential” (*HTI* 94).<sup>3</sup>

Heidegger himself recognizes that he must earn his claim that primordial time is really time: “We must clarify how and why the development of the vulgar concept of time comes about in terms of the temporally grounded constitution of being of Da-sein taking care of time. The vulgar concept of time owes its provenance to a leveling down of primordial time. By demonstrating that this is the source of the vulgar concept of time, we shall justify our earlier interpretation of temporality as *primordial time*” (*BT* 405/372).<sup>4</sup> According to Heidegger, the “vulgar” understanding of time does in fact consist “among other things, precisely in the fact that it is a pure succession of nows, without beginning and without end, in which the ecstatic character of primordial temporality is levelled down” (*BT* 329/302). This vulgar understanding of time, Heidegger argues, originates in a more primordial temporality that is then inauthentically temporalized to produce ordinary time. If he is able to show the dependence on and source of ordinary time in originary time, Heidegger believes he will be justified in calling the latter “time.” We can note here the relationship to his Kant project; Heidegger is attempting to show that by understanding the fundamental horizon of Dasein's being to be rooted in temporality, he can account not only for the ecstatic, non-sequential care structure, but also for the ordinary, sequential sense of time and the “within-timeness” of worldly things. Heidegger will unify these seemingly antithetical branches by showing that both arise out of originary, ecstatic time—and in particular, how ordinary sequential time does. By demonstrating that commonsense understandings of time are not primordial but arise, instead, from originary temporality, we will be

justified in understanding Dasein's primordial temporality *as* a form of time (BT 329/302).<sup>5</sup> "Originary temporality and ordinary time are not two otherwise unrelated phenomena, one of which happens to explain the other. Rather, we shall see, originary temporality modifies itself—its own features—so as to yield the more complex phenomenon that is ordinary time. The conceptual features that define ordinary time are derived from originary temporality insofar as originary temporality can be modified to make them up" (HTI 95). As Blattner goes on to argue, however, Heidegger faces serious difficulties in his attempt to link the non-sequential originary temporality that grounds the care structure with the sequence of undifferentiated nows that characterizes ordinary time. Indeed, Blattner argues that Heidegger ultimately fails in his attempt to show "that originary temporality is ordinary time stripped of one of its disunifying features" (HTI 126).

As we will see, the reason that Blattner reaches this verdict ultimately lies in the fact that he does not take into account the unique temporality of being-with—a mode of temporality that explains the transition from originary time to ordinary time *through* world-time.<sup>6</sup> Blattner's neglect of this intersubjective dimension is likely rooted in Heidegger's own failure to articulate the implications of his own position in this regard, however, and to the obfuscation and confusion in which this results. In what follows I will demonstrate the route that Heidegger should have taken in tracing the origin of ordinary time, an interpretation that recognizes the pivotal role that the shared temporal nature of a community of Dasein must play in the establishment of world and world time.

Accounting for the originary temporal sense of the "present"—the temporal horizon established when multiple temporalizing Dasein encounter each other—will be essential for doing so. As we have seen, in mapping Division One's care structure onto the temporal structures of past, present, and future, Heidegger equates having beenness with thrownness, and futurity with projection. When it comes to the present, however, Heidegger claims that, unlike the past/thrownness and future/projectedness connections, "such an indication is lacking for the third constitutive factor of care: entangled being-together-with" (BT 328/301). Though Heidegger does not directly address the reason for this lack, I will argue that it arises from two related phenomena: (1) Heidegger's confusion of being-with and fallenness—a tendency that becomes increasingly pronounced as *Being and Time* progresses; and (2) the resulting masking of the complexity that will be required of Heidegger's position if he is to genuinely account for the manner in which multiple temporality-defined Dasein interact with each other. This confusion and oversimplification

becomes evident when he attempts to move from originary time to ordinary time through world time.

### Being-With or Fallenness?

Though the claim that being-with is not necessarily fallen or inauthentic is, as we can recall from chapter 1, obviously a controversial one, in what follows I will show that there is an ambiguity in Heidegger's understanding of the relationship between being-with and fallenness—an ambiguity with which any interpreter must come to terms. Despite contradictory textual evidence that could be marshaled against this view, I will argue that Heidegger's account would be more structurally coherent if he maintained his initial distinction between being-with and fallenness by designating the former as the modally indifferent existential that is expressed in either an authentic or inauthentic way. Such an interpretation is more in keeping with the general structure of Heidegger's characterization of Dasein's fundamental suspension between authentic and inauthentic ways of being. Though the manner in which one encounters other Dasein may encourage tendencies toward inauthenticity, then, this is not structurally necessary and the distinctness of these concepts must be maintained.

Early claims in *Being and Time* indicate that Heidegger's original sense of the care structure takes being-with, and not fallenness, as the fundamental existential specific to encountering other Dasein: "Da-sein is essentially constituted by being-with" (BT 120/113). "Being-in is *being-with* others" (BT 118/112) he argues; "the understanding of others already lies in the understanding of being of Da-sein because its being is being-with" (BT 123/116). Elsewhere, however, he will explicitly claim that "the third constitutive factor of care, falling prey, has its existential meaning in the *present*" (BT 346/318) and that "the fundamental, ontological characteristics of this being are existentiality, facticity, and falling prey" (BT 191/178). This ambiguity leads Blattner to claim that "textually it is a little unclear how to fill out the structure of care" (HTI 34). As we will note below, however, Blattner's own account tends to follow Heidegger in equating being-with with fallenness, despite his claim that "given that the term 'falling' moves around in Heidegger's architectonic, it is best to treat it as an ambiguous term and to sort out the various phenomena to which it equivocally applies" (HTI 55). John Haugeland also notes this troublesome ambiguity when he argues—in terms of the

modes of disclosure specific to dimensions of the care structure—that “Heidegger is not consistent about this . . . sometimes falling is substituted for telling [Haugeland’s translation of *Rede*, or discourse] (SZ 349), and other times all four are given (SZ 269, 335).”<sup>7</sup>

Such a blurring of the fallenness/being-with distinction is present at BT 328/301, for example, where Heidegger points to the lack of a clear indication of the connection between temporality and the third constitutive dimension of care, which he here describes as “entangled being-together-with.” This is not supposed to mean, he continues, that “falling prey is not also grounded in temporality” (BT 328/301). The suggestion here is that “entanglement”—and not modally undifferentiated being-together-with—is to be taken as the third dimension of the care structure. In contrast, however, he thereafter claims that “resolute, Dasein has brought itself back out of falling prey in order to be all the more authentically ‘there’ for the disclosed situation in the ‘Moment’ [Augenblick]” (BT 328/301–2), which he defines elsewhere as the *authentic present* (BT 338/311).

But if falling prey is a constitutive dimension of the care structure it is not clear how Dasein can be “brought out” of falling prey to reach the authentically temporal “Moment.” Indeed, grouping falling prey with thrownness and projectedness as fundamental *existentials* would seem to make authenticity structurally impossible, since authenticity is not an escape from Dasein’s care structure, but a different mode of existing in terms of it. Heidegger’s early position recognizes this: “*Angst* takes away from Da-sein the possibility of understanding itself, falling prey, in terms of the ‘world’ and the public way of being interpreted” (BT 187/175). But if falling prey were an equiprimordial existential in the same way that projection and thrownness are, it would not be possible to “take it away as a possibility.” Indeed, Heidegger even claims at BT 186/174 that “*the turning away of falling prey is rather based on Angst which in turn makes fear possible.*” If falling prey and attunement were equiprimordial dimensions of the care structure, how could falling prey be *based on Angst*—a particular attunement? Similarly, the third mode of disclosure—discourse, the one specific to the third dimension of care (whatever that turns out to be)—is characterized, along with understanding and attunement—as having particular *fallen* modes (idle talk, curiosity, ambiguity) which would seem to indicate that discourse is a modally indifferent disclosure that is then *modified* by falling prey.

If the original characterization of the care structure as thrown, projecting, being-with is maintained, then, Heidegger can avoid the difficulty that the authentic/inauthentic modalities pose to any account that includes falling prey as a fundamental dimension of care. This interpre-

tation is supported by the fact that even authentic Da-sein will “be with” worldly things and persons—just in a different, non-fallen mode: “*Authentic being one’s self* is not based on an exceptional state of the subject, a state detached from the they, *but is an existentiell modification of the they as an essential existential*” (BT 130/122). Though Heidegger does acknowledge that the modification of being-with that occurs in authenticity will be extreme, he does not claim—as he does with falling prey—that Dasein will be “brought out” of it. Thus he will claim that “in *Angst*, the things at hand in the surrounding world sink away, and so do innerworldly beings in general. The ‘world’ can offer nothing more, nor can the *Mitda-sein* of others”<sup>8</sup>—but note that it is the particular innerworldly way of being that stops being meaningful in a *particular way*; *Angst* cannot be understood as “transposing an isolated subject-thing into the harmless vacuum of a worldless occurrence” but instead as bringing “Da-sein in an extreme sense precisely before its world as world, and thus itself before itself as being-in-the-world” (BT 188/176). Unlike being-with, then, taking falling prey as an existential cannot be reconciled with Dasein’s way of being as a suspension between authenticity and inauthenticity because falling prey does not continue to obtain in authenticity—while being-with does. Thus Heidegger notes in *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* that “in choosing itself Dasein really chooses precisely its being-with others and precisely its being among beings of a different character. In the express self-choice there is essentially the complete self-commitment, not to where it might not yet be, but to where and how it always already is, qua Dasein, insofar as it already exists” (MFL 190). If we recognize being-with as a constitutive dimension of being-in-the-world, Heidegger can make room for being-with both in its authentic and inauthentic modes of being.

The question of *why* Heidegger increasingly elides the distinction between being-with—a dimension of the care structure—and falling—the tendency to succumb to its inauthentic manifestation—cannot be addressed here; for now, I will simply assume that such a distinction can be made and that a reformulation of Dasein’s care structure in terms of temporality must therefore map being-with—understood as modally indifferent *existential*—onto the originary present. In doing so, I will therefore take this originary present—like the originary future and past—to be modally undifferentiated with regard to authenticity and inauthenticity. Originary temporality is, as the essence of selfhood, more primordial than the authentic and inauthentic modes in which it will necessarily manifest itself: “Only because this being is, in its essence, defined by selfhood can it, in each case, as factual, expressly choose itself as a self. The ‘can’ here includes also its flight from choice” (MFL 189). Blattner also endorses this interpretation, arguing that Heidegger’s authentic/inau-

thentic distinction implies a basic structure of temporality that is then modified by these different modes: “Heidegger begins his treatment of Dasein’s temporality by focusing on authentic temporality. However, in order to understand how authentic temporality is possible, he must show how it is a mode of a more basic sort of temporality, the sort of temporality that Dasein cannot help but have, the sort of temporality that characterizes Dasein’s being as such . . . *authentic temporality is merely one mode of originary temporality*” (HTI 99).

This is not an uncontroversial view, however; there appears to be a fundamental ambiguity in Heidegger’s texts regarding the relationship between original temporality and authentic temporality, and some readers question whether the two are in fact equivalent. Thus in *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers ‘Sein und Zeit’: Aporien, Probleme und ein Ausblick*, Margot Fleischer argues that: “Die Analyse der Zeitlichkeit kann das nicht leisten, was Heidegger sich mit ihr offensichtlich vorgenommen hat—eben, wie erwähnt, eine ontologische Metaebene zu betreten, d.h. die Sorge als Sein des Daseins auf ein zugrundeliegendes Sein hin zu überschreiten und also in der Zeitlichkeit ein Seinsgeschehen zu fassen, das gegen die Seinsvollzüge der ‘alltäglichen’ und der eigentlichen Sorge wie das Fundierende vom Fundierten abzugrenzen wäre.”<sup>9</sup> Indeed, she claims that Heidegger himself fails to consistently maintain this distinction, blurring the relationship between “the founding” and “the founded.” The distinction is clear in texts such as *Being and Time* paragraph 16 of section 65, she argues, where Heidegger implies that originary temporality is the condition for the possibility of authentic temporality: “Temporality temporalizes, and it temporalizes possible ways of itself. These make possible the multiplicity of the modes of being of Da-sein, in particular the fundamental possibility of authentic and inauthentic existence” (BT 328/302). In paragraphs 7 to 9 of section 65, however, Heidegger seems to conflate the two, according to Fleischer, since he seems to repeatedly equate resoluteness with the general structures of temporality—having been, making present, and futurity.

As a result of texts such as the latter, Daniel Dahlstrom disagrees with Fleischer’s claim that Heidegger distinguishes originary from authentic temporality, arguing, on the contrary, that Heidegger does not explicitly use the term “original” to refer to this temporality that is the condition for the possibility of the authentic and inauthentic modes.<sup>10</sup> Though Dahlstrom admits that this does not rule out Fleischer’s claim that Heidegger characterizes originary time as the condition for the possibility of authentic time, he argues that “the fact that Heidegger so explicitly and constantly links original and authentic temporality should give one pause before endorsing Fleischer’s interpretation.”<sup>11</sup> The nec-

essary linkage between the authentic and the originary is particularly evident, Dahlstrom thinks, in *Being and Time's* multiple references to "primordial and authentic temporality" (BT 329/302–3). As Dahlstrom notes, "These claims represent a substantial hurdle for any interpretation asserting that Heidegger implicitly considered or, on his own understanding of original temporality, ought to have considered it something indifferently instantiable as authentic or inauthentic."<sup>12</sup>

It is important to note, however, that these references linking primordial and authentic temporality occur immediately after the above-mentioned claim that temporality makes possible the inauthentic and authentic modes—thereby implying that the discussion that follows is simply an *elaboration* on the authentic mode. And in refusing the distinction between authentic and originary time, Dahlstrom does not want to deny that Heidegger has some account of Dasein's temporality "in general." He admits that Heidegger "does characterize temporality in a rather neutral way as the unified phenomenon of this future 'having been presenting,' but temporality, so characterized, is not identified with original temporality. If the characterization needs to be labeled, it would seem to be an account of 'the temporality of Dasein in general.'"<sup>13</sup> According to Dahlstrom, however, this characterization of temporality "in general" is so abstract and barren that it cannot be understood in terms of the richness and power that Heidegger attributes to notions of origin. Indeed, Dahlstrom claims that it is particularly evident that this "temporality in general" cannot be equated with originary temporality insofar as "Heidegger explicitly sets out to establish that inauthentic time is 'not original and instead is springing away (*entspringend*) from authentic temporality.' In other words, not only is inauthentic temporality *in no way* originary temporality, it also does not directly spring, strictly speaking, from original temporality, but rather from authentic temporality (even though authentic temporality is *in some way* originary temporality)."<sup>14</sup>

To argue that *inauthentic* temporality is not originary temporality, however, does not allow us to conclude that therefore authentic temporality is. As I will be arguing below, Heidegger's position is that neither authentic nor inauthentic temporality can be equated with original temporality. Though inauthentic temporality does not directly "spring" from original temporality, neither, I will argue, does *authentic* temporality; rather, both are modifications of world time—and it is *world time* that arises out of original temporality. Though inauthenticity may be characterized as a "springing away" from authenticity, then, this does not allow us to conclude that authentic temporality just *is* original temporality. Rather, both are modifications of original time's worldly expression.

Though Dahlstrom's distinction between authentic/originary tem-

porality and an abstract, general sense of temporality underlying its modal manifestations allows him to both accommodate cases where Heidegger appears to equate originary and authentic temporality *and* to allow for an underlying, modally undifferentiated temporal structure, it appears to be a rather artificial distinction. This is evident, as Blattner notes, insofar as

the term (*überhaupt*) that Dahlstrom translates as “in general” in “temporality in general” can also be read, as I do, to mean “at all.” So, when . . . Heidegger states that Dasein can be “authentically futural,” only in virtue of “coming toward itself *überhaupt*,” he can mean, and I think it makes more sense to read him as meaning, that authentic futurity depends on futurity at all, that is, the futurity in virtue of which Dasein is in any way futural . . . Heidegger states that “coming toward itself *überhaupt*” makes possible the authentic future. So temporality *überhaupt* is an originary phenomenon, one that makes possible authenticity. (*HTI* 100)

Though it cannot be denied that there are cases in which Heidegger appears to equate original and authentic time, these cases are better understood, I believe, as ambiguously phrased attempts to emphasize the authentic manifestations of original time. Focusing on points at which Heidegger *does* clearly articulate the relationship between authentic/inauthentic temporality and the modally undifferentiated primordial temporality underlying it will help keep this in mind: “If resoluteness constitutes the mode of authentic care, and if it is itself possible only through temporality, the phenomenon at which we arrived by considering resoluteness must itself only present a modality of temporality, which makes care possible in general” (*BT* 327/300). Such a claim, as well as his statement at *BT* 350/321 that “the disclosedness of the There and the fundamental existentiell possibilities of Da-sein, authenticity and inauthenticity, are founded in temporality” seem to be a strong indication that Dasein’s basic temporal structure cannot be characterized as authentic or inauthentic.

The strongest justification for my interpretation, however, is found in the general structure of Heidegger’s project. Like the refusal to equate being-with and fallenness, Heidegger’s characterization of Dasein as fundamentally suspended between authentic and inauthentic ways of being supports the distinction between modally neutral temporal structures of selfhood and its authentic manifestation. Structurally, Dasein is not just authentic or inauthentic but is defined in terms of the underlying ontological makeup that makes both modes possible. Though Dasein will only



ever exist concretely in terms of these modes, reducing one to the other will not help elucidate their shared structure.

For this reason, in clarifying the nature of the originary present, I will bracket considerations of the explicitly authentic and inauthentic manifestations of Dasein's present. Heidegger refers to the former as the *Moment* (*Augenblick*) and the latter as a type of abstract and distorted "now": "The vulgar understanding of time sees the fundamental phenomenon of time in the *now*, and indeed in the pure now, cut off in its complete structure, that is called the 'present.' One can gather from this that there is in principle no prospect of explaining or even deriving the ecstatic and horizontal phenomenon of the *Moment* that belongs to authentic temporality *from this now*" (BT 426–27/391). Rather than examining the *Moment* or the "present," I will isolate the now "in its complete structure"—the modally indifferent temporality from which they are derived. I will similarly avoid Heidegger's discussions of historicity, since they invariably speak only of *authentic* historicity, and thereby fail to isolate the general underlying structures.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Heidegger indicates that Dasein's historicity is itself a function of its underlying temporality: "the *temporality* of Da-sein, which constitutes this being as historical" (BT 417/383), and it is this that needs to be analyzed.

### The Originary Present

It would seem, then, that the originary present is the modally indifferent primordial temporalizing that enables the being-with dimension of Dasein's care structure. But what exactly are we to understand by the "originary present"? The basic structures of originary time underlying both authentic and inauthentic time are difficult to discern because of Heidegger's tendency to explicate them only in terms of their modal manifestations. Nevertheless, we can see hints: one indication is found at BT 328/302, for example, where he expresses the basic structures of originary time as follows: "Future, having-been, and present show the phenomenal characteristics of 'toward itself,' 'back to,' and 'letting something be encountered'" (BT 328/302). Later, he claims that "making present always . . . temporalizes itself in a unity with awaiting and retaining, even if these are modified into a forgetting that does not await" (BT 407/373–74). Elsewhere, he claims that we can characterize this "being toward presencing things as a holding in attendance or, more generally, *making present*" (MFL 202). Just as futurity can only be understood in

terms of Dasein's projecting toward potentialities of being and pastness can only be understood in terms of Dasein's being burdened with what it always already has been, so too must the present be understood in terms of a primordial dimension of Dasein's being. In this case, the originary present is the space opened up by the tension between pastness and futurity such that an encounter—an "enpresenting"—is enabled. The originary sense of the present is Dasein's letting something be encountered through its temporal unifying of awaiting and retaining—a point that is clearly reminiscent of our discussion of temporality as the unifying horizon of intuition in the Kant book.

What is the nature of this unity that "lets something be encountered"? According to Heidegger, the modes of disclosure belonging to the care structure—understanding, attunement, and discourse—are themselves derivatives or manifestations of the *expressive* nature of the temporal disclosure that is the essence of Dasein. The modes of disclosure must be understood in light of the fact that primordial temporality always *expresses* or *interprets* itself in time: "If in saying 'now' we are not addressing ourselves to anything extant, then are we addressing ourselves to the being that we ourselves are? But surely I am not the now? Perhaps I am, though, in a certain way . . . The *Dasein*, which always exists so that it takes time for itself, *expresses itself* . . . it utters itself in such a way that *it is always saying time*. When I say 'now' I do not mean the now as such, but in my now-saying I am transient" (*BPP* 259). Dasein's interpretive expression of its temporal structure is not an occasional activity but the subtext of all its activities: "Time is constantly there in such a way that . . . in all our comportments and all the measures we take, we move in a silent discourse" of now saying (*BPP* 259). According to Heidegger, the now is "nothing but the 'expression,' the 'speaking out,' of original temporality in its ecstatic character" (*BPP* 270). Time as we understand it in an everyday way is a derivative of temporality's self-disclosure: "The making present that interprets itself, that is, what has been interpreted and addressed in the 'now,' is what we call 'time'" (*BT* 408/375). Temporality expressed is time, and this expression is the very selfhood of Dasein's being-in-the-world.<sup>16</sup>

To better understand the implications this temporal structure has for how Dasein is able to encounter other Dasein as what they are, we must consider the four features that characterize this self-expressive temporality: spannedness, datability, publicity, and significance (*BT* 416/382). As we will see, all of these features demonstrate the *ecstatic* nature of originary temporality—that in "speaking itself out," Dasein is constituted by certain types of *relationality* or possibilities of encounter. Heidegger notes in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, "Temporality as unity

of future, past, and present does not carry the Dasein away just at times and occasionally; instead, as *temporality*, it is itself *the original outside-itself*, the *ekstatikon*. For this character of carrying-away we employ the expression *the ecstatic character of time*" (BPP 267). To understand Dasein's primordial temporality as expressive or ecstatic is to recognize the fundamental other-directedness of Dasein's existence—the fact that its very way of being is a pressing out into relations with that which it is not. Levinas himself acknowledges this structure in Heidegger's thought:

Without being cognition, temporality in Heidegger is an ecstasy, a "being outside oneself." This is not the transcendence characteristic of theory, but it is already the leaving of an inwardness for an exteriority . . . indeed it is he who has grasped, in its deepest form, the ultimate and universal essence of this play of inwardness and exteriority, beyond the "subject-object" play to which idealist and realist philosophy reduced it. What is new in this conception is that this ecstasy is seen to be more than a property of the soul; it is taken to be that through which existence exists. It is not a relationship with an object, but with the verb to be, with the action of being. Through ecstasy man takes up his existence. Ecstasy is then found to be the very event of existence.<sup>17</sup>

Each of the four features of ecstatic temporality—spannedness, datability, publicity, and significance—demonstrates a particular type of "outside itself," of ecstatic relation to otherness. In keeping with Heidegger's critique, however, this type of relation cannot be modeled on the subject/object relationship, which presupposes the independence of the subject and the contingency of its encounter with objects. Rather, Dasein's very way of being is to be the site of encounter with otherness—the genuine subjectivity of the subject *is* to be opened up to world and in this very openness to simultaneously express the "who" of its own existence. Dasein's existence "is the original unity of being-outside-self that comes-toward-self, comes back to self, and enpresents" (BPP 267). Dasein's originary now is the moment of openness in which both things and Dasein itself become present as what they are—a moment characterized by the "carrying away toward something" (BPP 267) that is the essence of temporality's ecstatic structure.

This temporal ecstasis finds various forms, however, which Heidegger notes in his distinction between the four features of temporality. As we will see, these are the different ways in which Dasein exists outside of itself in relation to otherness. In the case of spannedness, the present maintains itself in terms of a relation to past and future. In datability, the now is ecstatically related to a pragmatically weighted thing or event. In

publicity, it is the originary temporality of the other Dasein to which the now is ecstatically related. And in significance, the now speaks itself out into relation with the significance-constituting norms or measures that characterize what Heidegger calls “world.”

### Dimensions of Ecstasy

*Spannedness* receives little attention from Heidegger, perhaps because it is a feature characteristic of all time dimensions and refers to their inseparability—it designates the space or “span” opened up by the now’s simultaneous relation to both past and future (*BPP* 270). Spannedness is a type of temporal stretch, the lasting or enduring quality that arises because Dasein’s temporality is a drawing of the past and the future into relation with the present such that the duration “from then until then” is experienced as such: “Expressed time, the now, is dimensionally future and past . . . each now stretches itself out as such, within itself, with respect to the not-yet and the no-longer. The transitory character of each now is nothing but what we described as the spannedness of time” (*BPP* 273–74). Thus in spannedness, the now accomplishes what Heidegger elsewhere calls “the ecstatic unity of future and having-been-ness” (*MFL* 207). Time cannot accomplish this breadth or span quality simply by amassing a collection of nows, however, since each now is *itself* characterized by this kind of spread; each now is always pulled open between the past and the future. The fundamental unity of the temporal dimensions is therefore evident in spannedness—every now is a now only insofar as it is simultaneously a coming back to and a going toward. It seems in this regard that Heidegger is indebted to Husserl’s account of internal time consciousness, which engages in an exhaustive examination of how the experience of time as enduring indicates that retention and protention “extends the now-consciousness.”<sup>18</sup> Like Husserl, Heidegger takes this kind of span to be essential to the very possibility of experience—of intentional directedness toward that which it is not (*BPP* 268). For this reason Heidegger will claim that “as the primary outside-itself, temporality is stretch itself” (*BPP* 270). This primary “outside itself”—which Heidegger also speaks of as originary temporality’s “expressive” character—is what enables Dasein to transcend toward entities. Note also that this primary outside-itself is only possible on the basis of temporality’s structure as articulated *unity*—a point that supports Heidegger’s claim that his temporality analysis will serve to demonstrate the fundamental unity of the care structure. Dasein is always outside itself because it is always simul-

taneously on-its-way-to and on-its-way-from—a fact that gives the now its particular character of both stretch and presentness “in the sense of the enpresenting of something” (*BPP* 269). As we saw in the Kant discussion, Dasein’s temporality thereby provides a unified horizon against which things can announce themselves as what they are.

This unity is further demonstrated by the fact that like all four ecstases, spannedness is deeply entwined with the meaning and expression of the other features. Thus Heidegger will note that the span’s breadth is “variable” depending on the manner in which it is *dated*: “But every ‘then’ is *as such* a ‘then, when . . .’; every ‘on that former occasion’ is an ‘on that former occasion when . . .’; every ‘now’ is a ‘now that . . .’ We shall call this seemingly self-evident relational structure . . . *datability*” (*BT* 407/374). Thus the duration of some now—its span—will depend on what is occurring “within” it: “The diversity of this duration is grounded in concern itself and in what has been placed under care for the time being. *The time which I myself am each time yields a different duration according to how I am that time*” (*HCT* 231).

Because the temporal nature of Dasein’s “speaking-itself-out” is one of ecstatic transcendence, it is defined in terms of these relational structures. With datability, Heidegger claims, “in the enpresenting of a being the enpresenting, intrinsically, is related ecstatically to something” (*BPP* 269). In the case of datability, this “something” is some worldly thing or event of encounter. Datability is temporality’s expressive relatedness to some instance of such making-present: “If I say ‘now’ . . . I encounter some being as that by reference to which the expressed now dates itself. Because we enunciate the now in each case in and from an enpresenting of some being, the now that is thus voiced is itself structurally enpresenting. It has the relation of datability, the factual dating always differing in point of content . . . In other words, time in the common sense, the now as seen via this dating relation, is only the index of original temporality” (*BPP* 269). This mode of temporality’s ecstatic relationality or indexicality—its self-locating in terms of a particular thing or event—plays a central role for Heidegger, since Dasein does not necessarily index or date the now according to an objective calendar time—indeed, Heidegger notes that “the dating can be calendrically indeterminate” (*BPP* 262). Rather, the things and events according to which dating occurs are generally determined on the basis of Dasein’s practical projects. Datability is therefore the primary temporal expression of Dasein’s practical way of being. Though this will be further explained in terms of significance, datability expresses Dasein’s purposive character by tying its temporal self-expression to the events and objects that are made salient by its practical projects: “The now itself guides and pushes us forward to that which is

just transpiring there in the now . . . the now is, in its essence, a ‘now when this and that . . .,’ a ‘now wherein . . .’” (MFL 200). All of the examples Heidegger uses to demonstrate this sense of the now’s being indexed to a “this” or a “that” make reference to particular projects or events with which Dasein may be engaged—lecturing, discovering that one’s book is missing, and so on. “When we say ‘now,’ we are not focused thematically on the now as an isolated now-thing” he notes; “we are, rather, occupied with things, related to them” (MFL 200, 201).

It is for this reason that the future ecstasis of originary temporality is of such importance in understanding the temporal structure of Dasein’s way of being qua care; it is the basis of Dasein’s projective ability to understand itself by pressing forward into different possibilities and thereby accounts to a large degree for the fact that expressed temporality is dated. Temporality is tied or indexed to particular things or events—it receives connotation, we could say—because of Dasein’s ability to express itself in terms of possible ways of being-in-the-world. It is important to note that these possibilities are not to be conceived of as some “not yet nows” that are waiting to be actualized, however. This is, for example, the interpretation of Dasein’s “purposiveness” that Mark Okrent gives in *Heidegger’s Pragmatism*: “Understanding consists in projecting an end or purpose for oneself in terms of which those things other than Dasein have a significance, and that one’s understanding of oneself is as an end to be accomplished.”<sup>19</sup> Okrent repeatedly makes use of this idea of “accomplishment” or “realization” in reference to Dasein’s projecting: “The self-understanding of Dasein itself as an end to be realized.”<sup>20</sup> The problem with such language, however, is its implication that Dasein’s being-toward itself is something that *could* be realized or attained—a picture that contradicts Dasein’s nature as open-ended and incomplete. Such realization or actualization is *in principle* not possible, according to Heidegger, because Dasein is “*always already its not-yet* as long as it is” (BT 244/227). Thus projection and the future ecstasis in which it is rooted cannot be characterized as Okrent does since “the constant being-ahead-of-itself, is neither a summative together which is outstanding, nor even a not-yet-having-become accessible, but rather a not-yet that any Dasein always has to be, given the being that it is” (BT 244/227). Characterizing the teleological structure of action in terms of states of affairs that are not yet now but are somehow waiting to be actualized—to be “made” now through action—misinterprets what Heidegger means by Dasein’s futurity or purposiveness. Since it is an existential feature rooted in Dasein’s way of being qua originary temporality, Dasein’s projecting toward an end refers to a possible self that Dasein continually struggles to *be*—it does not refer to a succession of events that eventually culminate in a final state.

As Theodore Schatzki puts it: “The end at which an action aims . . . must be its end as long as the action is performed. The end achieves this by being a *possible way of being* pursued by the actor. The end (or purpose) of an action is not something that occurs after the action; it is not a state of affairs that does not yet obtain.”<sup>21</sup>

Despite the tendency to take futurity as the primary ecstasis, then, futurity’s entwinement with past and present makes such a prioritization impossible. The structure of expressed temporality is a unity of the ecstases and cannot therefore focus on futurity in isolation from the other ecstases:

The then, which is utterable and arises in making-present, is always understood as “now not yet” (but rather: then). Whichever then I may choose, the then as such always refers in each case back to a now, or more precisely, the then is understood on the basis of a now, however inexplicit. Conversely, every formerly is a “now no longer” and is as such, in its structure, the bridge to a now. But this now is, in each case, the now of a particular making-present or retention in which a “then” and a “formerly” is, in each case, uttered. (*MFL* 202)

The futural ecstasis of originary temporality operates in and through *this* now—not some yet to be actualized now—and in datability, it does so by allowing particular things or events that are made present to achieve a particular import for Dasein’s self-understanding. Thus Heidegger claims that Dasein is constantly dating the now in everything taken care of: “First, because in addressing itself to something interpretively, it expresses *itself* too . . . And secondly because this addressing and discussing that also interprets *itself* is grounded in a *making present*, and is possible only as this” (*BT* 407–8/374). As we will note in our examination of the remaining features of expressed time—publicity and significance—it is not *necessarily* the case that the content of specific datings is determined by Dasein’s practical projects, however. Indeed, we will come to see that the public dimension of expressed time results in a mode of dating the now that is *not* tied to my particular projects, but establishes measures by which dating can be *shared*.

Before turning to these remaining features, however, we must note, first, that the expression of spanned, dated—ecstatic—temporality is only rarely *explicit*, despite its omnipresence. For the most part the now is expressed, according to Heidegger, “unthematically,” and “latently” (*MFL* 201). Despite our tendency to overlook it, however, the ecstatic relationality of the expressed now plays a crucial role for Heidegger: in spannedness it establishes and maintains the movement whereby origi-

nary temporality ties itself or locates itself within a specifiable present, while simultaneously managing to maintain its reference and openness to the past and future ecstases. Similarly, datability's "relational structure" (*BPP* 262) establishes an ecstatic link between Dasein's originary temporality and worldly things or events.

### World Time

In both of these cases the ecstatic nature of the now is characterized by what Heidegger calls a particular type of "double visage": its relational structure both maintains that which it expresses—originary temporality—while simultaneously granting it a type of detachment through its relation to otherness: "The now has a peculiar double visage . . . Time is held together within itself by the now; time's specific continuity is rooted in the now. But conjointly, with respect to the now, time is divided, articulated into the no-longer-now, the earlier, and the not-yet-now, the later . . . The now that we count in following a motion is *in each instance a different now* . . . The ever different nows are, *as different*, nevertheless always exactly *the same*, namely, now."<sup>22</sup> In saying "now," Dasein thus expresses a temporal moment that encompasses both sameness and difference: all nows are expressive of Dasein's original temporality, but this interpretive self-expression comes in the form of a temporal articulation that is always defined in terms of "otherness, *being-other*" (*BPP* 247). Thus in characterizing the "then"—the expression of originary temporality's futurity—Heidegger will "locate" it "neither in objects nor in subjects (in the traditional conception), neither here nor there but, as it were, on the way from the subject to the object! But we are already acquainted with this 'on-the-way,' as the stepping-over, as *transcendence*. This on-the-way is only a reference to the 'location' where, in the end, that 'is' which we utter as time character" (*MFL* 202).

Thus the now occupies a pivotal role: using admittedly dangerous language considering Heidegger's attempts to overcome this dichotomy, it brings the "subjective" into the "objective"—while maintaining its subjective nature by first giving it a relational context for self-interpretive expression. This constituted context is the essence of what Heidegger means by *world time*: "World time is more 'objective' than any possible object because, with the disclosedness of the world, it always already becomes ecstatically and horizonally 'objectified' as the condition of the possibility of innerworldly beings . . . But world time is also 'more subjective' than any possible subject since it first makes possible the being of the factual existing self, that being which, as is



*now well understood, is the meaning of care*" (BT 419/384–85). World time is therefore the context in which Dasein—the factual existing self—first becomes possible. Dasein's temporality "speaking itself out" into time is what first constitutes the horizon in terms of which Dasein can understand itself as existing *qua* factual self—and results in the context in terms of which things can be encountered as existing within time at all. Thus Heidegger will claim that "the relationship we have to time at any given time is in no way tacit [or] something negligible, but is precisely what sustains our dwelling in the world" (ZS 66–67). Indeed, he makes explicit note of this order of temporal constitution: "Temporality, as ecstatic and horizontal, first temporalizes something like *world* time that constitutes a within-timeness of things at hand and objectively present" (BT 420/385). Originary temporality expresses itself in a world time which then constitutes the intratemporality definitive of things.

This dependence of the intratemporal on world time is clear: "That time should hold-around beings, contain them, in such a way that we recognize what it holds as intratemporal, is possible and necessary because of the character of time as world-time" (BPP 274). Emphasizing the distinction between ordinary time and world time—and characterizing the former as founded on or derivative of the latter—differs from interpretations such as Frederick Olafson's, which consistently equates the two.<sup>23</sup> Such an interpretation is clearly opposed to Heidegger's distinction between them, however: whereas world time is explicitly characterized by significance, datability and publicity, in vulgar time these are concealed and forgotten: "The vulgar interpretation of time *covers* them over" (BT 422/387). It is true, he acknowledges, that it is possible to conceive of time in terms of that which is nearest to us—*Zuhanden* things—such that we characterize the now in terms of undifferentiated objective presence. This is the essence of the vulgar concept of time: since "the common understanding of time is aware of being only in the sense of extant being, being at hand . . . time gets interpreted also as something somehow extant . . . The nows appear to be intratemporal" (BPP 272). Despite this intratemporal model for characterizing the now, however, we also recognize the now to be that within which the intratemporal occurs. Heidegger will consequently characterize the now as both articulated "in time" and as unifyingly *constitutive* of within-timeness. Though we generally overlook the complexity of this ecstatic structure and think of it merely in terms of vulgar undifferentiated instants, he is clear about the necessary complexity and order of priority for any adequate characterization of Dasein's being-in-the-world: "Which is the 'true' time? Let us suppose that time were merely given to us as a sequence in which the aforementioned characteristics—datability, significance, extendedness, and

publicness—were all leveled down to an empty ‘now’ sequence. Affected only by time represented this way, we would become deranged” (ZS 50).

The world time context within which intratemporal things are encountered—and within which Dasein can first exist qua factual self—is essentially constituted not only by the ecstatic relationality of spannedness and datability, however, but by the remaining features of time to be considered: publicity and significance. Though the ordinary sense of time takes its understanding from thingly within-timeness, by analyzing the role that significance and publicity play in constituting world time, we can recognize the ontological priority that encounters with other Dasein will play in the possibility of world time. In the following sections it will become clear that the inter-Dasein encounter serves to *co-constitute* world time—encounters which therefore have priority over the *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden* encounters with things that occur *within* this constituted world-time context. This intersubjective world-constitution thereby refutes critics such as Michael Theunissen, who argue that Heidegger’s claims regarding the difference between encountering things and encountering other Dasein is undermined by the priority that his work consistently gives to *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden*—thingly—existence. Contrary to Theunissen’s claims, “the inner order of the *event of encountering*”<sup>24</sup> does not, in fact, prioritize the latter, since thingly “intra-temporal” encounters are dependent on the publicity of time and the context of significance that this helps to establish.

## Publicity

In Dasein’s expression of its primordial temporality it speaks-itself-out into a now that both indexes and manifests Dasein’s ecstatic nature, thereby granting the now a “peculiar double visage”—a temporal ecstasis that is nonetheless tied to a datable present. Encounters between *several* such temporalizing beings navigate this complex structure of sameness and difference: “Several people can say ‘now’ together, and each can date the ‘now’ in a different way: now that this or that happens. The ‘now’ expressed is spoken by each one in the publicity of being-with-one-another-in-the-world. The time interpreted and expressed by actual Dasein is thus also always already *made public* as such on the basis of its ecstatic being-in-the-world” (BT 411/377). The import of such a claim is profound, for it characterizes the encounter between temporality-defined Dasein on the most fundamental level. The capacity to express my originary temporality in a now indexically tied to an event of making-present

for me—a now that is nevertheless *also* a now that is accessible *for you* and is thus simultaneously an expression of *your* originary temporality—will be the essence of a Heideggerian response to Sartre’s criticism. “Although each of us utters his own now, it is nevertheless the now for everyone” (BPP 264). In simultaneously speaking-themselves-out into a common now—a temporal structure defined by both commonality and difference—multiple Dasein encounter each other *as* beings defined by originary temporality:

Fourth, the datable, significant, and extended “now” is also never initially a “now,” merely referring to me. This erroneous opinion could impose itself insofar as at any given time I am the one who says “now.” In each instance that very “now” I just said is the “now” *we* say; that is, in each case, without reference to the particular I who says “now,” we all jointly understand it immediately. It is a “now” that is immediately commonly accessible to all of us talking here with each other. (ZS 48)

Thus the publicity that is definitive of temporality’s self-expression points us again to Heidegger’s claim that *nowness* is always “*otherness, being-other*” (BPP 248)—the now is a paradoxical structure in that it is a context of sameness that nevertheless expresses difference. The type of ecstatic relation to otherness characteristic of the now is not only the temporal reference to past/future or to worldly event, however, but also involves an intrinsic ecstatic relation to the multiple voices saying now, the many Dasein engaged in expressing their originary temporality:

There is no need to mediate between the individual egos through an [act of] reflection as if they said “now” separately and only subsequently agreed with each other that they were referring to the same now. Therefore, the “now” is neither something first found in the subject, nor is it an object which can be found among other objects, as for instance this table and this glass. Nevertheless, at any given time the spoken “now” is immediately received-perceived jointly by everyone present. We call this accessibility of “now” the *publicness* [*Öffentlichkeit*] of “now.” (ZS 48)

The ecstasis definitive of making present, then, cannot be understood simply as a “standing out” from future and past, but must be characterized in terms of the ecstatic encounter *with the other Dasein’s originary temporality*. This allows Heidegger to escape a criticism that Fleischer puts forth in *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers ‘Sein und Zeit’*; namely, that Heidegger’s turn to temporality is unnecessary since the analysis of care essentially already accounts for Dasein’s way of being: “Wird Zeitlichkeit dem Dasein nicht

als sein Sein zugrunde gelegt, dann entsteht nach meiner Auffassung, wie ausgeführt, für die Ganzheit der Sorge kein Schaden.”<sup>25</sup> Contrary to Fleischer’s claims, however, the move from care to its underlying basis in temporality demonstrates the manner in which the encounter with other selves—the being-with dimension of care—is always operative despite the inauthentic tendency to misconstrue the otherness that defines this encounter. The ecstatic nature of the now has its vector of ecstasis not simply in terms of the temporal extension of my *own* being, but primarily in terms of the others with whom the intersubjectivity of world time is established and maintained. Thus Heidegger notes that the publicity of the now cannot be understood as the contingent accomplishment of isolated egos—rather, Dasein’s individual now-saying is always already an openness to the now-saying of other Dasein.

Heidegger seems to recognize this social nature of the establishment of world time: “Fellow humans . . . join in constituting the world” (BPP 297). This shared and yet individuated nature of expressed time is what allows for the constitution of intersubjective world time: allowing Heidegger to ask—though he does not pursue—“How is the *simultaneity* of different things possible?”<sup>26</sup> This question is, he recognizes, “more precisely, the question of the possibility of an intersubjective establishment of simultaneous events” (BPP 237). Though the intersubjective nature of world time is not explored in detail, it nevertheless accounts for his move from originary temporality to ordinary time. As Heidegger notes, “‘Public time’ turns out to be *the* time ‘in which’ innerworldly things at hand and objectively present are encountered. This requires that we call these beings unlike Dasein beings *within-time*” (BT 412/378). Beings like Dasein, however, are the ones who constitute public time—or “*the*” time that provides an “objective” context within which things can be encountered. This objectivity is established through intersubjective encounters with others whose basic ontological structure is also originary temporality speaking-itself-out.

Heidegger’s failure to elaborate on this essentially public nature of originary time may explain Blattner’s failure to recognize its import. In order to support his claim that Heidegger cannot account for the shift from originary to ordinary time, Blattner must show that the move through world time will not provide the sequentiality that is present in ordinary time, but absent in originary time. By ignoring the role of publicity, however, Blattner misses Heidegger’s solution to this problem. Namely, that the first step in achieving sequentiality is in recognizing that though Dasein’s primordial temporality is not *itself* sequential, through the encounter with other Dasein its expression is limited and *relativized*. Sequentiality depends on the recognition of times other than my own—

*nows other than this now.* The bringing into relation or taking account of time in terms of the temporality of other Dasein—which we will examine further in our analysis of significance—is essential for the arrangement or ordering of Dasein’s temporal expression and thereby a necessary precondition for the completely ordered arrangement of sequential “vulgar” time.<sup>27</sup>

Blattner focuses, instead, on what he calls “pragmatic temporality,” which is intended to link originary time and world time: “Dasein’s experience of world-time is grounded in its originary temporality . . . First, one understands world-time by reckoning with time. Time-reckoning is the mode of understanding in virtue of which Dasein is able to encounter and to understand world-time. Second, time-reckoning depends upon pragmatic temporality . . . Third, pragmatic temporality depends upon originary temporality” (*HTI* 135–36). This relationship is due, Blattner believes, to the fact that “pragmatic temporality makes possible Dasein’s understanding of world-time, because world-time is based on its understanding of the pragmatic Now” (*HTI* 149). Thus “pragmatic temporality turns out to be an elaboration of originary enpresenting” (*HTI* 161) which somehow collapses or expresses the three dimensions of originary temporality *within* the present: “The entire pragmatic framework belongs to the originary Present” (*HTI* 162).

This is in keeping with our earlier discussion of the datability of the now and the manner in which Dasein’s practical projects—including their future and past ecstases—are expressed in the now. Blattner’s problem arises when he notes that “the structure from the awaiting to the retaining is the understanding of the Now. But it is essential to the Now that it is part of a sequence of Nows. An understanding of a sequence, however, is in no way represented in the structure depicted here. To get the understanding of a sequence, Dasein must interpret the structural unit that ranges from the awaiting to the retaining as *iterated*” (*HTI* 162). With his emphasis on the *pragmatic* Now, however, Blattner overlooks the feature of Dasein’s temporality that allows this iteration: its *publicity*. The iteration required for sequentiality cannot be accomplished from within the private parameters of a pragmatic temporality but depends on the recognition of a multiplicity of temporalities—of times that are not my own. Without the other Dasein speaking out their “nows” it would not be possible to recognize a now other than the one within which my own originary temporality is always expressed.<sup>28</sup>

That the role of other Dasein has essentially dropped out of consideration is evident in Blattner’s interpretation: “How can world-time be the way in which time shows up in our ongoing, everyday activity, if it is a sequence of Nows, and if everyday activity is a form of absorption

in work? After all, if one is absorbed in work, one does not confront a sequence of Nows. Other Nows are not at issue. As Brown lectures, absorbed in her task, there is only the Now, when she lectures, and its boundaries, the former and the then" (*HTI* 149). Note Blattner's claim that "other Nows are not at issue." The fundamental feature of temporality's publicity, I argue, is precisely the fact that in encountering other Dasein it is "other nows" that are at issue. Indeed, the example Blattner uses is precisely one of conflicting interpersonal now-saying—the disruption that is caused when the significance of the now of one person comes into conflict with the significance of another's, when the other's desire for a coffee break interrupts Brown's lecture—but Blattner fails to recognize its import for Heidegger's position. Though he emphasizes the datability, spannedness, and significance of Brown's now, all he says of its publicity—its temporally *intersubjective* dimension—is that "finally, all this is public, humorously available to all the students in the class" (*HTI* 151).

According to Heidegger, however, temporality's essential publicity is not as superficial as such a reading indicates. That Blattner overlooks the crucial importance of the intersubjective dimension in Heidegger's account is evident in his virtual dismissal of Heidegger's account of discourse, which is, as we will discuss further in the following chapter, the mode of disclosure specific to being-with. According to Blattner, "Heidegger offers nothing distinctive to say about the temporality of discourse," since he "passes this project off into a promissory note" (*HTI* 122). This "promissory note" is Heidegger's claim that

our analysis of the temporal constitution of discourse and the explication of the temporal characteristics of language patterns can be tackled only if the problem of the fundamental connection between being and truth has been unfolded in terms of the problematics of temporality. Then the ontological meaning of the "is" can be defined, which a superficial theory of propositions and judgments has distorted into the "copula." The "origination" of "significance" can be clarified and the possibility of the formulation of concepts can be made ontologically intelligible only in terms of the temporality of discourse, that is, of Dasein in general. (*BT* 349/320–21)

Heidegger's explicit commentary on the temporality of discourse is admittedly sketchy and does seem to arbitrarily defer *its* analysis—but not that of the temporality of understanding or attunement—until after the being/truth connection has been clarified. The reason for this is Heidegger's own failure to fully elaborate on the intersubjective dimension on which his account is based. Whether he was unwilling or unable to

acknowledge the complexity demanded of his account if it were to fully accommodate world-constituting encounters with other temporality-defined Dasein, or whether he simply failed to *recognize* the essential supporting role that this intersubjective dimension was playing in his own account is unclear. It is evident, however, that this role is overlooked by Blattner—as well as many others. Thus he interprets Heidegger's claims that "discourse does not temporalize itself primarily in a definite ecstasy" and that "*making present* has, of course, a *privileged* constitutive function" (BT 349/320) as being evidence that Heidegger "does not say much, after all" (HTI 122). On the contrary, I believe that discourse's mode of temporalizing is not limited to a determinate ecstasis because it is the mode in which other Dasein qua temporalizing beings—that is, *beings unlimited to one definite ecstasy*—are disclosed.

### Reckoning with Time

According to Heidegger, the profound publicity of time that is articulated in discourse "does not occur occasionally and subsequently" (BT 411/378)—rather, the intersubjective nature of temporality's expression structures all of Dasein's comportments: "Since Dasein is always already disclosed as ecstatic and temporal and because understanding and interpretation belong to existence, time has also already made itself public in taking care. One orients oneself *toward it*, so that it must somehow be available for everyone" (BT 411/378). This "orienting toward time" such that "time taken care of" is made intersubjectively available, occurs when Dasein "reckons" with time—a reckoning that is essentially "*time measurement*" (BT 415/381). In this reckoning time-orientation, Dasein "initially discovers time and develops a measurement of time. Measurement of time is constitutive for being-in-the-world. Measuring its time, the discovering of circumspection which takes care of things lets what it discovers at hand and objectively present be encountered in time. Innerworldly beings thus become accessible as 'existing in time'" (BT 333/305–6).

It is this time-measure that establishes world time—the *shared* arena of significance, datability, and duration necessary for innerworldly beings to become accessible. Dasein submits itself to standards of temporal ordering that are available to all and thereby establishes a public "arrangement" of time—a point essential for the transition from ecstatic original temporality to sequential ordinary time. Through measure, the multiplicity of *nows* are brought into an ordered alignment. In developing these orienting measures that are available for everyone, Dasein

essentially builds on its intersubjective co-temporality to create an established context that is more explicit, efficient, and inclusive by looking for objects or events (such as sunrise) by which it can engage in shared “datings” of the simultaneous now-saying. In such cases, Heidegger claims, “That which dates is available in the surrounding world and yet not restricted to the actual world of useful things taken care of . . . everyone can ‘count on’ this public dating in which everyone gives himself his time. It makes use of a *measure* that is available to the public” (BT 413/379). Note that the event or thing chosen for public dating is *not* restricted to the practical projects of a particular Dasein’s understanding, contrary to the emphasis that Okrent, Blattner, and others place on the essentially pragmatic nature of expressed temporality. Indeed, Heidegger explicitly claims that “that which dates is available in the surrounding world and yet not restricted to the actual world of useful things taken care of” (BT 413/379). Instead Dasein establishes a measure for indexing its originary temporality that is in a certain sense *independent* of its pragmatic abilities-to-be. Indeed, Heidegger clarifies that datability must be understood *primarily* in terms of this “reckoning” mode of dating, the mode of dating characteristic of temporality’s publicity:

Although taking care of time can be carried out in the mode of dating that we characterized—namely, in terms of events in the surrounding world—this always occurs basically in the horizon of a taking care of time that we know as astronomical and calendrical *time-reckoning*. This reckoning is not a matter of chance, but has its existential and ontological necessity in the fundamental constitution of Da-sein as care. Since Da-sein essentially exists entangled as thrown, it interprets its time heedfully by way of a reckoning with time. *In this reckoning*, the “real” *making public* of time temporalizes itself so that we must say that *the thrownness of Da-sein is the reason why “there is” public time*. (BT 411–12/378)

Dasein dates the now primarily in light of the others with whom it must share time by developing an ecstatic relation to public norms or standards of time-reckoning according to which all Dasein orient and order their different temporalities. Dasein is “heedful” of the others by submitting itself to measures that allow for a shared temporal space.

Contrary to many interpretations of the normalizing role that these public measures play in Heidegger’s work, this self-subsumption to shared norms is not inherently inauthentic. Heidegger notes that reckoning with time does not necessarily result in an inauthentic now: “the pure now, cut off in its complete structure” (BT 426–27/391). Rather, Heidegger explicitly claims that in such a measuring orienting-toward-time, “The now is always already understood and *interpreted* in its complete structural con-



tent of datability, spannedness, publicness, and worldliness” (BT 416/382). Nevertheless, temporality’s self-expression in terms of measure is *conducive* to Dasein’s understanding of the now in a truncated and distorted way—that is, inauthentically—since such ordered now-saying involves encountering a temporality other than one’s own, and thereby opens the possibility of interpreting temporality as completely *unowned*. This may explain Heidegger’s tendency to elide fallenness and being-with. This distortive consequence is not a necessary result of Dasein’s tendency to orient itself toward time in terms of publicity and measure, however. Such distortion occurs only when Dasein loses sight of the nature of its measure-taking, subsuming itself to interpretations appropriate to intratemporal, thingly being.

Properly understood, however, “reckoning” or time measure does not involve Dasein subsuming itself to thingly being—the clock or the sun—but to some intersubjectively shared making-present that establishes parameters for temporality’s self-expression in dating the now. Thus “what is ontologically decisive” in measuring lies not in the *thing* against which something is measured, but

in the specific *making present* that makes measurement possible. Dating in terms of what is objectively present “spatially” is so far from a spatialization of time that this supposed spatialization signifies nothing other than that a being that is objectively present for everyone in every now is made present in its own presence. Measuring time is essentially such that it is necessary to say now, but in obtaining the measurement we, as it were, forget what has been measured as such so that nothing is to be found except distance and number. (BT 418/383–84)

What is definitive is not the thing measured or used to measure, but the shared *measuring*. Thus Heidegger will claim in *The Zollikon Seminars*: “We say ‘now’ when we speak to each other. In so doing, the ‘date’ is used in the original sense of the word as ‘that which is given’; in our discussion the ‘now’ refers to this ‘givenness’” (ZS 47). Indeed, in a discussion of Leibniz from *History of the Concept of Time*, Heidegger indicates the necessity of the “compresence” of multiple Dasein for measuring (HCT 235).

## Significance

Throughout his work we see Heidegger arguing that the making-present accomplished through the co-giving of measure includes an implicit acknowledgment of the other Dasein engaged in temporalizing

now-saying—others with whom Dasein establishes shared (present-for-everyone) standards by which Dasein can orient itself. These shared standards against which Dasein can “signify to itself its ability to be” (BPP 295–96) is what “we call *significance* . . . the structure of what we call the *world in the strictly ontological sense*” (BPP 295–96). The world is the normatively structured public context defined by significance: the fourth feature of expressed originary temporality. As Kisiel notes, “The dynamics (and so the temporality) of this signifying milieu will tend to be obscured by an abstractive categorizing when it is reiterated over the years that meaningfulness, significance, is the central and primary character-of-being of the world.”<sup>29</sup> Early on, however, Heidegger more clearly recognizes the dynamic temporalizing of the many Dasein involved in constituting this signifying milieu. This context of appropriateness relations is co-constituted by the many Dasein who orient themselves in terms of communal measures of temporal expression. The world—this shared normative space—is accomplished through temporality’s ecstatic speaking itself out through the now’s relation to the temporal ecstases, to worldly things and events, to others defined by temporality, and to the norms of measure according to which multiple Dasein can orient themselves. It is for this reason that Heidegger can claim that “time is essentially a self-opening and expanding into a world” (MFL 210). Primordial temporality expresses itself in an intersubjective time of shared significance through reckoning, measuring, and ordering with the others—thereby *constituting* the context of sequentiality and significance in which Dasein finds meaningful standards for orienting its way of being in the world. “We see then the peculiar productivity intrinsic to temporality, in the sense that the product is precisely a peculiar nothing, the world” (MFL 210). This “product” is co-constituted *with* the others through shared measures that accommodate the temporal way of being of many Dasein. “If the time we take care of is ‘really’ made public only when it gets measured, then public time is to be accessible in a way that has been phenomenally unveiled” (BT 414/380). To understand this making-public through measure, Heidegger demonstrates its rootedness in norms of *appropriateness* and *inappropriateness*:

When the “then” that interprets itself in heedful awaiting gets dated, this dating includes some such statement as: then—when it dawns—it is *time* for the day’s work. The time interpreted in taking care is always already understood as time for . . . The actual “now that so and so” is as *such* either *appropriate* or *inappropriate*. The “now”—and thus every mode of interpreted time—is not only a “now that . . .” that is essentially datable, but is at the same time essentially determined by the

structure of appropriateness. Interpreted time has by its very nature the character of “time for . . .” or “not the time for . . .” The making present that awaits and retains of taking care understands time in its relation to a what-for, that is in turn ultimately anchored in a for-the-sake-of-which of the potentiality-of-being of Dasein. With this relation of in-order-to, time made public reveals *the* structure that we got to know earlier as *significance*. It constitutes the worldliness of the world. As time-for . . . , the time that has been made public essentially has the nature of world. (BT 414/380)

For Heidegger, then, world is the context in which Dasein enacts its ability to be according to public *norms* or *measures*. These measures are characterized by reliability—they are something “everyone can ‘count on’” (BT 413/379) and they are uncontroversial and accessible—they are “for ‘everyone’ at any time in the same way so that within certain limits everyone is initially agreed upon it” (BT 413/379). Indeed, Heidegger will claim that “the idea of a standard implies unchangingness” (BT 417/383) and thus is available “at every time for everyone” (BT 417/383). The public measuring that constitutes world is normative not only because the standards it institutes are unchanging and universally accessible, however, but because they are *constraining*; they are “binding for everyone” (BT 417/383). The other is a necessary condition for the possibility of the world qua context of normative significance, then, insofar as the measures of appropriateness in terms of which I orient my temporalizing would not achieve obligating force if the others did not require me to *accommodate* my temporalizing to their time through the establishment of binding public standards: “One orients oneself *toward it*, so that it must somehow be available for everyone” (BT 411/378). This point allows us to recognize that Heidegger’s account makes room for a claim that the other makes on me *prior* to and as a condition for these public norms. Though he fails to examine the implications of this—especially the ethical implications—his position clearly involves such a moment of claim: all of Dasein’s time-reckonings, regardless of its care-driven projects, “must still be in conformity with the time given by the others” (BT 418/384). We will discuss this issue in greater detail in the following chapters.

Despite this ethical moment at work in his account, however, the primary arena in which Heidegger analyzes the normativity of the public sphere is in the functionality of tools and equipment, where the being of the tools used is determined by their “specific equipmental function” (BPP 292). Things encountered in the world are understood in terms of what they are *for*—an understanding with an inherent recognition of the normative possibilities of succeeding or failing. “Each individual piece

of equipment is by its own nature *equipment-for*—for traveling, for writing, for flying. Each one has its immanent reference to that *for which* it is what it is. It is always something *for*, pointing to a *for-which*" (BPP 163–64). Dasein's everyday immersion in things cannot obscure the fact that their meaning is determined by normative functionality relations and that these functionality relations are themselves grounded in Dasein's way of being qua originary temporality—which includes the ecstatic relation to the other Dasein.

Letting-function, as *understanding of functionality*, has a *temporal constitution*. But it itself *points back to a still more original temporality*. Only when we have apprehended the more original temporalizing are we able to survey in what way the *understanding of the being of beings*—here either of the equipmental character and *handiness* of handy equipment or of the thinghood of extant things and the *at-handness* of the at-hand—is *made possible by time* and thus becomes transparent. (BPP 294)

The emphasis on the role of the others in co-constituting the world should not obscure the emphasis that Heidegger places on the for-the-sake-of grounding the world's context of significance, however. Though the others are essential for establishing the publicity and bindingness of worldly significances, the commitment with which Dasein submits itself to them is rooted in its way of being qua mineness. In "On the Essence of Ground," for example, Heidegger explicitly claims that interpreting being-in-the-world requires "starting from the 'for-the-sake-of' as the primary character of world."<sup>30</sup> This point returns us to chapter 2 and the nature of Dasein as a being defined by a *mineness* that drives it to seek objective standards according to which it may measure its success at existing. "If temporality constitutes the primordial meaning of being of Dasein, and if this being is concerned *about its being* in its very being, then care must need 'time' and thus reckon with 'time.' The temporality of Da-sein develops a 'time calculation'" (BT 235/217). We note here how deeply this way of being runs—Dasein does not simply establish this or that standard of measure, but always expresses itself to and with the others such that world time and the corresponding context of normative significance—world—can be. This urge to measure—the very manner in which time becomes public—is, according to Heidegger, the essential structure of all of Dasein's comportments: "All measuring is not necessarily quantitative. Whenever I take notice of something as something, then I myself have 'measured up to' [*an-messen*] what a thing is. This 'measuring up' [*Sich-anmessen*] to what is, is the fundamental structure of human comportment toward things. In all comprehending of some-

thing as something, for instance, of the table as a table, I myself measure up to what I have comprehended" (ZS 100). Underlying the norms and measures characterizing world is Dasein's nature as a being-entrusted with its own being, a self-responsibility that manifests itself in the *commitment* to these norms and measures. Recall the discussion from chapter 4, where it was shown that the interruption of the *Zuhanden* could be overcome in a principled manner insofar as Dasein is committed to getting itself right—and therefore *cares* about getting its encounters with things right. This existential self-responsibility is a necessary condition for understanding the world as normative context of significance, since Dasein must care about how it is to be in heeding the other's temporal claim and committing itself to shared measures. The appropriateness relations definitive of the public arena depend on the fact that this appropriateness *matters* to Dasein. Thus speaking itself out into world—Dasein's mundanizing temporal self-expression—must be understood as directed by the *mineness* of the way in which this self-expression is accomplished.

The measured expression into world—in which Dasein both expresses the mineness of its being, and accommodates that of the others—is neither chosen nor avoidable: "This reckoning is not a matter of chance" (BT 411/378). Rather, such mundanizing temporalizing is an essential consequence of Dasein's way of being: "The fact *that* transcendence temporalizes itself as a primordial occurrence, does not stand in the power of this freedom itself. Yet impotence (thrownness) is not first the result of beings forcing themselves upon Dasein, but rather determines Dasein's being as such. All projection of world is therefore thrown" ("OEG" 135). The unique structure of world is such that it is both constituted by Dasein and yet first provides it a context for being; in "On the Essence of Ground" Heidegger defines Dasein's temporalizing transcendence as "that surpassing that makes possible such a thing as existence in general" and as that which "constitutes selfhood" ("OEG" 108); he further claims that "'Dasein transcends' means: in the essence of its being it is *world-forming*, 'forming' [*bildend*] in the multiple sense that it lets world occur, and through the world gives itself an original view (form [*Bild*]) that is not explicitly grasped, yet functions precisely as a paradigmatic form [*Vor-bild*] for all manifest beings, among which each respective Dasein itself belongs" ("OEG" 123).

We can see here echoes of our earlier discussion of Heidegger's indebtedness to Kant and Husserl: the active-passive structure of the fundamental horizon of intuition—expressed temporality's world-forming—is evident here. Dasein speaks itself out in a responsive, relational transcending toward the world that is both constituted by, and makes possible, Dasein's way of being. Though such a structure may appear to be

somewhat paradoxical, it is important to be clear that this is a transcendental claim and cannot be understood as a type of occurrence that takes place in time: “‘Time’ is neither objectively present in the ‘subject’ nor in the ‘object,’ neither ‘inside’ nor ‘outside,’ and it ‘is’ ‘prior’ to every subjectivity and objectivity, because it presents the condition for the very possibility of this ‘prior’” (BT 419/384–85). There is not first a worldless, originary temporal Dasein and then, through its temporalizing, world is formed. Rather, Dasein is always already worldly and as such it is always already sharing this world with the others. What is being articulated is the condition for the possibility of a shared intratemporal world within which the finitude and mineness of Dasein’s originary temporality are nevertheless expressed. Husserl faces this same problem in the fifth of his *Cartesian Meditations* insofar as he starts from the immanence of the transcendental ego and attempts to demonstrate how it is always already intersubjective. There are serious difficulties with Husserl’s approach, however, insofar as he clings to the essential solipsism of the “primal ego.”<sup>31</sup> Though the details of Husserl’s account cannot be addressed here,<sup>32</sup> it seems clear that Heidegger is both indebted to Husserl’s account and attempts to escape its difficulties by reversing the order of precedence. He starts with our worldly, intersubjective way of being and attempts to demonstrate that the finitude and mineness of originary temporality is a condition for its possibility.

### Inauthentic Temporalizing

The role that others play in this shared world-constituting—the finitude and mineness of *their* way of being qua co-constitutors—can be acknowledged to varying degrees. It is possible to encounter other Dasein not only in terms of their originary temporality to which I must accommodate my own, but also as innerworldly, intratemporal beings. Indeed, this is how the distinction between *Mitsein* (being-with) and *Mitdasein* (co-Dasein) is best understood—not as a difference between a category and a particular, but as a difference between dimensions of intersubjective encounter—world-constituting and innerworldly. Thus Heidegger claims that “we must not overlook the fact that we are also using the term *Mitdasein* as a designation of the being to which the existing others are freed within the world” (BT 120/113). *Mitdasein* refers to the mode of being of other Dasein insofar as they can be considered worldly, the “everyday innerworldly *Mitdasein* of others” (BT 121/114). Though others can be encountered as *co-constitutors* of the world—insofar as they have a unique

now-saying to which I must accommodate *my* now-saying—they can also be encountered in terms of the innerworldly context that is established through these measures. Heidegger's comments indicate that the term *Mitda-sein* designates only the latter, innerworldly mode of being and encounter. So, for example, Heidegger will claim that *Mitdasein* is a kind of being of "something encountered within the world" (BT 140/131–32)—a worldly encounter that depends on a more primordial *Mitsein* way of being: "Only because it has the essential structure of being-with, is one's own Da-sein *Mitda-sein* as encounterable by others" (BT 121/113). *Mitda-sein* is the innerworldly or *intratemporal* manifestation of the other's being, which is made possible by the very world that presupposes—and is established on the basis of—*Mitsein*: "Our analysis has shown that being-with is an existential constituent of being-in-the-world. *Mitda-sein* has proved to be a manner of being which beings encountered within the world have as their own" (BT 125/117). He elaborates further on *Mitda-sein* as the *innerworldly* manner of being-with: "The world not only frees things at hand as beings encountered within the world, but also Da-sein, the others in their *Mitda-sein*. But in accordance with its own meaning of being, this being which is freed in the surrounding world is being-in in the same world in which, as encounterable for others, it is there with them" (BT 123/115).

Like the others, I too am encountered as *Mitda-sein* when I am encountered as an innerworldly entity, and such innerworldly being is made possible by the world. What this means is that I am encountered—and I encounter others—in terms of the public norms and measures that define this intersubjective sphere. Dasein's everyday way of encounter with others is delineated by public, worldly roles and meanings: "One's own Da-sein, like the *Mitda-sein* of others, is encountered, initially and for the most part, in terms of the world-together in the surrounding world taken care of" (BT 125/118). What this does not entail, however, is that I *only* encounter other Dasein as "innerworldly"—intratemporal and public—though the fallen tendency to focus solely on the innerworldly tends to this interpretation. It is the more primordial dimension of intersubjective encounter—a mode forgotten and yet operative in everydayness—that establishes and maintains the "world-together" that is presupposed in all innerworldly *Mitda-sein* encounters.

To what extent does this account of Dasein's intersubjective temporalizing overcome Sartre's critique? Though the fact of Dasein's being-in-the-world indicates that there must be other Dasein with whom such a world is co-constituted, to what extent are these others encountered as *individuals*? Have we answered Sartre's worry, or have we merely reiterated being-with as an a priori category—though complex and tempo-

ral—under which individual Dasein are subsumed? Recall that in order to avoid the conclusion that the shared nature of the world is *only* experienced when concrete others are present—the problem that afflicted Sartre’s account—it must be the case that the world *itself* contains references to the others with whom I share it. Once a public, shared time has been established based on communal standards of measure, the intratemporal things encountered therein will point to the other Dasein who can potentially encounter or use a thing. Thus Heidegger claims that “in the kind of being of these things at hand, that is, in their relevance, there lies an essential reference to possible wearers for whom they should be ‘cut to the figure’” (BT 117/111).

This characterization of things as defined by a type of horizon of reference to possible others is deeply reminiscent of Husserl’s analyses of the intersubjective nature of the objectivity of objects. Every perception of an object refers to a horizon of anticipations of further possible perceptions, including perceptions that belong to other possible perceivers. A difficulty arises, however, when we recognize that for Husserl, this horizon of reference is anonymous and unlimited. As Dan Zahavi notes,

As a transcendent object, it possesses an infinite diversity of coexisting and compatible profiles, and my experience of it naturally does not presuppose that each of its profiles is simultaneously perpetually intended by a subject, which would presuppose an infinite plurality of foreign I’s who are currently actually perceiving it (and who are perceived by me as so doing). Although not only the appresentation but also the horizontal givenness of the object (i.e., the *appearance* of the object) seem to presuppose some sort of relation to foreign subjectivity, it is neither a matter of the relation to one foreign I alone, nor a matter of the relation to the factual existence of several I’s.<sup>33</sup>

In other words, the horizontal reference to other subjectivities implicit in the encounter with worldly things seems to be a reference to a type of thematic or a priori other—the other “in principle”—and not to the factual experience of this or that other concrete subjectivity. According to Zahavi, Husserl’s account therefore demands that one distinguish between several types of experiences of others. On the one hand, perception’s anonymous structural reference to possible others points to “an *infinite plurality of possible others*, which Husserl occasionally characterizes as the *open intersubjectivity*.”<sup>34</sup> On the other, “it is only the concrete experience of others that permits the self-mundanization of the transcendental I and the thematic experience of validity-for-everyone.”<sup>35</sup> In this regard, one could characterize being-with as Heidegger’s version of this type



of open intersubjectivity—a conclusion that would force us to conclude that Heidegger’s account does not escape Sartre’s criticisms.<sup>36</sup> This interpretation seems to be implied in comments such as Heidegger’s claim that “the Dasein is, as such, essentially open for the co-existence of other Daseins” (*BPP* 296).

In light of such claims, should all of our everyday encounters with other Dasein be characterized as a type of primal co-constitution of world, or simply as innerworldly, anonymous encounters that merely *rely* on the previously established intersubjective realm? There are a number of points that must be kept in mind here. First, the “openness” and anonymity of the intersubjective reference at play in the thing’s referral to possible others is *dependent* on the concrete encounter with another Dasein’s temporal particularity. The reason for this is that the recognition of another now that is simultaneous but transcendent to my own—the type of transcendence essential for establishing a shared world time—could not be accomplished as a type of imaginative variation on my own now. Acknowledging another now is inherently acknowledging a foreign temporality-defined self. The initiation into co-temporality must be accomplished in the concrete encounter with other Dasein expressing *their* originary temporalities. A similar point is made by Tugendhat in regard to Husserl’s account of intersubjectivity; namely, that if others were not encountered as foreign co-constituting subjectivities, their role *as* co-constitutors would be impossible.<sup>37</sup>

On the basis of this inaugural encounter with another subjectivity, the transference of this co-presence to other encounters may occur in terms of the shared world that results—in other words, the world may refer to a type of open intersubjectivity, such that the trace of some other Dasein is present in the cultivated field or the encountered artifact. Nevertheless, the order of precedence prioritizes the inaugural encounter with concrete foreign temporalities. Though the presence of other Dasein can be encountered through anonymous worldly roles and norms, then—a situation necessary to account for the publicity of worldly things and spaces—the condition for this possibility is the primal encounter with the foreign now that evokes or initiates shared roles and norms. The category *Mitsein* is operative qua category, but it is characterized by a temporal *responsiveness* to the concrete encounter—as our discussion of Heidegger’s debt to Husserl and Kant in this regard has indicated. Like the other *existentials*, being-with is in the service of temporal intuition; but in this case, intuition does not give *intratemporal* things, but foreign originary temporalities—*other Dasein*.

Since Dasein’s way of being is temporalizing, encountering another Dasein involves encountering a temporalizing being expressing itself in

time. The “with” of being-with is a constant speaking out of my now to the others such that we come to *share* a particular temporal now and thereby establish a common space of measured meaning. And because my encounter with the other who says “now” is a direct experience of her originary temporality—the fundamental expression of her concrete care-defined way of being—such encounters are not simple subsumptions of the other to an a priori category, as Sartre claims. Simultaneous “speaking out” of temporality into world time—expressions that first institute the possibility of simultaneity—are concrete encounters with others unmediated by abstract categories or worldly interpretations. Other Dasein are given in the particularity of their temporal self-disclosure—their expressive now-saying—and it is only thus that we can co-constitute the world. Though our fallen tendency to take our understandings from intratemporal things encourages distorted characterizations of the condition in which we find ourselves, the fact that the shared space of world time and significance is accomplished in the co-now-saying of multiple Dasein cannot be completely elided: “Somewhere and somehow time breaks through, even if only in the common understanding or misunderstanding of it. Wherever a Da, a here-there, is intrinsically unveiled, temporality manifests itself” (*BPP* 307).

The manner in which the other’s temporalizing way of being is experienced as such will be elaborated in much greater detail in the following chapter. There I will demonstrate that, for Heidegger, the recognition of others as co-constituting the world is always present in and through every innerworldly encounter.

## *Fürsorge*: Acknowledging the Other Dasein

As we saw in chapter 5, the encounter with the originary temporality of other Dasein is acknowledged in the very fact that there are public standards to which one submits oneself. The existence of foreign nows to which I must accommodate my own originary temporality is a necessary condition for the bindingness and publicity of the norms and shared structures of meaning that characterize what Heidegger means by world. It is for this reason that worldly structures and objects speak to me of the presence of others, a point that allows Heidegger to overcome the difficulty that faced Sartre regarding how the world is experienced as *shared* even in the absence of concrete others. One experiences a type of Dasein-presence through worldly things—in the cultivated field, for example—and the encounter is experienced as personal insofar as particular dimensions of these worldly things are salient. Thus one does not recognize the presence of other Dasein simply through this or that expanse of dirt, but in the trace of her purposive activity; in the fact that this expanse of dirt is cultivated and thereby succeeds in meeting particular standards of purpose: “These others do not stand in the referential context of the environing world, but are encountered in that with which they have to do, in the ‘with which’ of their preoccupation as the ones who are preoccupied with it. They are encountered as they are in their being-in-the-world, not as chance occurrences but as the ones who till the field” (*HCT* 240). Other Dasein and the traces of their work are not encountered as “chance occurrences” but as practical agents expressing their attuned, projective being-in-the-world through purposive worldly roles and activities.<sup>1</sup> Others are not simply part of the referential context of meaning delimited by one’s projects—another “part” of the world. Rather, they are encountered “as they are in their being-in-the-world” (*HCT* 240): thrown into the world and committed to projects that center meaningful contexts of reference. These equipmental contexts, these roles and activities, are manifestations or expressions of the care that makes them meaningful *as* publicly significant equipment or action. Without others who exist in this heedfulness to one another and the public

measures evoked by such heedfulness, the world qua context of significance would not be possible as such.

This being-there-too with them [the others] does not have the ontological character of being objectively present “with” them within a world. The “with” is of the character of Da-sein, the “also” means the sameness of being as circumspect, heedful being-in-the-world. “With” and “also” are to be understood *existentially*, not categorically. On the basis of this *like-with* being-in-the-world, the world is always already the one that I share with the others. The world of Da-sein is a *with-world*. (BT 118/111–12)

*On the basis of this like-with* the world is one I share with the others, not vice versa. Though the order of priority is clear—the world as public, normatively binding context of significance depends on the intersubjective encounter with particular others—we have nevertheless not yet shown that the encounter with *every* other Dasein involves a being-toward the other qua originary temporality. The worldly space of shared significance demands that *some* others be recognized as such—it requires an “open intersubjectivity”—but in order to completely refute Sartre’s critique, we must show that *every* other is encountered as such at least on some minimal level.

### Specific Intersubjectivity and Solitude

*Fürsorge* is Heidegger’s answer to this requirement. Generally translated as “solicitude” or “concern,” *Fürsorge* is meant to designate a mode of care specific to encountering other Dasein. Thus Heidegger insists that *Fürsorge* is not the same as taking care of *things*—“although this kind of being is a *being toward* beings encountered in the world, as is taking care of things” (BT 121/114). Ecstatic transcendence or “being toward” characterizes both taking care of things and solicitude for others, but the fact that in the latter case it is another *Dasein* to whom I am related marks an insuperable difference: “The being to which Da-sein is related as being-with does not, however, have the kind of being of useful things at hand; it is itself Da-sein. This being is not taken care of, but is a matter of *concern*” (BT 121/114). In concern Dasein recognizes a being that differs fundamentally from the innerworldly things experienced in *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden* modes of encounter.<sup>2</sup> *Fürsorge* designates Dasein’s way of being toward the others who express their originary, ecstatic temporality

in a co-constituting of the world. Insofar as it is the way of being-toward specific to Dasein, then, *Fürsorge* inherently acknowledges the temporalizing care operating in and through the innerworldly forms in which it is encountered. Despite Heidegger's insistence on the basic quality of this distinction, however, the question remains: how is this concerned acknowledgment of the other Dasein experienced as such in particular instances of encounter?

For Heidegger there is a continuum of such acknowledgment, the extremes of which he characterizes as "leaping-in" and "leaping-ahead."<sup>3</sup> Though one pole of the *Fürsorge* continuum involves such a minimal level of Dasein-acknowledgment as to encompass all sorts of abuse and disregard, we will show in this chapter that every point on the continuum registers the other Dasein as a being defined by originary temporality—despite the tendency to forget this in light of everyday, "vulgar" time. To do so we will analyze the underlying structure of *Fürsorge* at work throughout the entire continuum and determine thereby what type of Dasein acknowledgment characterizes *every* intersubjective encounter. This chapter will discuss the everyday ways in which the other is typically encountered as co-Dasein and will end with a discussion of discourse—the mode of disclosure specific to *Fürsorge*. It is only in the following chapter that we will examine the extremes of this continuum to demonstrate how at one extreme—leaping-ahead—one takes the other's status as temporally particular mineness as one's guiding directive, while at the other extreme—leaping-in—only a bare minimum of Dasein-recognition occurs.

Though the term *Fürsorge* or "solicitude" seems to indicate a genuine involved connection between two people, this is a technical term that Heidegger uses to characterize the range of possible ways of being toward others. Thus behaviors and attitudes that we would characterize as indicating a *lack* of concern are themselves different *modes* of concern on his account:

Being-for, against-, and without-one-another, passing-one-another-by, not-mattering-to-one-another, are possible ways of concern . . . These modes of being show the characteristics of inconspicuousness and obviousness which belong to everyday innerworldly *Mitda-sein* of others, as well as to the handiness of useful things taken care of daily. These indifferent modes of being-with-one-another tend to mislead the ontological interpretation into initially interpreting this being as the pure objective presence of several subjects. It seems as if only negligible variations of the same kind of being lie before us, and yet ontologically there is an essential distinction between the "indifferent" being together of arbi-

trary things and the not-mattering-to-one-another of beings who are with one another. (BT 121–22/114)

Even in behaviors and attitudes where the other is treated callously—as if he were a thing—this “as if” can never completely conceal the ontological difference between things and persons experienced in every encounter with other Dasein: “*The Dasein understands, in equal originality with its understanding of existence, the existence of other Daseins and the being of intraworldly beings*” (BPP 279). Note here that when Heidegger refers to Dasein’s “understanding of existence” he is not referring to some thematic “existence in general” but to the concrete having to be of Dasein’s existing here and now. Note also that he distinguishes the *existence* of Dasein—mine and the other’s—from the “*being* of intraworldly beings.” Instances in which our indifference toward others may *seem* to be the same as the indifference felt for objects—or simply a “negligible variation” thereof—are in fact radically, *essentially* distinct modes of being. There is a fundamental difference in kind between intraworldly beings and world-expressing Dasein.

## Respect

Heidegger’s basic distinction between persons and things—his characterization of the intersubjective encounter as involving an ontologically based *inability* to experience the other as a thing—points to the ethical implications of his position. Indeed, several commentators have noted Heidegger’s similarity to Kant in this regard. Sonia Sikka argues in “Kantian Ethics in *Being and Time*” that

Heidegger’s agreement with Kant’s practical philosophy is not limited to some cursory remarks about “solicitude” which might seem merely to qualify, or attenuate, the dominant tenor of his descriptions. Rather, a retrieval of central Kantian ideas . . . is present in *Being and Time*’s account of the basic structure of *Dasein* and the world. As a result, *Being and Time*’s emphasis on the situated character of human judgment is supplemented by a definition of appropriate behaviour toward all entities possessing a certain character, where this definition is grounded in the most fundamental elements of Heidegger’s ontology.<sup>4</sup>

Like Kant, Heidegger offers a characterization of encounters with other persons as profoundly different from encounters with things, a differ-

ence that is grounded in fundamental elements of Dasein's ontology. Many commentators have attempted to read a type of Kantian moral injunction into such a distinction:

Building on the fundamental Kantian distinction between persons and things, Heidegger has differentiated that circumspective concern we display to the things about us from our solicitous comportment toward other persons. Only through solicitous behaviour do other persons enter into our experience *qua* persons (instead of things). It is toward them that we are able to exhibit moral responsibility. Reminiscent of Kant's injunction that the prime moral responsibility is to treat them *qua* persons and to enhance *their* own free self-development, Heidegger abjured the domination of others because it fringes on their own sovereignty of care.<sup>5</sup>

The tendency of most such interpretations, however, is to recognize the ethical implications of Heideggerian *Fürsorge* solely in its *authentic* manifestations. Thus only the manner in which leaping-ahead and *authentic* modes of solicitude echo Kantian notions of respect are emphasized. In doing so, however, such accounts fail to characterize the specific other-directedness of *all* modes of solicitude as involving a type of minimal level of "recognition respect"—an acknowledgment of others as ontologically distinct from things.<sup>6</sup> This seems to be the case above when Sherover implies that others *only* appear in my experience as persons when I treat them solicitously—but I *could* treat them, and thus, apparently, *experience* them, otherwise. Lawrence Vogel's reading also fails to recognize the type of Dasein-acknowledgment that is operative in all modes of *Fürsorge*, emphasizing instead only the *authentic* mode of being-with and its possible interpretation as an "existential basis for the second version of Kant's categorical imperative."<sup>7</sup> In a similar attempt to link Heidegger to Kant's ethics, Julian Young counts only authentic solicitude as a "moral relationship . . . for what it amounts to is the fundamental Kantian principle of respect: never treat humanity either in your own person or that of another as a mere means, but always as an end-in-itself."<sup>8</sup>

The problem with such comparisons to Kant's notion of respect is not only their failure to consider the extent to which the *entire Fürsorge* continuum involves a being-toward the other *qua Dasein*, but their related tendency to collapse several different morally relevant dimensions of intersubjective encounters under a single term. In failing to differentiate the basic structures of solicitude from one of the modes in which it can be realized, such accounts confuse the following essential moments:

(1) the immediate recognition of the other as a being with a way of existing different from that of things, (2) the corresponding obligation or claim that I limit or accommodate myself to the other who is so acknowledged, (3) the responsiveness to the claim—the degree and manner in which the claim is heeded or evaded through self-limiting or its lack, and (4) the role that explicit self-ownership and responsibility play in all of the above. Despite the tendency in discussions of the moral implications of Heideggerian intersubjectivity to give pride of place to (4), this approach is misguided. Though Heidegger's own interest in authenticity seems to justify this emphasis, I will argue below and in the following chapter that the degree to which the other-responsiveness articulated in aspects (1) through (3) requires a prior authenticity is highly questionable, and should not simply be assumed as a necessary condition when elaborating the moral dimensions of the social encounter. The reason for this is that basic aspects of the moral encounter—the acknowledgment of the other Dasein's status as fundamentally distinct from a thing and the moment of claim inherent in this acknowledgment—lie deeper than authentic/inauthentic ways of being in the world. Indeed, we have already seen that the temporal accommodation that constitutes the acknowledgment of the other Dasein's claim on me is the very basis on which world has its being.

Though the requirement of a prior authenticity is an issue to which we will be returning, then, the other three requirements seem to be necessary structural dimensions of the minimally ethical encounter: recognizing the other's personhood, the immediate claim that the other's personhood makes on me, and the capacity to respond or avoid responding to this claim. "I respect you" means that I not only acknowledge your ontological status as another Dasein and am obligated in some way in and through this acknowledgment, but that I take on this obligation through self-limiting. The ability to subsequently deny or turn away from the initial acknowledgment of the other's claim—that is, the possibility that one can *fail* to meet one's moral obligations—is what makes the relation normative and one for which an agent can be held responsible. Such turning away can only be understood *as* a failure, however, insofar as there is a preexisting claim that is first acknowledged as such on some level. Though there is more to morality than acknowledging the other's humanity and experiencing a certain type of limit or claim in light of this acknowledgment—one must respond to this claim *appropriately* in order to be moral—the foundational elements of acknowledgment and claim within the interpersonal encounter are necessary dimensions of morality. These elements characterize the *entire Fürsorge* continuum, however, not



just the authentic forms in which the responsibility for an appropriate reply to these claims is explicitly owned as such.

For the purposes of the current discussion, then, we will be focusing on these structural elements and examining the relationship between acknowledgment and claim in order to come to a better understanding of the extent to which Heidegger's account of Dasein-specific modes of encounter involve a call for one Dasein to accommodate itself to another. Such a limiting moment must be a necessary dimension of all *Fürsorge* if we are to show that *every* encounter with the other involves an immediate—though often subsequently forgotten—acknowledgment of her concrete temporal particularity. As Olafson puts it in *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*, we have to show how others subject us to constraints “from which we cannot release ourselves simply by choosing to do so.”<sup>9</sup> Even in instances that appear to be cases of this self-release, the claim and its acknowledgment must be shown to remain on a minimal level.

It will become evident in our discussion that Heidegger's general hostility to the language and approach of traditional ethics is not a failure to recognize or accept this obligating dimension of the Dasein-to-Dasein encounter. This is a common way to read Heidegger, however, of which Herman Philipse's claims are representative: “Heidegger locates all moral norms on the ontical level. His ontology of human existence cannot contain a substantial ethical theory because, he says, it merely investigates the ‘existential condition for the possibility of the “morally” good and for that of the “morally” evil.’”<sup>10</sup> Contrary to Philipse's assertions that Heidegger's hostility to lists of particular moral laws precludes him from providing a genuine ethics, such hostility must be seen as arising in response to the tendency to characterize such laws in terms of a type of objective presence that is incompatible with Dasein's way of being qua temporalizing care. Thus in *The Essence of Human Freedom* Heidegger will claim that “what is crucial for understanding the moral law, therefore, is not that we come to know any formula, or that some value is held up before us. It is not a matter of a table of values hovering over us, as if individual human beings were only realizers of the law in the same way that individual tables realize the essence of tablehood.”<sup>11</sup> What he rejects in his renunciation of “ethics” is the philosophical tradition's attribution of an inappropriate ontological status to these moral laws and the beings who are meant to realize them. As Olafson argues, the tradition “simply postulates that there is a model—an archetype—of some kind to which our actions are to conform. As it is typically understood, this model has a distinctly thinglike or *vorhanden* character.”<sup>12</sup> Though Olafson intimates that the problem with this model is the understanding of temporality with

which it is operating—since it cannot account for the character of repetition at work when ethical norms direct one to repeat “the same action in the same circumstances”<sup>13</sup>—he fails to examine these temporal dimensions in any detail. In the following discussion it will become clearer how the appropriate model for understanding the ontological constraint that the other’s presence places on me—a constraint from which I cannot simply choose to be released—is based on Dasein’s originary temporality coming into ecstatic contact with the temporality of the other.

### Ends in Ourselves

How, then, do we experience the fundamental thing/person distinction, and in what way does the encounter with the latter always involve both a dimension of particularity and a type of unavoidable *claim*? Heidegger’s reference to the difference between a living other and a human corpse is interesting in this regard, for it demonstrates both his general failure to discuss Dasein’s embodiment and, perhaps, why he feels justified in doing so: the distinction between the corpse and the living other seems not to be a *physical* difference, but an ontological one. In death the way of being of the other—the *presence* of the other qua Dasein—is gone. And the objectively present bodily remains provide—perhaps better than anything else—an example of the immediate experience of the difference between Dasein and thing. When the other dies,

their being-in-the-world is as such no more. Their still-being-in-the-world is that of merely being on hand as a corporeal thing. The unique change-over of an entity from the kind of being belonging to Dasein, whose character is being-in-the-world, to a bare something which is still only on hand is especially evident here. This “still being on hand” is the extreme counterinstance to the foregoing kind of being of this entity. Strictly speaking, we can no longer even say that something like a human body is still on hand. We must not deceive ourselves. For with the dying and the death of others, an entity is indeed still on hand, but certainly not their Dasein as such. (*HCT* 310)

The corpse’s on-handness provides an “extreme counterinstance” to its prior way of being, but what exactly distinguishes the two? It cannot be movement, since any horror-movie fan can attest to the fact that moving corpses do not a person make. Indeed, the example of horror movies may help us, interestingly, since what horrifies us in the spectacle of

animated corpses is precisely the amalgamation of thing-like body with the remnants of meaningful behavior. These monsters are engaged in purposive action, but it is no longer anchored in the finite care that gives it its human meaning. The source of discomfort in this type of horror movie, I would argue, lies precisely in its violation of this ontological distinction between person and thing. Being exposed to such ontological hybrids creates not simply fear but a kind of deep existential unease.

Horror movies aside, we can see that Heidegger follows Kant quite closely in answering the question of what distinguishes Dasein from things: it is not its body or its status as “rational animal”—that is, *simply* its capacity for purposive action, as the zombie example indicates. Rather, the corpse and the person are differentiated primarily by the existential self-givenness—the care-defined first-person having to be—that leads Kant to characterize persons as purposive “ends in themselves” and prompts Heidegger to describe Dasein in terms of mineness or being-for-the-sake of itself: “The *essence of person*, the *personality*, consists in self-responsibility. Kant expressly emphasizes that the definition of man as rational animal does not suffice, for a being can be rational without being capable of acting on behalf of itself, of being practical for itself” (EHF 179–80). Heidegger is in agreement with Kant on this—as on so many things<sup>14</sup>—noting that it is only in the structure of the for-the-sake-of that Kant can gain the possibility of “distinguishing *ontologically* between *beings that are egos* and *beings that are not egos*, between *subject* and *object*” (BPP 138). It is this character of mineness that accounts for the sharp distinction between persons and things: “The Dasein exists; that is to say, it is for the sake of its own capacity-to-be-in-the-world. Here there comes to be the structural moment that motivated Kant to define the person ontologically as an end, without inquiring into the specific structure of purposiveness and the question of its ontological possibility” (BPP 170).

For the most part, then, Heidegger agrees with Kant’s person/thing distinction and the basis on which he makes it—Dasein’s purposive mineness. At the end of the day, however, Heidegger is troubled by Kant’s failure to examine the underlying structures of this existential responsibility. As a result he reaches the conclusion that despite Kant’s best efforts to sharply distinguish between person and thing, he ultimately fails to do so and treats the person as another kind of natural entity.<sup>15</sup> Heidegger’s analyses in *Being and Time* are aimed at overcoming this failure by showing Dasein’s status as an “end in itself” to be grounded in its ecstatic, finite, temporal particularity. The finitude and particularity of Heideggerian self-responsibility are therefore in sharp contrast to the anonymity of Kant’s law-giving universal rationality. John Llewelyn notes

that “the Kantian account of personality is given in terms of reason and a moral law which, far from inflating the ego, deflates it to the point of impersonality . . . This is one reason why Heidegger’s interpretation of Kant is so significant. It offsets the threat of anonymity by underlining Dasein’s *Jemeinigkeit* and being towards death.”<sup>16</sup>

Though we cannot address whether an adequate interpretation of Kant’s moral theory would be able to answer these accusations, Heidegger clearly recognized both its strengths and its seeming weakness. His reinterpretation aims at maintaining these strengths while avoiding the difficulties associated with an anonymous account of Dasein’s status as ultimate for the sake of which—difficulties which include the fact that such a position (1) cannot offer a compelling account of *why* one would or should take on *self-responsibility* for *universal* rationality, and (2) undermines the ability to respect the other in the concrete particularity of her being, rather than simply as an instantiation of universal reason. In this latter sense, Heidegger’s reformulation of Kant can succeed in overcoming the very difficulty that Sartre finds in Heidegger’s own position. By pointing out the temporalizing finitude and particularity that underlie Dasein’s status as end in itself, Heidegger provides a more personal understanding of this self-giveness—attempting, thereby, to continue and deepen Kant’s fundamental insights regarding the personhood that distinguishes us from things.<sup>17</sup>

### The Mineness of the Other

It seems clear that I am able to make such a person/object distinction when the person under consideration is *me*—since I *am* this mineness way of being that characterizes the personhood in question—but in what way can I experience the mineness of the other? The very notion seems paradoxical. Though it seems contrary to claim that I may somehow encounter the other’s mineness, Heidegger is clear that he does not mean mineness or “I-ness” to refer only to me but not to you. Rather, he is interested in articulating the structures of selfhood that characterize both the “I” and the “thou.” Thus in *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* he claims that

the object of inquiry is not the individual essence of my self, but it is the essence of mineness and selfhood as such. Likewise, if “I” is the object of ontological interpretation, then this is not the individual I-ness of my self, but I-ness in its metaphysical neutrality; we call this neutral

I-ness “egoicity” . . . I-ness does not mean the factual ego distinguished from the thou; egoicity means, rather, the I-ness at the basis of the thou, which prevents an understanding of the thou factually as an alter ego . . . a thou is what it is, only qua its self, and likewise for the “I.” Therefore I usually use the expression “selfhood” [*Selbstheit*] for metaphysical I-ness, for egoicity. For the “self” can be said equally of the I and the thou: “I-myself,” “you-yourself,” but not “thou-I.” (*MFL* 188)

Though he does not pursue the matter in any detail, to experience another Dasein *as* Dasein would involve experiencing him as a *self*. Thus, I must in some sense encounter the concrete and particular “having to be-ness” of the other’s existence. This does not mean, then, that I apply some abstract category “selfhood” to the other and attempt to ascertain if he meets its parameters. Nor does it imply that I must experience the individuating mineness of the other’s existence as in some sense mine—just as I do not experience the equipmentality of equipment by existing in some sense as equipment. Such talk of egoicity and selfhood and mineness also cannot be read as amounting to a Cartesian subjectivism that Heidegger simply failed to escape, as thinkers like Jacques Taminiaux have argued. While Taminiaux acknowledges that Heidegger’s critique is aimed at overcoming the weakness of Descartes’s approach—he notes, for example, Heidegger’s recognition of the fact that there is a “nonradical element remaining in the Cartesian *sum* . . . the character of ‘mineness’ of the *sum*, its *Jemeinigkeit*, is somehow neutralized”<sup>18</sup>—Taminiaux nevertheless claims that Heidegger fails to radicalize this “nonradical element,” despite his efforts to do so. Though Taminiaux argues that such radicalizing efforts include favoring Leibniz over Descartes as an intellectual predecessor (because of the former’s emphasis on the appetitive aspect of existing), he claims that Heideggerian fundamental ontology remains a “reinforcement of the Cartesian legacy” in which Dasein is a type of exclusively *self*-directed transcendental subject.<sup>19</sup> But emphasizing that mineness characterizes the selfhood of both the I and the thou—that both you and I exist in a first-person having to be in the world—does not amount to reinforcing the solipsism of the Cartesian legacy. If this were indeed the case, it would be impossible to experience the other as such. But the nature of the individuation that the notion of mineness picks out does not signify that “Dasein is always engaged in the care of itself, and of itself alone, and that Dasein wills itself exclusively.”<sup>20</sup> Indeed, Heidegger argues that interpreting the claim that Dasein exists for the sake of itself as a type of solipsistic egoism is to completely misunderstand his meaning: “In fact, if this were the sense of the claim of the ontology of Dasein, then it would indeed be madness. But then neither

would it be explicable why one would need an analysis of Dasein in order to assert such outrageous nonsense" (*MFL* 186).

As we have shown in the previous chapter, Dasein's mineness—its existential self-responsibility—can only be understood in terms of the temporal structures that define its way of being since "temporality makes possible the Dasein in its ontological constitution" (*BPP* 280), and "every character of the being of Dasein is governed by this fundamental determination" (*HCT* 154). Thus Heidegger not only uses the term *Jemeinigkeit* to refer to the fundamental character of Dasein as mineness, he also uses the term *Jeweiligkeit* in order to more explicitly express its temporal meaning:

The fundamental character of the being of Dasein is therefore first adequately grasped in the determination, *an entity which is in the to-be-it-at-its-time*. This "in each particular instance" [*je*], "at the (its) time" [*jeweilig*], or the structure of the "particular while" [*Jeweiligkeit*] is constitutive for every character of being of this entity. That is, there is simply no Dasein which would be as Dasein that would not in its very sense be "*at its time*," *temporally particular* [*jeweilig*es]. This character belongs ineradicably to Dasein insofar as it is. (*HCT* 153)

As we have already noted, however, this temporal specificity is far from being solipsistic in structure—on the contrary, it is defined by a sameness brought into ecstatic relation with the otherness of past and future, of worldly events, of other Dasein, and of structures of significance. Though time is, for Heidegger, the "true principle of individuation"<sup>21</sup>—it is an individuation that occurs in relation not only to the finitude of its being-toward-death, but also in relation to the alterity of other Dasein. Indeed, Heidegger makes clear at the very outset of *Being and Time* that Dasein's being is an ecstasis that nevertheless permits individuation: "The transcendence of the being of Da-sein is a distinctive one since in it lies the possibility and the necessity of the most radical *individuation*" (*BT* 38/34).

Understood in terms of temporality, then, it becomes clearer how it is possible for one transcending Dasein to encounter another being so defined by temporalizing mineness: "Facticity and individuation are grounded in temporality, which, as temporalization, unifies itself in itself and individuates in the metaphysical sense, as *principium individuationis*. But this individuation is the presupposition for the primordial commerce between Dasein and Dasein" (*MFL* 209). Indeed, Heidegger will claim elsewhere that this temporal particularity is what differentiates a "who"

from a “what”: “Belonging to this being, called Dasein, is the *temporal particularity of an I* which is this being. When we ask about this entity, the Dasein, we must at least ask, *Who* is this entity?, and not, *What* is this entity?” (HCT 236–37). Encountering the temporal particularity of another now-saying I—and the world-constituting manner in which I take heed of such encounters—is endemic to Dasein’s most basic temporal structures. Thus in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, Heidegger attempts to answer three questions—“What is world? What is individuation? What is finitude?” (FCM 171)—all of which turn out to be unified because “our three questions themselves reach back into the *question concerning the essence of time*” (FCM 171). And since these temporal structures are characterized by both individuating originary time and by the temporal self-expression that brings this individuated selfhood into ecstatic contact with otherness, Taminiaux’s interpretation of existential mineness is off the mark. Mineness is not solipsism. Rather, Dasein is given to itself as a particular finite way of being in time that is always already heedful of the presence of other particular finite beings in time.

As Alfred Schutz notes in his analysis of the mutual immediacy of the we-relationship, there is the “pure awareness of the *presence* of another person. His presence, it should be emphasized, not his specific traits.”<sup>22</sup> Though I meet others through the worldly activities and objects with which they are concerned—their specific traits—they do not thereby take on the innerworldly within-timeness that characterizes things—“they are not encountered as objectively present thing-persons” (BT 120/113). They are defined, rather, by the transcending, world-expressive toward-which of Dasein’s ecstatically temporal way of being: “These others do not stand in the referential context of the enviroing world but are encountered . . . in the ‘with which’ of their preoccupation (field, boat) as the ones who are preoccupied with it. They are encountered as they are in their being-in-the-world” (HCT 240). Others are resistant to being encountered as mere innerworldly entities and Heidegger is quite explicit that this is so:

The worldhood of the world appresents not only world-things—the enviroing world in the narrower sense—but also, *although not as worldly being*, the co-Dasein of others and my own self. (HCT 241–42, emphasis mine)

This being of others, who are encountered along with environmental things, is for all that not a being handy and on hand, which belongs to the environmental things, but a *co-Dasein*. This demonstrates that even

in a worldly encounter, the Dasein encountered does not become a thing but retains its Dasein-character and is still encountered by way of the world. (*HCT* 239)

The others, though they are encountered in the world, really do not have and never have the world's kind of being . . . The possibility of the worldly encounter of Dasein and co-Dasein is indeed constitutive of the being-in-the-world of Dasein and so of every other, *but it never becomes something worldly as a result.* (*HCT* 242, emphasis mine)

The other Dasein always retains her Dasein-character—her way of being as originary temporality speaking itself out in a shared world-forming—despite being encountered from the world. As Heidegger says, the world itself is “what happens in being-with-one-another” (*HCT* 278). This distinction between the innerworldly thing and the world-constituting other who is nevertheless encountered in the world is what ensures the ability of one Dasein to encounter the other in its selfhood, in its temporalizing being-entrusted with its own way of being in the world.

This characterization of Dasein as simultaneously world-constituting and innerworldly brings to mind Kant's distinction between noumenal and phenomenal dimensions of the self, and returns us to our previous discussion regarding respect and the relationship between recognition and claim in *Fürsorge*. In keeping with our earlier comments regarding the tendency to overemphasize authenticity, commentators have attempted to map Heidegger's notions of authenticity and inauthenticity onto these Kantian notions of the noumenal and the phenomenal.<sup>23</sup> But if we consider Kant's characterization of persons as both “intelligible beings determined by the moral law (by virtue of freedom), and *on the other side* as active in the sensible world in accordance with this determination,”<sup>24</sup> it seems more in keeping with my distinction between Dasein's innerworldly (*Mitda-sein*) and world-constituting (*Mitsein*) dimensions, both of which are features of the first-personal structure of Dasein's temporalizing particularity that precede and make possible its authentic and inauthentic manifestations. In light of the fact that “mineness belongs to existing Da-sein as the condition of the possibility of authenticity and inauthenticity” (*BT* 53/49), these two modalities are better understood as ways of being-toward this fundamentally ecstatic, complex structure of Dasein's worldly and world-expressive existence. Experiencing the distinction between persons and things cannot be dependent on a prior authenticity, then, despite the tendency to equate the world-constituting nature of mineness with authenticity. As Raffoul notes, “Authenticity, choosing oneself, and inauthenticity, fleeing oneself, are *both* possible



on the basis of primordial selfhood, which is therefore *neutral* with regard to them.”<sup>25</sup>

For Heidegger, as with Kant, this having of oneself to be defines Dasein’s existence regardless of whether we have explicitly and authentically taken over or lived up to this way of being. Indeed, very few beings will succeed in counting as persons if the distinction between persons and things is limited to those beings displaying or experiencing *authentic* self-responsibility. It is for this reason, Allen Wood notes, that in *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone* Kant designates *humanity* as an end in itself—and not moral *personality*. This seems bizarre since “personality seems ‘higher’ than humanity in that it has essential reference to *moral* value, moral responsibility, and the ‘positive’ concept of freedom, where humanity includes none of these.”<sup>26</sup> Kant characterizes the fundamental distinction between persons and things on the basis of humanity, however, because our obligation to preserve and respect rational nature is unconditional; it applies even when self or other is acting contrary to this rational nature. Thus Wood notes how “Kant must deal with the fact that rational nature apparently comes in degrees”: his response is to designate “anything possessing the capacity to set ends and act according to reason as an end in itself, however well or badly it may exercise the capacity.”<sup>27</sup> It is important to note the similarity of Heidegger’s language in this regard: his emphasis is on beings *capable* of explicit self-responsibility and accountability—not just on those displaying its actualized form but on those whose way of being allows for the possibility of such owned self-responsibility. The condition of being able to succeed or fail at living up to my self-responsibility—having myself to be, whether responsibly or irresponsibly—just *is* Dasein’s way of being qua mineness.

The foregoing discussion regarding respect and the distinction between capacity and realization brings to mind John Drummond’s work on phenomenological approaches to respect, where—like Darwall—he distinguishes between respect for meritorious persons and respect for persons as such. According to Drummond, “Respect for meritorious persons is an affective response to the other as a rational agent committed to freely chosen and true—or at least defensible—goods,” while “Respect for persons as such is an affective response to the presence of a rational agent *capable* of such a commitment.”<sup>28</sup> The respect we feel for persons as such, Drummond argues, is derivative of “the value of the realized authentic life [which] is so estimable and central to our shared humanity that it would be incoherent not to respect the mere possession of the capacities without which that life is impossible”<sup>29</sup> In both kinds of respect, argues Drummond, we recognize the other as either potentially or actually a “rational free agent possessed of certain capacities for authentic

thinking, feeling, and acting”<sup>30</sup> and we engage in respectful behavior because we value this nature. On Drummond’s account, though Dasein’s way of being toward the other is not limited to those who have actualized their potential for a self-responsible, authentic life, this being-toward is dependent on recognizing their *capacity* to do so.

Drummond’s distinction between esteem-based and person-based respect echoes Darwall’s distinction between appraisal and recognition respect mentioned above. Though both Darwall and Drummond make a similar distinction between such modes of respect, however, they articulate a profoundly different relationship between the two, and the connection between recognition and claim operative within them. Drummond characterizes respect as a response to certain “cognizable, descriptive features of the other”<sup>31</sup> and “persons as such” are owed respect only on the basis of their *capacity*—however unrealized—to live what is *truly* valuable: the actualized self-responsible life. In Heideggerian language, this would imply that my obligation to respect the other is not due to her being another Dasein, but due to her *potential* for achieving authenticity. Darwall emphasizes, in contrast, that there is no set of features that could *justify* the respect that we owe to persons. This allows Darwall to avoid Drummond’s somewhat counterintuitive conclusion about recognition-respect being *derivative* of esteem-respect. According to Darwall—advocating a position that is highly reminiscent of Levinas—recognition respect is not derivative of some other condition but is an immediate acknowledgment of the other’s status as such.<sup>32</sup> Recognition respect is not a consequence of the *potential* authority of the other person’s esteem-worthy lifestyle, but a second-person acknowledgment of the *actual* authority of the other to make particular types of claim on me. Contrary to Drummond, who considers the other’s authority to be derivative of the recognition of her potential to actualize what is truly valuable, Darwall argues that acknowledging the other’s status as co-Dasein cannot be dependent on some theoretically—but not actually—realized capacities. Rather, it must arise in the concrete immediacy of the encounter with the other as she *now* is. In this sense, Darwall’s reading is more in keeping with Kant’s distinction between humans and things, which is not based on the capacity for moral exemplarity, but on the reality of rational humanity. In contrast to the third-person tenor of Kant’s account, however—the anonymity of the universal rationality that characterizes his human/thing distinction—Darwall is advocating a type of second-personal picture insofar as the other’s dignity cannot be equated with the possession of a certain nature (with Drummond’s capacity for realizing the valuable life of autonomy, for example), since this “misses the authority to demand or ‘exact’ respect.”<sup>33</sup> In other words, it does not account for the first-person

experience of *being claimed* that characterizes the encounter with the other: “The dignity of persons consists, not just in requirements that are rooted in our common nature as free and rational, but also in our equal authority to require or demand of one another that we comply with these requirements.”<sup>34</sup>

Knowing on a theoretical level that the other belongs to a particular category—person, transcendental subject, and so on—is not a prior condition for experiencing him as a being who demands that I heed his temporalizing presence. Rather, the experience of being claimed is itself *constitutive* of the recognition. The manner in which recognition respect operates, then—the acknowledgment of the other’s personhood—concerns “not how something is to be evaluated or appraised, but how our *relations* to it are to be *regulated* or *governed*. Broadly speaking, to respect something in this sense is to *give it standing in one’s relations to it*.”<sup>35</sup> Darwall thus expresses the way in which encounters with another person involve a moment wherein my way of being-toward that other must take him into account or “give standing” to his way of being. This moment of claim is prior to him meeting certain criteria that could be recognized from a third-person perspective; it involves, rather, an immediate experience of the limit posed by his presence. As Levinas puts exactly this point in “Is Ontology Fundamental?": “The other (*autrui*) is not an object of comprehension first and an interlocutor second. The two relations are intertwined. In other words, the comprehension of the other (*autrui*) is inseparable from his invocation.”<sup>36</sup>

As is no doubt clear, my contention is that Heidegger falls much more firmly in the Darwall/Levinas-style camp than the Drummond camp, despite the many interpreters—including Sartre and Levinas himself—who read Heidegger as claiming that the other Dasein’s claim to intersubjective partnership is only justified insofar as she possesses the set of qualities that allow her to be subsumed to the category being-with. As we have already indicated, however, Dasein’s categories must be understood in the concrete texture of Dasein’s existing, and this means that the nature of encounters between Dasein cannot be elaborated solely in their third-person aspect. While Heidegger recognizes that it is possible to engage in such abstract characterizations of Dasein and its being-in-the-world—including an articulation of the qualities through which the other is experienced as other Dasein—his intent in the existential analytic is to provide a thorough phenomenological examination of Dasein’s existing in its first-person particularity. Understood as such, a third-person account of the Dasein-to-Dasein relationship is insufficient; what is needed is an analysis of how the other is actually experienced in the immediacy of an encounter in which one Dasein meets the particu-

larity of the other. This approach, as we noted above, is evident in Heidegger's attempt to ground Kant's person/thing distinction in the concrete temporal particularity of *this* Dasein. Though Drummond may be right that there are aspects of the other's nature that account for or justify the fact that I recognize her as other Dasein and not as innerworldly object—namely, her way of being qua originary temporality speaking itself out into the world—such justification is secondary; it is neither necessary nor sufficient for recognition to occur in the immediacy of encounter. The immediacy of the Dasein-to-Dasein acknowledgment, when characterized in terms of justification misleads us into the belief that it involves some type of inferential judgment that the other belongs to the concept or category “person.” Nothing could be further from the truth: as Heidegger notes, “When the others are encountered personally or, as we can most appropriately put it here, ‘in the flesh,’ in their bodily presence, this being of the other is not that of the ‘subject’ or the ‘person’ in the sense which is taken conceptually in philosophy” (*HCT* 240). Rather, the other's way of being qua other now-sayer can only be understood insofar as it is lived through a second person *being-limited* or *relativizing* of my own now-saying. As we will discuss further below, Dasein encounters the other through the experience of being claimed—*not* through an abstract interpretive category.

### The Other's Claim

Recall from the previous chapter the manner in which the ecstatic encounter with other Dasein occurs on the most basic level: in the mutual taking heed of the other's temporalizing in the originary present. Other Dasein require me to *accommodate* my temporalizing to their temporalizing through the establishment of binding public standards. “One orients oneself *toward it* [a public measure], so that it must somehow be available for everyone” (*BT* 411/378). Dasein's temporalizing essentially involves an ecstatic encounter with the temporalizing of the others whose now-saying *I must take into account*. All of Dasein's time-reckonings, regardless of its care-driven projects, “must still be in conformity with the time given by the others” (*BT* 418/384). For Heidegger, then, the other's presence involves a type of *demand* that I accommodate myself to it, and this experience of claim is *prior* to, and a condition for, public norms and universal definitions of human nature. Indeed, the heedfulness characteristic of the intersubjective encounter—shared temporal measure—is responsible for instituting the very publicity and universality that such

third-person accounts make use of. The immediacy of recognition that occurs on the most fundamental level of the *Fürsorge* encounter does not involve an explicit cognizing or reflection, then, but occurs in the very way we navigate time *in light of* the other's presence. The limitation of the I by the other occurs in the most primordial dimensions of Dasein's ecstatic temporality, in its pre-reflective and immediate taking heed of the other's temporal expression. This limiting and relativizing of my now-saying by the other is, we can recall, the essential requirement for the establishment of the sequentiality of everyday time, since sequentiality depends on the recognition of times other than my own—*nows other than this now*. Experiencing a now that is simultaneous but transcendent to my own could not be accomplished as a type of third-person imaginative variation on my own—since this presupposes the very temporal alterity that is instituted in the encounter with the other.

On Heidegger's account, then, such encounters involve a type of immediate claim to temporal acknowledgment—an acknowledgment that involves some minimal degree of heedful self-limiting. The notion of *limit* is fundamental here, for it allows us to reconcile the dimensions of recognition and obligation mentioned above. What distinguishes the encounter with the other Dasein is the experience of the other as a particular type of check or boundary: "What constitutes the nature of the person, its *essentia*, and limits all choice, which means that it is determined as freedom, is an object of respect" (*BPP* 138). Such an interpretation is echoed in Heidegger's invocation of Kant's notion of the *personalitas moralis*, where he quotes Kant: "Rational beings are called *persons* because their nature . . . singles them out already as ends in themselves, as something which may not be used merely as a means, and hence in this degree limits all arbitrary choice (and is an object of respect)."<sup>37</sup> Respect, for Heidegger, is a type of encounter that involves an openness and responsiveness to the experience of being limited and claimed: thus Heidegger will characterize "Kant's notion of 'having respect for' as being-open for the Ought as the moral law's mode of being-encountered" (*EHF* 22). I experience the other person *as* a person through the limiting of my own temporal expression in the face of her temporal alterity—and respect is the name of this experience.

This is an uncommon way in which to read Heidegger, considering the many Levinas-inspired interpretations claiming that, despite Heidegger's assertions to the contrary, Dasein's fundamental egotism is evident in the solipsism of mineness. As Levinas claims, for example, "In the finitude of time the 'being-toward-death of *Being and Time* sketches out—despite all the renewals of handed down philosophy that this brilliant book brings—the meaningful remains enclosed within the imma-

nence of the *Jemeinigkeit* of the *Dasein* that *has to be*" ("DR" 115). I hope to have shown that this is a false reading of Heidegger's position, however; a falsity, one may argue, that is likely rooted in a hyperbolic effort on Levinas's part to distance himself from a position that was in many respects similar to his own. Understanding the encounter with the other as involving temporal alterity shares similarities with Levinas's idea of diachrony or the "time of the other"—the fact that the other has a past that will never be available to me as a present. As Levinas claims of the relation to the other in "Diachrony and Representation," "This way of being avowed—or this devotion [to the other]—is time. It remains a relationship to the other as other, and not a reduction of the other to the same. It is transcendence" ("DR" 115). If we recall the profound debt that Levinas acknowledged that he owed to Heidegger's thought, these similarities no longer seem so bizarre. Though there are clearly significant differences between Heidegger and Levinas's positions, it is my contention that despite the many attempts to portray them as fundamentally at odds with each other—both by Levinas and by others—Levinas and Heidegger (and indeed Husserl) should be understood as existing much more on a continuum characterized not by unbridgeable divides but by a gradual progression toward understanding the nature of time as "a relationship to the other as other." Heidegger's relationship to Levinas's notion of the diachrony of the intersubjective encounter becomes an area for further investigation, then, once we recognize that the Heideggerian self must be understood in terms of a temporal particularity in heedful relation to the temporal particularity of others—despite Levinas's many attempts to portray *Dasein* as fundamentally solipsistic. Though these are clearly controversial claims that cannot be adequately argued for here, Heidegger's position can and should be read as advocating a position on temporality somewhat similar to Levinas's own: namely, that "time itself refers to this situation of the face-to-face with the Other."<sup>38</sup>

Though Heidegger's characterization of the encounter with other *Dasein* as a type of *originary limit* on my temporal self-expression is still a far cry from a fully articulated sense of moral obligation, he falls into the Levinas/Darwall camp—though on a much more minimal level, admittedly—insofar as he characterizes the intersubjective encounter as an experience of always already having responded to the demand that I accommodate my temporalizing self-expression to that of another. Despite the tendency to conceal the particularity of *Dasein*'s way of being behind the anonymity of general standards, then, this particularity is evident in every encounter with other *Dasein*. This is clear insofar as we are limited by the presence of the other's temporal alterity and seek to overcome this limitation through establishing and maintaining public measures to level

down the difference—the most obvious being vulgar time’s imposition of clock regulations for all life. Despite such efforts, however, the other’s originary temporality always continues to speak itself out in and through these worldly norms.

### Everyday Modes of Acknowledgment

Such heedful acknowledgment of the other’s temporalizing presence does not generally involve explicit cognizing or reflection, then, but occurs in our very relationship to time. This being-limited by the other’s now is evident not only in the world-constituting establishment of worldly norms, but in every Dasein-to-Dasein encounter. This is so because even in the most basic modes of encounter the presence of other Dasein is structured in terms of their temporal ecstasis. Each of us is unique in our temporal particularity and in the past experiences and the future anticipations that this particularity generates. The consequence of this fact is that any attempt to predict the other’s behavior can never be completely successful. As James Mensch notes in *Ethics and Selfhood: Alterity and the Phenomenology of Obligation*: “If it were, the other would be my double.<sup>39</sup> The other Dasein’s selfhood is rooted in the finitude and uniqueness of its originary temporality and though this temporality always speaks itself out into the shared world, its ecstatic character makes itself known in a past that I can never fully access and a future that I can never entirely predict. With every experience of the other’s resistance to perfect predictability, I am forced to acknowledge the existence of a temporal stretch that is not my own. The other’s excessiveness to my expectations—whether registered in delight or fear or in greater efforts to control and manage—reveals the other’s temporal alterity. “Alterity shows itself in the fact that the other shows himself as other than what I project from my perspective. He or she exceeds the intentions that are based on this . . . this very exceeding manifests the openness of the future.”<sup>40</sup> Thus the other’s temporal alterity gives her projects and attunements a foreignness and unpredictability constitutive of my experience of her as something other than me and as something other than mere thing in the world. My continuous failure to entirely control what the future brings is testament to the fact that being-in-the-world is a constant project of heedfully acknowledging a temporalizing presence other than my own. The other person’s presence thus makes it impossible for me to understand the world solely in my own terms—an experience that Mensch refers to as “decentering”: “The fact that the determinants of this action—his

memories and anticipations—do not appear prevents me from reducing the anticipated future to my projections of my past. His presence in other words, is that of the future in the sense of the new. It is that of the contingency and openness of the future.”<sup>41</sup> Characterized thus, we can see how Dasein’s very experience of time is shot through with the presence of the other—an experience that shifts Dasein’s self-understanding from the simple confines of the I to the complex, heedful responsivity of the *we*.

Accounting for the experience of the other as a kind of “decentering” is reminiscent of Sartre and his claim that the contingency and alterity of the other subject creates a shift in my relationship to my own possibilities. In the presence of the other, he argues, my possibilities become mere probabilities (*BN* 352–55). Unlike Sartre, however, Heidegger recognizes that it is a *temporal* alterity that is responsible for this decentering experience. And because of the simultaneity of our now saying—a temporal expressiveness that is both shared with the other and expressive of each Dasein’s originary temporality—the Heideggerian account can accommodate a decentering experience that arises without the subject/object dialectic characteristic of Sartre’s approach. For Heidegger, *both* Dasein are simultaneously engaged in the project of speaking themselves out into the world, and it is this very simultaneity that gives rise to the demand for heedfulness. In opposition to Sartre’s position, then, Heidegger’s emphasis on the “double visage” of time accounts for a Dasein-to-Dasein experience of the other’s ecstatic subjectivity that does not require a corresponding experience of one’s own objectification. Though such an encounter is an experience of one’s temporality being limited and placed in relation to the other, this is not a *destruction* of one’s status as ecstatic subjectivity, but an essential element of its very structure. Dasein encounters the others as those who it must heed in its temporal self-expression—but in so doing this expression finds the richness of shared time and worldly meaning. The others do not simply objectify Dasein, then, but help create the very arena in which its selfhood can be meaningful; the arena of shared time that “first makes possible the being of the factual existing self, that being which, as is now well understood, is the meaning of care” (*BT* 419/384–85).

Because we are, so to speak, at the mercy of the others qua temporal co-constitutors of the world—they make a claim on me that I must accommodate, and my very way of being depends on them to find its worldly expression—Heidegger often uses the language of “binding” and “dependence” to characterize being-with others:

Being-with is not being on hand also among other humans; as being-in-the-world it means at the same time being “in bondage”



[*hörig*] to the others, that is, “heeding” and “obeying” them, listening [*hören*] or not listening to them. Being-with has the structure of belonging [*Zu(ge)hörigkeit*] to the other . . . This listening to one another, in which being-with cultivates itself, is more accurately a compliance in being-with-one-another, a co-enactment in concern. The negative modes of enactment, non-compliance, not listening, opposition, and the like are really only privative modes of belonging itself. (*HCT* 266)

We will be analyzing the notion of a “co-enactment in concern” in our discussion of discourse below and examining the “cultivation” of being-with that occurs in listening in greater detail in chapter 7. The point of import here, however, is the fact that on the most fundamental level the others are present in and through the public sphere as those who one must heed; those to whom one is obligated—“in bondage”—and upon whom one is “dependent.” This presence is not merely to others in general but to the specificity of the particular other whose presence claims me: “The existential relationship cannot be objectified. Its basic essence is one’s being concerned and letting oneself be concerned. [It is] a responding, a claim, an answering for, a being responsive on grounds of the clearedness of the relationship” (*ZS* 185). Indeed, Heidegger explicitly notes that it is this immediacy of involvement or dependence that distinguishes the concrete presence of a particular other from mere open intersubjectivity: “The distinction between a personal meeting and the other’s being gone takes effect on the basis of this environmental encounter of one another, this environmentally appresented being-with-one-another. This with-one-another is an environmental and worldly concern with one another, having to do with one another in the one world, *being dependent on one another*” (*HCT* 240).

For the most part, however, we do not *explicitly* acknowledge the other’s temporal alterity or the manner in which we are dependent on it. Just like everybody else, we simply engage in the worldly structures that give our behavior the very predictability that allows for the smooth, uncomplicated interaction that defines our everyday practices. We drive immediately into the intersection because the light has turned green, for example—trusting our lives to the fact that others will stop on red (except in Houston). It is, in fact, rare for others to entirely escape our predictions in such a way that we are forced to *explicitly* acknowledge their alterity. But for Heidegger, this is not because this originary temporal particularity and unpredictability does not characterize our experience of the other Dasein’s being, but because we specifically design standards and practices to accommodate and manage it. Heidegger therefore generally characterizes our dependence on the others in terms of

the anonymity and averageness of public norms—ways in which we have *institutionalized* this dependence to such an extent that we no longer recognize it as such. However, though we often fall into an inauthentic way of thinking that encourages us to view the standards governing self and other as thinglike, unchanging, and perfectly predictable, they do not thereby achieve a law-like hold that necessitates conformity—despite the inauthentic belief that they do or Heidegger’s own hysteria over the recalcitrance of the average. Underlying this averageness is the alterity of the other’s temporal ecstasis. And it is the very foreignness of the other’s experience, memory, anticipations, motivations—rooted in the finite particularity of his way of being qua *Jeweiligkeit*—that *necessitates* the imposition of these public standards.

### The Other Self

One may wonder, however, if the very transition to the shared public world distorts or conceals the specificity of the other Dasein. Is the other’s mineness some type of private inner state that is ultimately inaccessible, disappearing into anonymity as soon as the other Dasein participates in public roles and norms—leaving only a kind of trace or absence? Mensch suggests such a view when he claims that “in the common world, inner time gives itself as not being able to be given. It gives itself as something that, from the perspective of the common world, appears as a disruption of the given.”<sup>42</sup> Despite acknowledging the accessibility of the other by the I, then, Mensch ultimately characterizes the other’s temporality in terms of “disruption” because “the temporality of the ‘I can’ is based on elements that cannot appear in the objective world.”<sup>43</sup> Is Heidegger’s position condemned to a similar conclusion—that the other is never entirely accessible because an inner core of private subjectivity remains that is incapable of being translated into the shared world? Does Dasein’s mineness mean that it is characterized by a kind of radical privacy such that one Dasein can never fully experience the other as a self?

If we recall the discussion of intentionality and mineness from chapter 2, it will become clear why such questions are misguided. The world-constituting presence of the other—her temporalizing particularity, her mineness—shines through the common world and its anonymous public roles. Just as chapter 2 distinguished between the individuating mineness that is the source of one’s *commitment* to norms and the public meanings and measures that provide these norms with their form and content, so too is this distinction operative in *Fürsorge*. Though the

other is encountered in terms of the publicly available roles and meanings delineated by the shared world, the existential self-responsibility that is a necessary condition for the binding force of these norms—the fact that the other Dasein is *committed* and *responsive* to them—is an expression of that individual’s care for who she is to be. “‘I’ means the being that is concerned *about* the being of the being which it is” (BT 322/296), and this concern is expressed in the other Dasein’s purposive commitment to the various meanings and measures that will allow it to assess its success in being.<sup>44</sup> Thus as we noted in chapter 2, Dasein’s subsumption to these shared norms must not be read as a sort of *absence* of self in everydayness—either of the self, *or of the other*. The other’s responsive commitment to the same public measures allows one to recognize that others too orient their behavior according to standards of appropriateness—a possibility grounded in Dasein’s basic way of being as an entity that strives to meet, maintain, and develop these standards because it cares about succeeding in its having to be. Robert Brandom makes a similar claim regarding the role others play in establishing and maintaining public norms when he notes that to recognize other Dasein as such is to treat the other’s behaviors and responses as equally authoritative over “appropriateness boundaries.”<sup>45</sup> Olafson’s account in *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics* also interprets Heidegger’s notion of *Mitsein* as involving the fact that “we must see in another human being someone whose observations are in principle relevant to a determination of truth (and falsity) in just the way our own are.”<sup>46</sup> Experiencing the other Dasein’s responsive commitment to meeting and establishing norms of appropriateness that can be publicly instituted—and that do not simply flow from the “private” constraints of a means/end rationality—is the everyday way in which I can experience the other Dasein’s mineness and temporal particularity—not just as a disruption of the world, but as a creative source of its significance. Recognizing another Dasein *as* Dasein does not arise through a perception of some actor “behind” the actions—it involves understanding particular events *as* actions; in other words, as *commitments* to possible ways for this other to be his or her own self.

It is important to be clear, then, that it is not simply through *conformity* to public standards that one Dasein encounters the other as such—since this might imply that those who challenge or subvert accepted standards are unrecognizable as other Dasein. Rather, a distinction must be made between the *care* for self that commits one to public norms, and the *source* of the norms to which one is committed. This distinction is evident not only in the self, but also in the encounter with all other Dasein. Though our everyday way of being encourages unthinking interpretations of self and others in terms of ready-made public measures and

meanings, and the inauthentic tendency is to simply focus on the content of these standards—the responsive committedness that always operates in and through these standards is the public, worldly expression of the other’s existential self-responsibility and the temporal particularity on which it is grounded.

Dasein’s responsiveness to others as beings committed to public standards is evident, for example, when Heidegger speaks of *distantiality*—that tendency to seek and maintain averageness. Even as representatives of *das Man*, the co-Dasein of others and their efforts to succeed in living out their own care are recognized on some minimal level. Thus distantiality generally involves a heedfulness to *particular* others *in light* of anonymous public norms:

The others are environmentally there with us, their co-Dasein is taken into account, not only because what is of concern has the character of being useful and helpful for others, but also because others provide the same things of concern. In both respects to the others, the being-with them stands in a relationship to them: with regard to the others and to what the others pursue, one’s own concern is more or less effective or useful; in relation to those who provide the exact same things, one’s own concern is regarded as more or less outstanding, backward, appreciated, or the like. (*HCT* 244)

In other words, Dasein assesses itself not only in terms of generalized standards of success and failure, but always in terms of the comparative successes of the particular others who are also attempting to live up to these standards. Though it is true that to a certain extent these others just *are* “the They” comprising these generalized standards, it is important to be clear that Heidegger differentiates between the averageness comprising these generalized standards, Dasein’s impulse toward averageness, and the “distance” from the average that Dasein can assess in itself and the other individuals it encounters. Indeed, despite his emphasis on the “averageness impulse,” he discusses people who are motivated by ambition and intent on maintaining themselves in *not* being average (see *HCT* 244–45). Such an acknowledgment of the particular other’s striving to meet a public norm need not be positive in order for it to count as such acknowledgment:

At first and above all, everyone keeps an eye on the other to see how he will act and what he will say in reply. Being-with-one-another in the Any-one is in no way a leveled and indifferent side-by-side state, but far more one in which we intensely watch and furtively listen in on one another.

This kind of being-with-one-another can work its way into the most intimate relations. Thus, for example, a friendship may no longer and not primarily consist in a resolute and thus mutually generous way of siding with one another in the world, but in a constant and prior watching out for how the other sets out to deal with what is meant by friendship, in a constant check on whether he turns out to be one or not. (*HCT* 280)

It is because the other individual's self-responsible commitment to these shared standards is always operative that it is possible to be with another *as* other—despite the averageness of the roles through which she is encountered.

None of the above can be taken to imply, however, that I can experience the other's being in the same way that she can. Though Heidegger speaks of the Dasein-to-Dasein encounter in terms of "self-transposition" into the other's being,

self-transposition does not mean the factual transference of one existing human being into the interior of another being. Nor does it mean the factual substitution of oneself for another being so as to take its place. On the contrary, the other being is precisely supposed to remain *what* it is and *how* it is. Transposing oneself into this being means going along with what it is and with how it is . . . [but] this self-transposition does not mean actually putting oneself in the place of the other being and displacing it in the process. (*FCM* 202)

The other remains other throughout the concerned being-toward that grants access to her. Such talk of "transposition" does not mean some type of "projection" of oneself into the other, then. Indeed, such an understanding is precisely the problem with traditional theories of empathy: "The ideas of empathy and projection already presuppose being-with the other and the being of the other with me. Both already presuppose that one has already understood the other as another human being; otherwise, I would be projecting something into the void" (*ZS* 162). Rather than explaining how or why such projection into the other is possible or necessary, such accounts tacitly presuppose the status of the other as a subject into whom such projection is possible—thereby assuming what they pretend to prove.

This conception of self-transposition, one which is also widespread in philosophy, contains a fundamental error precisely because it overlooks the decisive *positive* moment of self-transposition. This moment does not consist in our simply forgetting ourselves as it were and trying our

utmost to act as if we were the other being. On the contrary, it consists precisely in we ourselves being precisely ourselves, and only in this way first bringing about the possibility of ourselves being able to go along with the other being while remaining *other* with respect to it. There can be no going-along-with if the one who wishes and is meant to go along with the other relinquishes himself in advance. (*FCM* 202–3)

Thus the self-transposition into the other is always a particular way for *me* to be. And the more I understand the nature of my own being as temporalizing the more I will be able to understand the nature of my heedful relationship to the other Dasein who share the world with me.

As we will discuss in the next section, “going along” with the other in shared attempts to meet, maintain, and institute worldly meanings and measures—a going along with in which we always remain other—is definitive of the mode of disclosure that Heidegger refers to as *discourse*. Discourse is the everyday way in which a type of shared being-in-the-world with other Dasein is accomplished; a sharing in which the temporal particularity and commitment of the participants are nevertheless implicitly respected and maintained. I understand the other through the world in which I encounter her, but because of her status as co-constitutor of this world and its “remarkable possibility”—“that it lets us encounter Dasein, the alien Dasein as well as my own” (*HCT* 242)—I understand her as *more* than worldly. It is for this reason that Heidegger will say, in critiquing theories of empathy: “I do not understand the other in this artificial way, such that I would have to feel my way into another subject. I understand him from the world in which he is with me, a world which is discovered and understandable through the regard in being-with-one-another” (*HCT* 243). In light of Heidegger’s existential reformulation of understanding, to say that one “understands” the other Dasein is to say that one is skillfully responding to and participating in its mode of being.<sup>47</sup> As our discussion of discourse will demonstrate, the world itself is made available to me—it is discovered and understandable—through my being with other Dasein. “Dasein-with means not only: being also at the same time, even simply qua Dasein, but rather the mode of Being of Dasein first brings authentic sense to the ‘with.’ ‘With’ is to be grasped as participation, whereby foreignness as participationlessness is only an alteration of participation. The ‘with’ therefore has an entirely determined sense and does not simply mean ‘together,’ nor the being-together of such that have the same mode of Being. ‘With’ is a proper way of Being.”<sup>48</sup> My everyday way of being with others is to *participate* in their being or existing like I do—a notion that is essential for understanding what Heidegger means by discourse.

### Discourse: Disclosing *Mitsein*

Discourse is the everyday way that particular Dasein are disclosed as concrete individuals co-constituting the world—a mode of disclosure that is only accomplished by *taking part* in the other's purposive, committed way of being.<sup>49</sup> To more fully determine the everyday way in which one encounters others in solicitude, then, we must examine Heidegger's account of discourse as a type of *co-participation in the other's being-in-the-world*.

Heidegger seems to imply at times that unlike understanding and attunement, discourse is not one of the equiprimordial modes of disclosure. For example, in the introduction to the section on discourse (section 34) he claims that “the fundamental existentials which constitute the being of the there, the disclosedness of being-in-the-world, are attunement and understanding” (BT 160/150). Indeed, he frequently refers to Dasein only in terms of these two modes of disclosure—leading one to doubt that discourse is one of three modes of disclosure equiprimordially disclosing Dasein's being-in-the-world. He claims, for instance, that “it is only because being-in-the-world as understanding and concerned absorption appresents the world that this being-in-the-world can also be concerned with this appresentation of the world explicitly” (HCT 211). Does discourse, then, fail to “appresent the world” as understanding and “concerned absorption” do? This conclusion must be questioned, however, when we recognize that elsewhere he specifically says that “in our previous interpretation of attunement, understanding, interpretation and statement we have constantly made use of this phenomenon [discourse], but have, so to speak, suppressed it in the thematic analysis. *Discourse is existentially equiprimordial with attunement and understanding*” (BT 161/150). As we have seen him do elsewhere in *Being and Time*, Heidegger begins with certain facets of Dasein's way of being—facets that provide an easier way in to the analytic—and later introduces dimensions that must be taken as equiprimordial despite the fact that their complexity demands a more careful introduction. Discourse receives the same treatment and the reason becomes clear when we recognize that it is the mode of disclosure specific to other Dasein. Though each of the different modes of disclosure—attunement, understanding, and discourse—disclose Dasein's being-in-the-world, they bring this to light in different ways; if this were not the case, Heidegger would have no basis for differentiating disclosure into three modes. Though the different modes are equiprimordial dimensions of Dasein's unified care structure, then—and thus intimately linked—nevertheless they can be considered in thematic separation. In doing so we have noted that attunement is the mode of disclosure belonging most specifically to Dasein's thrownness,

while understanding discloses being-in-the-world primarily in terms of its character as project and possibility. Discourse is the mode of disclosure specific to being-in-the-world qua being-with.

Heidegger describes discourse as the “articulation of intelligibility” (BT 161/150). “Articulation” generally means expression, verbalization, communication, as well as marking or being marked by joints. These meanings can be unified; an “articulate” person pronounces or expresses words or ideas such that distinguishable parts are clearly defined or communicated. Since intelligibility is holistic for Heidegger—each particular thing is meaningful in terms of its place in a system of reference—the articulation of intelligibility will involve disclosing the particular thing under consideration as well as the referential context that makes it intelligible *as* the thing it is. “Making manifest through discourse first and foremost has the sense of interpretive appresentation of the environment under concern” (HCT 262). Heidegger also claims that discourse is the “*existential-ontological foundation of language*,” while language is its *worldly* mode of being (BT 161/150). To understand discourse, then, requires showing how it both (1) articulates holistic contexts of meaning *and* (2) provides the basis of language. Before proceeding to these matters, however, it will be necessary to examine several readings that mischaracterize Heidegger’s notion of discourse by overemphasizing only *one* of these two requirements. Such interpretations either reduce discourse to language or simply assimilate it to Heidegger’s concept of understanding. This tendency results, I believe, from a failure to give due weight to the communicative dimension of discourse. As we will see below, this communicative aspect makes it possible to *share* with others the intelligibility that arises through one’s practical, affective activities—a sharing that is ‘institutionalized’ in language but is on the most basic level a pre-linguistic encounter with the other Dasein as temporal co-constitutor of the world. In this sense, discourse is the foundation for language but irreducible to it because it first makes possible the co-appropriation of meaning necessary for the publicity of the world’s significance and the linguistic forms in which this is normally communicated. Or in Heidegger’s words: “There is language only because there is discourse” (HCT 265).

## Language

The close connection between language and discourse has led some to simply identify them. In *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*, Cristina Lafont argues that language is *itself* the articulation of intelligibility:



Dasein always understands itself and the world in terms of possibilities, and because there is “a *symbolic medium* that ‘controls and distributes’ (BT, p. 211) the realm of *determinate* possibilities”—namely, language as a system of sign-relations—this understanding is fundamentally linguistic (HLWD 47).<sup>50</sup> Lafont seems to believe that Heidegger’s claim that Dasein’s originary mode of being is understanding implies that “Dasein has a symbolically mediated relation to world (or that it ‘is’ in a symbolically structured world)” (HLWD 33fn27). Dasein always understands itself and the world in terms of possibilities, and “owing to the existence of a *symbolic medium* that ‘controls and distributes’ (BT, p.211) the realm of *determinate* possibilities” (HLWD 47), Dasein’s understanding must be articulated through this symbolic medium: language as a system of sign relations. In a footnote to this claim, Lafont argues that “there is no doubt that ‘possibilities’ can be ‘given’ only in a symbolic medium . . . ‘being open upon possibilities,’ can arise only on the level of culture, which is characterized by symbolic structures” (HLWD 47fn). In other words, Dasein’s understanding always encounters entities *as* a this or a that, and this “as” is constituted by symbolic language structures and sign referentiality, which stipulate all the possible “thises” or “thats” according to which an entity can be encountered. Thus Lafont argues that Dasein’s capacity to intend objects “as” must be understood as a symbolic, linguistic articulation of the world and that there is no “understanding as” that can be characterized as a type of pre- or even *non*-linguistic practical articulation of the world. Indeed, Lafont claims that “world”—the articulated totality of significance—just *is* language for Heidegger: “The most important point is that meaning is always already articulated, that it constitutes a totality of significance that is given to Dasein, and with respect to which Dasein comports itself ‘understandingly.’ This system of sign-relations (which Heidegger here calls ‘world’ and later will call ‘language’) is not reducible to the subject-object schema of the teleological model of action” (HLWD 42–43fn40).

But as Mark Okrent correctly notes, even if such linguistic idealism is consistent with the later Heidegger, it is not present in *Being and Time*. There Heidegger explicitly rejects the idea of world as a system of sign relations. Instead, “Heidegger analyzes signs as a determinate kind of equipment,”<sup>51</sup> that is, as something that *depends upon* the world as a context of significance. In response, Lafont suggests that characterizing signs as “equipment” cannot account for a sign’s public, worldly meaning. Linguistic significance differs from pragmatic significance, she argues, since it does not derive from the activities of particular agents. The pragmatic reading therefore fails, according to Lafont, because it characterizes intelligibility as “*something brought about* by the individual” (HLWD 41). Lafont’s

response misconstrues the pragmatist position, however. Arbitrarily treating a book as a desk does not turn it into one. For Heidegger, equipmental reference—like linguistic reference—relies on *worldly* contexts of meaning, not on individual practices. As Okrent puts it: “Such holistically integrated functional systems of tool types are articulated independently of and prior to the activity of any given agent . . . [by] the system of assignments which define how we are *supposed* to act with what things in which situations.”<sup>52</sup> The normativity of appropriate use inherent in the significance of particular things is not determined by *my* activities, but by inherited public practices and institutions establishing how “one” ought to do things. As we have seen, Heidegger generally refers to this public normativity delineating possible ways to be and do—and the intelligibility arising through them—as *das Man*, a term meant to capture precisely the anonymous publicity of these shared meanings. What Lafont has not shown, then, is that the public possibilities articulating norms of appropriate use and meaning can only be “transferred” through the symbolic medium of language.<sup>53</sup> Rather, language appears to make explicit a more basic shared context of meaning—what Heidegger refers to as *world*.

## Articulation

Since discourse is the “articulation” of structured intelligibility, and this articulation need not be linguistic, it is tempting to follow John Hauge-land and Hubert Dreyfus in translating *Rede* not as “discourse” but as “telling,” which has “to do with distinguishing, identifying, and even counting—such as telling apart, telling whether, telling what’s what, telling one when you see one, telling how many, and so on”—as Hauge-land claims—“these latter senses clearly echo the image of articulation, and are plausibly prerequisite to the possibility of putting things into words.”<sup>54</sup> Dreyfus further notes that one “manifests” these prior articulations “simply by telling things apart in using them.”<sup>55</sup> On this interpretation, we can clearly see how discourse is an “articulation of intelligibility” that grounds—but is not reducible to—language.

The problem with such a view, however, is the fact that discourse thereby becomes indistinguishable from Heidegger’s notion of understanding. We can note, for example, how Dreyfus claims that “ontological telling” “refers to everyday coping as manifesting the articulations already in the referential whole which are by nature manifestable.”<sup>56</sup> Such a reading of “telling” obscures a distinction Heidegger makes between an

articulation inherent in understanding itself—which he calls “interpretation”—and the kind of articulation that belongs to *Rede* as distinct from understanding. The former is the cultivation of meaning possibilities disclosed through understanding. Of the articulation occurring in *discourse*, however, Heidegger says that through it “the meaning highlighted in interpretation becomes available for being-with-one-another” (HCT 268). Thus the former includes no reference to other Dasein while the latter is defined in terms of it. This distinction between interpretation and discourse is further clarified when Heidegger claims that “the mode of enactment of understanding is interpreting, specifically as the cultivation, appropriation, and preservation of what is discovered in understanding. *The meaningful expressness of this interpretation is now discourse*” (HCT 265). While interpretation simply articulates what the understanding has uncovered, discourse *expresses* Dasein’s interpretation in a meaningful way. For this reason Haugeland and Dreyfus’s reading of discourse as “telling” things apart cannot be right; it does not do justice to the connection with *telling others about this* “telling apart.”

In a variant of this reading, Blattner’s *Heidegger’s Temporal Idealism* attempts to accommodate this *social* dimension of discourse. Blattner notes that the elements essential to discourse are “the about-which,” “what is discoursed as such,” and “communication” (HTI 71).<sup>57</sup> Dasein’s activity delineates a particular context of significance based on possible ways for it to be in the world, and elements of this context are that “about-which” discourse discourses. The differentiation and relation of these elements are “what is discoursed as such.” It is the communicative element of discourse that is of particular import for our discussion, however, since we have seen that it is what distinguishes *discourse’s* differentiation and interrelation of the context of significance from that belonging to *understanding*. Though Blattner acknowledges that “communication is a more difficult element to grasp,” he nevertheless argues that because “Heidegger links communication with ‘making known’ or ‘making manifest’ (*Bekundung*),” we can conclude that “to communicate is simply to make something publicly available” (HTI 72).

The problem, however, is that there is nothing simple about the “making publicly available” that discourse accomplishes. Indeed, it is precisely this communicative dimension of discourse as *making* public that has been consistently overlooked or misunderstood by Heidegger scholars, primarily because it seems to conflict with the view that the intelligibility to be articulated is *always already* public insofar as it is delineated by worldly meanings or language. This stance is evident, for example, in Blattner’s example: “As Smith walks on the sidewalk . . . he differenti-

ates sidewalks from roads . . . the very act of walking on the sidewalk offers the differentiation publicly . . . Every act of walking on the sidewalk tends publicly to communicate, that is, make known, that sidewalks are to be walked upon" (*HTI* 73). On this reading, walking on sidewalks is a form of discourse. Indeed, *everything* I do must be discourse: insofar as my activities differentiate the world, and these activities always occur in the public realm, *all* my actions "offer the differentiation publicly." On such a view, however, we have not escaped the reduction of discourse to understanding that afflicted Dreyfus and Haugeland.<sup>58</sup> However, Blattner is right to point to the communicative dimension of discourse as the way in which Dasein's interpretive differentiations are *made publicly known*. The consequence being that the distinction must be maintained between communication's ability to "*make public*" and the fact that "communication requires a public domain" in which to "affirm" the articulations that are essentially already public (*HTI* 73).

The question, then, is how we are to understand the *making* public that occurs in discourse without reducing it to the mere endorsement of some dimension of what is *already* public—the articulated possibilities available to understanding. The answer emerges if we recall that, for Heidegger, "all discourse . . . is, as a mode of the being of Dasein, essentially being-with. In other words, the very sense of any discourse is *discourse to others and with others*" (*HCT* 263). Discourse is not simply the articulation of the intelligibility of being-in-the-world, it is an articulating of intelligibility *to* and *with* and *in terms of* others that reveals my existence as always imbued with the presence of the others who share in this intelligibility. It is this presence that I *actively* share in discourse: "Being-with is 'explicitly' *shared* in discourse, that is, it already *is*, only unshared as something not grasped and appropriated" (*BT* 162/152).

This point can be better understood when we recognize that the communicative aspect of discourse is nothing more than a sharing with the other of that about which the discourse is, *through* what is said (*HCT* 263). The saying is merely the medium through which communication—*sharing with*—is accomplished.<sup>59</sup> This sharing cannot simply be understood as people experiencing something in the world simultaneously, however, since it includes an essential reference to them as partners in the meaning event. It is not *communication* if we just happen to be directed toward the same thing. Rather, this is a mode of sharing that makes possible a *co-directedness* toward the same thing: for Heidegger, communication "means the enabling of the appropriation of that about which the discourse is, that is, making it possible to come into a relationship of preoccupation and being to that of which the discourse is . . . The understanding of communication is the *participation in what is manifest*."

All subsequent understanding and co-understanding is as being-with a *taking part*" (HCT 263).

Recall that it is precisely this co-participation in what is manifest that characterizes the publicity of temporal expression—Dasein speaks itself out into a shared world time by *participating* in the other's reckoning with time. Everyday instances of communicative encounter demonstrate this same structure of taking part in the world's meaning together. As we saw in chapter 5, Dasein's taking care is "essentially determined by the structure of appropriateness . . . the character of 'time for . . .' or 'not the time for'" (BT 441/381). These appropriateness contexts are unified in the notion of world by heedfully attending to the "taking care" of other Dasein. This same structure is operative in discourse: my attuned understanding orients me to a particular situation such that certain options matter and certain aspects of the context become salient. Discourse refers to Dasein's sharing of these orientations with others. According to Heidegger, for me to share my orientation to a particular situation with another Dasein—its being time for this and not time for that—involves a type of a "co-enactment in concern" in which our care becomes unified (HCT 266). Through communication multiple Dasein become oriented toward the same things that matter, they become responsive to the same "structures of appropriateness." In communication, our mineness can be brought into alignment, so to speak.

An example may help illuminate the matter under consideration. Imagine I run into the room yelling "Where is my baseball bat?" followed by a huge strange man. There are a number of different orientations to this situation that are available: for example, you could assume that I am keen to play ball with my new friend. You could also assume that I am being threatened by a sinister character and am desperate for a weapon. Communication is the way of being in the world together such that I *enable* your participation in my stance or orientation to the particular situation so that you share my sense of what would count as an appropriate response to that situation. The terror in my face, the jerky speed with which I stagger about the room, the hostile look of the stranger—among a thousand other "cues" attuning you to my situation—provoke you to turn immediately toward the room as a context offering or failing to offer weapons or safety. I have communicated to you the sense that it is "time for" defensive action—and not time for a game of ball. Note that your participation in my orientation need not involve language; my panicked flailing about would be enough to provoke a shared orientation such that we both experience the situation as *mattering* in a particular way.

This creation or evocation of co-orientation is what Heidegger means by the communicative moment in discourse; communication is

“discourse expressing itself. Its tendency of being aims at bringing the hearer to participate in disclosed being toward what is talked about in discourse” (BT 168/157). This participation in disclosure—the sharing of the “actual mode of attunement” or what *matters* in a particular situation—is generally accomplished through what Heidegger calls “expression,” which is found in “intonation, modulation, in the tempo of talk, in ‘the way of speaking’” (BT 162/152). When I whisper I express to you that it is “time for” secrecy, intimacy, caution—that a certain way of being in the world together is now appropriate. In so doing, we can understand the fourth element of discourse that we mentioned above: *Bekundung*—making manifest, or making known. Despite Blattner’s equation of this element with the communicative, Heidegger is clear that there are four structural moments characterizing discourse, and in *manifestation*—the fourth moment: “Dasein itself and its disposition are co-discovered. Discoursing with others about something as speaking about is always a *self-articulating*. One oneself and the being-in-the-world at the time likewise become manifest, even if only in having the disposition ‘manifested’ through intonation, modulation, or tempo of discourse” (HCT 263). The specificity of self in its particular worldly orientation is manifested in *Bekundung*—a point that is essential for recognizing how discourse can be characterized as the everyday way in which particular Dasein encounter each other as such. In discourse one does not act with the other merely in terms of some public, anonymous standard that is already in place. Rather, discourse is a sharing with the other of *which* orientation ought to be taken in this situation—a sharing that offers to the other the stance that the particularities of self and context strike one as eliciting. In discourse multiple Dasein don’t just experience each other *through* some public role or norm, then—rather, they *share* with each other their way of being as *responsive* to situations in and through such roles and norms.

Such sharing can only occur because Dasein is not an isolated Cartesian subject “broadcasting” information from its inner space, but is always speaking itself out in the world in such a way that others can participate in its way of being: “Da-sein expresses itself not because it has been initially cut off as ‘something internal’ from something outside, but because as being-in-the-world it is already ‘outside’ when it understands” (BT 162/152). Discourse does not simply “point” to particular entities in a context of significance, but enables Dasein to inhabit or exist in specific worldly modes of transcendence *together*; it “brings about the ‘sharing’ of being attuned together and of the understanding of being-with” (BT 162/152). In communicative discourse I share not only the particular worldly entities under consideration, then, but the particularity of the attuned, understanding way of being that *allows* this consideration to

occur. Note Heidegger's assertion that in the self-articulating that characterizes manifestation, the temporal specificity of one's "being-in-the-world at the time" is what becomes manifest. Discourse is a mode of disclosure that makes known not only the worldly thing under consideration, but Dasein's way of being-in-the-world in its specificity. Such a characterization of discourse therefore allows Heidegger to accommodate our intuition that it involves a type of sharing of the unique particularity of one's being with the other, without characterizing communication as somehow giving "access" to the inherently private domain of my mental cabinet. On the contrary, discourse is a sharing of one's being-in-the-world, and "is not to be regarded as if it involved a reciprocal relation to one's own inner experiences, which somehow become observable through sounds" (HCT 264). Because communication and the self-manifesting that is its correlate is "a situation where the being-with-one-another is intimately involved in the subject matter under discussion" (HCT 263), what I am given to understand also cannot be characterized as neutral "information"—the matter communicated receives a particular shape and meaning *through* communication. In other words, how I am with somebody deeply affects what they mean—and communication includes the sharing of the "how we are together."

Communication does not mean the handing over of words, let alone ideas, from one subject to another, as if it were an interchange between the psychical events of different subjects. To say that one Dasein communicates by its utterances with another means that by articulating something in display it shares with the second Dasein the same understanding comportment toward the being about which the assertion is being made. In communication and through it, one Dasein enters with the other, the addressee, into the same being-relationship to that about which the assertion is made, that which is spoken of. Communications are not a store of heaped up propositions but should be seen as possibilities by which one Dasein enters with the other into the same fundamental comportment toward the entity asserted about. (BPP 210)

We can see now that the understanding given in discourse—understanding in Heidegger's sense of *ways for me to be* in the world—can therefore be characterized as a type of *participation* in the other's meaningful, committed activities of existing. Particular ways of being in the world are not simply mine, but *ours*.<sup>60</sup> Thus Heidegger asserts that being-with "belongs" to discourse, "which maintains itself in a particular way of heedful being-with-one-another" (BT 161/151)—a heedful being together that allows the articulated intelligibility of the world to manifest to *us* because

of our shared involvement in this manifestation. Discourse is being-with made explicit, and the explicitness refers to how I *am* this being-with as particular ways in which I take part in the existing of particular others as co-constitutors of the world and its meaning.<sup>61</sup>

Though we are often attuned to particular situations in the same way, then, this is not necessarily so, and attunements can and do change. We do not always control such changes—I cannot simply choose to be exultant rather than terrified, for example—and attunements can be changed *for us*, as the communication of my fear in the above example indicates. The sharing of attuned understanding accomplished in discourse is often a giving or receiving of orientation—a point that will have particular import in the following chapter when we discuss the call of conscience and authentic being-with. This communicability of one's orientation in the world is quite common; we seek out people in a good mood to “infect” us with theirs; we avoid restaurants with oppressive atmospheres, and so on. Our behavior manifests an implicit awareness of the way others enable changes in our orientation to the world.<sup>62</sup> It is abundantly clear that others infect us with their orientations, and this possibility of infection is necessary not only for the communication of *mood*, but also for the entire normative structure of significance that constitutes world. The essence of discourse is to *place* us “in the dimension of understandability . . . discourse gives something to be understood and demands understanding” (*FCM* 306). This emphasis on social participation—which acknowledges the relationship between individual care-laden responsiveness to norms and the publicity and anonymity of these shared measures—allows us to account for the fact that these norms must and can be *learned*: that children are socialized into responding to particular standards of meaning and behavior.<sup>63</sup> The notion of specific shared orientations between particular Dasein therefore points to a way in which we can better understand how Dasein *achieves access* to these particular *das Man* understandings, a difficulty that has received insufficient attention in the literature. Communication's ability to orient others toward particular ways of being in the world can go a long way toward understanding how children grow into themselves as Dasein. The articulation of intelligibility that defines discourse, then, is not the same as the articulation of meaning contexts that arises through the practical roles and activities of understanding. Though public norms will determine the possible ways in which communication succeeds as such, communication is governed by different norms than understanding.<sup>64</sup> The difference in these domains of normativity demonstrates how Dasein can help others achieve access to *das Man* understandings without having to presuppose that they are already available or operative.



A similar conclusion must be reached with regard to the linguistic interpretation found in Lafont. Though language and equipment have a unique normative structure, neither can we conclude that discourse is simply governed by language norms. On the contrary: discourse norms govern language since it is language that is grounded on a more basic norm-sharing and co-instituting that defines the publicity of world. What the above discussion allows us to conclude, then, is that discourse is an expression of Dasein's particular orientation to the world—a mode of expression that enables other Dasein to come to share in this orientation. And as Heidegger claims in *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, the very unity of the world lies in its potential to be shared with others:

Only on the basis of possible communication can one succeed at all to make a unitary fact of the matter accessible to several individuals in its unitary character. The λόγος is at work here as a *communicating* λόγος. By means of it, the world becomes accessible in its unitary articulation. That is the primordial function that the λόγος has insofar as it communicates. If I make an assertion about a specifically perceived fact of the matter, doing so in the public world of existence, then “communication” [*Mit-teilung*] in the precise sense means making what is spoken of so accessible to someone else that I share it with him [*mit ihm teile*]. Now we both have the same thing. Attention should be paid here to the middle-voiced meaning of ἀποφαίνεσθαι. (*IPR* 21)

Though language is the form of such communication par excellence, its efficacy rests in the structure of the types of creatures that we are—beings defined by the presence of the others who share the world and understand its meaning through temporalizing commitments and compartments that we can come to share.

## Idle Talk

Despite the irreducibility of language to discourse, Heidegger believes that language in some sense *encourages* us to misconstrue the nature of its ontological grounding in discourse. The tendency, he argues, is to distort our everyday way of discoursing by covering over its communicative dimension and concealing the recognition of other Dasein inherent in it. The reason for this, Heidegger claims, is because within language “lies an average intelligibility; and in accordance with this intelligibility, the discourse communicated can be understood to a large extent with-

out the listener coming to a being toward what is talked about in discourse so as to have a primordial understanding of it . . . what is talked about is understood only approximately and superficially” (BT 168/157). Heidegger refers to this superficial discourse as “idle talk,” in which I am “given” the matter under consideration without engaging in a prior genuine orientation toward it. The ontological “uprootedness” of discourse from the communicative element grounding it within particular attuned understandings therefore leads Heidegger to describe idle talk as “disoriented” discourse (HCT 269) in which Dasein is “cut off from the primary and primordially genuine relations” (BT 170/159) to self, world, and others.

Language is the mode of discourse particularly prone to obscure its communicative and self-manifesting dimensions because it plays up the *other* constitutive factors—what discourse is about and what is said as such. As Heidegger notes, “Some of these factors can be lacking or remain unnoticed in the factual linguistic form of a particular discourse” (BT 163/152). In our everyday way of being, the factors that most often go unnoticed are the communicative and the self-articulative. In *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, for example, Heidegger specifically examines *apophantic* discourse as the mode of shared understanding dedicated to the kind of “pointing out” found in propositions and statements. This mode of discourse is the subject matter of logic and most philosophies of language, and because of this, Heidegger analyzes it in more detail. Indeed, he often seems to equate *all* discourse with apophantic discourse and much of the confusion regarding the nature of Heideggerian discourse is a failure to recognize that apophantic sharing is only one type—and the type most conducive to the groundlessness of idle talk.<sup>65</sup>

The danger of idle talk’s linguistic form lies in the fact that it allows us to *assume* that it succeeds as communicative discourse—since in its structure “speaking in itself makes a claim to communicate” (IPR 29) and implies that there has been a genuine “giving to understand” (BT 271/251) of the situation—whereas it only takes the *form* of doing so. “For what is said is initially always understood as ‘saying,’ that is, as discovering. Thus, by its very nature, idle talk is a closing off since it *omits* going back to the foundation of what is being talked about . . . because it presumes it has understood” (BT 169/158). So, Heidegger claims, “While the matter being spoken of thus slips away with the absence of the understanding relation of being . . . what is said as such—the word, the sentence, the dictum—continues to be available in a worldly way” (HCT 268–69). Language allows an empty co-orientation to the words—not a full sharing of the affective, practical stance—such that only a residue of genuine communication remains. What is most worrisome about this

mode of “communication,” however, is the fact that it encourages Dasein to be complacent in this emptiness: “Even when Da-sein repeats what has been said, it comes into a being toward the very beings that have been discussed. But it is and believes itself exempt from a primordial repetition of the act of discovering” (BT 224/206). Such a “*free-floating interpretation, which belongs to everyone and no one*” (HCT 270) is, as we will see in the next chapter, characteristic of inauthenticity, in which the “unowned” now of vulgar time forgets the world time on which it is based—including world time’s structures of intersubjective normativity.

However, though language is *conducive* to inauthenticity because it enables shared orientations without demanding a primordial repetition of the act of discovering or a complete acknowledgment of the other Dasein, it does not condemn us to it. The ability to communicate in the absence of a fully shared orientation also allows for modes of “giving to understand” across time and distance in a way that would be otherwise impossible. Lafont makes note of this in a recent article, arguing that despite the common tendency to do so, one need not conclude that “there is a *necessary* connection between social externalism and inauthenticity in Heidegger’s account of linguistic communication.”<sup>66</sup> According to Lafont, Heidegger recognized that some concepts are not individuated by laymen but by experts, and “though everyday communication requires this structure of deferral of authority . . . by its very nature it opens up the possibility of Dasein’s inauthenticity.”<sup>67</sup> Nevertheless, though the deferral of authority “opens up the possibility” of inauthenticity, it does not amount to condemning us to it. Indeed, characterizing such forms of communication as a “deferral of *authority*” indicates the type of basic—though unrecognized—intersubjective acknowledgment of other Dasein operative even here.

Though linguistic giving can tend toward a superficial, inauthentic giving to understand, then, it is not always or necessarily so—and it can, in fact, serve the *opposite* tendency: “The discoveredness of Dasein, in particular the disposition of Dasein, can be made manifest by means of words in such a way that certain new possibilities of Dasein’s being are set free. Thus discourse, especially *poetry*, can even bring about the release of new possibilities of the being of Dasein.”<sup>68</sup> The fact that language gives new understandings to others in this way therefore opens up the possibility of expanding the opportunities or manifestations of genuine appropriation available to other Dasein. Indeed, as we will note in the following chapter, leaping-ahead and its corresponding modes of discourse—hearing and acting as the call of conscience for the other—are the modes of encounter that explicitly acknowledge and *encourage* the other to take an appropriate existential responsibility for her own

selfhood. In this sense, it is a communication that acts as a “release” of the most profound possibility of the being of the other Dasein. The understanding found in discourse—understanding in Heidegger’s sense of ways for me to be in the world—is therefore a type of participation in the other’s existence that can *make available* to him particular ways for him to be in the world—authentic *or* inauthentic. Discourse’s structure as a sharing in the other’s being in the world means, however, that even in the most inauthentic modes of encounter—in which the communicative, Dasein-manifesting dimensions of encounter are overlooked or ignored—these dimensions and the Dasein-acknowledgment they express are nevertheless always operative: “The four structural moments belong together in the very essence of language, and every discourse is essentially determined by these moments. The individual moments in it can recede, but they are never absent” (*HCT* 264).

### Concluding Words

The key contribution of discourse lies, then, in this: it discloses the everyday way in which we participate in the other’s way of being qua existential selfhood. The public world designates which public, average roles, norms, and contexts of meanings it is generally *possible* to share, whereas the communicative dimension of discourse refers to the actual *sharing itself*, a sharing that brings to light the other’s shifting commitments and stances on these possibilities as well as the selfhood that makes such norm-responsiveness possible. In order to communicate that *now* it is the time for this or time for that—to communicate to the other the appropriateness of my orientation to a situation—I must experience her in the temporal specificity of a being who says *now* and cares about the appropriateness of its expression, a care rooted in her commitment to her own existence. Though the other is encountered in terms of the publicly available roles and meanings delineated by the shared world, then, the other’s existential self-responsibility for these norms—the fact that the other Dasein is *committed* and *responsive* to them—is a necessary condition for the sharing of world operative in *Fürsorge* and the discourse that is its everyday expression. Recall the baseball bat example; though fleeing coward, indifferent observer, or courageous defender are all worldly possibilities available for me to be, I *am* only one of them through my commitment to the norms of appropriateness inherent in the chosen role, and I share this commitment with the others to whom I communicate my way of being in the world. The innerworldly categories and mean-

ings through which I encounter the other thus reveal self and other in the particularity of our existential commitment to our own being in the world. Because such commitments are rooted in the fundamental self-responsibility or mineness that expresses Dasein's originary temporality, in the encounter with the other's commitment to her own existence I encounter her in her concrete individuality.

## Authenticity, Inauthenticity, and the Extremes of *Fürsorge*

Considering Heidegger's negative descriptions of the type of being-toward others that characterizes leaping-in—one pole of the *Fürsorge* continuum—one may be tempted to doubt whether the radical distinction between things and persons articulated above genuinely exists on his account. In its extreme forms leaping-in seems to involve *no* acknowledgment of the other qua world-constituting self. Despite defining both leaping-in and leaping-ahead in terms of a structurally minimal recognition of the other's way of being qua Dasein, what characterizes the former seems, rather, to be the extent to which my understanding of and behavior toward the other are based on the categories applicable to *things*. But if the distinction between person and thing is a fundamental ontological dimension of my very being in the world and always involves such minimal recognition, in what way can I treat the other "as if" he were a thing? Stanley Cavell makes a similar query in *The Claim of Reason*: "Many people, and some philosophers, speak disapprovingly of treating others, or regarding them, as things. But it is none too clear what possibility is envisioned here. *What* thing might someone be treated as?"<sup>1</sup>

For Heidegger, however, the answer is clear—the other might be treated solely as if she were an innerworldly and intratemporal thing—in other words, in terms of a vulgar conception of time that conceals or forgets the original recognition of the other's ecstatic originary temporality. This is possible because Dasein have both a worldly and a world-constituting dimension, so to speak—dimensions that we designated in the above distinction between *Mitsein* and *Mitda-sein* modes of being. In treating the other as a thing, I treat her *only* in terms of the worldly—that is, intratemporal—face that she shows me. As we noted earlier, Heidegger recognizes that Dasein's interpretations "can draw the conceptuality belonging to the beings to be interpreted from these themselves or else force them into concepts to which beings are opposed in accordance with their kind of being" (BT 150/141). In reifying modes of being-toward, the problematic concept into which the other is forced is not simply some worldly aspect of the other's being—the fact that

she can be defined in terms of social categories or is a physical object in space. Rather, insofar as I treat her *simply* as an innerworldly entity and not *also* as temporal co-constitutor of the worldly space of meaning, I am forcing her into a simplistic category opposed to her kind of being. In doing so, however, I do not thereby destroy the distinction between persons and things—I never encounter the other *as* a thing, or succeed in changing her into an entity that is no longer defined by this status of temporal co-constitutor. Rather, it means that I have fallen into a narrow mode of thinking and acting toward others defined primarily in terms of their *intratemporality*, forgetting the fact that underpinning this worldly dimension is a world-constituting self expressing its committed, temporalizing having to be in a way that I always immediately recognize.<sup>2</sup>

The extent to which we tend to focus on either the other's innerworldly being or on the other's temporalizing mineness or selfhood represent the poles of the concern continuum within which the different ways of being toward others may fall. "Between the two extremes of positive concern—the one which does someone's job for him and dominates him, and the one which is in advance of him and frees him—everyday being-with-one-another maintains itself and shows many mixed forms" (BT 122/115).<sup>3</sup> Even at the extremes of this continuum, however, both dimensions are always present; one can never encounter the other purely in terms of her intratemporal *or* her temporalizing dimensions. Leaping-in and leaping-ahead merely articulate the ways in which we can overwhelmingly emphasize one or the other.

### Leaping-In

At the innerworldly-focused end of the spectrum is that minimal mode of solicitude Heidegger terms "leaping-in." In this extreme mode one Dasein "does the other's job for him"—a way of being-toward the other that encompasses domination and abuse. Leaping-in, he argues, is when my being-toward the other person takes "the other's 'care' away from him and put[s] itself in his place in taking care, it can *leap in* for him" (BT 122/114). Notice that Heidegger puts care in scare quotes—'care'—here to indicate that we must always understand care to be what is radically one's own—the first-person self-responsibility each self has for living into different possible ways for it to be. He recognizes, however, that certain ways that one is oriented toward the other Dasein can make it more difficult for him to recognize or act upon this mineness—on this

responsibility for his own existence: "The other can become one who is dependent and dominated even if this domination is a tacit one and remains hidden from him" (BT 122/114).

Frederick Elliston notes that leaping-in is a mode of solicitude that requires a "placing of oneself in the other's shoes," and in keeping with Heidegger's practical orientation, this occurs "in *practice*, not in *imagination*: I literally take over the other's task, rather than merely picture myself doing so."<sup>4</sup> The most extreme forms of this displacement and interference in the other's care include instances in which the tasks I take from the other are basic to her very survival, as in cases of torture or murder. In an everyday way, however, leaping-in exists in more subtle forms—higher up on the concern continuum, so to speak. In all instances of leaping-in, however, there is an element of displacement of the other whereby the other's expression of his care for who he is to be is inhibited.

Concern takes over what is to be taken care of for the other. The other is thus displaced, he steps back so that afterwards, when the matter has been attended to, he can take it over as something finished and available or disburden himself of it completely. In this concern, the other can become one who is dependent and dominated even if this domination is a tacit one and remains hidden from him. This kind of concern which does the job and takes away "care" is, to a large extent, determinative for being with one another and pertains, for the most part, to our taking care of things at hand. (BT 122/114)

The notion of displacement is essential for understanding leaping-in, for it characterizes the interchangeability of one Dasein for another, an interchangeability that can be assumed only when the individuality of the world-constituting temporality of the other is overlooked in favor of worldly, thing-appropriate categories: "In the case of leaping-in, the emphasis falls not on the person but on his world."<sup>5</sup> Indeed, such a mode of being-toward the other seems to involve forgetting one's *own* mode of world-constituting temporality—one's person in favor of one's world. A certain degree of symmetry in forgetting is therefore necessary, since taking over the *other's* possibilities as my own requires me to forget the uniqueness and mineness of my *own* possibilities and the way of being through which they arise. Instead, I focus solely on possibilities—the other's and my own—as if they were innerworldly on-hand things somehow separable from the particularity of the life that is to live them. This leads Theunissen to characterize the displacement characteristic of leaping-in as a type of domination of the other: "By putting myself in his place, I



make his possibilities my own. The Other is ‘thrown out of his place.’”<sup>6</sup> Leaping-in is correlatively a type of *self*-domination, however, insofar as it involves subsuming an appropriate understanding of my way of being to an innerworldly characterization of possibilities as objects for trade. “This leaping-in can only be a domination insofar as it is at the same time a being dominated. In everyday inauthentic being-with-one-another, Others exercise a domination over me in that they dissolve me in their kind of being. I am dominated by the Others in everyday solicitude in that I act in place of the Other or as an Other . . . By putting myself in his place, I make his possibilities my own.”<sup>7</sup>

One may argue that this type of self-forgetting is in fact the *purpose* of such domination and abuse, since it creates the illusion of an infinity of bald, free-floating possibilities—it allows the abuser to believe herself free from the temporal particularity that anchors her to the responsibility (and limits) of her having to be. Simone de Beauvoir makes a similar point in *The Ethics of Ambiguity* about those who *suffer* abuse: she argues that there is, ironically, a certain feeling of *safety* that can come with being treated as a thing. Things cannot be held responsible for their own existence or feel the anxiety associated with finite freedom—namely, having to act into some possibilities and thereby choose to forfeit others.

### The (Il)logic of Deficient Modes?

Characterizing leaping-in as a mode of being-with in which I “acknowledge” the others as non-things but treat them as if they were has led Klaus Hartmann to criticize Heidegger’s position as displaying a fundamental incoherence. Not only does Heidegger want to claim that we always already experience others as persons through our being-with them in the world, but he also seems to want to claim that this “always already” can somehow accommodate instances of the (seemingly) total absence of recognition that this involves. Thus in “The Logic of Deficient and Eminent Modes in Heidegger,” Hartmann notes that Heidegger defines Dasein in terms of *existentials* with different modes of *existentiell* manifestation. The problem, Hartmann claims, is Heidegger’s tendency to claim certain “deficient modes” as manifestations of their existential structures—despite the fact that they appear to be *negations* or *absences* of the very structures they supposedly instantiate. The difficulty is that “a deficient mode appears to be the negation in concreteness of what the

existential pre-ordains in abstraction. The deficient mode, overtly the flat denial of the existential, is subject to the existential of which it is the denial, for it is still a mode of what it denies.”<sup>8</sup> The question, in other words, is how Heidegger can claim that participatory acknowledgment of the other’s being-in-the-world is an essential feature of my very being and yet that there are cases in which I appear to directly contradict this acknowledgment. How can leaping-in be a mode of *Mitsein*, if it amounts to the denial or destruction of the other’s status as co-constitutor of the world—and we have defined all modes of *Mitsein* as involving degrees of acknowledgment of this status? As Hartmann notes, “Clearly such a ‘logic’ is paradoxical as a species cannot be the denial of its genus.”<sup>9</sup>

A fruitful way of understanding a deficient mode may be achieved by comparing it to Heidegger’s discussion of the manner in which the animal is “poor” in world, or “deprived” of world in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*. There he distinguishes between the deprivation or poverty of world that characterizes animals and the worldlessness that characterizes the stone: “Both represent a kind of not-having of world . . . [but] the possibility of being deprived of world requires further considerations” (FCM 196). Heidegger defines the animal’s deprivation as “not having, yet being able to have” (FCM 209), and “not-having *in* being able to have is precisely *deprivation*, is *poverty*” (FCM 211). The animal’s possibility of having world, but not having it, is a different type of lack than the stone’s absence of ability—the former, unlike the latter, is a sort of absence in presence.

So too must the deficiency of solicitude that characterizes leaping-in be differentiated from the *absence* of this possibility that characterizes the encounter with things:

For it is part of the essential constitution of human Dasein that it intrinsically means being with others, that the factually existing human being always already and necessarily moves factually in a particular way of being with . . . , i.e., a particular way of going along with. Now for several reasons, and to some extent essential ones, this going along with one another is a going apart from one another and a going against one another, or rather, at first and for the most part a going alongside one another. It is precisely this inconspicuous and self-evident going alongside one another, as a particular way of being with one another and being transposed into one another, that creates the illusion that in this being alongside one another there is initially a gap which needs to be bridged, as though human beings were not transposed into one another at all here, as though one human being would first have to empathize their way into the other in order to reach them. (FCM 206)

On such a reading, a deficient mode that may appear to be a *complete* absence of a particular condition cannot be read as its total absence and may indeed be the positive manifestations of another mode. Hartmann seems to recognize some variation on this possibility insofar as he notes that Heidegger “rejects the idea that a deficient mode is no more than the denial of an existential structure. It is something positive, too.”<sup>10</sup> The example that Hartmann gives to demonstrate this is the shift from the ready-to-hand to the present-at-hand mode of encounter with things. Though just staring at something is a “deficient mode” of tool use, it too is a way of being toward the thing, a positive mode of encounter. Understood from the perspective of practical orientations, objective presence is deficient—but it is not thereby an *absence* of encounter; from the perspective of disengaged observation, for example, it too is a positive mode of being-toward the object. Note that both of these modes of engagement are ontological categories specific to the encounter with innerworldly things and represent a type of continuum that allows Heidegger to both claim that objective presence is a positive mode of encounter with the object *and* that it is deficient in terms of handiness. Thus at *BT* 75/70 Heidegger notes that when tool use is interrupted “what is at hand becomes deprived of its worldliness so that it appears as something merely objectively present.” Nevertheless, “the character of objective presence making itself known is still bound to the handiness of useful things” (*BT* 74/69). It is still a positive manner of being-toward an object but its deficiency lies in the fact that it fails to be Dasein’s normal mode of being-in-the-world qua immersion in practical coping.<sup>11</sup> It thereby fails to be a manner of being-toward objects that is consistent with the ontological category through which they are primordially encountered. In other words, the *Zuhanden* and *Vorhanden* represent the poles of the continuum characterizing the possible ways of being-toward objects—in terms of their usability or in terms of their objective presence, respectively—and though the former represents the ontologically primary orientation against which behaviors emphasizing the latter are deemed deficient, the entire continuum is characterized by a positive transcending toward the object.

An analogy can perhaps be drawn, then, between the *Zuhanden/Vorhanden* continuum with regard to encountering things, and the leaping-in/leaping-ahead continuum with regard to encountering others. Leaping-ahead and leaping-in represent the poles of the continuum characterizing the possible ways of being-toward others—in terms of their co-temporalizing or in terms of their intratemporality, respectively—and though the former represents the ontologically primary orientation against which behaviors emphasizing the latter are deemed de-

ficient, the entire continuum is characterized by a positive transcending toward the other. Lawrence Hatab makes a similar point when arguing that the norm in encountering others is a type of “empathic care,” and its absence is analogous to a transfer from a *Zuhanden* to a *Vorhanden* mode of encounter with things:

I suggest then that we take empathic moments to be primal, and that indifference (or worse) is noticed as “negative.” Here is an analogy to Heidegger’s analysis of *Zuhandenheit*, where a breakdown in tool function is noticed as a disruption, which accordingly illuminates the meaning of the more primal mode of involvement. If we notice disengagement as a deviation (recall Heidegger’s description of indifference as a deficient mode of *Fürsorge*), we might have phenomenological evidence for the primacy of empathic concern.<sup>12</sup>

Hatab’s characterization of the everyday, default mode of encounter as “empathic care” is perhaps too strongly ethical in tone, but his emphasis on a certain primordial mode of being-toward other Dasein—and the fact that generally a behavioral deficiency is judged as such based on whether it is consistent with the other-acknowledgment inherent in this mode—is correct. So too is his recognition of the analogy between the *Zuhanden/Vorhanden* and the attunement/disengagement continuums that characterize the encounter with, respectively, things and persons. It is important to note, however, that care must be taken in using such an analogy insofar as Heidegger indicates that the normal way of being-toward objects is simply an immersed practical coping, whereas our everyday encounter with other Dasein falls somewhere closer to the “middle” of the *Fürsorge* continuum. Thus Heidegger claims that “just as *circumspection* belongs to taking care of things as a way of discovering things at hand, concern is guided by *considerateness* and *tolerance*. With concern, both can go through the deficient and indifferent modes up to the point of *inconsiderateness* and the tolerance which is guided by indifference” (BT 123/115). This point comes immediately after his observation that everyday being-with maintains itself in mixed forms, and though he does not examine them further, this point seems to indicate that these everyday mixed forms of being-toward the other should be characterized as varieties of considerateness and tolerance—a point that can further support our earlier analyses of temporal accommodation and discursive sharing of the world. Heidegger will later claim that “‘inconsiderate’ being-with ‘reckons’ with others without seriously ‘counting on them’ or even wishing ‘to have anything to do’ with them” (BT 125/118). But despite such reckoning being deficient in a genuine acknowledgment

of the other, this inconsiderateness is nevertheless still *reckoning*—the manner, we will recall, in which world time is instituted with the others. Thus Heidegger will claim that even inconsiderateness occurs “only by a definite being with and toward one another” (BT 125/118). In light of this, the fact that everyday being-with manifests itself in mixed forms does not undercut the implicit temporal acknowledgment of the other underlying these forms or prevent Heidegger from judging one pole of the continuum as a deficiency in light of this acknowledgment.

It is for this reason that Heidegger generally characterizes the deficient modes as extremely *minimal* and *concealed* manifestations of a condition—not as the condition’s complete denial or destruction, despite Hartmann’s claims. Thus Heidegger notes that “the *deficient* modes of omitting, neglecting, renouncing, resting, are also ways of taking care of something, in which the possibilities of taking care are kept to a ‘bare minimum’” (BT 57/53). Indeed, this is the meaning of the word “deficient”—not an absence, but a failure to fully live up to what is standard or required. It is in the same way that leaping-in must be understood as a deficient mode of *Fürsorge*—not as an absence of this way of being-toward specific to other Dasein, but as a way of being-toward the other that fails to fully live up to the standard of acknowledgment that is set in the immediacy of Dasein-to-Dasein recognition.<sup>13</sup> In leaping-in Dasein both registers the other as a being defined by co-temporalizing care, and subsequently acts toward him solely in terms of the intratemporal manner in which he manifests himself in a worldly way. This way of being toward, Heidegger claims, is a type of inconsistency in my way of being that undermines the manner in which my care expresses itself in the world. Thus in *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, Heidegger will note that “neglecting can be characterized as *deficient* caring. A being is deficient if, in the manner of its being, it is detrimental to what it is with and to what it, as an entity, is related. The neglecting is thus itself a care and, indeed, a *deficient care, in such a way, that the care cannot come to what, in accordance with its own sense, it is concerned about*” (IPR 65).

Such deficiencies are essentially an existential discrepancy in which Dasein’s behavior contradicts its fundamental structures of care; a way of being in which it fails to live into the appropriate modes in which care “comes to” what it is concerned about. In the deficient modes of being-toward, care does not lose its concern or cease to relate to the object of its concern, but it ceases to do so in a way that “accords with its own sense.” This is the reason that Heidegger characterizes leaping-in as *inauthentic*: leaping-in is defined by a profound *inappropriateness* insofar as that toward which Dasein transcends is recognized as having a particular type of being, but the mode in which this transcending finds worldly ex-

pression is distorted and inconsistent with this way of being—a discrepancy that is both harmful for the other Dasein (“it is detrimental to what it is with,” *IPR* 65) and prevents one from fully encountering it (“*the care cannot come to what . . . it is concerned about,*” *IPR* 65).<sup>14</sup>

This, then, must be the response to Hartmann’s objection regarding the deficiency of these modes of being-toward the other: that they are the most minimal manifestations of the Dasein-acknowledgment that characterizes the *Fürsorge* continuum and are characterized as deficient in terms of a model of existential consistency within which Dasein’s behavior and its ontological commitments better coincide. Before turning to an examination of what such coincidence *would* look like, however—the mode of being-toward others that Heidegger dubs “leaping-ahead”—we must examine further Dasein’s tendency to fall away from behavior consistent with the always already operative structures of its being—including the acknowledgment of other Dasein that characterizes being-with.

### Inauthenticity

Leaping-in involves a type of turning away from the world-constituting dimensions of the intersubjective encounter in favor of its *innerworldly* dimensions—a turning away that involves a mischaracterization of Dasein’s nature as a temporalizing possibility-being. This mode of solicitude is inauthentic because it disguises Dasein’s genuine nature by focusing only on the worldly, intratemporal aspects of Dasein’s being and tending to assume that this worldly dimension simply makes Dasein the *same* as worldly things. Such a thing-oriented interpretation of Dasein’s being—in both self and other—inhibits the full recognition of this way of being and therefore results in behaviors that are inadequate to it. As François Raffoul notes of leaping-in:

This solicitude is clearly inauthentic, in at least three respects: first, because it treats the other Dasein as something ready-to-hand (as Heidegger notes at GA 2, 122); second, because it consists in *taking the place* of the other, such a substitution representing for Heidegger an inauthentic relation to others; and third, because it disburdens the other Dasein of his/her care, a third characteristic which represents for Heidegger inauthenticity *par excellence*, if it is the case that inauthenticity consists of a fleeing of Dasein in the face of its own existence and of its weight.<sup>15</sup>

Inauthenticity is the tendency to live in an undifferentiated and anonymous way in which one is simply one among many—a tendency enabled and enforced by the interpretation of self and other as *thinglike*, because it allows us to understand our possibilities not as “mine to be,” but as interchangeable qualities accruing to me and to you like predicates. In such a condition, possibilities are experienced “not for me as me, not for you as you, not for us as us, but *for one*. Name, standing, vocation, role, age and fate as mine and yours disappear” (FCM 136). By this Heidegger does not mean that you and I suddenly disappear into an undifferentiated super-subjectivity, or a “universal ego in general” (FCM 136). The averageness structures of *das Man* do “not comprise some *abstraction* or generalization in which a universal concept ‘I in general’ would be thought” (FCM 136). Rather, Heidegger claims that the self’s individuating, temporally particular mineness is forgotten and thus not explicitly lived as such. Nevertheless, this condition of mineness—the existential responsibility of selfhood—continues to operate despite the fact that Dasein looks away from this toward its own worldly manifestation.

This is evident in Heidegger’s point about the manner in which *time* is lived inauthentically: “one feels timeless, one feels removed from the flow of time” (FCM 141). In inauthenticity these temporalizing structures do not disappear or stop functioning—I do not become an “I in general”—but I do not live *in light* of them, in light of my way of being qua mineness: “fate *as mine and yours* disappear” (FCM 136, emphasis mine). Possibilities are no longer mine and yours—given to us by the temporal particularity of our having to be, our “fate”—they become bare, “general” possibilities disassociated from the particularity of our existences. In this way, inauthenticity allows Dasein to forget its responsibility for having to be; it “relieves Dasein of the task . . . to be itself by way of itself. The Anyone takes Dasein’s ‘to-be’ away and allows all responsibility to be foisted onto itself” (HCT 247).

Because of this forgetfulness of Dasein’s mineness, leaping-in is sometimes characterized as involving a category mistake—in which the other is treated in terms of a model of time and possibility appropriate only for innerworldly things, rather than one adequate to her temporalizing having-to-be. Though this is correct, it is important to be clear that characterizing it as a category mistake oversimplifies what is a very complex structure. In the Dasein-to-Dasein to encounter I always already experience the other as *both* temporalizing and intratemporal, but by becoming too focused on the intratemporal dimension I can slide into a way of thinking and acting that treats Dasein like the *other* intratemporal things that I encounter. Dasein is *essentially* intratemporal and inner-

worldly—it is always expressing itself into a world time that relativizes and publicizes its originary temporalizing, but this in itself is not enough to inauthentically mischaracterize Dasein as being *only* this. The distortion characteristic of inauthenticity lies in its tendency to take an interpretive stance equating Dasein's way of being with things because in focusing *only* on the worldly dimensions of Dasein's existence, it forgets or ignores that this worldly dimension does not simply make it the same as worldly entities: "Because by its concept understanding is free self-understanding by way of an apprehended possibility of one's own factual being-in-the-world, it has the intrinsic possibility of shifting in various directions. This means that the factual Dasein can understand itself primarily via intraworldly beings which it encounters . . . It is the understanding that we call *inauthentic understanding*" (BPP 279).

A problem arises once we recognize that Heidegger sometimes seems to imply that it is not only this innerworldly dimension but the inauthentic stance that is an inevitable aspect of our being-with-one-another—namely, that *all* being-with is inauthentic. His talk of *das Man* certainly encourages this interpretation. As a result, articulating *authentic* modes of being-with—which Heidegger explicitly designates as a possibility—becomes extremely hard to reconcile with this implicit view that being-with-one-another is *inherently* inauthentic.<sup>16</sup> As we have already shown in chapter 5, Heidegger is in fact extremely inconsistent on this point, and the difficulties in interpretation that this produces are significant. As Michael Theunissen notes: "Heidegger, regardless of his recognition of authentic being-with-one-another, very often simply equates the inauthentic everyday with being-with-one-another."<sup>17</sup>

Though we have already discussed this difficulty somewhat, it will be fruitful to return to it here now that a fuller picture of Dasein's way of being qua intersubjective temporalizing is at our disposal. As I argued in chapter 5, the assumption that all being-with is inauthentic is rooted in Heidegger's general failure to adequately maintain his own distinction between being-with—the *existential*—and its inauthentic manifestation. By maintaining this difference we can take Heidegger at (some of) his own words and maintain a more logically consistent position. In light of this, the modal indifference of average *everydayness* must similarly be maintained despite the fact that, in placing so much interpretive emphasis on authenticity and inauthenticity, Heidegger encourages us to overlook the range of everyday ways of being that fall between these extreme modes in which being-with can be instantiated.<sup>18</sup> Being-with and its average everyday expressions are not equivalent to inauthenticity, but are modally indifferent conditions that can *become* authentically or inauthentically differentiated.



This move to separate everydayness and inauthenticity is somewhat controversial, considering Heidegger's tendency to speak of it in terms of inauthenticity—such as his claim that Dasein tends to plunge “into the groundlessness and nothingness of inauthentic everydayness” (BT 178/167). Such inconsistencies between the logical demands of his position and his careless forms of expression lead thinkers like Theunissen to note that “the relationship of inauthenticity to ‘everydayness’ is extremely problematic”—even going so far as to describe it as the “murkiest point in *Being and Time*.”<sup>19</sup> And as Dreyfus argues, these two aspects can be recognized in Heidegger's work, “But unfortunately, in *Being and Time* Heidegger does not distinguish these two issues but jumps back and forth between them, sometimes even in the same paragraph. This is not only confusing; it prevents the chapter from having the centrality it should have in an understanding of *Being and Time*.”<sup>20</sup>

Despite Heidegger's tendency to blur the difference between the two, making sense of his position as a whole requires that everydayness be understood as a modally indifferent condition that can be modified in a movement toward inauthenticity (through falling) or in a movement toward authenticity (through resoluteness). Indeed, “indifference” is a term Heidegger seems to use at points to explicitly designate this “between” of everydayness: “Mineness belongs to existing Da-sein as the condition of the possibility of authenticity and inauthenticity. Da-sein exists always in one of these modes, or else in the modal indifference to them” (BT 53/49). And elsewhere he will note: “This indifference of the everydayness of Da-sein is *not nothing*; but rather, a positive phenomenal characteristic. All existing is how it is out of this kind of being, and back into it. We call this everyday indifference of Da-sein *averageness*” (BT 43/41). The priority of this everyday “indifference”—which is then differentiated in the direction of either authenticity or inauthenticity—is further supported by his claim in Division Two that “this *potentiality-of-being* that is always *mine* is free for authenticity or inauthenticity, or for a mode in which neither of these has been differentiated” (BT 232/215). We can also note Heidegger's tendency to understand Dasein's existence as a continuum in which everydayness is stretched between the poles of authenticity and inauthenticity when he claims that “authenticity is only a modification but not a total obliteration of inauthenticity” (BPP 171). Indeed, though he generally tends to equate the worldly range of possibilities articulated by *das Man* as essentially inauthentic, this too must be understood as modally indifferent: as Heidegger notes in *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*: “The ‘*every-one*’ [translating *das Man*] has to do with something definite and positive—it is not only a phenomenon of fallenness, but as such also a how of factual Dasein” (OHF 14). Dasein

essentially expresses itself into a worldly temporality and significance that relativizes and publicizes its originary temporalizing and it is this fact that Heidegger is attempting to articulate with such claims. This notion is more clearly expressed, however, when he characterizes inauthenticity and authenticity as modified grasps of the more basic average *everydayness*: “Authentic existence is nothing which hovers over entangled everydayness, but is existentially only a modified grasp of everydayness” (BT 179/167). There will always be a dimension of self and other expressed in the intratemporality of the world, and though this worldly average-ness is an unavoidable aspect of Dasein’s being, this does not allow us to equate average everydayness with an inauthentic stance in which this averageness is characterized in terms of thingliness.<sup>21</sup>

### Falling . . . Not Fallenness

Despite his confused formulations, then, the everyday worldly modes of being with others are not inherently *fallen* but merely display a tendency toward inauthenticity. In this tendency toward inauthenticity “there is a peculiar *nonexplicitness*, in that the care *falls prey* to the object of its concern. The care as such has no time for any sort of deliberation as to whether what it is preoccupied with is not in the end determined by *it* itself” (IPR 61). It has “no time” for such deliberation because having such time would require *taking it*—and thereby acknowledging its way of being qua world-constituting originary temporality. It is, instead, tending toward an absorbed fascination with the intratemporal things of the world itself. In this falling away from itself Dasein “drifts toward an alienation in which its ownmost potentiality for being-in-the-world is concealed” (BT 178/166). As we have seen, falling is a covering-over of Dasein’s being-in-the-world that “operates by way of reinterpretation” (HCT 316)—a reinterpretation of oneself and other in terms of categories inappropriate for Dasein-being. Falling is a “tendency of being” (BT 313/289) or “kind of ‘movement’ of Dasein” (BT 178/167), and inauthenticity—or fallenness—is essentially the extreme condition of self-alienation that is accomplished when Dasein has given in to this “constant temptation of falling prey” (BT 177/165).

This interpretation allows us to make more sense of Heidegger’s seeming confusion regarding the relationship between everydayness and inauthenticity. Namely, everydayness is a condition in which the *temptation* to inauthenticity—the tendency toward falling—is always present. This does *not* allow us to conclude, however, that everydayness is there-

fore inherently inauthentic. Although we are always exposed to this tendency, we do not always give in to it.<sup>22</sup> Though everydayness is defined by the temptation of inauthenticity, of itself it is neither authentic nor inauthentic. The notion of inauthenticity as temptation brings to mind Dreyfus and Rubins's discussion of Division Two of *Being and Time*, in the appendix to Dreyfus's *Being-in-the-World*. There they claim that "there are *two* versions of falling in *Being and Time*."<sup>23</sup> One is a structural story, in which Dasein's absorbed coping in the world tends to "turn Dasein away from confronting itself," and the other version is a "motivational story that Dasein *actively resists*" the call to authenticity.<sup>24</sup> The consequence of this, they argue, is

a double contradiction; inauthenticity becomes both inevitable and incomprehensible. On the one hand, if one holds that falling as absorption is motivated by fleeing, i.e., that absorption is a way of covering up Dasein's nullity, then, since absorption is essential to Dasein as being-in-the-world, Dasein becomes essentially inauthentic. On the other hand, if facing the truth about itself leads Dasein to equanimity, appropriate action, and unshakeable joy, resoluteness is so rewarding that, once one is authentic, falling back into inauthenticity becomes incomprehensible.<sup>25</sup>

As Taylor Carman argues, however, falling and fleeing must be understood as a difference of degree, and in this sense his view agrees with my interpretation of inauthenticity as one extreme of a continuum. Carman designates "fleeing" as a condition in which one is, so to speak, further gone in the temptation to be inauthentic, but the two are, "from a practical and phenomenological point of view wholly continuous, differing only in degree. Anxious flight is not just some random psychological aberration, but an 'intensified' or 'aggravated' modification of falling (*SZ*, 178)."<sup>26</sup> According to Carman, it is the fact that we "inhabit the shared social and semantic space in which entities are collectively intelligible to Dasein as the things they are" that accounts for the falling of everydayness.<sup>27</sup> The "*generic drift*" of this public arena pulls Dasein away from recognizing its own concrete particularity, thereby accounting for its tendency to fall further and further toward the completely self-forgetful banality of fallenness. Indeed, Heidegger implies that such inauthenticity is just the *cultivation* of this generic drift: "Insofar as there is in Dasein the tendency to take and do things lightly, this unburdening of being which Dasein cultivates as being-with obligingly accommodates it. In thus accommodating Dasein with this unburdening of its being, the public maintains a stubborn dominion" (*HCT* 247). Dasein's everyday

way of being is always already characterized by such a generic drift insofar as it encounters a now-saying other than its own; another now that *relativizes* its own. In the Dasein's encounter with another mineness and its move to express itself through shared worldly measures evoked by this encounter, Dasein's way of being opens the *possibility* of losing itself in the encounter. "Dasein itself presents itself with the possibility in idle talk and public interpretedness of losing itself in the they, of falling prey to groundlessness" (BT 177/165). This possibility is merely presented as a temptation, however—a temptation that Dasein may be prone to act on insofar as it wants to flee the awareness of its own responsible finitude. Acting on this temptation involves cultivating this unburdening; moving from the relativization of possibility inherent in publicity toward the displacement of possibility that this allows.

Even when we give in to this temptation of forgetting and concealing, however, we can never completely elide the status of self and other *as Dasein*—as temporalizing co-constitutors of the world. This is evident in the fact that Heidegger speaks of inauthenticity as something that inhibits or conceals the fundamental structures of selfhood and its temporal heedfulness—structures that are nevertheless *always* operative: falling "has the functional sense of suppressing the Dasein in the Anyone" (HCT 278) such that "being toward the world as well as toward others and itself is disguised" (HCT 280). Despite such "suppression" and "disguise," however, Dasein continues to be characterized by selfhood: inauthenticity's "'not I' by no means signifies something like a being which is essentially lacking 'I-hood,' but means a definitive mode of being of the 'I' itself" (BT 109/116). Note here the similarity with our discussion of deficiency and lack as a type of minimal or suppressed form of that which is standard or required. Inauthenticity is not a lack of these structures or a total lack of awareness of them—since we must be aware of that from which we are fleeing in order to cultivate stances of avoidance—it is, rather, a way of being that fails to fully live up to the standard of acknowledgment that is set by the structures of its existing.

### Ontological Imperatives

Heidegger is clearly aware that we are capable of such ontological inconsistency—that we can focus our behavior solely on the innerworldly "thing-like" dimensions of self and other, despite the constant implicit acknowledgment of our mutual status as world-constituting co-Dasein. But there is nevertheless a certain ontological imperative to appropriate-

ness that generates an obligation to follow through on the immediate Dasein-recognition to which I have always already responded; to act in a way consistent with the always-operative recognition of other Dasein as such. Dasein does not merely seek to meet the standards articulated in public norms—it also seeks to conform to the demands implicit in the very type of being that it is. This imperative to appropriateness is, we can also recall from chapter 2, grounded in Dasein’s having itself to be and the manner in which it attempts to succeed in its being by meeting standards of appropriateness. This is a defining impulse of Dasein’s transcending mineness—an impulse that motivates its heedfulness to public norms, to the temporalizing others, and to its own ontological structures in measuring the success of its having to be.

But if Dasein *cannot* experience the other as a thing, and this other-recognition *necessarily* involves responding in terms of temporal accommodation and self-limit—in what way can such ontological constraint be characterized in normative terms such as “respect” or “obligation,” and in what way am I further compelled to do more than rest easy with this minimal level of acknowledgment inherent in all encounters? What compels me to seek, rather, a response that is *more* appropriate or consistent with the other’s way of being? As we have characterized the *Fürsorge* continuum, *any* answer to the other counts as a response to the other’s claim on me, since all encounters involve an accommodation of their temporal claims to a shared now. But as James Mensch notes in *Ethics and Selfhood*: “Ethics involves more than responsibility—i.e., more than just responding to the other. The necessity for something further comes from the fact that this response need not be ethical in any recognizable sense. I can, for example, respond to the need of the other by turning away . . . [but in ethics the others] do not just call on me to respond, they also raise the question of my response. They invite me to examine its adequacy.”<sup>28</sup>

The apparent absence of minimal conditions for what counts as acknowledging the other is a problem that also afflicts Levinas’s philosophy, argues Bernard Waldenfels.<sup>29</sup> If all responses count *as* a response, how can we move from this seemingly empty form of responsibility to genuinely ethical constraint? By turning to a brief discussion of possible Levinasian solutions we may find a way toward a Heideggerian answer. László Tengelyi takes up concerns with the unavoidability of the Levinasian ethical claim in *The Wild Region in Life-History*, where he questions the nature of an ethics in which “one *cannot* but answer”; an ethics, therefore, that “has nothing to do with any kind of moral *ought*.”<sup>30</sup> The answer to this problem, Tengelyi argues, lies in Levinas’s articulation of an “ineluctable appeal” that is irreducible but nevertheless deeply *related* to such “moral oughts”: it is “the source of a responsibility which is not lim-

ited by any law, right, or measure” but is instead presupposed by moral law as “the ultimate source of its own sense.”<sup>31</sup> For Levinas, intersubjectivity is characterized by a certain type of paradox, rooted in the fact that the ethical appeal does not take place in the closed relationship of the I and thou but is always already witnessed by others—third parties—whose human presence also demands an ethical response. This fundamentally public context of my ethical selfhood demands that my immediate, infinite ethical responsibility to *one* alters to encompass an infinite responsibility to *all*. Two conflicting forms of responsibility are required: the responsibility of the face-to-face encounter, expressed in the ethical relationship, and the responsibility of justice—which accommodates this multitude of others. As Levinas says in “Peace and Proximity,”

The first question in the interhuman is the question of justice. Henceforth it is necessary to know, to become consciousness. Comparison is superimposed on my relation with the *unique* and the incomparable, and, in view of equity and equality, a weighing, a thinking, a calculation, the comparison of incomparables, and, consequently, the neutrality—presence or representation—of being, the thematization and the visibility of the face in some way de-faced as the simple individuation of the individual.<sup>32</sup>

Because of the multitude of others that I am called to answer, infinite ethical responsibility demands, paradoxically, that public institutions and meanings be established that can act as shared measures to mediate these infinite responsibilities; measures in terms of which we may navigate this public space of shared presence. In this sense, my account of Heidegger’s establishment of world time—shared significances according to which we can heedfully accommodate the temporal expression of all the others—is not so different from Levinas’s requirement that justice temper ethics. Both thinkers emphasize the necessity of establishing public measures to accommodate the multitude of beings whose way of existing is nevertheless irreducible to such comparison and measure.<sup>33</sup> As Tengelyi describes it: “Although wild responsibility cannot be traced back to the moral law, it still requires this law as a principle which provides its boundary and measure . . . although the moral law cannot be derived from wild responsibility, either, it still presupposes this kind of responsibility as the ultimate source of its own sense.”<sup>34</sup>

In the same way, we can understand the fact that, for Heidegger, Dasein’s temporalizing way of being demands expression into a world time that accommodates the many now-sayers by establishing shared standards of measure. Understood as such, these worldly standards have their ultimate source of sense in the heedful encounter of Dasein to Da-

sein. Nevertheless, their very worldly mode of being qua average and in-tratemporal means that they can become harmful and inappropriate for understanding and navigating this Dasein being. In such cases, Dasein's care for consistency and appropriateness in its way of being provokes it not simply to strive to *meet* such public standards, but also to *resist* such norms when they are inconsistent with Dasein's most basic ontological structures—including the *Mitsein* recognition of others as profoundly different from things. Sonia Sikka thus argues that despite the common view that Heidegger completely rejects all “transhistorical norms for ethical conduct,” Heidegger's ontology in fact defines “appropriate behaviour toward all entities possessing a certain character.”<sup>35</sup>

Though these public meanings and measures can permit inappropriate interpretations of the other that will nevertheless still count as a “minimal” recognition of her way of being, Dasein's overarching concern for existential consistency will militate against this: local, contingent, and distorting standards of appropriateness will be rejected—*themselves* deemed inappropriate—according to the most basic standards established by Dasein's temporalizing way of being. In this sense, the ontological imperative to appropriateness may demand a transformation in the public norms by which one has been measuring one's success at being. Indeed, as Heidegger argues, we commonly feel distress over the ways in which our inauthentic modes of solicitude inhibit our genuine encounter with the other; we feel “burdened by our inability to go along with the other” (*FCM* 206), registering the tension between public standards of interpretation and the immediacy of Dasein-recognition that is their grounding purpose. This feeling of lack is so upsetting, Heidegger notes in the *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, that overcoming it results in “a new sense of elation in our Dasein each time we accomplish such going-along-with in some essential relationship with other human beings” (*FCM* 206).

Though Levinas initially appears quite far away from Heidegger's position, then, upon closer inspection we can recognize significant similarities. Levinas's notion of *infinite* responsibility, for example, may appear to be a substantial difference from Heidegger's view, but insofar as this notion is essentially a refusal to recognize such “finitizing” third-person institutions of measure as *prior* to the second-person relationship of claim characterizing the Dasein-to-Dasein encounter, their views do not differ as much as Levinas's hyperbole appears to indicate. And though it is often acknowledged that Levinas's characterization of the ethics/justice relationship is one of paradox or “alternating movement” between these different orders of responsibility<sup>36</sup>—the need for third-person comparison vs. Dasein's resistance to such comparison—Heidegger also recognizes that public norms are infected with a type of contingency or limit for this

very same reason, a contingency that is most fully and explicitly brought to light in anxiety, being-toward-death, and the call of conscience. In light of these considerations, we can understand leaping-ahead as a mode of solicitude aimed at nurturing this second-person other who both sub-tends and interrupts these third-person measures.

### Leaping-Ahead

In contrast to the inauthentic tendency of leaping-in—in which I acknowledge but subsequently conceal or turn away from the other’s temporalizing care by focusing only on intratemporal modes of existing—leaping-ahead acknowledges the ontological difference. Leaping-ahead is a way of being-toward another Dasein that takes the complexity of his way of being as its guiding principle.<sup>37</sup> Unlike leaping-in, which conceals, distorts, and resists the other’s status as co-constitutor of the world and the temporal taking-hed that implicitly recognizes it, leaping-ahead explicitly acknowledges and nurtures it: “There is the possibility of a concern which does not so much leap in for the other as *leap ahead* of him, not in order to take ‘care’ away from him, but to first give it back to him as such. This concern which essentially pertains to authentic care; that is, the existence of the other, and not to a that which it takes care of, helps the other to become transparent to himself *in* his care and *free for* it” (BT 122/115). Leaping-ahead involves a more explicit concern for the other in the full complexity and particularity of her being, a concern that builds on the most basic structure of recognition that characterizes all *Fürsorge*: as Heidegger says in the “Letter on Humanism,” “Every affirmation consists in acknowledgment. Acknowledgment lets that toward which it goes come toward it.”<sup>38</sup> In leaping-ahead, this acknowledgment is an affirmation that frees the other to more fully be the type of being that I have always already recognized her to be. I help to reveal to the other her own nature—this “nature” being the other’s world-constituting originary temporality that is the condition for these innerworldly categories. In contrast to leaping-in’s deflection away from the person toward her worldly concerns, leaping-ahead emphasizes her selfhood, not its worldly manifestations.

In this emphasis on the person Heidegger claims that one Dasein can “give” the other her care back to her—“free” her for it. But insofar as care is the very way of being of Dasein as such, how can it be “given back” to Dasein? As Walter Brogan queries, “What kind of exchange is this that gives the other what it already is—its being as possibility?”<sup>39</sup> There is a clear correspondence here between Heidegger’s talk of “freeing” the



other and his claims about authentic Dasein “untangling” itself from the world to free itself for its *own* possibility, and it is for this reason that he designates leaping-ahead as an *authentic* mode of *Fürsorge*. The problem of how one is to free the other for her *own* finite and self-responsible way of being, however—and its relationship to the *self*-freeing of authenticity—is one that we must examine. In doing so it will become clear why it is inaccurate to characterize being-with other Dasein as inherently preventative of authenticity, insofar as other Dasein can in fact serve as a motivating or enabling force for provoking the move toward authenticity. As we will see, it is the *discursive* manner of authentic disclosure that is of the greatest import here, for it is qua *discourse* that the authentic mode of being-with explicitly manifests itself. This will become clear insofar as conscience is the discursive mode through which Dasein’s way of being is revealed to it in its mineness and wholeness—as both worldly *and* world-constituting. It is in terms of the communicative sharing or “giving to understand” of this way of being that Heidegger speaks of one Dasein acting as the call of conscience for another. He is articulating the possibility of a type of authentic discourse whereby one Dasein can bring the other into an orientation toward her own way of being that enables and promotes its authentic grasping. Though only the other Dasein can take on the self-responsibility of her own authenticity—I cannot be authentic *for* another—acting as her call of conscience can bring her into a position that makes this possible. This is the real meaning of leaping-ahead—I bring the other into an orientation toward her way of being that frees her to exist in light of it.

Before we can examine the manner in which one Dasein can act as the call of conscience for the other, however, we must first understand authenticity as a realization of the other tendency characterizing Dasein’s way of being—not the movement of falling in which Dasein understands itself in terms of innerworldly and thing-appropriate interpretive categories, but the resolute tendency toward an appropriate grasping of Dasein’s way of being in its wholeness. This resoluteness is evoked and instantiated not only in conscience, but in the other modes of disclosure specific to authenticity as well—*Angst* and being-toward-death.

## Authenticity

Heidegger’s discussion of authenticity begins by questioning how Dasein can drag itself out of its tendency toward falling such that it achieves a more adequate understanding of its way of being. He questions how Dasein can get a grip on itself as a unified whole, despite the fact that its very

nature is one of ecstatic transcendence characterized by both worldly and world-constituting dimensions. Dasein is not a finished intratemporal thing that can be simply grasped and defined; its ecstatic temporal expression into world time means that “something is always still *outstanding* in Da-sein which has not yet become ‘real’ as a potentiality-of-its-being. A *constant unfinished quality* thus lies in the essence of the constitution of Da-sein. This lack of totality means that there is still something outstanding in one’s potentiality-for-being” (BT 236/219–20). In answering how Dasein can comprehend itself in the face of this ecstatic incompleteness, Heidegger cannot resort to an understanding of the self as simple, monolithic ego—as he makes clear in his rejection of the Cartesian cogito. Nor can this explicit grasping of Dasein’s way of being—authenticity—simply be equated with the existential self-responsibility that Heidegger dubs “mineness,” since “it is only because Dasein in essence is in each instance my own that I can lose myself in the Anyone [*das Man*]” (HCT 309). What differentiates authenticity from inauthenticity is not the mineness of Dasein’s existence, then, but the manner in which Dasein *lives* this condition of temporal ecstasis and existential self-responsibility. In authenticity, Dasein takes this mineness upon itself—making itself responsible for its having to be, so to speak—while inauthentic Dasein gives in to the temptation to flee it.

In keeping with Heidegger’s characterization of the self as way of *being*—not as a substance with properties—authenticity must therefore be understood not as “having” this “information” about one’s complex ecstatic structure of being, but as a particular way of *existing in light of it*. To demonstrate this, Heidegger examines the specific manifestations of the three modes of disclosure that evoke and attest to this way of existing: *Angst*, being-toward-death, and conscience. These are the authenticity-specific manifestations of attunement, understanding, and discourse, and as such each is a way of being that testifies to and instantiates the possibility of existing in an explicit grasping of one’s way of being qua temporally particular having-to-be. They disclose a mode of existing that takes Dasein’s temporalizing mineness as its guiding principle, in contrast to the inauthentic tendency to model Dasein-understanding on the temporal categories appropriate to things.

### Being-Toward-Death

The condition through which the temporality and mineness of one’s existence most powerfully asserts itself is mortality, and it is for this rea-

son that Heidegger's analyses of authenticity focus on death in articulating these aspects of Dasein's being, describing it as one's "*ownmost non-relational possibility not to be bypassed*" (BT 251/232). It is important to be clear, however, that for Heidegger, "death" is not some future event—the moment of my demise—but is his term for the omnipresent possibility of one's absolute *impossibility*. Though many commentators misinterpret Heidegger's use of "death" to mean the end of life,<sup>40</sup> Heidegger's intent is to designate an existential condition of radical contingency and finitude that infects all of the possible ways for Dasein to be—not mere demise.<sup>41</sup> As inauthentic Dasein, I conceal from myself the fact that my finitude is "essentially and irreplaceably mine" (BT 253/234) by fleeing into the anonymity of interpretive categories that belong to innerworldly things—precisely *because* they operate with a vulgar, non-temporally particular notion of time. This applies even when speaking of the event of one's own future dying; though it is in fact possible at any moment, inauthentic Dasein conceptualizes its "possibility of impossibility" as a locatable event in a linear sequence of undifferentiated nows. Such inauthenticity allows Dasein to focus entirely on the worldly tools and projects with which it is absorbed, thereby concealing the existential responsibility—the *mineness*—on which the intelligibility of these projects is based. "In not wanting to think about it, however, Dasein bears witness in its being in death itself. Conversely, death is not first in Dasein because it by chance thinks about it. That before which Dasein flees in its falling flight in everydayness, even without expressly thinking about death, is nothing other than Dasein itself, specifically insofar as death is constitutive of it" (HCT 316).

In *authentic* being-toward-death, however, Dasein grasps the contingency of its existence: "In such being-toward-death this possibility must not be weakened, it must be understood *as possibility*, cultivated *as possibility*, and *endured as possibility* in our relation to it" (BT 261/241). In other words, Dasein can exist its radically possible, unfinished, and contingent way of being as such by cultivating, enduring, and understanding itself as being the type of being it is, a condition of explicit self-grasping that Heidegger sometimes characterizes in temporal terms with the word *anticipation*: "*Anticipation reveals to Da-sein its lostness in the they-self, and brings it face to face with the possibility to be itself*" (BT 266/245). In authentic being-toward-death, the *non-thinglike* temporal particularity and possibility of Dasein's being are illuminated in an anticipatory understanding of "*the possibility of the impossibility of existence*" as possibility (BT 262/242)—and the "anticipatory" nature of this stance lies in the fact that this "possibility of impossibility" is always present *as still to come*.<sup>42</sup> Adopting such a stance enables Dasein to appropriate this groundless-

ness and hinder fallen interpretations of this groundlessness simply as future “event” waiting to be actualized. This anticipatory appropriation enables a “kind of being of Da-sein in which it can be *wholly as Da-sein*” (BT 259/239). Grasped “wholly” as Dasein, I understand my being not only in the worldly, intratemporal dimensions I have in common with things, but also in my temporalizing having to be.

### *Angst*

Despite Dasein’s best efforts to forget this condition of responsible finitude by immersing itself in the innerworldly and intratemporal, awareness breaks through from time to time. *Angst* is Heidegger’s term for this disruptive attunement that discloses the fact that Dasein “has to take over solely from itself the potentiality-of-being in which it is concerned absolutely about its ownmost being” (BT 263/243). What *Angst* reveals is that “death does not just ‘belong’ in an undifferentiated way to one’s own Da-sein, but it *lays claim* on it as something *individual*” (BT 263/243). This “laying claim” individuates by pulling Dasein out of the self-forgetfulness of inauthenticity and bringing it face to face with its own condition as temporally particular having-to-be. This does not mean that Dasein was not an “individual” prior to authenticity—Dasein is *always* a self defined by mineness; rather, in *Angst* Dasein is called to an explicit awareness and appropriation of its nature as such: “The fact that Da-sein is entrusted to itself shows itself primordially and concretely in *Angst*” (BT 192/179). As Haugeland puts it, “In anxiety, a person’s individuality is ‘brought home’ to him or her in an utterly unmistakable and undeniable way.”<sup>43</sup> This unmistakable experience reveals to Dasein the different possible ways it can exist in terms of itself—it discloses the possibilities of self-recognition or self-delusion of which it is capable and thereby undermines its ability to focus only on the fallen possibility of self-forgetting. *Angst*, Heidegger claims, “takes away from Da-sein the possibility of understanding itself, falling prey, in terms of the ‘world’ and the public way of being interpreted” (BT 187/175); it “fetches Da-sein back from its falling prey and reveals to it authenticity and inauthenticity as possibilities of its being” (BT 191/178).

Despite Heidegger’s talk of the world “falling away,” however, we must recall that Dasein is “*not* a subject or consciousness, which only incidentally provides itself with a world” (HCT 305). We cannot interpret the “distance” from world that *Angst* induces as a retreat into the autonomous confines of the solitary self, since its transcendent being-in-the-world is

precisely that *about* which Dasein is anxious: “*Angst* individualizes and thus discloses Da-sein as ‘*solus ipse*.’ This existential ‘solipsism,’ however, is so far from transposing an isolated subject-thing into the harmless vacuum of a worldless occurrence that it brings Da-sein in an extreme sense precisely before its world as world, and thus itself as being-in-the-world” (BT 188/176). What characterizes anxiety is that Dasein’s relation to the world itself—the manner in which the world comes to be the meaningful context of Dasein’s temporalizing—becomes a matter of concern, and *not* the particular meaningful things found within this context. Indeed, the “utter insignificance” of innerworldly beings is revealed in *Angst*, but Heidegger is clear that this does not thereby “signify the absence of world”; rather, it means that this attunement reveals the insignificance of the particular innerworldly things that normally fascinate and absorb because for the first time “the world is all that obtrudes itself in its worldliness” (BT 187/175). Anxiety thus reveals the conditions and context in which care normally operates by placing the particular instances of its operation out of play and allowing the *structure* of its normal functioning to become evident. In *Angst* Dasein is anxious *for* its being-in-the-world—including the fact that this being-in-the-world is defined by a being-with that makes possible the very world in which it normally finds meaning: “This ‘there’ is first of all being-there-with-others, which is the publicly oriented there in which every Dasein constantly remains, even when it withdraws completely into itself” (HCT 254).<sup>44</sup> Heidegger’s talk of the “worldlessness” of *Angst* and the “non-relationality” of being-toward-death make it easy to interpret him as advocating a type of solipsism in which the Dasein-to-Dasein relationship is destroyed or bracketed, however, and many scholars read him as articulating just this position.<sup>45</sup> This interpretation is supported by such Heideggerian claims as: “The non-relational character of death understood in anticipation individualizes Dasein down to itself . . . It reveals the fact that any being-together-with what is taken care of and any being-with the others fails when one’s ownmost potentiality of being is at stake” (BT 263/243). When understood in context, however, it becomes clear that the “being-with-others” to which Heidegger refers in such instances is the worldly mode of encounter:

But if taking care of things and being concerned fail us, this does not, however, mean at all that these modes of Da-sein have been cut off from its authentic being a self. As essential structures of the constitution of Da-sein they also belong to the condition of the possibility of existence in general. Dasein is authentically itself only if it projects itself, *as* being-together with things taken care of and concerned being-with . . . , primarily upon its ownmost potentiality-of-being, rather than upon the

possibility of the they-self. Anticipation of its nonrelational possibility forces the being that anticipates into the possibility of taking over its ownmost being of its own accord. (*BT* 263–64/243)

Insofar as we recall that the world in its worldliness is dependent on the encounter with other co-temporalizing Dasein, however, Heidegger's characterization of the "utter insignificance" of the *innerworldly* becomes less open to interpretations that emphasize the solipsistic tone of anxiety's individualizing. This is supported by his explicit claims emphasizing the continuing presence of the others despite authenticity: "The *authenticity of Dasein* . . . the *self* that Dasein can be, such that it does not really extricate itself from this being-with-one-another but, while this remains constitutive in its being as being-with, it is still itself" (*HCT* 248). In *Angst*, then, it is in terms of the specifically *innerworldly* manifestation of being-with that the others "fall away" and lose significance: "In *Angst*, the things at hand in the surrounding world sink away, and so do innerworldly beings in general. The 'world' can offer nothing more, nor can the *Mitda-sein* of others. Thus *Angst* takes away from Da-sein the possibility of understanding itself, falling prey, in terms of the 'world' and the public way of being interpreted. It throws Da-sein back upon that for which it is anxious, its authentic potentiality-for-being-in-the-world" (*BT* 187/175–76). The normal roles and measures through which we take heed of the others lose their meaning and familiarity because the entire context of meaning and my commitment to it has come into question. As Rebecca Kukla notes: "In cutting off my capacity for unreflective, fallen action, the uncanny reveals that everyday practices *never did* simply determine my actions as the laws of nature can determine my movements. I was bound by the norms of the everyday in virtue of my free commitment to them rather than by compulsion, even if this free commitment is only available through hindsight."<sup>46</sup>

What *Angst* reveals to me is not that all norms are meaningless or make no claim on me—but that I am implicated in the fact that they *do* make such claims. Thus Heidegger's statements about the "non-relationality" of death can be understood as a realization of the contingency of the *worldly* standards of significance and measure with which we normally operate. Eric Sean Nelson notes, therefore, that "death" for Heidegger is a possibility that is "non-relational in that it can not be ordered in the relationality of the world but places relationality itself into question."<sup>47</sup>

This point returns us to the above discussion of the relationship between general standards and particular others, where we noted that though the norms governing public life are generally taken to be settled

and law-like, they are nevertheless haunted by a profound contingency due to Dasein's way of being. In the anxious experience of this contingency of all particular innerworldly norms, Dasein's way of being—the condition for the possibility of these norms obtaining—is first disclosed. What is revealed is Dasein's thrown projecting being-with: the fact that its responsive, understanding sharing of time with others is what makes innerworldly significance possible as such. Though he says, then, that "being-with the others fails when one's ownmost potentiality-of-being is at stake" he also notes that this "does not, however, mean at all that these modes of Da-sein have been cut off from its authentic being a self. As essential structures of the constitution of Da-sein they also belong to the condition of the possibility of existence in general" (*BT* 263/243). What fail in my being-with the others are the specific *innerworldly* roles and measures that have been instituted to accommodate our mutual temporalizing. Though these are the manner in which we normally encounter other Dasein, *through* their failure the others can become evident *as* co-constitutors of world and world time. As Phillip Buckley notes: "For Heidegger (as well as for Husserl), authenticity has something to do with thematizing properly that which remains unthematized in both everyday and scientific life, with making explicit what was only implicit. For Heidegger, what goes totally unnoticed in everyday, indifferent existence is the ontological meaning of Dasein as temporality."<sup>48</sup> Because Dasein's ontological meaning as temporality essentially involves an accommodating openness to the others with whom it constitutes the world, the authentic realization of this meaning necessarily involves an explicit recognition of the role of others in creating and maintaining this context of significance. In authenticity Dasein recognizes the way of being specific to Dasein—but this recognition is not restricted only to its *own* Dasein being.

The temporal nature of authenticity's Dasein-realization is evident not only in understandingly being-toward-death in anticipation; it is also evident in authentic attunement. This becomes particularly clear when we consider Heidegger's discussion of profound boredom, which, along with *Angst*, is a fundamental attunement that allows Dasein's structures of significance—rather than particular significant things—to become a matter of concern. In his analyses of fundamental boredom, he explicitly characterizes the *temporal horizon* as his focus, but here too he is articulating the sense in which we can recognize that which "holds beings as a whole open and makes them accessible in general as such" (*FCM* 147), an accessibility, Heidegger notes, that involves the way in which the temporal horizon "must simultaneously bind Dasein to itself and entrance it" (*FCM* 147). This normally happens in terms of particular innerworldly things, but in authenticity, this temporal horizon *itself* grips Dasein—its

own temporalizing way of being is disclosed to it as such, thereby inhibiting its engagement with the intratemporal things that this temporalizing enables. “Time entrances [*bannt*] Dasein, not as the time which remained standing as distinct from flowing, but rather the *time beyond such flowing and its standing*, the time which in each case *Dasein itself as a whole* is. This whole time entrances as a horizon. Entranced by time, Dasein cannot find its way to those beings that *announce themselves in the telling refusal of themselves* as a whole precisely within this horizon of entrancing time” (FCM 147). Fundamental attunements such as *Angst* and boredom interrupt the everyday functioning of world and world time such that their role *as the horizon* “which properly makes possible” (FCM 148) becomes evident as such. This authentic awareness that interrupts the everyday entrancement of time to reveal temporalizing itself is, according to Heidegger, “able to rupture it, insofar as it is a specific possibility of time itself” (FCM 151). Heidegger characterizes this temporal possibility of rupture as the authentic now, or the “Augenblick” (FCM 149). But as we will see in the next section, it is the third authentic mode of disclosure—conscience—that primarily accounts for the rupturing quality of the authentic now; it *calls* us into this moment of authentic time and *demands* authenticity of us.

### The Call of Conscience

After discussing *Angst* and being-toward-death, Heidegger asserts that “the question hovering over us of an authentic wholeness of Dasein and its existential constitution can be placed on a viable, phenomenal basis only if that question can hold fast to a possible authenticity of its being attested by Dasein itself” (BT 267/246). The call of conscience is the mode of discursive disclosure that attests to the possibility of authenticity such that Dasein in the whole of its existing can be brought into the existential fore-having necessary for understanding this existence. Understood as discourse, then, we can recognize that conscience *articulates the intelligibility* of the basic structures of Dasein’s way of being; the call *gives to understand* Dasein’s temporalizing existence in all its mineness and particularity.

Because inauthentic Dasein resists this self-understanding, authenticity demands that Dasein be brought back to itself from its fallen immersion in worldly understandings, and “this bringing-back,” Heidegger says, “must have the kind of being *by the neglect of which Da-sein* has lost itself in its inauthenticity” (BT 268/248). As we noted, it is neglect of the



temporalizing mineness and finitude of existence that leads Dasein to take its interpretive guidance from intratemporal things that are not defined by possibility and self-responsibility. In doing so, Dasein fails to live into these possibilities *as its own*, drifting along instead in the anonymous and inherited roles and interpretations that have, so to speak, chosen it. Inauthenticity lulls Dasein into going along with the roles that are given to it such that it not only fails to choose specific possibilities as genuinely its own, but also fails to recognize its way of existing as a being capable of such self-responsible choice. Thus becoming authentic involves overcoming a condition in which one both fails to be a free self *and* forgets that this is even a possibility. Grasping its own potentiality of being cannot, therefore, involve a straightforward choice to resist fallenness. Heidegger realizes that Dasein cannot simply “decide” to be authentic, since this *capacity* is itself concealed and evaded in fallenness. Conscience therefore has the task of uncovering—awakening—the very *potential* for authenticity that is ordinarily forgotten. The difficulty, as Heidegger recognizes, is how this neglected capacity for responsibility can become a possibility for actualization if Dasein has given in to the tendency to fall away from itself: how to choose choice when the capacity for choosing has been forgotten?

The answer involves a certain type of “self-finding”: “Because Dasein is lost in the ‘they,’ it must first *find* itself. In order to find *itself* at all, it must be ‘shown’ to itself in its possible authenticity” (BT 266/248). But what is the form of this authentic self-showing that can, paradoxically, occur from within inauthenticity? Heidegger points the way forward in querying: “How is the authenticity of existence to be defined at all if not with reference to authentic existing? Where do we get our criterion for this? Obviously Dasein itself in its being must present the possibility and way of its authentic existence, if such existence is neither imposed upon it ontically, nor ontologically fabricated. But an authentic potentiality of being is attested in conscience” (BT 234/216). Conscience plays the role of giving Dasein’s way of being to it to be *understood*. But insofar as existential understanding is a way of *being* for Heidegger—not simply an abstract *knowing*—for conscience to bring Dasein’s potential authenticity into the space of understanding is not simply to grant Dasein *information* about a capacity. Rather, it must itself be an initial or inaugural realization of the capacity itself. This, indeed, is the reason “attestation” is the term used to describe the role of conscience: attestation generally means a substantiation or corroboration of something. Conscience attests to Dasein’s potential authenticity by first demonstrating or manifesting this possibility—by first *existing* it. The call that brings Dasein back from its fallenness must reverse the neglect of this capacity

by first engaging it, then, but it must do so in a way that doesn't illicitly presuppose that this reversal has already occurred. It is for this reason that Heidegger describes inaugural instances of authenticity as "making up for not choosing . . . *choosing to make this choice*—deciding for a potentiality-of-being, and making this decision from one's own self" (BT 268/248). The possibility of Dasein inaugurating an authentic way of being despite the fact that this very authenticity seems necessary to resist falling—a seemingly vicious circle—lies in the nature of conscience as call. In conscience one is summoned to one's own structure as temporalizing care in a type of double movement, a "calling back that calls forth": "*forth* to the possibility of taking over in existence the thrown being that it is, *back* to thrownness in order to understand it as the null ground that it has to take up into existence" (BT 287/264). Understood as such, Heidegger makes room for an initial choosing of one's being in the face of the groundless conditions out of which all such choices must be made and the self-forgetfulness that this motivates. Conscience is a self-summoning to responsiveness that creates the very responsiveness that it needs in order to be heard. As Rebecca Kukla puts it: "This call *discloses* Dasein, by uncovering the implicit normative structure of Dasein's fallen dealings, but in doing so it also *constitutes* Dasein in its individuated being. While fallen, Dasein has 'forgotten' that it is not merely the They, and it must remember this through its recognition of conscience's call. But since, in a chronological sense, we are 'first' lost in the everyday, this remembering has to be of a funny sort."<sup>49</sup> This "remembering" occurs through conscience's unique structure as a calling of the self to a resolute choosing of the way of being that it nevertheless must always be.

### Hearing the Call

What is it about the call of conscience that allows for this initial "making possible" of Dasein genuinely living into its way of being in its wholeness? The answer to this question lies in the fact that Heidegger understands conscience as a discursive *call*. The notion of "the call" is a recurring theme in many of Heidegger's works—in "Language," in "Letter on Humanism," and other texts it plays an important role. In *What Is Called Thinking?* Heidegger plays with the verb "to call," exploring other verbs that it evokes—summon, demand, instruct, direct, command—as approximations to its meaning. He clarifies that the sense of call with which he is concerned does not just imply demand, however, but "rather implies an anticipatory reaching out for something that is reached by our

call, through our calling” (WCT 386). The nature of such an “anticipatory reaching out” is clarified further when he asserts that to call is “to command,” which “basically means, not to give commands and orders, but to commend, entrust, give into safekeeping, to shelter” (WCT 387). Understood in this manner, conscience is a type of anticipatory reaching out and evocative nurturing of one’s ability to live in light of one’s being qua worldly and world-constituting mineness. These explorations are also instructive in that each characterization of “calling” involves a type of bringing into relationship; calling is a summoning and granting “bringing together”—a relation, indeed, in which the *relata* are not clearly reducible to “agent” and “recipient”: “The call is precisely something that *we ourselves* have neither planned for nor willfully brought about. ‘It’ calls, against our expectations and even against our will. On the other hand, the call without doubt does not come from someone else who is with me in the world. The call comes *from* me, and yet *over* me” (BT 275/254). Such a middle-voice structure is particularly evident in Heidegger’s emphasis on the dimension of *hearing* that belongs to conscience. Further examination of the “choice” that makes choosing possible leads Heidegger to argue that such an inaugural authentic existing is essentially a certain type of “hearing” or responsiveness in the face of the call that grants Dasein an understanding of its way of being. Dasein’s being in its wholeness qua worldly and world-constituting can be disclosed when the capacity to hear the disclosure has been awoken. Conscience’s status as call both grants Dasein an understanding of its way of being and evokes the type of open listening that makes it capable of receiving such a “giving to understand”: “Da-sein fails to hear itself, and listens to the they, and this listening gets broken by the call if that call, in accordance with its character as call, arouses another kind of hearing which, in relation to the hearing that is lost, has a character in every way opposite. If this lost hearing is numbed by the ‘noise’ of the manifold ambiguity of everyday ‘new’ idle talk, the call must call silently, unambiguously, with no foothold for curiosity” (BT 271/250–51). Heidegger’s account of conscience as “alternative” hearing allows us, then, to clarify the structure of this inaugurating instance of a forgotten or hidden capacity, a structure that he first characterizes with his claim that conscience calls Dasein to choose choosing. Better: conscience calls Dasein to *hear* its own forgotten way of being.

Interestingly, the use of the concept of “hearing” is not experienced as being nearly so circular, and its greater palatability lies, I believe, in our inability to conceive of “choice” as anything other than explicit, self-conscious, willful act. The concept of choice resists the middle-voiced structure that Heidegger attempts to attribute to it—the reason, per-

haps, that he is so often accused of a willful decisionism.<sup>50</sup> But for Heidegger, Dasein's resolute "taking action" in authenticity "would have to be so broadly conceived that 'activity' also encompasses the passivity of resistance" (BT 300/276).<sup>51</sup> The concept of hearing as an existential openness to the discursive giving to understanding of Dasein's way of being more adequately captures this notion than "choosing to choose" can. Its ambiguous status as a type of active receiving or passive activity is more appropriate for characterizing this inaugural instance in which Dasein allows itself to resist the tendency toward falling. It is for this reason, I would argue, that Heidegger describes hearing as the most "primary and authentic openness" (BT 163/153). As John Llewelyn notes:

The voice of conscience is a middle voice, akin to the Greek voice that Heidegger finds most suitable to express the mood of the phenomenological thinking called for in *Being and Time*, a thinking which must be cooperative and vigilant listening obedience. "Listening-to . . . is Dasein's existential way of Being-open as Being-with for Others" (BT 163). Here and in the paragraph immediately following this sentence in *Being and Time* the words used are *hören* and *horchen*, where along with the idea of hearkening there are overtones of heed, *gehörchen*.<sup>52</sup>

As we will argue below, this notion of *heed*—a concept we have seen before in terms of accommodating the foreign temporality of the other—applies not only to the *self*-calling of conscience, but characterizes the *other*-calling and responsive openness characteristic of leaping-ahead.

What Heidegger is articulating here, however, is a *self*-calling characterized by a type of unity of activity and passivity evident in his claim that despite the fact that the "tendency toward disclosure of the call lies [in] the factor of a jolt, of an abrupt arousal" it nevertheless only reaches "him who wants to be brought back" (BT 271/251). Understood as such, we can understand conscience not simply as offering Dasein the possibility of authenticity, but *summoning* it to live in light of this disclosed way of being. Such a summoning accounts for the manner in which conscience differs from *Angst*, which simply "fetches Dasein back from its falling prey and reveals to it authenticity and inauthenticity as possibilities of its being" (BT 191/178). Conscience is not simply a revelation, however, but a type of *invocation* and *demand*. Thus in introducing the discussion of conscience, Heidegger notes that "we must investigate to what extent *at all* and in what way Dasein *bears witness* to a possible *authenticity* of its existence from its ownmost potentiality-of-being, in such a way that it not only makes this known as *existentially* possible, but *demands* it of itself" (BT 267/246). Conscience is the mode of disclosure in which Dasein's pos-

sible authenticity is given to it as a certain *imperative*, an imperative whose “content” is not given by the particular worldly roles and measures that have been called into question, but by the very structures of Dasein’s being qua temporalizing mineness. In this sense the call of conscience is the normative injunction that I live in light of the way of being that I have to be, rather than fleeing it into thingly-interpretations. Though authenticity is not, in this sense, a worldly or a contentful norm—it does not tell me specific things to do—neither is it empty. Instead, it demands that I meet my potential of taking responsibility for these worldly norms by recognizing and acting consistently with my way of being as a shared world-constituting with other Dasein. In this regard, it counteracts falling’s tendency toward inauthenticity.

Thus Rebecca Kukla notes that conscience’s call is “such that hearing its call constitutes subjects as responsive and responsible negotiators of normative claims.”<sup>53</sup> As Kukla makes clear, however, we always already *are* responsive negotiators of normative claims—the claims of everyday standards of appropriateness, and, on a more fundamental ontological level, the claims of attuned understanding and the temporal constraints of the shared now. This responsiveness is always operative in our everyday way of being with others, though it is not recognized and “owned” as such: “This responsiveness could not exist if we were fully and irretrievably fallen. The problem is that if we were *merely* carried along by the everyday, then our relationship to it would not be normative at all. The norms of the They would function for us like laws of nature, compelling us immediately at the level of blind impulse, rather than binding us in virtue of our recognition of their force and our commitment to them.”<sup>54</sup> It is for this reason, argues Kukla, that Heidegger’s project must be understood as a transcendental one: he is “arguing from the existence of normative responsiveness to the conditions of its possibility, not proving the possibility of such a responsiveness from a starting point that makes no appeal to it.”<sup>55</sup> What conscience expresses, then, is a demand for a type of existential consistency in which Dasein explicitly recognizes and takes responsibility for—lives in light of—these always already operative existential structures of being-in-the-worldly space of significance.<sup>56</sup> Because Dasein is subjected to this summons to resolute existing, we can recognize the source of the *demand* that I act in ways consistent with my way of being, an imperative that appeared problematic when we considered the fact that on a minimal and unavoidable level, Dasein is *always* acting in ways consistent with its way of being—since it cannot help but do so. As Bernhard Radloff notes, with this notion of a “having to be” that I both always am and yet must “live up” to being, Heidegger is demonstrating the significant influence that Aristotle had

on his thinking: “Heidegger—following his retrieval of Aristotle—understands this being of a being as the movement (*kinesis*) of a being into its own proper limit and form, as determined by the principle of unfolding (*arche*) inherent in it.”<sup>57</sup> Unlike Aristotle, however, Heidegger’s only articulation of this “proper limit and form” is in the structure of its temporal ecstasis qua thrown projecting being-with. Thus with the notion of ontological imperatives to appropriateness, Heidegger may offer a middle way between a robust perfectionism and a pure formalism: in the call of conscience, “‘rising’ to the occasion of existence”<sup>58</sup> is demanded of Dasein, but meeting this norm occurs only by Dasein taking *responsibility* for the constraints that are, qua *existentials*, always already operative. Thus Heidegger notes that if Dasein does so, he will “successfully” and adequately “respond to what presses upon him as a necessity, namely not acting counter to what is essential in Dasein. Not acting counter to the essential here means *being held to oneself*” (FCM 174). With the notions of authenticity (self-holding) and inauthenticity (self-forgetfulness) Heidegger makes room for the fact that Dasein can succeed or fail at a being that it nevertheless cannot help but be:

Yet do we not all know this? Yes and no. We do not know it to the extent that we have forgotten that man, if he is to become what he *is*, in each case has to throw Dasein upon his shoulders; that he precisely is not when he merely lets himself set about things in the general fray, however “spirited” this may be; that Dasein is not something one takes for a drive in the car as it were, but something that man must specifically take upon himself . . . Man must first resolutely open himself again to this demand. (FCM 165)

Successfully responding to what “presses upon it as a necessity” therefore requires that Dasein is in a certain sense “held to itself” such that the response is adequate to the appeal. This being held to oneself—a formulation that doesn’t entirely capture its middle-voiced structure of a self-holding/being held—is the essence of authenticity, in which Dasein takes on the responsibility of the claims inherent in its having to be.

### Ethical Implications

The foregoing points allow us to better understand our earlier discussion of the Levinasian “ineluctable appeal” of ethics—a claim to which I cannot help but respond, but for which my response can nevertheless be

deemed inadequate. It returns us to Kant, as well, since Kant defined the human being in terms of a fundamental rationality whose claims one is still blameworthy in failing to meet. Heidegger is further in agreement with Kant insofar as he ties the moral status of an action to the degree to which Dasein takes explicit responsibility for the original claims of its having to be: “*Self-responsibility is the fundamental kind of being determining distinctively human action, i.e. ethical praxis*” (EHF 180). Heidegger’s appreciative interpretation of Kantian ethical theory finds particular expression in *The Essence of Human Freedom*, where he examines this essential dimension of existential self-responsibility that is its heart:

Unless pure willing, as the genuinely actual of all ethical action, actually wills itself, a material table of values—however finely structured and comprehensive—remains a pure phantom with no binding force. This willing is allegedly empty, but at bottom it is precisely this which is most concrete in the lawfulness of ethical action. The ethicality of action does not consist in realizing so-called values, but in the actual willing to take responsibility, in the decision to exist within this responsibility. (EHF 190–91)

Unlike Kant, however, Heidegger takes this self-responsibility to encompass all of the dimensions of ecstatic being-in-the-world—not just Dasein’s rationality. For Heidegger, authentic resoluteness is Dasein deciding to “exist within the responsibility” of its way of existing as attuned, understanding, and in relation with others—an existing that it is always already compelled to be. He therefore makes room for appropriating dimensions of Kantian theory and rejecting others when, in his analysis of the will as “*nothing other than practical reason and vice versa*” (EHF 187) he claims that “*to actually will is to will nothing else but the ought of one’s existence. Only in this kind of willing is that actual within which the fact of the ethical law is actually a fact . . . The factuality of this fact does not stand over against us but belongs with us ourselves such that we are claimed for the possibility of this actuality, not just in this or that way, but in our essence*” (EHF 196). Insofar as Heidegger understands the ought and the essence of one’s existence differently, he is not a Kantian, but the structure of claim and responsibility-taking is similar, as he recognizes: “This fact of an unconditional obligation may well exist, and if so is obviously connected with what we call ‘conscience’” (EHF 197). Thus despite the fact that talk of self-responsibility and “self-binding” has led some to accuse Heidegger of reducing norm-responsiveness to a type of arbitrary self-relation, he is clear that the claims to which Dasein must bind itself are not merely accidental or arbitrary objects for selection, but essential

dimensions of Dasein's being-in-the-world—including the fact of being heedful to the other Dasein's temporalizing being-in-the-world. Authentic self-responsibility is “to bind oneself to oneself, but not egotistically, i.e. not in relation to the accidental ‘I’” (EHF 199).

Characterizing such normative claims in the absence of this moment of self-responsibility would turn them into a type of natural law that simply compels obedience. On the contrary, “a genuinely normative call must serve as an authoritative source of action, but it must not *complete* the determination of the action, so that it leaves its target free to responsibly and authoritatively respond to its authority.”<sup>59</sup> Normative claims can always be refused, evaded, covered over—as Dasein's tendency to falling makes clear. In the absence of this responsibility-taking such claims will not cease being obligations—but they would fail to bind me to them. As Rebecca Kukla notes:

Transcendental conscience discloses the normative demands made upon us as *binding*, rather than leaving them to sit passively in experiential space, as some perhaps do for the psychopath, who is perfectly capable of internalizing moral rules in the sense of memorizing them, but for whom they have no binding force. Hence such conscience commands nothing, *not* in the sense that there are no legitimate, concrete commands that bind subjects, but in the sense that the *responsibility for responding* to these commands, which this conscience must instill, is never reducible to or explicable by an appeal to mere exposure to yet a further set of commands.<sup>60</sup>

This being free to take on or turn away from my obligations is, Heidegger claims, “not a property of man but is synonymous with behaving ethically” (BPP 141). Such a characterization of self-responsibility recognizes that the essence of obligation is to compel and summon—but not coerce. It is important to be clear, then, that Heidegger is not asserting the unbounded or unlimited nature of Dasein—that we are not subjected to any claims until we decide to make something into a claim. Rather, he is articulating the necessary conditions for explicitly responding to claims *as* claims—namely, that Dasein must take part in *committing* itself to them as such:

Letting something stand-over-against as something given, basically the manifestness of beings in the binding character of their so-and-that-being, is only possible where the comportment to beings, whether in theoretical or practical knowledge, already acknowledges this binding character. But the latter amounts to an originary self-binding, or, in Kantian terms, the giving of a law unto oneself. The



letting-be-encountered of beings, comportment to beings in each and every mode of manifestness, is only possible where freedom exists. (EHF 205)

My obligation to respect a certain claim cannot make me act in light of it unless I take responsibility for who I am to be in the face of such claims. “Freedom makes Dasein in the ground of its essence, responsible [*verbindlich*] to itself, or more exactly, gives itself the possibility of commitment” (MFL 192). In understanding what it means for Dasein to *take responsibility* for the possibility of normative commitment, we can agree with Steven Crowell’s suggestion in “Facticity and Transcendental Philosophy” that “to recognize my responsibility in the existential sense is to understand that the *being* normative of norms, their functioning *as* norms, is grounded in my concern for normativity as such,” and this concern for normativity as such “rests on what Heidegger calls an ‘ontological’ basis, namely, on the existential circumstance that a *concern* with normativity *constitutes* selfhood.”<sup>61</sup>

But as we have shown, my concern for normativity is rooted not only in my desire to meet adequately the constraints of my way of existing, but also in my desire to accommodate the temporalizing having to be of the other Dasein. This deep intertwinement of my having to be with that of other Dasein is most evident in the fact that the others can themselves be the *source* of this summons to adequacy. In this sense, it seems clear that concern for the other is not a simple *derivative* of authentic self-responsibility, since the latter is often secondary to the former. By acting as the other Dasein’s call of conscience, I can summon her to take over her responsibility for having to be. This is the essence of the mode of *Fürsorge* that Heidegger dubs “leaping-ahead”: it is a mode of being-with in which I disclose and nurture the other in the wholeness of her existence qua worldly *and* world-constituting having-to-be, and it finds its voice in the call of conscience.

### The Call of the Other

It is important to note from the outset that when he claims that Dasein can become the conscience of others he uses “scare” quotes to convey the sense that Dasein can only act as a conscience-*like* phenomenon for the other: “Resolute Dasein can become the ‘conscience’ of others” (BT 298/274). Dasein can function *like* the other’s conscience, then, but it cannot in fact *be* the other’s conscience; there remains a significant dif-

ference between conscience's self-calling, and this conscience-like "being called." This difference is demonstrated when we consider a major difficulty facing the claim that I may be the recipient of a silent call from another Dasein which evokes an authentic hearing. Namely, the coincidence of caller and called within the same articulated Dasein seemed to be essential to the unified existing that characterized authenticity. Since conscience is both the call to another hearing and the first instance of this hearing itself, it thereby provides a type of inaugural instance of responsiveness to my responsibility for being that evokes my authentic existing. If this is the case, however, how can we talk about this inaugural authentic hearing without the call coming from—and simultaneously triggering responsiveness in—my own Dasein?

It is here that we must rely on Heidegger's use of scare quotes regarding the other's ability to act as the call of conscience. Conscience can—qua discourse—allow others to give me an understanding of being in its mineness through a communicative sharing in which what I had previously fallen away from—an awareness of my way of being—is made explicit to me. Though the other's call can therefore summon me to a responsive self-understanding of this way of being qua having to be, it cannot fulfill the other dimension of conscience: the responsibility-taking that accounts for it being a genuine inauguration of authenticity. In other words, the others cannot *take responsibility* for this being in my place. Indeed, the other's belief that he *can* take responsibility for my being in my place is precisely the misunderstanding and distortion at the root of leaping-in. The other who calls me with the voice of conscience gives me a self-understanding that I did not previously have, then, but it is a giving that summons *me* to take responsibility for *my own* having to be.

A potential problem that arises with this interpretation lies in the fact that the *summoning* quality of conscience appears to rely on the fact that it is a *self-calling* from out of our everyday tendency toward inauthenticity. The possibility of interrupting falling lies in being summoned *immediately*, argues Heidegger, and this character of immediacy is attributable to conscience because it is Dasein calling *itself*. Though our initial understanding of the call of conscience seemed to require that the Dasein presenting the possibility of authentic existing is the *same* Dasein as the one to whom this possibility is attested, however, nothing in Heidegger's account requires that we reach this conclusion. Indeed, he never offers any argument for the claim that Dasein's potentiality-for-being-a-whole can *only* be triggered by the immediacy of self-calling. This is not the only way to understand this immediacy, however: note how he claims that the call of conscience is necessary for Dasein to be brought back from its lostness in the they "*if this is to be done through itself*" (BT 271/250, em-

phasis mine). Such an “if” implies that one may also be called back from this lostness by something—or someone—other than the self. Though he emphasizes the necessity of conscience being the “*self* calling the self” to its ownmost possibilities if the immediacy of the call is to achieve its “jolting” disclosure, then, Heidegger seems to simply *assume* that the call must be *from* my authentic self if it is to succeed as a call to *be* this authentic self, particularly when the call cannot be from “someone else who is with me in the world” (BT 275/254). Thus he asserts that “when the caller reaches him who is summoned, it does so with a cold assurance that is uncanny and by no means obvious. Wherein lies the basis for this assurance, if not in the fact that Da-sein, individualized to itself in its uncanniness, is absolutely unmistakable to itself? What is it that takes away from Da-sein so radically the possibility of misunderstanding itself from some other direction and failing to recognize itself, if not the abandonment in being delivered over to itself?” (BT 277/256).

Wherein lies the basis of *this* assurance? Why must the absolute immediacy with which the call takes away the possibility of misunderstanding imply that it could *only* have come from me?<sup>62</sup> Since communicative discourse is the sharing of new orientations and understandings, its very structure allows for this possibility. Nevertheless, it cannot have come from “someone else who is with me in the world,” since “in its who, the caller is definable by *nothing* ‘worldly.’ It is Da-sein in its uncanniness, primordially thrown being-in-the-world, as not-at-home, the naked ‘that’ in the nothingness of the world” (BT 276–77/255). As we have already shown, however, the others, too, are characterized by a dimension that is “nothing worldly”; something which accounts for the fact that the world’s structures of significance and measuring are *constituted* in Dasein-to-Dasein encounters. If we are to take seriously Heidegger’s claim that I may be the recipient of a conscience-like call originating in another Dasein, then, this call would have to originate in the world-constituting temporalizing mineness of the other Dasein—and not in the other’s “worldly” mode of being. Thus in noting the fact that “hearing the call depends on the very abilities it is supposed to constitute,” one can conclude that the temporality of the call “cannot be that of placement within chronological succession, since as an ontological moment it comes ‘before’ events that are chronologically earlier than it. It is this sort of consideration . . . that led Heidegger to insist upon the non-primordially of chronological time.”<sup>63</sup> Sources of this primordial claim must therefore be irreducible to the innerworldly, intratemporal dimension. As Heidegger notes in *The Essence of Human Freedom*, the reality of a natural thing has its “what-content” “in the actual objects of spatio-temporal experience” (EHF 185). Since freedom is not

like this, but is nevertheless still a fact, “the reality of freedom must be capable of intuitive presentation in a mode other than that applicable for natural things. The reality of freedom requires another kind of actuality than that exhibited by natural objects, i.e. the reality of freedom is *not an objective reality*” (EHF 185). Since *other Dasein* meet this criterion, it is not only my own voice of conscience that can be a source of such “extratemporal” and “otherworldly” calling claims. In being called by the other, I am also called with such a voice. Heidegger makes room for this possibility because of his emphasis on *hearing* as the discursive manner in which conscience summons and provokes in *Dasein* an understanding of its way of being. The very same structure characterizing openness to my *own* call of conscience is what characterizes the most essential openness to the *other Dasein*: “Listening to . . . is the existential being-open of *Da-sein* as being-with for the other. Hearing even constitutes the primary and authentic openness of *Da-sein* for its ownmost possibility of being, as in hearing the voice of the friend whom every *Da-sein* carries with it” (BT 163/153). The implication here is that *Dasein*’s responsiveness to its own potentiality of being is primarily constituted through the very *same* receptive moment of discourse that discloses *Dasein*’s essential being-with others.<sup>64</sup>

This mention of “the voice of the friend whom every *Da-sein* carries with it” brings to mind current discussions of the self-relational dimension of ethics as a type of “internalized other.”<sup>65</sup> Such a characterization of hearing led Levinas to query whether the *self-calling* nature of conscience is—qua discourse—derivative of *other-calling*: that is, discursive being-with: “One must ask if this very discourse, despite its allegedly interior scissions, does not already rest on a prior sociality with the Other where the interlocutors are distinct. It is necessary to ask if this forgotten but effective sociality is not nonetheless presupposed by the rupture, however provisional, between self and self, for the interior dialogue to still deserve the name dialogue” (“DR” 102).<sup>66</sup> The question of whether conscience is *derivative* of “conscience” or whether the self-oriented and the other-oriented modes of authentic discourse are *equiprimordial* cannot be further addressed here; nevertheless there is certainly a case to be made for the former interpretation despite the decidedly Levinasian slant that this would give Heidegger. If we recall that discourse is the mode of disclosure belonging essentially to being-with, however, this interpretation does not seem so foreign: “This capacity to listen to the other with whom one is, or to oneself who one is in the mode of discoursing, where it is not at all a matter of utterance in the sense of external speaking, is grounded in the structure of being of the original being-with-one-another” (HCT 266).

## Silence

If others are to act as the call of conscience for me, they must trigger this other hearing, and they must call in a mode that is other than worldly, intratemporal modes of discourse; their call cannot take the form of ordinary calling. Instead it must “call silently, unambiguously, with no foothold for curiosity” (BT 271/251). It is for this reason that Heidegger analyzes the essential possibility of discourse that correlates to authentic hearing: *keeping silent*. This is a form of communicating, he argues, that is not an “external speaking,” but which can nevertheless “let something be understood” by the other person (BT 164/154). Despite its silence, such a call “loses nothing of its perceptability” (BT 273/252–53).<sup>67</sup> This perceptible yet silent “something” that I let the other understand, Heidegger claims, “makes manifest and puts down ‘idle talk’” (BT 165/154).

What is this “something” that can only be understood outside the domain of idle talk? According to Heidegger, keeping silent implies that Dasein is in “command of an authentic and rich disclosedness of itself” (BT 165/154). One can conclude, then, that in such communicative keeping silent, what I give the other to understand is Dasein-being and the potentiality of authentic existing implied therein—certainly topics outside the domain of idle talk. Thus Heidegger goes on to say that “keeping silent” implies that Dasein has something to say but *refrains* from doing so and that this reticence “articulates the intelligibility of Dasein so primordially that it gives rise to a genuine potentiality for hearing and to a being-with-one-another that is transparent” (BT 165/154). This primordial articulation, this “silent communication” that grants transparency, is a clear echo of the structures of conscience—but in these passages the indication is that such a silent communication is possible not only between my authentic and inauthentic “selves” but between my authentic self and another Dasein. Indeed, by claiming that it “gives rise to a genuine potentiality for hearing”—a genuine hearing that, being authentic, I myself have supposedly already achieved—Heidegger clearly indicates that authentic Dasein has the capacity to awaken this potentiality in other, inauthentic Dasein. The capacity to engage in such a mode of silent, yet communicative—*shared*—discourse is the essence of the discursive nature of the call of conscience, which establishes the authentic mode of being-with that Heidegger terms “leaping-ahead.”

Before we can turn to the final section of this discussion—in which we will examine the implications of these analyses for understanding leaping-ahead more concretely—we must face two final objections arising from the fact that most interpreters insist that only previously *authentic* Dasein can act as the call of conscience that establishes the authentic

Dasein-to-Dasein relationship. First, if a prior authentic resoluteness is required for leaping-ahead, it seems that such authentic being-with will not only be extremely rare, but it will only take the form of refusing to treat the other in terms of thing-appropriate categories. In other words, it will not encompass positive human relationships. Many commentators argue that insofar as authenticity is inherently isolating, it cannot account for the entire range of human relationships that we hope to encompass within the leaping-in/leaping-ahead continuum, such as love and justice.<sup>68</sup> Thus Theunissen notes, for example, that from a positive standpoint, such a letting of the other be “stands for the recognition of the ownmost being of Others, [but] is, from a negative standpoint, the dissolution of all direct connection between Others and me. Others can only be freed *for themselves* inasmuch as they are freed *from me*.”<sup>69</sup> Dan Zahavi takes a similar stance when he claims that this “helping” the other to authenticity—which appears to characterize the authentic relationship for Heidegger,

is a merely negative kind of help. I cannot individualize the other; I can only help the other by not confirming the other in his *inauthentic* existence. Thus at best, the only way I can help is by *not* taking the other’s care away from him, but simply leaving the other in his own potentiality-of-being (SuZ 298). It is therefore not at all the case that genuine being-with-one-another as such could somehow help the Dasein who is living in everydayness make the transition to a genuine relation to being; Dasein cannot profit *positively* from being in some specific relation to me; it must attain its authentic self non-relationally.<sup>70</sup>

On these interpretations, leaping-ahead can only be described as a *lack of interference*, and the extremes of the *Fürsorge* continuum would therefore be meddling interference and respectful distance. Loving justice and passionate concern do not appear to be described in such a picture.

As I have already shown, however, authenticity does not destroy or prevent Dasein-to-Dasein encounter; it merely calls its innerworldly and intratemporal forms of expression into question and demands that each Dasein take responsibility for its own having-to-be. And as we will see in the final section, Heidegger’s use of hearing and keeping silent—the non-worldly and temporalizing modes of authentic Dasein-to-Dasein encounter—can indeed provide an account of the most positive forms of human togetherness. Before doing so, however, we must first respond to the accusation that Heidegger’s position is *contradictory* insofar as the call of conscience requires a prior authenticity; this requirement means that it assumes the very authenticity that the other’s calling is supposed

to help me accomplish. "If Da-sein is first free for the Thou by individualization, how can this authentic relation to the other be the very relation that helps Da-sein become individualized?"<sup>71</sup> By reversing the terms of the statement that authentic Dasein can act as the call of conscience for another, however, we see that a prior authenticity cannot be the case for both parties. Though the one *calling* may require a prior authentic understanding of Dasein's way of being in order to communicate this to another Dasein, the one *being* called by the other's conscience-like summons cannot already be authentic or the other's communication could not act as *call*; the idle chatter of *das Man* would already have been interrupted, another hearing would already be in place. Zahavi himself notes that "the contradiction disappears, however, when one sees that for Heidegger, authentic being-with-one-another is *not* a reciprocal relation. If I am already individualized, I can help the other to confront himself with his own possibilities of being."<sup>72</sup> Though Zahavi concludes that this "help" is not much help at all, he recognizes, at the least, that the relationship of caller and called is a complex one in which genuine concerned being-with is not simply a *derivative* of a prior authenticity on the part of *both* Dasein. The recipient of the call clearly cannot be in a prior state of authentic resoluteness if the disruptive, disclosive nature of the call is to succeed in interrupting the fallen modes of Dasein interpretation. In this sense, at least one of the parties first has the possibility of authenticity communicated to her *through* this relationship.

Indeed, I would even argue that *calling* the other in the voice of conscience need not always require that Dasein have achieved a prior authentic resoluteness. The reason for this lies in the very same lack of reciprocity or exact symmetry defining the relationship. Namely, the weight of responsibility for my own being tends to provoke the fall toward self-misunderstanding and inauthenticity, but when it is the *other's* way of being that I come to understand in all its temporalizing having to be, this anxiety-inducing dimension of self-responsibility is not so pressing. I may be able to see more clearly in the other what I cannot or will not recognize in myself. Indeed, I believe that the authentic relationships that are established on such a basis can act as a type of feedback loop in which Dasein help each other toward greater self-understanding. It is for this reason that we can argue that the authentic Dasein-to-Dasein relationship need not be such a rare thing, since it does not require a prior authenticity in at least one of the parties, and it may not require it in either. By examining how this notion of "calling the other" can allow us to understand the authentic leaping-ahead relationship that it establishes in terms of the most positive modes of human interaction, we may be able to support these claims more fully.

## Love, Justice, and Giving the Other Time

In order to demonstrate that the most positive human relationships are encompassed within Heidegger's notion of the leaping-ahead that frees the other and the call of conscience that is its voice, we must note that, despite the scarcity of the text available in which Heidegger explicitly addresses these themes, he is characterizing a type of relationship in which one person takes the growth and well-being of the other as its guiding principle, which means "helping to bring it [another Dasein] to itself" (*FCM* 202). Recall that in *What Is Called Thinking?* Heidegger defines calling in terms of an "anticipatory reaching out" that brings together and establishes a relationship in which the relationship of caller and called is "to commend, entrust, give into safekeeping, to shelter" (*WCT* 387). Such a description of the Dasein-to-Dasein relationship that is established when I act as the call of conscience for the other does not imply a respectful distance—simply leaving the other alone—but characterizes a type of nurturing concern. This is supported by Heidegger's analysis of what it means to "free" someone in "Building, Dwelling, Thinking": "To free actually means to spare. The sparing itself consists not only in the fact that we do not harm the one whom we spare. Real sparing is something *positive* and takes place when we leave something beforehand in its own essence, when we return it specifically to its essential being, when we 'free' it in the proper sense of the word into a preserve of peace."<sup>73</sup> Behavior toward the other that is oriented toward a positive nurturing that returns the other to peace in its "essential being" characterizes all of our most positive modes of human interaction. Though such language seems somewhat schematic and abstract when we realize that Heidegger is essentially talking about *loving concern*, this is indeed what he is talking about: "To embrace a 'thing' or a 'person' in its essence means to love it, to favor it. Though in a more original way such favoring [*Mögen*] means to bestow essence as a gift. Such favoring is the proper essence of enabling, which not only can achieve this or that but also can let something essentially unfold in its provenance, that is, let it be."<sup>74</sup>

Heidegger's talk here of enabling, and letting be invokes the same middle-voiced structures that we have seen throughout. In this case, however, we can note their explicitly ethical implications: if the other that I seek to protect and nurture is defined in her very being by an ecstatic openness and incompleteness, respecting her essence will require me to give her the necessary space and time in which to realize it herself. For Heidegger, freeing beings for their own possibility means that the "character of possibility always corresponds to the kind of being of the beings understood" (*BT* 151/141). The character of possibility per-



taining to the other Dasein is one of temporalizing mineness expressing its being-in-the-world. To correspond to *this* character of possibility demands a nurturing heedfulness that not only permits but *enables* the other to pursue his own care. Kenneth Gallagher better expresses this conception of love in “Intersubjective Knowledge,” where he argues that “my love calls forth the being of the other.”<sup>75</sup> Love is essentially a call to the other’s inner potential to be herself—a self that I have put myself in the service of evoking. In the relationship between the lover and the beloved, “he knows her in a manner that only one who loves her can know her. For her ‘being’ or her ‘person’ is not an already realized objective reality viewed by him from a more advantageous perspective: it is a creative category. The boy’s love is the creative invocation of her being: it is a participation in the mystery of her uniqueness.”<sup>76</sup> Such a creative invocation is the essence of what Heidegger means by leaping-ahead—a summoning of the other’s being in its wholeness that is given voice in conscience and expressed in behaviors that instantiate this being-in-service to the other.

An example will help us illustrate the manner in which everyday behaviors can manifest this mode of *Fürsorge* in which I act as a summons to the other to live fully into his being. My nephew and I are going to go to the park. He is just learning how to tie his shoes, and as I watch him struggle with the task, I find myself increasingly motivated to take the thick awkward laces from his little hands and do it myself—it is getting dark, I must be back to make dinner, and indeed he very much *wants* me to do it for him. The goal—having tied laces—may be more important, I think, than dedicating the time to enabling the boy to master the activity of lace-tying. But as I watch him struggle, I admire his sheer will to achieve this ability in spite of continued frustrating setbacks and I restrain myself from taking this opportunity to practice from him. I even resist the immediacy of his desire that I do it for him, because I recognize—and desire to nurture—his existence in its wholeness. I do not leap in and take over this careful struggle to be from him—I hold myself back in a type of restraint that is nevertheless characterized by a hovering attentiveness, a silent co-willing, an expressive encouragement and recognition of his struggle. Such restraint cannot be adequately described simply as freeing the other from my interference, as Zahavi and Theunissen suggest. A genuinely patient orientation toward another person does involve a type of “holding oneself back,” but it is by no means easy or indifferent—patience can be an incredible effort in the service of the other that nevertheless fails to make much of a “worldly” appearance. It is, for the most part, a silent communication.

In such an everyday example of patience one can see a stance

toward the other that recognizes the achievement of the ability as more important than the goal itself. In such a stance one is oriented toward the successful expression of the other's being in its complex temporal entirety—not just now, but in all future lace-tying. Though such a situation could be described as a simple case of one of my desires overriding another—for my nephew to practice shoe-tying rather than for the shoe to be tied as quickly as possible—the orientation at work in this overriding is fundamentally other-directed. In the case of the latter desire—that the shoe be tied immediately—I am interested in accomplishing some particular goal as a step toward achieving a situation I desire: going to the park. In the former case, however, though my desire includes an interest in accomplishing the tied shoe so we can go to the park, my intention is directed primarily toward the *other* person's achieving of this goal. Though both desires are aimed at the same end result, in the case of patient leaping-ahead, I fundamentally alter or qualify this desire such that it is only genuinely satisfied if the *other* person is the one who has brought it about. In this sense my guiding principle is the other person's ability to be as such.

This accounts for the fact that we can, for the most part, tell the difference between the person who is being genuinely patient, and the person who is merely tolerating us. Though the external behavior may be virtually indistinguishable between the two, one can sense on some implicit "Dasein-to-Dasein" level whether the other is silently sharing an orientation to one's task and its purpose, or if she has simply removed herself mentally so as not to interfere with the situation. From a third-person perspective the "worldly" manifestations of this difference will often be extremely hard to distinguish, but the recipient of patience will not find it so: the silent, summoning communication that characterizes leaping-ahead can be heard by the one who receives it.

The essentially temporal aspect of the leaping-ahead relationship is also obvious in patience: the patient person says "take your time"—a curious expression in itself—but one that clearly indicates the type of explicit recognition and accommodation of the other's temporalizing having to be that characterizes this pole of the *Fürsorge* continuum. Thus Heidegger notes that in such a stance, "when Dasein places itself in the reticence of carrying things through, its time is different. Publicly regarded, its time is essentially slower than the time of idle talk, which 'lives faster'" (*HCT* 279). The impatient person, on the contrary, feels that the other person is "taking too much time"—an expression that indicates a desire not to have to deal with the fact that I am always already in a situation of accommodating the temporalizing of the others. Underlying the impatient desire seems to be the belief that the time required for you

to express your being in the world is *taking* time from the expression of mine.

Indeed, this idea of “giving the other her time” is related to how Heidegger defines *justice* in his reflections on the Anaximander Fragment. The famous fragment, which reads: “Whence things have their coming into being there they must also perish according to necessity; for they must pay a penalty and be judged for their injustice, according to the ordinance of time,” is interpreted by Heidegger as indicating a type of deep relationship between temporality and justice.<sup>77</sup> In his analysis of this text, Heidegger wonders “How is it that what presences, staying, stands in injustice [ἀ-δικία]? What is unjust about the thing that presences? Does it not have the right to stay awhile, from time to time, and so fulfill its presencing?” (“AS” 267). The conclusion he reaches is not that temporalizing expression into the now—or “presencing”—is itself unjust, but that in certain *modes* of presencing things are out of joint, not right, unjust. “What presences is what stays awhile,” Heidegger claims, and “the while presences as the transitional arrival in departure. It presences between coming hither and going away. Between this two-fold absence presences the presencing of all that stays” (“AS” 267). As we have seen, the temporal particularity that is the essence of Dasein’s being is defined by presence and absence; its temporalizing is ecstatic and fundamentally related to otherness. Here Heidegger refers to it as “jointed.” The “dis-jointure,” by which he refers to the fundamentally temporal structure of injustice, arises from the fact that Dasein can seek to resist or subvert its fundamental structures of ecstatic relationality in order to maintain itself in a type of constant presence: “What has arrived may even insist on its while, solely to remain more present” (“AS” 267). Dasein tries to insist on “pure persistence in duration,” as Reiner Schürman puts it: “The ‘unjust’ entity disjoins itself from the finite flow of absencing-presencing-absencing and ‘holds fast to the assertion of its stay.’ The present insists on its presence, consolidates it, persists against absence . . . This essence of the will by which it is set on constant presence stands in agreement with conceptual, i.e., ‘grasping’ thought . . . It is that force which seeks to establish the self as permanent and time as lasting.”<sup>78</sup> This grasping refusal to recognize the ecstatic finitude of temporality—by refusing to acknowledge its passage or the others with whom it is shared—is the fundamental root of all injustice. Injustice is, for Heidegger, insisting on *my* time—*my now*—and refusing to heed the coming to presence of anyone or anything else. According to Heidegger, this attempt to maintain oneself unjustly in presence—usually at the cost of others—primarily takes the form of falling into interpretative stances that use temporal categories appropriate to things. In doing so, Dasein

can believe itself to exist in time the way a stone sits in a field—fundamentally unchanging and independent of that which surrounds it. Thus Kisiel notes how Heidegger characterizes “‘falling’ as the drag of substantive fixity characterizing possession, the reifying tendency wanting to maintain the constancy of presence.”<sup>79</sup>

Despite the schematic language, we can recognize how such a stance can be the essence of all human injustice. Indeed, talk of going to any means to “try to prolong and solidify its stay; having arrived into presence, it can insist on its presentness”<sup>80</sup> brings nothing to mind so much as a corrupt incumbent politician. Though completely refusing presence to others is in principle impossible, injustice is the attempt to do so—generally by denying them social or physical modes of manifestation, by leaping-in and taking their projects and opportunities for care from them. Justice is, on the other hand, the stance in which I share presence with the other.<sup>81</sup> In its more extreme forms, such leaping-ahead can take the form of a love in which I not only *share* presence with the other, but encourage him to take his time, granting him presence at the expense of my own. In this mode of *Fürsorge*, I offer the other my care and silently summon him toward a greater self-flourishing.

---

## Conclusion

Though many have been initially drawn to Heidegger's reformulation of traditional concepts of subjectivity, his lack of an articulated account of the social dimension of the self—and the seemingly problematic form it must take as a result of this reformulation—has been off-putting for many. In contrast, this book has argued for the central role that other Dasein play in one's temporalizing caring being-in-the-world—implying, thereby, that one can accept Heidegger's account of selfhood without being committed to the negative social ontology that is often deemed to be its direct consequence. Though Heidegger himself did not develop a detailed theory of intersubjectivity to correspond with his new understanding of subjectivity, he provides the resources with which to do so and indicates the direction in which this development must occur. Using these resources and following these indications, my project has been to construct a Heideggerian account of interpersonal relations that is most consistent with Heidegger's texts, with his general project, and—most importantly—with the social “things themselves.” In doing so, it has become evident that a much more complex position must be attributed to Heidegger's account than is generally recognized.

Developing a Heideggerian theory of intersubjectivity required us to respond directly to the long-standing critique of Heidegger's notion of *Mitsein*. This criticism—as expressed in Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*—argues that Heidegger simply stipulates “being-with” as an a priori category of Dasein's being, a category which—due to its categorial status—cannot provide for immediately experiencing others in their concrete particularity because they are always simply interchangeable tokens whose uniqueness is subsumed under the generality of the established category. In order to demonstrate that Heidegger is not committed to such a picture of intersubjectivity, it was necessary to indicate first how it is possible to understand Dasein as an individual self, despite the fact that (1) definitions in terms of substance are no longer available to Heidegger, and (2) he seems to characterize our everyday way of being in terms of a kind of selflessness. In response to such constraints, much Heidegger scholarship interprets the possibility of Dasein's individuation solely in terms of achieving authenticity—a position that I have shown to be both unnecessary and untenable. Dasein's individual, first-person self-

hood is always already its way of being—even when it is *inauthentic*—and this is the meaning of the existential *mineness* that Heidegger emphasizes throughout. Despite its inauthentic tendencies, Dasein is always already a self individuated by its existential commitment to its having to be.

In determining how I can encounter *other* such selves, it was necessary to (1) examine being-with in terms of how Heidegger understands the status of the a priori in general, and (2) analyze the implications of this understanding for characterizing Dasein-to-Dasein encounters. My argument proceeded by showing that the existential analytic follows Husserl in its phenomenological approach to the a priori as *responsive* to particular encounters in concrete existence. I further demonstrated that Heidegger also maintains a Kantian approach insofar as these *existentials* are all a type of responsiveness to *temporal* intuition, which provides the horizon within which all category-initiating and enriching encounters may occur. This temporal responsiveness of Dasein's being was worked out in detail in chapter 5, where I showed that the temporality of being-with occurs most fundamentally in the transition from originary to world time, wherein Dasein speaks itself out into a time that it heedfully shares with others. All of the structures of temporalizing—spannedness, datability, publicity, and significance—are defined by this transcending that establishes and maintains Dasein's relation with otherness. In publicity and significance, this relation takes the form of an accommodation of the other's temporalizing expression through the establishment of common meanings and measures. In this discussion it became evident that the most fundamental level of Dasein-to-Dasein encounter is unmediated by worldly categories because it is through such encounters that the standards of significance and measure characterizing world are first constituted.

Like the other *existentials*, being-with is *responsive* to temporal intuition—but in the case of being-with, intuition does not give *intratemporal* things but announces the presence of “foreign” originary temporalities—*other Dasein*. And because this originary temporality is the fundamental expression of the other's concrete care-defined way of being, such encounters are not characterized by categorial anonymity but direct particularity. Though Dasein generally experiences other Dasein in terms of shared innerworldly and intratemporal roles and meanings, then, the other Dasein's responsive commitment to these worldly norms bespeaks the fundamental mineness of another self. In the encounter with the other's commitment to his own existence I encounter him in his concrete individuality.

This recognition of the other can be forgotten or concealed to varying degrees, but it is never entirely absent. Despite the false self-

and other-interpretations with which Dasein may operate, it nevertheless continues to be characterized by the temporalizing structures that define its selfhood and necessitate the implicit acknowledgment of the other qua Dasein. Even when I leap in and take over the other's care, I must encounter him as a being *defined* by it, though this acknowledgment occasionally occurs in such a way that simultaneously obfuscates or even destroys this way of being. Though Heidegger recognizes this possibility of refusing to behave in a manner consistent with the ontological status of the other Dasein co-constituting the world, failing to meet this norm of appropriateness specific to our being-toward-others does not undermine the recognition of the other underlying it. In this sense, the ethical resources that Heidegger's fundamental ontology offers are not Platonic in bent because to know the good does not guarantee its performance—to encounter the other as Dasein does not ensure that one will act consistently with this acknowledgment. Though Dasein's care for who it is to be propels it to act appropriately in light of the basic standards against which it can measure its success in being, the anxiety produced by this responsibility can also have the opposite effect insofar as Dasein seeks to flee understanding of its way of being. The possibility of adopting the opposing authentic stance—in which I acknowledge my way of being and explicitly take responsibility for it as such—is revealed in each of the modes of disclosure specific to authenticity. It is in the call of conscience, however, that it takes the form of an enabling *summons* to this stance. This calling is not only a possibility for *self-calling*, however, since we have shown that it can also occur between Dasein in such a way that one helps another resist the tendency to avoid responsibility for her existence. This calling of the other involves granting her the time and meaningful space in which to live more fully into her being, demanding that one resist the unjust tendency to insist on one's own constant presence. Understood as such, we can recognize how—despite typical interpretations to the contrary—a Heideggerian account of intersubjectivity can indeed accommodate the entire range of human relationships, from murderous to loving.

There are, of course, many questions that remain. The role of the body is an obvious absence in Heidegger's work and one that I could not address here. A further concern relates to the status of one's desire to succeed at having to be—the desire underlying the sense of appropriateness that makes Dasein a norm-following being in everydayness and an authentic being in the face of the ontological inconsistencies of inauthenticity. Is this desire for consistency simply a derivative of the desire to succeed in being—and therefore a type of variation on Spinoza's *conatus*? The implication of such a conclusion would be that my heedful-

ness of the others—my desire to treat them appropriately and thus not as worldly things—would therefore be *derivative* of my overarching desire to succeed in my own being. Such an interpretation would be more in keeping with most Heidegger interpretations. I hope to have shown, however, that despite the questions that may remain, reaching this traditional conclusion requires one to oversimplify and ignore a great deal of what Heidegger has to say. Insofar as the other is present as a partner on the most basic levels of temporalizing worldliness—and can act as a *summons* to my desire and ability for consistency and self-awareness—the other's claim that I heed her temporalizing presence appears to be at least equiprimordial with Dasein's care for its own appropriateness in being. Ultimately, I think that Heidegger's reference to the joy that one can feel in accomplishing a connection with another person points to the profound fact that the desire for a genuine being-with others just *is* definitive of our existence. This, indeed, is the heart of what it means to be a *thrown* being-in-the-world—simply put, the world matters to me because I am a creature for whom things can matter, a mattering that does not arise from me choosing that they do, but comes from my responsiveness to the ways in which I am solicited and summoned. And in the case of the other persons with whom I constitute the temporal landscape of the innerworldly, these summons matter to me very much indeed.



---

## Notes

### Introduction

1. “Dasein” is the term Heidegger uses to refer to the beings that we are—a term that is meant to avoid the conceptual baggage affiliated with terms such as “subject,” “self,” or “consciousness.” It will be used throughout the book to designate the self as Heidegger conceives it.

2. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: State University of New York Press, 1996). Heidegger’s critiques of such a Cartesian view of consciousness can be found throughout *Being and Time*. See, for example: 60, 61, 62, 136, 137, 146, 162, 204, 205, 206, 273, 288, 289. The German text is Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001). Further citations of *Being and Time* will be given in the text and referenced as *BT*, with the German pagination cited first, followed by the English translation’s pagination. Attributing such a picture of the self to Descartes does not entirely do him justice, however, since Descartes’s system relies on the presence of something other than the self—namely, God—in order to “get the world back” so to speak. Nevertheless, Descartes’s work powerfully influenced the distinctively modern shift toward emphasizing the independent, individual notion of the self, and in this regard, he is taken as a representative figure. For a particularly illuminating discussion of Heidegger’s critique of Cartesianism, see Matthew Shockey, “Heidegger’s Descartes and Heidegger’s Cartesianism,” *European Journal of Philosophy* 20, no. 1 (2012). The relationship between the two figures is also examined in John Richardson, *Existential Epistemology: A Heideggerian Critique of the Cartesian Project* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

3. See, for example, Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*, trans. Dorion Cairns (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999). Such approaches, Heidegger notes, start “by imagining an Ego in a purely Cartesian sense—an Ego given by itself in the first instance who then feels his way into the other—thus discovering that the other is a human being as well in the sense of an *alter Ego*. Nevertheless, this is a pure fabrication.” Martin Heidegger, *The Zollikon Seminars* (1959–1969), trans. Franz Mayr and Richard Askay, ed. Medard Boss (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2001), 111. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *ZS*.

4. Indeed, as Stephen Mulhall shows, such approaches tend to beg the question insofar as “the similarity that legitimates the inductive inference . . .

turns out to be the similarity that it is supposed to demonstrate.” *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Heidegger and “Being and Time”* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 63.

5. Frederick A. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics: A Study of Mitsein* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 15.

6. Though typically translated as “anxiety,” the original German word *Angst* will be used throughout the text in an effort to distinguish it from the contemporary psychological usage of the term “anxiety” as interchangeable with “worry.” Such a usage is at odds with the existential dread and sense of uprootedness that Heidegger is designating with the term. Further discussion of *Angst* can be found in chapter 7.

7. Dominique Janicaud, “The Question of Subjectivity in Heidegger’s *Being and Time*,” in *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, ed. Simon Critchley and Peter Dews (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 54. Janicaud points out that Heidegger’s critique of subjectivity in *Being and Time* tends toward caricature insofar as it presents subjectivity as “a reified, narcissistic, high-strung ego that repeats: ‘I, I’” and “fashions thereby a custom-made foil” (54). As Janicaud rightly notes, Kant, Hegel, and Husserl would “all agree with Heidegger’s criticism, in the end to enhance it, *in the very name* of a subjectivity given back its depth.”

8. In “Heidegger’s Descartes and Heidegger’s Cartesianism,” Matthew Shockey shows that Heidegger’s anti-Cartesianism is in fact a methodological critique of Descartes’s inability to analyze the very subjectivity that Heidegger himself took to be Descartes’s greatest discovery.

9. Some may object that the use of later texts such as *The Zollikon Seminars* is inconsistent with Heidegger’s so-called turn. Though it is impossible to make the case for it here, it is my belief that such a break between the early and the later Heidegger is not so definitive as commentators make it out to be.

## Chapter 1

1. See especially *BT* Division One, chap. 6, section 43.

2. Thus when Heidegger compares *Dasein* to Leibniz’s concept of the “windowless monad” he claims that they are windowless “not because they do not need to go out, rather because they are essentially already outside.” Martin Heidegger, *Einleitung in die Philosophie* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996), 144. Translation found in Jean Greisch, “The ‘Play of Transcendence’ and the Question of Ethics,” in *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, ed. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 105.

3. See, for example, *BT* 60–62/56–58, 136–37/128–29, 204–6/189–91. For helpful discussion of Heidegger’s thought on this point, see Charles Guignon, *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1983), 86; Steven Crowell, “Subjectivity: Locating the First-Person in *Being and Time*,” *Inquiry* 44 (2001); and Mariana Ortega, “*Dasein* Comes After the Epistemic Subject, But Who Is *Dasein*?” *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (2000).

4. Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, trans. Albert Hof-

stadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 298. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *BPP*.

5. Heidegger's dissatisfaction with his ability to capture this quality in language affected him throughout his writing life. In his later work he moved increasingly away from this type of language toward more symbolic, poetic formulations. The danger, however, is that such formulations are so novel that the reader is given no sense of what the phenomenon is to which Heidegger is attempting to refer. Heidegger's early work, I believe, most clearly indicates what other philosophical approaches were attempting to express while simultaneously distancing itself from their flaws.

6. For Heidegger's account of care, see in particular *BT* Division One, chap. 6, sections 41 and 42. As Theodore Kisiel notes in *The Genesis of Heidegger's "Being & Time"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 201, Heidegger's use of the term "care" derives from the Latin *cura*, which he translates early on as "*Bekümmierung* (distress, concern, the trouble of search)" by drawing on "a Latin etymological tradition which relates *cura* to *quaero*, seeking, and its concomitant tribulation or anxiety." Thus "care" includes the sense that the self *matters* to itself—a point to be examined further in the discussion of mineness in chapter 2.

7. As Jean Greisch puts it in "The 'Play of Transcendence' and the Question of Ethics," Heidegger "accuses all philosophies of consciousness and reflection (including Husserlian phenomenology) with simultaneously under- and over-determining the essence of subjectivity. The underdetermination is that the self-founding and self-determining autonomous subject of modernity does not require the other in order to achieve its self-understanding. At least on the level of understanding, it has enough in itself. The over-determination is that the lacking relation to the other must be compensated for, (i.e., overcompensated for) through a theory of intersubjectivity, or more modern still, of 'communication'" (104).

8. For example, Heidegger shows in *BPP* 140–54 why he believes Kant's notion of the I to be fundamentally Cartesian—that is, *substantial*.

9. Michael Theunissen, *The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre and Buber*, trans. Christopher Macann (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1984), 169.

10. See Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: Second Book*, trans. R. Rojcewicz and F. Kersten (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989). Further citations of this work will be given in the text and notes and referenced as *Ideas II*.

11. This is evident as early as the fifth *Logical Investigation*, in which intentionality is characterized as placing the subject in a relation with objects that are not *reell* constituents of consciousness but transcendent to it. See Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, trans. J. N. Findlay, ed. Dermot Moran (New York: Routledge, 2001). The later Husserl moves increasingly in the direction of the self's worldliness, as we see, for example, in Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*, trans. David Carr (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970).

Further citations of this work will be given in the text and notes and referenced as *Crisis*. For a discussion of this development, see Donn Welton, *The Other Husserl*, particularly “Cartesian Enclosures” (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

12. See Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book*, trans. F. Kersten (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1998). Further citations of this work will be given in the text and notes and referenced as *Ideas I*. Husserl claims that through my intentional orientation “this world is not there for me simply as a world of mere things but, in the same immediacy, as a world of values, a world of goods, a practical world” (*Ideas I*, 50). Husserl’s approach, as Donn Welton puts it, is to “treat . . . subjectivity and world as equiprimordial moments . . . to understand subjectivity as a co-originary correlative feature of what is meant by horizon” (*The Other Husserl*, 96). Further discussion of this issue can be found in Felix O’Murchadha, “Reduction, Externalism and Immanence in Husserl and Heidegger,” *Synthese* 160 (2008).

13. Heidegger makes this statement in the context of explaining Max Scheler’s position as a positive though insufficient move away from the traditional, substantive view of subjectivity. Insofar as Heidegger approves of Scheler’s move away from “psychical” to *intentional* interpretations of personhood, this statement can be taken as representative of Heidegger’s view, though this is not to imply that he unqualifiedly accepts Scheler’s position; on the contrary, Heidegger feels that Scheler’s view fails insofar as it does not analyze what this “carrying out” of intentional acts must be.

14. For further discussion, see Dermot Moran, “Heidegger’s Critique of Husserl’s and Brentano’s Accounts of Intentionality,” *Inquiry* 43, no. 1 (2000).

15. See Steven Crowell, “Reason and Will: Husserl and Heidegger on the Intentionality of Action,” in *Heidegger-Jahrbuch 6: Heidegger und Husserl*, ed. Rudolf Bernet, Alfred Denker, and Holger Zaborowski (Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 2012).

16. James C. Morrison, “Husserl and Heidegger: The Parting of the Ways,” in *Heidegger’s Existential Analytic*, ed. Frederick Elliston (New York: Mouton, 1978), 48.

17. See Husserl, *Ideas II*, 406.

18. As we have already noted, the “primacy of the practical” is evident in many of Husserl’s analyses of the lived body. It is also a major theme in his efforts to demonstrate the pragmatic foundations of the theoretical—see *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969), for example, where Husserl demonstrates the *practical* basis of many theoretical modes of intentionality.

19. Sheehan demonstrates that the late Heidegger’s term *Ereignis* derives from *sich ereignen*, the primary meaning of which is “to come into view, to appear, to be brought forth and revealed”—an event that should not be thematized as some kind of one-time metaphysical happening, then, but as the very condition of being open to the self-showing that is enacted and analyzed in phenomenology. Thomas Sheehan, “A Paradigm Shift in Heidegger Research,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 32, no. 2 (2001): 15.

20. See Jitendranath Mohanty's elaboration on the distinction between *prinzipien-theoretisch* and *evidenz-theoretisch* approaches in *The Possibility of Transcendental Philosophy* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985), 215.

21. For a discussion of this relationship, see chapter 4 of Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006).

22. Representatives of this view include Jacques Derrida, *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); M. Haar, *Heidegger and the Essence of Man*, trans. Will McNeil (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993); and essays in the collections *Who Comes After the Subject?* ed. Eduardo Cadava, Peter Conner, and Jean-Luc Nancy (New York: Routledge, 1991), and *Companion to Heidegger's "Contributions to Philosophy,"* ed. Charles E. Scott, Susan Schoenbohm, Daniela Vallega-Neu, and Alejandro Vallega (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001). François Raffoul, *Heidegger and the Subject*, trans. David Pettigrew and Gregory Recco (New Jersey: Humanities, 1998); Jean-Luc Marion, *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*, trans. T. A. Carlson (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1998); and Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, *Subjekt und Dasein* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1974) all argue, to varying degrees, that Dasein must be understood as a reinterpretation of the meaning of subjectivity—not its rejection—but they do so under the auspices of a commitment to a reading of Being in the later Heidegger that gives it a metaphysical slant which is problematic at best.

23. This tendency is evident, for example, in perhaps the best-known account of Heidegger's theory of being-with: Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural*, trans. Robert Richardson and Anne O'Byrne (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000). There Nancy reaches metaphysical conclusions about the nature of reality that are not substantiated through phenomenological analyses. Thus he claims, for example, that "there is no other meaning than the meaning of circulation. But this circulation goes in all directions at once, in all the directions of all the space-times [*les espace-temps*] opened by presence to presence: all things, all beings, all entities, everything past and future, alive, dead, inanimate, stones, plants, nails, gods" (*ibid.*, 3). But claims about the "circulation" characterizing the relationship to "gods" and "the future"—let alone rocks and the dead—are extremely problematic philosophically, as are claims about the nature of Being as "indissociably individual and collective" (*ibid.*, 49). Though Nancy gestures toward the phenomenologist's demand that one avoid metaphysical presuppositions—"the primordial requirement of ontology or first philosophy must now be that Being not be presupposed in any way or in any respect"—in the very next paragraph he simply asserts that "existence exists in the plural, singularly plural" (*ibid.*, 56). Even if this claim is true, Nancy provides no phenomenological grounding for accepting it. He seems to believe that this claim—and many others like it—is justified by the mere fact that it is the reversal of the traditional monist view. But in the absence of phenomenological grounding in any kind of first-person *Evidenz*, we have little reason to accept Nancy's claims about the nature of Being itself or its relationship to rocks, nails, or gods.

24. See, in particular, Martin Heidegger, *What Is Called Thinking?* trans.

J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper and Row, 1968). Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *WCT*.

25. One strand of Heidegger interpretation dismisses such claims as still too mired in the (misguided) philosophical tradition. Heidegger came to reject demands for this kind of traditional philosophical grounding, they argue, because he was committed to uncovering “a ‘more originary essence’ than essence . . . a more fundamental foundation” than could be recognized on accepted paradigms of truth-telling. Rodolphe Gasché, “Tuned to Accord: On Heidegger’s Concept of Truth,” in *Heidegger Toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930’s*, ed. James Risser (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 41. In other words, Heidegger’s shift to the “happening of Being” undermines traditional philosophical methodology. See also Walter Brogan, “Da-sein and the Leap of Being,” in *Companion to Heidegger’s “Contributions to Philosophy,”* ed. Charles E. Scott et al. Even if we accept claims about the need to transform philosophical methodology, however, the inquiry dedicated to uncovering this “fundamental foundation” still must be governed by norms of adequacy—else we have no way of assessing when the inquiry goes astray. For Heidegger—both early and late—these norms include some reference to the first-person *Evidenz* of the thinker. Here too there are those who disagree, however—claiming, in essence, that philosophical reflection need not be governed by *any* norm for assessing the appropriateness of the response (i.e., its truth): “The best experiences with *Contributions* happen when readers feel no requirement to agree or disagree but feel a drawing allowance to encounter Heidegger in the process of his thought with as much thoughtful intensity as they can stand. I believe it is the quality of the engagement that counts, not agreements.” Charles Scott, “Introduction: Approaching Heidegger’s *Contributions to Philosophy* and Its Companion,” in *Companion to Heidegger’s “Contributions to Philosophy,”* ed. Charles E. Scott et al., 4. But without the norm of truth, one’s ruminations are not philosophy, however pleasant or “intense” the experience.

26. Morrison, “Husserl and Heidegger: The Parting of the Ways,” 54.

27. Phenomenology avoids traditional skeptical questions—including the problem of other minds—because its project is one of analyzing how existence claims show up as meaningful within experience, not one of proving that something does or does not exist. Thus the task of the *Epoché* is to bracket the existence claims characteristic of the natural attitude in order to uncover their structure, not to prove their legitimacy. As Husserl notes in the *Crisis*: “The point is not to secure objectivity but to understand it” (§55, 189). Through the shift in attitude brought about by the *Epoché*, Husserl is able to distinguish between *beings* and the manner in which they become manifest. This distinction can of course be understood as a precursor to Heidegger’s ontological difference, according to which the difference between beings and Being is recognized. It is therefore false to claim—as many readers of Heidegger do—that for Husserl “the phenomena of phenomenology are *beings* (*Seienden*)” (Morrison, “Husserl and Heidegger: The Parting of the Ways,” 50). Rather, for Husserl the phenomena of phenomenology are the *how of manifestation* of beings—not beings themselves.

28. Steven Crowell, “Does the Husserl/Heidegger Feud Rest on a Mistake?”

An Essay on Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology,” *Husserl Studies* 18 (2002).

29. *Ibid.*, 134–35.

30. Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being in the World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division 1* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991), 168. Dreyfus also notes why certain commonly used translations are inappropriate: “mental state,” for example, suggests “a determinate condition of an isolable, occurrent subject,” while Heidegger is explicitly trying to *avoid* characterizations implying private, “inner” mental states. Alternatively, “disposition” implies too “external” a characterization of the phenomenon—particularly in light of its use by behaviorists.

31. Martin Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, trans. Theodore Kisiel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 254. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *HCT*.

32. The classic Heideggerian example being the hammer, whose intelligibility *as* a hammer relies on its location in a web of equipment that is ultimately grounded in my particular ways to be in the world—as a carpenter, for example, or as one who dwells sheltered from the elements. See *Being and Time's* Division One, section 15.

33. It is this “subjective” quality of meaning that prompted the later Heidegger to doubt the adequacy of his earlier philosophical efforts. Jeff Malpas traces the development from the subjectivity-tinged “meaning of being” to the Dasein-independent “truth of being” in *Heidegger's Topology*, especially chapter 4. Well-known accounts of the nature of this “turn” in Heidegger’s thought include William J. Richardson’s *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003); and Otto Pöggeler’s *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking* (New York: Humanity Books, 1994). However, as Thomas Sheehan points out, this shift cannot mean that Being alone simply takes center stage and Dasein becomes merely secondary. Despite the popularity of this narrative, this would mean that philosophy engages in a kind of “‘Big Being’ story and hypostasize[s] *das Sichentziehende* into Being Itself in its absential mode (the ‘Lethe’) and then have It (whatever ‘It’ is) do the withdrawing, the opening-of-the-open, and the giving-of-being. But this would only be metaphysics in its most banal and vulgar form, the destruction of everything Heidegger stood for” (Sheehan, “A Paradigm Shift in Heidegger Research,” 16–17). In contrast to this approach, we must come to an understanding of Dasein that genuinely acknowledges its receptive and thrown qualities—not simply its agency and self-assertion—instead of fixating on some mystical notion of Being. In Sheehan’s words: “What Heidegger is expressing in both the earlier language of *Geworfenheit* and the later language of *Ereignis* is that being-open is the ineluctable condition of our essence, not an occasional accomplishment of our wills” (*ibid.*, 12).

34. Martin Heidegger, *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 80. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *PIA*.

35. William Ralph Schroeder, *Sartre and His Predecessors: The Self and the Other* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 132.

36. Heidegger, *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, 84–85. Translation by Greisch,

“The ‘Play of Transcendence’ and the Question of Ethics,” 101. Greisch notes there that because of this profoundly social feature of being, solitude is a deficient state for human beings: “For this reason can solitary confinement in an isolation cell be perceived as a heightened punitive measure” (“The Play of Transcendence,” 103).

37. Martin Heidegger, *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, trans. John van Buren (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 26. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *OHF*.

38. Frederick Elliston, “Heidegger’s Phenomenology of Social Existence,” in *Heidegger’s Existential Analytic*, ed. Frederick Elliston (New York: Mouton, 1978), 72.

39. Dreyfus, *Being-in-the-World*, 143.

40. See, for example: Pierre Bourdieu, *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*, trans. Peter Collier (San Francisco: Stanford University Press, 1991); Karl Löwith, *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism*, trans. Gary Steiner (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995); Richard Wolin, *The Politics of Being* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992); and Julian Young, *Heidegger, Philosophy, Nazism* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

## Chapter 2

1. Sydney Shoemaker, “First-Person Access,” in *The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 50 (emphasis mine). See also John Heil, “Privileged Access,” *Mind* 97 (1998).

2. Shoemaker, “First-Person Access,” 50.

3. There are, however, pathological cases in which this is not true. For an interesting account of the schizophrenic’s loss of his sense of the mineness of his experiences, see Dan Zahavi, *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005), 74–77.

4. Shoemaker, “First-Person Access,” 50–51.

5. See, for example, D. M. Rosenthal, “Higher-Order Thoughts and the Appendage Theory of Consciousness,” *Philosophical Psychology* 6 (1993); D. M. Armstrong, *A Materialist Theory of the Mind* (London: Routledge, 1993); and Peter Carruthers, *Phenomenal Consciousness: A Naturalistic Theory* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

6. Carruthers, *Phenomenal Consciousness*, 184.

7. For a critique of this view, see John Drummond, “The Case(s) of (Self-) Awareness,” in *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*, ed. Uriah Kriegel and Kenneth Williford (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006).

8. I cannot do justice to the range and complexity of the analytic debates on these issues, but here my purpose is simply to indicate how Heidegger’s general orientation toward such issues differs from prevailing tendencies. As Donald Davidson describes it in “Knowing One’s Own Mind,” in *Mind and Cognition: A Reader*, ed. William Lycan (Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999), the general tendency is to view the mind as “a theater in which the conscious self watches a



passing show [which] consists of ‘appearances,’ sense data, qualia, what is given in experience” (392). The difficulty with this picture is not only how to account for the relationship between the “inside” and the “outside” but also how to “locate the self” when it “seems on the one hand to include theater, stage, actors, and audience; [and] on the other hand, what is known and registered pertains to the audience alone” (ibid.). The solution, Davidson argues—much as Heidegger does—is to free ourselves “from the assumption that thoughts must have mysterious objects” (ibid., 394). To be first-personally self-present is not to grasp certain “inner” objects as if they were external objects, but to relate to external objects in a particular way. For a general introduction to analytic approaches to these issues, see the anthology in which Davidson’s article can be found: *Mind and Cognition: A Reader*.

9. Lynne Rudder Baker, *Persons and Bodies: A Constitution View* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000). In terms of “weak” first-person phenomena, Baker discusses cases of chimpanzees that are able to recognize their own bodies as their own. See especially 59–89. See also José Luis Bermúdez, *The Paradox of Self-Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000). Bermúdez discusses what he calls “primitive” self-consciousness—a mode of consciousness that predates the capacity for linguistic self-reference.

10. Dan Zahavi, “First-Person Thoughts and Embodied Self-Awareness: Some Reflections on the Relation Between Recent Analytical Philosophy and Phenomenology,” *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 1 (2002): 10.

11. Recently the “self-representational” model has attempted to overcome these difficulties by arguing that a mental state is conscious if it represents *itself* in the correct manner. Conscious states are conscious by being simultaneously represented and representing in the right way. See Kriegel and Williford, eds., *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*. Though this seems a step in the right direction, it nevertheless continues to use the language of self-representation, which seems to maintain the inappropriate subject/object model for understanding first-person self-giveness. For a more thorough discussion of the difficulties with such approaches, see the work of Dan Zahavi, especially *Self-Awareness and Alterity: A Phenomenological Investigation* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1999).

12. In the language of many discussions of intentionality, Heidegger is interested in what makes us the types of beings that have intrinsic intentionality; for Heidegger, not only are such secondarily intentional things like signs derivative of our way of being, but so too are our own particular intentional acts. For an excellent discussion of the intrinsic/derivative debate, see John Haugeland, “Understanding: Dennett and Searle,” in *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

13. Galen Strawson, “Real Intentionality,” *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3 (2004): 293. See also John Haugeland, “The Intentionality All-Stars,” in *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

14. Even in the case of sheer observation—in which one cannot be taken to be engaged in trying to succeed at an action—the experience is normatively

governed insofar as experiencing the thing as meaningful requires us to understand it as an “x” or a “y,” and taking something *as* something in this way requires standards that allow one to determine whether it is in fact an x or a y in this instance. It also requires norms governing what counts as a normal instance of seeing, as Husserl makes clear throughout his corpus, especially in the analyses of perception found in *Ideas II*.

15. The authors note that they take this definition from Donald Davidson.

16. Jerome Wakefield and Hubert Dreyfus, “Intentionality and the Phenomenality of Action,” in *John Searle and His Critics*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 259.

17. *Ibid.*, 263.

18. *Ibid.*, 264.

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*, 265.

21. *Ibid.*, 267 (emphasis mine).

22. John Searle, “Response: The Background of Intentionality and Action,” in *John Searle and His Critics*, ed. Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 294.

23. John Searle, *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of the Mind* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 90.

24. Hubert L. Dreyfus, “The Primacy of Phenomenology over Logical Analysis,” *Philosophical Topics* 27, no. 2 (1999): 4 (emphasis mine).

25. *Ibid.*, 9.

26. Searle, “Response: The Background of Intentionality and Action,” 293.

27. *Ibid.*, 294.

28. Strawson discusses this danger in “Real Intentionality,” where he argues that unless you’re willing to restrict intentionality not simply to “aboutness,” but also to the “experiential realm,” the only way you can distinguish such things as conscious human intention, a robot’s purposive behavior, and a plant’s environmental responsiveness is through a “certain zoomorphic prejudice” (296).

29. Dreyfus, “The Primacy of Phenomenology,” 10.

30. *Ibid.*, 11.

31. *Ibid.*

32. In keeping with this position, Strawson has argued that, contrary to popular interpretations in analytic philosophy, though intentionality entails aboutness, not all aboutness entails intentionality, but only that aboutness which is “a matter of cognitive EQ content” (“Real Intentionality,” 306)—which he takes to be the first-personal, “experiential qualitative” or “what-it’s-likeness” of experience (*ibid.*, 289). In this regard I agree with Strawson’s argument, though I believe that his cut-off point for what counts as EQ content should not and need not be so cognitive, and expanding what counts as “EQ” need not commit us to the realm of “intentional thermometers” (*ibid.*, 296).

33. This is not to imply that this is *sufficient* for explaining the capacity for first-person self-givenness. Like Husserl, I believe that a complete account would require an analysis of the lived body and internal time consciousness (Heidegger’s version of which we will consider in the coming chapters). For Husserl’s

analyses of internal time consciousness, see *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, trans. John Barnett Brough (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1991). For his analyses of the *Leib/Körper* distinction, see *Ideas II* and *Cartesian Meditations*. As Thomas Metzinger puts it, “phenomenal subjectivity . . . amounts to the fact that under standard conditions the dynamics of conscious experience unfolds in a space that is centered on a singular, temporally extended experiential self” (“The Subjectivity of Subjective Experience: A Representationalist Analysis of First-Person Perspective,” in *Neural Correlates of Consciousness*, ed. Thomas Metzinger [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000], 289). Heidegger’s account is unique, however, in its recognition that such conditions are not sufficient for first-personal self-presence: rather, Dasein’s *care* for who it will be is the basis for all compartments in which the self is given to itself.

34. This care-based structure of our everyday self-presence is particularly evident when contrasted with schizophrenic cases. One young patient describes the distortion of the first-personal nature of her experiences in the following way: “I am more and more losing contact with my environment and with myself. Instead of taking an interest in what goes on and caring about what happens with my illness, I am all the time losing emotional contact with everything including myself. What remains is only an abstract knowledge of what goes on around me and of the internal happenings in myself.” Zahavi, *Subjectivity and Selfhood*, 74.

35. Richard Moran, *Authority and Estrangement: An Essay on Self-Knowledge* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 32.

36. *Ibid.*

37. *Ibid.*, 31

38. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 134.

39. Zahavi, “First-Person Thoughts and Embodied Self-Awareness,” 12.

40. Crowell, “Phenomenology and the First-Person Character of Philosophical Knowledge,” *The Modern Schoolman* 74 (2007).

41. See Crowell, “Does the Husserl/Heidegger Feud Rest on a Mistake?” where he demonstrates how Heidegger’s account—unlike Husserl’s—can explain what motivates adopting the transcendental standpoint. The Husserl/Heidegger relationship is discussed in greater detail in Crowell, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths Toward Transcendental Phenomenology* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2001). See also Matthew Burch’s excellent “The Existential Sources of Phenomenology: Heidegger on Formal Indication,” *European Journal of Philosophy* (forthcoming).

42. According to Kisiel and von Hermann, talk of reflection or theory misrepresents Heidegger’s project insofar as Heidegger accepts Natorp’s criticism of the necessarily distorting quality of reflection. See Paul Natorp, *Allgemeine Psychologie nach kritischer Methode* (Tübingen, 1912). In response, they claim, Heidegger develops a hermeneutic alternative which rejects the methodological use of reflection and seeks to base phenomenology on an a-theoretical, non-objectifying, and non-reflective form of understanding instead. See Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 47, 376; and Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, *Hermeneutic und Reflexion* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000), 23. But contrary to this view, Heidegger took phenomenological reflection

and its method—formal indication—to enable a kind of non-objectifying reflection that makes the intentional structures of life available to explicit conceptual grasping. I am especially indebted to Matthew Burch’s discussion of these issues in “The Existential Sources of Phenomenology.” See also Dan Zahavi, “How to Investigate Subjectivity: Natorp and Heidegger on Reflection,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 36 (2003).

43. Crowell, *Husserl, Heidegger and the Space of Meaning*, 140.

44. For further discussion of the manner in which Dasein is the being that is ontological, see Iain Thomson, “Heidegger’s Perfectionist Philosophy of Education in *Being and Time*,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 37, no. 4 (2004).

### Chapter 3

1. Simon Critchley, “Enigma Variations: An Interpretation of Heidegger’s *Sein und Zeit*,” *Ratio* 15, no. 2 (2002): 169, expresses this common view when he claims that according to Heidegger, “all relationality is rendered secondary because of the primacy of *Jemeinigkeit* [mineness].”

2. Emmanuel Levinas, “Time and the Other,” in *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, trans. Richard A. Cohen (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987), 93.

3. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956), 329. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *BN*.

4. Dan Zahavi, *Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*, trans. Elizabeth A. Behnke (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001), 136.

5. Schroeder, *Sartre and His Predecessors*, 147.

6. Nancy, *Being Singular Plural*, 50. All references in this section of the chapter will be to this work unless otherwise noted.

7. According to Nancy Bauer, Heidegger “conceives of our Being-with others, primordially, as a simple, if fateful ontological *fact*: the world of any single individual just is, inevitably and through and through, a world shared with others. And indeed, this fact creates at least as many philosophical problems as it solves” (“Being-With as Being-Against: Heidegger Meets Hegel in *The Second Sex*,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 34 [2001]: 141).

8. This claim to plurality can be contested, however—at least in the early Heidegger—since Dasein’s status as an ultimate for-the-sake-of-which unified in authenticity seems to undermine such plurality, as does *Being and Time*’s attempt to find the meaning of being in general. The later Heidegger seems to be more genuinely committed to an irreducible ontological pluralism (though not one from which Dasein’s contribution can be entirely separated, as Nancy would seem to have it). I am indebted to Iain Thomson for reminding me of this point. See chapter 1 of Thomson’s *Heidegger, Art, and Postmodernity* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

9. It is for this reason that we can recognize the enormous influence that Sartre had on Levinas—who not only criticizes Heidegger on similar grounds,

but adopts Sartre's phenomenological starting point. For Levinas, as for Sartre, the other appears as such in terms of the self's experience of its own freedom being called into question. In a particularly Levinasian turn of phrase, Sartre claims that the other appears as "a subject beyond my limit, as the one who limits me. In fact nothing can limit me except the Other" (BN 287). Levinas's work is of course full of such claims. See especially Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969), 194–201.

10. For further discussion of this experience, see Gavin Rae, "Sartre & the Other: Conflict, Conversion, Language and the We," *Sartre Studies International* 15 (2009); as well as Joseph S. Catalano, *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre's "Being and Nothingness"* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), especially "The Existence of Others," 152–68.

11. Theunissen, *The Other*, 240. Embedded quote: BN 555.

12. Theunissen, *The Other*, 238.

13. See BN 491–93, 517–28. For a helpful discussion of bad faith, see David Sherman, "Camus' Meurault and Sartrean Irresponsibility," *Philosophy and Literature* 19, no. 1 (1995).

14. To understand myself to be part of some universal group like "Humanity," then, is an "abstract, unrealizable project of the for-itself toward an absolute totalization of itself and of *all* Others" (BN 547). The project is unrealizable because its very possibility depends on the look of an other who could encompass all of humanity: God or aliens or some other outside third party who unifies us. It is only in the eyes of the third party that I can experience myself as part of the "community of equivalence" (BN 541) characteristic of the public world.

15. See Jean-Paul Sartre, *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, trans. Quentin Hoare (New York: Verso, 2010). The separately published *Search for a Method* is particularly helpful in this regard. See Hazel Barnes, "Sartre on the Emotions," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 15 (1984) for a discussion of this shift in Sartre's thought. Some of Sartre's later works also acknowledge the manner in which certain intersubjective groups may be less prone to bad faith because their oppression makes it impossible to think of themselves as pure freedom. See, for example, Jean-Paul Sartre, *Anti-Semite and Jew: An Exploration of the Etiology of Hate*, trans. George J. Becker (New York: Schocken Books, 1995); and Jean-Paul Sartre, *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*, trans. Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer, and Terry McWilliams (New York: Routledge, 2001). Stuart Zane Charmé discusses this in terms of the bourgeois devaluation of nature in "Sartre's Images of the Other and the Search for Authenticity," *Human Studies* 14 (1991).

16. In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre explains this project as the desire to be a god—simultaneously existing as fully self-aware consciousness and fully realized being. This "useless passion" is humanity's "perpetual surpassing toward a coincidence with itself which is never given" (BN 139).

17. Sartre's notion of conversion sounds remarkably Heideggerian at points. See especially Jean-Paul Sartre, *Notebook for an Ethics*, trans. David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 470–75. There he argues that in conversion one grasps oneself *as* having the burden of choosing who one will

be—a recognition that brings consciousness to “a new, ‘*authentic*,’ way of being oneself” (ibid., 474).

18. For further discussion of Sartre’s notion of conversion and its relationship to the self-other relationship, see Thomas C. Anderson, *Sartre’s Two Ethics: From Authenticity to Integral Humanity* (Chicago: Open Court, 1993); Michelle R. Darnell, “‘Being-Looked-at: Ontological Grounding for an Ethics’ in *Being and Nothingness*,” *Sartre Studies International* 10 (2004); and T. Storm Heter, “Authenticity and Others: Sartre’s Ethics of Recognition,” *Sartre Studies International* 12 (2006).

19. See Roger Frie, *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity in Modern Philosophy and Psychoanalysis* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997), 54: “The notion of a mistaken look admittedly leads Sartre to introduce a permanent presence of the other—in the form of my being-for-others.”

20. Theunissen, *The Other*, 241.

21. Ibid.

22. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 426.

## Chapter 4

1. The English translation is not available, but a translated *précis* has been published as Ernst Tugendhat, “Heidegger’s Idea of Truth,” in *Critical Heidegger*, trans. Christopher Macann (New York: Routledge, 1995).

2. Tugendhat, “Heidegger’s Idea of Truth,” 234.

3. Ibid., 240.

4. Christina Lafont argues this point in terms of the meaning-horizon established by language in *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*, trans. Graham Harman (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000). Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *HLWD*.

5. Henry Pietersma, *Phenomenological Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 123.

6. Diego Marconi, “On the Mind Dependence of Truth,” *Erkenntnis* 65 (2006) shows how Heidegger’s claim that *truth* is mind-dependent cannot allow us to assume that he takes *reality* to be mind-dependent. See also B. Harrison, “Heidegger and the Analytic Tradition on Truth,” *Topoi* 10 (1991).

7. Crowell, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning*, 93.

8. This term comes from John Haugeland’s “Truth and Finitude: Heidegger’s Transcendental Existentialism,” in *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, ed. Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000), 57.

9. Taylor Carman makes note of this in *Heidegger’s Analytic: Interpretation, Discourse, and Authenticity in “Being and Time”* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

10. Ibid., 196.

11. Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, trans. Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 2. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *IPR*.

12. James D. Reid considers the implications of such an “epistemological” stance in his “Ethical Criticism in Heidegger’s Early Freiburg Lectures,” *Review of Metaphysics* 59 (2005).

13. Charles Taylor, “Engaged Agency and Background,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles Guignon (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 323.

14. John Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality* (New York: Free, 1995), 2.

15. John Haugeland, “Objective Perception,” in *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

16. Taylor, “Engaged Agency and Background,” 319. Heidegger’s recognition of how Dasein’s existence provides conditions for the possibility of meaning in this way locates his early work in the tradition of transcendental phenomenology. See Henry Pietersma, “What Happened to Epistemology in Our Tradition?” *Review of Metaphysics* 59 (2006); and Kenneth Schmitz’s response: “Transcendentalism or Transcendentals? A Critical Reflection on the Transcendental Turn,” *Review of Metaphysics* 58 (2005).

17. Carman argues that in *Angst* even occurrent entities are experienced through a kind of breakdown that reveals their strangeness and radical otherness, which demonstrates that Heidegger must be read as a variety of realist: “Anxiety thus reveals what Dasein always already understands about occurrent reality, namely, that it is radically, stubbornly, awesomely independent of us and our abilities, our hopes, our fears, indeed the very conditions of our interpretations of things at large” (*Heidegger’s Analytic*, 195).

18. It is this perpetual possibility of resistance to Dasein’s understanding that Heidegger thematizes under the name “earth” in “Origin of the Work of Art,” in *Basic Writings*, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins, 1993).

19. Haugeland, “Truth and Finitude,” 55–56.

20. *Ibid.*, 58, 58–59.

21. *Ibid.*, 54

22. *Ibid.* Hubert Dreyfus and Charles Spinosa similarly argue that it is the conflict of incommensurable worlds that allows us to recognize that things exist independently of our interpretive or experiential frameworks (See “Coping with Things in Themselves: A Practice-Based Phenomenological Basis of Robust Realism,” *Inquiry* 42, no. 1 [1999]).

23. Haugeland, “Truth and Finitude,” 59.

24. In *Ethics and Finitude: Heideggerian Contributions to Moral Philosophy* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), Lawrence Hatab argues that the interruption of empathic engagement with others—an interruption that occurs in the deficient modes of *Fürsorge* (solicitude, the way of being towards other Dasein)—can be taken as *analogous* to the breakdown of *Zuhandenheit* that gives rise to *Vorhandenheit*. See 65–66, 143–45. However, despite his claim that “empathy could then serve as an existential exemplar, as a kind of measure for a significant range of ethical matters” (*ibid.*, 145), he fails to offer an account of how this type of normal empathic “going-along-with” is to act as a normative constraint. We will return to this in chapter 6.

25. Theunissen, *The Other*, 181.

26. *Ibid.*, 181.

27. *Ibid.*, 182.

28. This claim is reminiscent of Paul Ricoeur's critique of analytic thought experiments about the nature of selfhood—particularly in Derek Parfit's *Reasons and Persons*. Ricoeur argues that “what the puzzling cases render radically contingent is this corporeal and terrestrial condition which the hermeneutics of existence, underlying the notion of acting and suffering, takes to be insurmountable” (*Oneself as Another*, trans. Kathleen Blamey [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992], 150). In the case of being-with, what the “hermeneutics of existence” finds to be insurmountable is not the concrete fact of embodiment and rootedness on the Earth, but the concrete fact of encounters with individual others.

29. László Tengelyi, *The Wild Region in Life-History*, trans. Géza Kállay and László Tengelyi (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2004), 24.

30. See Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's “Being & Time,”* 135: “The ‘problem of facticity’ is not that of the transcendental determination of the individual out of ultimate logical laws. For the original facticity is not an absolute consciousness . . . but rather a primal reality ever to be experienced, the self in the actualization of life-experience . . . It is to be experienced not by taking cognizance of it, but by vital participation in it, being distressed by it, troubled and put out of ease, so that the troubled self who ‘minds’ or ‘cares’ is continually affected (*betroffen*) by this affliction.”

31. Lawrence Hatab makes a similar claim about concrete ethical terms: “I want to suggest a certain feedback loop between ethics and ontology, where ethical terms imply a situated involvement that keeps ontology in concrete existential territory, and where ontological terms drawn from, and pointing back to, ethical senses can ‘ontologize’ ethics in such a way as to surmount certain doubts, restrictions, or demotions that have been part of modern moral philosophy” (*Ethics and Finitude*, 80).

32. Ernst Tugendhat, *Der Wahrheitsbegriff bei Husserl und Heidegger* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967), 165: “Husserl's *a priori* itself holds absolutely, but only relative to the condition in question, which is not itself necessary” (translation mine, with thanks to Inga Römer).

33. See Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, sections 44–52. Klaus Hartmann, *Studies in Foundational Philosophy* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 1988), argues that phenomenology's reliance on self-evidence in this regard is entirely unsatisfactory because “we do not know why, or on what grounds, thought holds of being. To claim self-evidence, and on various levels of constitution at that, does not really solve this overriding problem” (52). Hartmann does admit, however, that in the absence of a Hegelian-style approach, with Husserl's phenomenology “what we have is much: a theory which tries to come as close as possible to wedding the quest for certainty to foundational, transcendental, and thus theoretical philosophy” (*ibid.*).

34. Martin Heidegger, *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 65. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *MFL*.



35. Crowell, *Husserl, Heidegger and the Space of Meaning*, 101.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. John J. Drummond, “Pure Logical Grammar: Anticipatory Categoriality and Articulated Categoriality,” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 11, no. 2 (2003): 136.
39. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 35.
40. Tugendhat, *Der Wahrheitsbegriff*, 165. “According to Husserl, the *a priori* no longer holds directly for beings or objects of our experience in general, and so arises the possibility of an open plurality of modes of experience, each with its own *a priori*” (translation mine, with thanks to Inga Römer).
41. *PIA* 74. It is important to note here that Heidegger refuses to separate the ontic from the ontological not just in this instance but *tout court*, since doing so would invalidate his phenomenological method. I am grateful to Iain Thomson for urging me to make this clear.
42. Martin Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, trans. Richard Taft (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 18. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *KPM*.
43. Note that, for Heidegger, such a total failure is also possible in the complete breakdown of the world’s meaning in *Angst*.
44. For a discussion of the Heidegger-Kant relationship on this issue, see James Luchte, “Makeshift: Phenomenology of Original Temporality,” *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 3 (2003).
45. Stephan Käufer, “Schemata, Hammers, and Time: Heidegger’s Two Derivations of Judgment,” *Topoi* 22 (2003): 81–82.
46. Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1965), A138/B177.
47. Though the focus of this chapter is Heidegger, not Kant, helpful discussions of the schematism can be found in Sarah L. Gibbons, *Kant’s Theory of Imagination: Bridging Gaps in Judgement and Experience* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994); Michael Pendlebury, “Making Sense of Kant’s Schematism,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55, no. 4 (1995); and Eva Schaper, “Kant’s Schematism Reconsidered,” *Review of Metaphysics* 18 (1964–65).
48. Heidegger quoting Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, A320, B376f (*KPM* 16).
49. For a more detailed discussion of the extent and manner in which the unity of the form of intuition is itself intuitively given—and the “rather tortuous reading” of Kant that Heidegger engages in on this point, see Martin Weatherston, *Heidegger’s Interpretation of Kant: Categories, Imagination, and Temporality* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002), 50–66.
50. *Ibid.*, 55.
51. Robert J. Dostal, “Time and Phenomenology in Husserl and Heidegger,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles Guignon (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 145.
52. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 409.
53. Benjamin D. Crowe, “Resoluteness in the Middle Voice: On the Ethical Dimensions of Heidegger’s *Being and Time*,” *Philosophy Today* 45, no. 3 (2001): 228.

54. Frederick A. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1987), 93.

55. John Llewelyn, *The Middle Voice of Ecological Conscience* (New York: St. Martin's, 1991), 87 (emphasis mine). Llewelyn notes that "Heidegger has problems avoiding an exaggeration of either the activity or the passivity in the attempt to describe this 'relation' which is neither just the one nor just the other" (ibid.). Insofar as he attempts to navigate such a middle ground, however, Llewelyn refuses to "follow Levinas in stressing as much as he does the place of practical power in the interpretation of Heidegger's ontology" (ibid.), especially since Levinas himself suffers from a similar difficulty in exaggerating only one dimension of such a relation.

56. Frank Schalow, "Kant, Heidegger, and the Performative Character of Language in the First Critique," *Epoché* 8, no. 1 (2003): 168.

57. Ibid., 172.

58. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's "Being & Time,"* 259.

## Chapter 5

1. William D. Blattner, *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 124. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *HTI*. See also Phillip R. Buckley, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1992), 172.

2. Steven Crowell, "Facticity and Transcendental Philosophy," in *From Kant to Davidson: Philosophy and the Idea of the Transcendental*, ed. Jeff Malpas (New York: Routledge, 2002). Crowell notes that simply interpreting this temporal dimension of facticity as historicity has resulted in many narrativist conceptions of the Heideggerian subject, but the interpretation of *Gewesenheit* on which they rely—translating it as "having been"—"is misleading, since the term names something that is 'not chronologically prior in any sense' . . . *Gewesenheit* indicates not a tense but an *aspect*: the '*a priori* perfect' . . . It is what I *always* already am" (114).

3. Interestingly, this objection has the same structure as Tugendhat's critique of Heidegger's notion of truth, which, as we mentioned above, argues that by defining truth as disclosure and jettisoning the claim that truth discloses the thing *as it is in itself*, what we *mean* by truth as a critical standard of evaluation is lost. According to Tugendhat, "Instead of broadening the specific concept of truth, Heidegger simply gave the word truth another meaning" ("Heidegger's Idea of Truth," 236).

4. See also *BPP* 269.

5. In *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, Heidegger notes that Henri Bergson first made such a distinction between "a derived and an original time" (*MFL* 203). Heidegger argues, however, that Bergson's account fails because he "went too far and said that time, once emerged, is space. Bergson thereby blocked the way to the real understanding of derived time, since he, in principle, mistakes the essence of emergent time, insofar as he does not view as emergent the time that has emerged" (*MFL* 203). The consequence, Heidegger argues, is that Bergson's

account theorizes having-been-ness as a kind of “accumulating dead weight I haul behind me and to which I could occasionally relate in one way or another” (MFL 206). By maintaining the continuously “emerging” quality of time, however, one can recognize that Dasein’s “having-been only ‘is,’ in each case, according to the mode of the temporalization of the future, and only in that temporalization” (MFL 206). Thus Heidegger rejects Bergson’s account because it remains within the confines of ancient views on time according to which time is “something present-at-hand, which is on hand somehow in the soul” (MFL 149). The accuracy of this presentation of Bergson’s position cannot be examined here—for our purposes it is enough to note that Heidegger rejected it as sufficient for the matter under consideration. For Bergson’s own account, see Henri Bergson, *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Mabelle L. Andison (New York: Citadel, 1992 [1946]); and Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, trans. F. L. Pogson (Charleston, S.C.: Nabu, 2010).

6. Edgar C. Boedeker Jr. argues in “Phenomenological Ontology or the Explanation of Social Norms? A Confrontation with William Blattner’s *Heidegger’s Temporal Idealism*,” *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 84, no. 3 (2002) that Blattner reaches this conclusion because he is operating under the mistaken assumption that Heidegger’s project is meant to have originary time *explain* ordinary time—as opposed to engaging in a phenomenological description of the conditions that make meaningful encounters in ordinary time possible. It is the emphasis on explanation, argues Boedeker, that leads Blattner to claim that Heidegger was trying—and failing—to endorse an idealist conception of time. Whether this position fails or not is immaterial, however, according to Boedeker, since Heidegger was not in fact endorsing it; “whereas Heidegger is trivially an ‘idealist’ about originary temporality, which surely depends on Dasein, he need not be read as committed to taking any stand—either realist or idealist—on the origin of ordinary time *per se*,” particularly insofar as Heidegger insisted that “his own position is beyond *both* realism and idealism” (ibid., 342). To a large extent I agree with Boedeker’s arguments, but I will be focusing on how Blattner’s failure to give due weight to being-with undermines attempts to account for the relationship between originary and ordinary time—regardless of whether this relationship should be characterized as an “explanation.”

7. John Haugeland, “Dasein’s Disclosedness,” in *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*, ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Harrison Hall (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992), 40, endnote 9.

8. BT 187/175. *Mitda-sein* should be translated as “co-Dasein,” and must be distinguished from *Mitsein*, or being-with. This distinction will be examined in detail below.

9. Margot Fleischer, *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers “Sein und Zeit”: Aporien, Probleme und ein Ausblick* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1991), 25: “The analysis of temporality cannot accomplish what Heidegger evidently resolved for it to do—simply, as mentioned above, to observe an ontological meta-level, namely to go beyond Care as the being of Dasein to an underlying being and so with the notion of temporality to characterize a happening of being which would have to be distinguished from the executions of being of the everyday

and of authentic care, as the founding would have to be distinguished from the founded” (translation mine, with thanks to Inga Römer).

10. Daniel Dahlstrom, “Heidegger’s Concept of Temporality: Reflections on a Recent Criticism,” *Review of Metaphysics* 49 (1995). For another position endorsing the view that originary temporality is authentic temporality, see Marion Heinz, “The Concept of Time in Heidegger’s Early Works,” in *A Companion to Martin Heidegger’s “Being and Time,”* ed. J. Kockelmans (Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology and University Press of America, Washington, D.C., 1986). Olafson also appears to hold this position, since he seems to imply in *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind* that originary and authentic temporality can be equated (91).

11. Dahlstrom, “Heidegger’s Concept of Temporality,” 112.

12. *Ibid.*, 113.

13. *Ibid.*, 111.

14. *Ibid.*, 112–13.

15. As Blattner notes, the main reason for “largely bypassing Heidegger’s discussion of historicity [not just because it relies on already working out what originary temporality and ordinary, sequential time are] is its unclarity; it slips quickly into a treatment of authentic historicity at the expense of that historicity that is modally indifferent” (*HTI* 29). Based on the individuation characterizing authenticity, it also seems evident that “authentic *volk*” is not a notion to which Heidegger is entitled if he wishes to remain consistent. Phillip R. Buckley makes a similar point in “Martin Heidegger: The ‘End’ of Ethics,” in *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, ed. John J. Drummond and Lester Embree (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002). For a more positive assessment of Heidegger’s notion of authentic historicity and the role it can play in a possible Heideggerian ethics, see Mariana Ortega, “When Conscience Calls, Will Dasein Answer? Heideggerian Authenticity and the Possibility of Ethical Life,” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 13 (2005).

16. Kisiel notes Heidegger’s indebtedness to both Dilthey and the Christian tradition in this regard: through them he was able to articulate the “paradox” of subjectivity (though Kisiel’s formulation still uses quite loaded language)—“that this outwardness of inwardness at once makes it accessible” (*The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 103). The condition of the “inner world” is that “it is at once a historical world which as such can be understood . . . a life which is understandable because it always spontaneously expresses itself” (*ibid.*, 103–4).

17. Emmanuel Levinas, *Existence & Existents*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1988), 81–82. For an account of the manner in which Levinas is indebted to Heidegger for his revolutionary account of the relationship between time and existence, see Tina Chanter, *Time, Death, and the Feminine: Levinas with Heidegger* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001).

18. Husserl, *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, 47.

19. Mark Okrent, *Heidegger’s Pragmatism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988), 30.

20. *Ibid.*, 35 (emphasis mine). Other examples include: “To understand myself as existing is to understand myself as an end that is not yet actual but that

I grasp as my possibility” (ibid.); “To understand myself it is necessary that I intend myself as a possible end to be realized” (ibid.); and “I understand myself as an end which is possible and to be attained” (ibid., 39).

21. Theodore Schatzki, “The Temporality of Teleology: Against the Narrativity of Action,” in *The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, ed. Burt Hopkins and Steven Crowell (Seattle: Noesis, 2005), 137. Schatzki argues that this is a major problem with much of narrative theory—David Carr and Alistair MacIntyre, among others, being guilty of it. David Wood makes a similar argument in *Time After Time* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007): the “unity, identity, [and] permanence” created by narrative is ultimately “an aesthetic illusion” (179).

22. *BPP* 247. This comment occurs in the context of Heidegger’s discussion of traditional concepts of time. Here he is analyzing the implications of Aristotle’s approach, but in doing so he is trying to bring out the manner in which Aristotle “broached a series of central problems relating to time, and in fact not indiscriminately but in their essential concatenation” (*BPP* 237).

23. See Olafson, *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind*, 75–84.

24. Theunissen, *The Other*, 181.

25. Fleischer, *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers ‘Sein und Zeit,’* 39: “If temporality is not understood as the being of Dasein, then according to my interpretation, as explained, no damage for the totality of care would arise” (translation mine, with thanks to Inga Römer). Dahlstrom, “Heidegger’s Concept of Temporality,” 99, makes note of this and argues that a similar position could explain the neglect of Division Two displayed by Dreyfus and Okrent.

26. *BPP* 237. David Scott examines the relationship between Bergson and Heidegger on this issue in “The ‘Concept of Time’ and the ‘Being of the Clock’: Bergson, Einstein, Heidegger and the Interrogation of the Temporality of Modernism,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 39 (2006).

27. Theodore Schatzki, “Where Times Meet,” *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 1 (2005) examines the relationship between these two dimensions of time—which he calls “ordinary time” and “the time of the soul.” However, Schatzki fails to recognize the necessarily intersubjective aspect of this relationship and attempts to ground it, like Blattner, in a kind of pragmatic temporality.

28. This is very much like the position that Levinas came to advocate: “How indeed could time arise in a solitary subject? The solitary subject cannot deny itself; it does not possess nothingness . . . the absolute alterity of another instant cannot be found in the subject, who is definitively *himself*. This alterity comes to me only from the other. Is not sociality something more than the source of our representation of time: is it not time itself? If time is constituted by my relationship with the other, it is exterior to my instant, but it is also something else than an object given to contemplation” (*Existence & Existents*, 96). According to Tina Chanter, Levinas believed Heidegger to belong with the rest of the tradition insofar as he “always conceives of time in a solitary subject” (*Time, Death, and the Feminine*, 27–28). I hope to have shown, however, that though Heidegger did not examine these issues in sufficient—or at least comparable—detail, such an ac-

cusation is false, and Levinas's own account must be seen as a continuation of—rather than a break with—Heidegger's characterization of temporal diachrony. For further discussion of the Levinasian understanding of such diachrony, see his examination of the notions of "paternity" and "fecundity" in *Totality and Infinity* (especially 267–69 and 274–80). Levinas also finds this temporal alterity in the distance between the "saying" and the "said." See "Time and Discourse" in Emmanuel Levinas, *Otherwise Than Being: Or Beyond Essence*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998). One can find a similar (Derrida-inspired) position in David Wood's notion of different "economies" of time (*Time After Time*).

29. Kisiel, *The Origin of Heidegger's "Being & Time,"* 329.

30. Martin Heidegger, "On the Essence of Ground," in *Pathmarks*, trans. William McNeill (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 122. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as "OEG."

31. Husserl, *Crisis*, 184–86.

32. For an examination of the status of Husserl's transcendental ego in this regard, see Dermot Moran, *Edmund Husserl: Founder of Phenomenology* (New York: Polity, 2007); and Dan Zahavi, *Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*.

33. Zahavi, *Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*, 50.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*, 59.

36. Zahavi considers this point, but argues that because Heidegger always seems to base his analyses on the utilization of the *Zuhanden*, being-with seems to be better characterized in terms of the anonymous publicity of what he takes to be a third Husserlian mode of encounter (*ibid.*, 128–29). In this sense, Zahavi is echoing Theunissen's (mis)interpretation whereby the thingly encounter has priority.

37. Tugendhat, *Der Wahrheitsbegriff*, 223–24. Zahavi claims that insofar as Tugendhat's understanding of constitution relies upon the traditional "opposition between epistemic and ontological priority" that the transcendental reduction was meant to overcome, "his suggestion misses the point" (*Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*, 107). The extent to which this is an accurate account of Husserlian constitution cannot be addressed here—the relevant point for our discussion is that the experience of the other as co-constitutor—as originary temporality speaking itself out into the world—cannot simply be a moment of my own originary temporality but is precisely an encounter with another now.

## Chapter 6

1. Recent studies in developmental psychology support this distinction in our way of being-toward things vs. being-toward persons: as young as six-months-old children attribute intentionality and goal-directedness to the movement of a human hand—evident in anticipatory eye movement—but not to similar movements when the "agent" is a machine or not visible. See Vittorio Gallese, "Intentional Attunement: Neural Correlates of Intersubjectivity" (paper presented at

the *Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity, Objectivity* conference held at the Center for Subjectivity Research, University of Copenhagen, September 23, 2006).

2. The term “recognition” has an enormous philosophical history rooted in G. W. F. Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), where he characterizes the “process of Recognition” in terms of the fact that “Self-consciousness exists in and for itself when, and by the fact that, it so exists for another; that is, it exists only in being acknowledged” (111). Though an investigation of Hegel’s influence would clearly be important and relevant for this discussion, the enormity of this task demands that it be bracketed. In light of this, my use of the term “recognition” is simply meant to designate the manner in which one subject experiences another subject as such, and not to invoke all of the Hegelian implications of this term. I will also refer to this mode of subject-encounter using the term “acknowledgment”—taken not only from Hegel, but from Stanley Cavell’s *The Claim of Reason: Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979). The use of this term is particularly helpful insofar as it has fewer “cognitive” implications and it also seems to indicate a moment of accommodation inherent in the encounter. However, as Axel Honneth notes in “Self-Reification: Contours of a Failed Form of Self-Relationship” (paper presented at the *Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity, Objectivity* conference held at the Center for Subjectivity Research, University of Copenhagen, September 23, 2006), the German word for recognition—*Anerkennung*—does not have such a cognitive tone, and also includes a sense of normative *affirmation*. For Honneth’s most famous examination of the meaning of recognition for understanding intersubjective encounters, see *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*, trans. Joel Anderson (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996).

3. Theunissen characterizes the interpretation of leaping-in and leaping-ahead as extremes on a continuum as “bizarre,” and claims that “it is certainly not to be assumed that ‘bypassing one another, not-being-involved with one another,’ provides the mean between the solicitude of leaping-in and leaping-ahead” (*The Other*, 397 fn. 32). If we consider the fact that these extremes are to encompass the entire range of human interaction, however—including murderous cruelty and self-sacrificial love—then characterizing the mean between them as bypassing one another in an indifferent state that is neither profoundly negative nor positive does not sound so “bizarre.”

4. Sonia Sikka, “Kantian Ethics in *Being and Time*,” *Journal of Philosophical Research* 31 (2006): 311.

5. Charles Sherover, “Founding an Existentialist Ethic,” *Human Studies* 4 (1981): 227.

6. Stephen Darwall makes this type of distinction between appraisal and recognition respect in his “Two Kinds of Respect,” *Ethics* 88 (1977). The former involves esteeming someone’s life or character as successful or worthy, whereas the latter is not a kind of esteem, but respect granted on the basis of the dignity of persons as such.

7. Lawrence Vogel, *The Fragile “We”: Ethical Implications of Heidegger’s “Being and Time”* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1994), 9.

8. Young, *Heidegger, Philosophy, Nazism*, 104.

9. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*, 49.
10. Philippe, "Heidegger and Ethics," *Inquiry* 42 (1999): 444.
11. Martin Heidegger, *The Essence of Human Freedom: An Introduction to Philosophy*, trans. Ted Sadler (New York: Continuum, 2002), 199. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as *EHF*.
12. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*, 49.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Kant's profound influence on Heidegger's thought is well chronicled in Kisiel's *The Genesis of Heidegger's "Being & Time"*, where he describes *Being and Time* as having "a Kantian overlay and impetus" from the start (411).
15. Dostal, "Time and Phenomenology in Husserl and Heidegger," 160.
16. Llewelyn, *The Middle Voice of Ecological Conscience*, 80.
17. There are those who read Heidegger's "call of care" or "call of being" as being equally anonymous; François Raffoul claims in "Otherness and Individuation in Heidegger," *Man and World* 28 (1995): 346, for example, that "the call of care, that Heidegger will later designate as the call of Being, manifests the otherness which lies at the heart of Dasein's self-appropriation. Dasein can belong to itself only if it takes upon itself a gift of Being which is so to speak impersonal, and at the very least pre-personal. This gift of Being is for Dasein otherness itself, even if Dasein constitutes itself on the basis of it." Though the case may be made for such an anonymous and external source of Dasein's subjectivity in the late Heidegger, it seems to directly contradict the early Heidegger's entire project—namely, to force us to recognize that abstract and anonymous ways of speaking about subjectivity are meaningless except in terms of the concrete particularity of Dasein's existing.
18. Jacques Taminiaux, *Heidegger and the Project of Fundamental Ontology*, trans. Michael Gendre (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 172.
19. *Ibid.*, xxi and 174.
20. *Ibid.*, xxi.
21. Raffoul, *Heidegger and the Subject*, 222.
22. Alfred Schutz, *On Phenomenology and Social Relations: Selected Writings*, trans. Helmut R. Wagner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 189.
23. See, for example, Sikka, "Kantian Ethics in *Being and Time*," 316; and Llewelyn, *The Middle Voice of Ecological Conscience*, 73.
24. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. Mary Gregor (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 88, 5:105.
25. Raffoul, *Heidegger and the Subject*, 243.
26. Allen W. Wood, *Kant's Ethical Thought* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 120.
27. *Ibid.*, 121.
28. John J. Drummond, "Respect as a Moral Emotion: A Phenomenological Approach," *Husserl Studies* 22, no. 1 (2006): 5 (emphasis mine).
29. *Ibid.*, 20.
30. *Ibid.*, 21.
31. *Ibid.*, 14–15.
32. Stephen Darwall, "Respect and the Second-Person Standpoint," *Proceed-*



*ings and Addresses of the APA* 78, no. 2 (2004). As Levinas notes in “Diachrony and Representation,” in *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, trans. Richard A. Cohen (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987), 112: “The order concerns me without it being possible for me to go back to the thematic presence of a being that would be the cause or the willing of this commandment. As I have said, it is again not a question here of receiving an order by first perceiving it and then subjecting oneself to it in a decision I take after having deliberated about it. In the proximity of the face, the subjection precedes the reasoned decision to assume the order that it bears.” Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as “DR.”

33. Darwall, “Respect and the Second-Person Standpoint,” 44.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*, 49.

36. Emmanuel Levinas, “Is Ontology Fundamental?” in *Basic Philosophical Writings*, ed. Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 6. Steven Crowell notes in “Kantianism and Phenomenology,” in *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, ed. J. J. Drummond and L. Embree (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002), 66, that for Levinas, “prior to the Kantian ‘fact of reason’ is the ‘face’ of the other, a command that requires no justification because it makes the project of justification possible . . . the universality of obligation does not derive from reason, but finds it.”

37. Heidegger quoting Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. Mary Gregor (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 286 (*BPP* 138).

38. Levinas, “Time and the Other,” 79. Indeed, following the discussion in “Diachrony and Representation” of the proximity of the other as a “putting into question” of the subject’s claim to perseverance, Levinas himself notes that “here is an indiscreet—or ‘unjust’—presence, which is perhaps already an issue in ‘The Anaximander Fragment,’ such as Heidegger interprets it in *Holzwege*. It puts into question the ‘positivity’ of the *esse* in its *presence*, signifying, bluntly, encroachment and usurpation! Did not Heidegger—despite all he intends to teach about the priority of the ‘thought of being’—here run up against the original significance of ethics?” (“DR” 108–9).

39. James Mensch, *Ethics and Selfhood: Alterity and the Phenomenology of Obligation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 161.

40. James Mensch, “Givenness and Alterity,” *Idealistic Studies* 33, no. 1 (2003): 3. Adrian Johnston provides a reading of Heidegger along these lines in “The Soul of Dasein: Schelling’s Doctrine of the Soul and Heidegger’s Analytic of Dasein,” *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 3 (2003), defining Dasein in terms of sameness and alterity that brings him in line with Schelling: “For Schelling and Heidegger, an adequate theory of subjectivity demands the paradox of thinking together both transcendence-potentiality and immanence-actuality at one and the same time, of positing that human beings are simultaneously immersed within a situated worldly reality as well as being constantly ‘in excess’ of this situation, continually stretching beyond the given-ness of the ‘there’” (241).

41. Mensch, *Ethics and Selfhood*, 162.

42. *Ibid.*, 160.

43. *Ibid.*

44. This notion speaks to the type of selfhood that Paul Ricoeur characterizes as *ipse* in *Oneself as Another*, where he notes that human selfhood implies “a form of permanence in time which is not reducible to the determination of a substratum . . . which is not simply the schema of the category of substance” (118). Instead, selfhood involves a type of constancy achieved through *commitment*. Though Ricoeur recognizes Heidegger’s contributions in this regard—“Heidegger is right to distinguish the permanence of substance from self-subsistence (*Selbst-Ständigkeit*)” (*ibid.*, 123)—Ricoeur simply equates the Heideggerian originary temporality of selfhood with *authentic* temporality—“it is not certain that ‘anticipatory resoluteness’ in the face of death exhausts the sense of self-constancy” (*ibid.*). As a result, he fails to realize that Heidegger’s distinction between the individuating temporality of selfhood and that of substance is prior to the modal manifestations of this selfhood in authentic or inauthentic form, and, consequently, that this dimension of selfhood is encountered in all expressions of *Fürsorge*.

45. Robert Brandom, “Heidegger’s Categories in *Being and Time*,” in *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*, ed. Hubert Dreyfus and Harrison Hall (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992), 54.

46. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*, 31.

47. As Brandom argues, “recognition must not be taken to be a mental act, but . . . must be given a social behavioral reading in terms of communal responsive dispositions” (“Heidegger’s Categories in *Being and Time*,” 53).

48. Heidegger, *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, 85. Translation found in Greisch, “The ‘Play of Transcendence’ and the Question of Ethics,” 101.

49. An earlier version of the following discussion was published as Irene McMullin, “Articulating Discourse: Heidegger’s Communicative Impulse,” *Southwest Philosophy Review* 22 (2006).

50. Lafont, *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*, 47.

51. Mark Okrent, “Equipment, World, and Language,” *Inquiry* 45: “Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*” (2002): 198.

52. *Ibid.*, 201.

53. Matthew B. Shockey addresses this issue in “Heidegger, Lafont and the Necessity of the Transcendental,” *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 34 (2008), where he argues that in response to the “tension between the transcendental and hermeneutic dimensions of Heidegger’s project” Lafont tends to reduce the former to the latter, thereby obscuring the Kantian thrust of Heidegger’s approach, according to which we must recognize the “universal, a priori, transcendental structures of meaning or being” (559, 558). Unlike the pragmatist tendency to separate “being from language by locating it in non-linguistic practice,” Shockey argues that “Heidegger locates it at a structural or ontological level, that is, a level which is in the Kantian sense universal and necessary” (*ibid.*, 562). As will become clear, my position is more in keeping with Shockey’s treatment, but the point is moot—our purpose here is merely to call into question Lafont’s equation of meaning with language.

54. Haugeland, “Truth and Finitude,” 52.

55. Dreyfus, *Being-in-the-World*, 215.

56. *Ibid.*, 217.

57. At HTI 71, fn. 51, Blattner indicates that he has grouped “making known” (*Bekundung*) under the heading “communication” (*Mitteilung*). Though Heidegger differentiates them (see *Being and Time*, section 34), Blattner finds it hard to tell any real difference between the two, and therefore analyzes them as one phenomenon. We will be returning to this point below.

58. Blattner distinguishes his position from theirs by arguing that “discourse does not limp along after significations but, rather, institutes them in the first place . . . words do sometimes accrue to significations. But language does sometimes *itself* institute differentiations” (HTI 74). Nevertheless, he implies that this is simply a feature of understanding *our particular* world, and is not fundamental to understanding discourse.

59. As Lawrence Hatab notes, for example, in “Dasein, the Early Years: Heideggerian Reflections on Childhood,” presentation at the 38th Annual North American Heidegger Conference, New Orleans (May 2004), 9: “The phenomenon of pointing, a precursor to language development, is unique to humans . . . and it also exhibits an inter-subjective structure because when infants point, they look back at adults to see if they notice it too (a ubiquitous feature of child behavior called ‘social referencing’).”

60. This notion is similar to Searle’s discussion of shared intentionality. See Searle, *The Construction of Social Reality* and “Collective Intentions and Actions,” in *Intentions in Communications*, ed. P. Cohen, J. Morgan, and M. E. Pollack (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990).

61. This does not address Heidegger’s discussions regarding shared understandings and attunements of entire historical communities. Though such shared world-orientations will certainly affect the manner and extent of sharing available to me, this does not change the fact that I exist in a wide variety of changing orientations to specific situations.

62. Max Scheler offers powerful phenomenological analyses of the varieties of such communication or communion in his *On the Nature of Sympathy*, trans. Peter Heath (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954). Though Heidegger critiques the traditional notion of subjectivity present in Scheler’s work, his analyses are still some of the best available on the varieties of being-with.

63. For an example of one such discussion, see Hatab, “Dasein, The Early Years.”

64. Taylor Carman makes this point in *Heidegger’s Analytic*: “There are norms not just for *doing*, that is, but also for *showing* and *saying*” (235).

65. His claim that “the examination of these λόγος belongs to rhetoric and poetics” (FCM 310) may be partially responsible for this.

66. Christina Lafont, “Was Heidegger an Externalist?” *Inquiry* 48, no. 6 (2005): 518.

67. *Ibid.*, 520. O’Murchadha challenges this reading of Heidegger, arguing that Lafont’s invocation of the notion of the “expert” and her corresponding emphasis on the propositional form of language contradicts Heidegger’s emphasis on the experience of average Dasein and the role that poetic communication

can play (“Reduction, Externalism and Immanence in Husserl and Heidegger,” 390). What is relevant for our purposes in Lafont’s characterization of Heidegger as an externalist, however, is the fact that through language Dasein regularly defers authority to others—*assuming* the other’s primordial experience of the matter being referenced without having to be brought into a genuinely communicative sharing of that experience. Thus “expert” can be very loosely understood here—other Dasein may be “experts” insofar as they have had a primordial experience that is then communicated. I agree with O’Murchadha’s reading of Heidegger, however, in recognizing that propositions—as opposed to poetic linguistic forms—tend to inhibit genuine communication in which the other is brought into a shared grasping. The relationship between phenomenology and the internalism/externalism debate is further examined in Steven Crowell, “Phenomenological Immanence, Normativity, and Semantic Externalism,” *Synthese* 160 (2008); and Dan Zahavi, “Internalism, Externalism, and Transcendental Idealism,” *Synthese* 160 (2008).

68. HCT 272. The capacity of certain types of linguistic expression to release new possibilities of being occupies a great deal of Heidegger’s later thought. See, for example, Martin Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: Harper and Row, 1971); and Martin Heidegger, “The Question Concerning Technology,” in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper and Row, 1983).

## Chapter 7

1. Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 372.

2. See Lauren Freeman, “Recognition Reconsidered: A Re-Reading of Heidegger’s *Being and Time* §26,” *Philosophy Today* 53 (2009): 88. Freeman argues that Heidegger’s notion of leaping-in must be understood as a continuum encompassing everything from indifference to violence. What characterizes this continuum, she argues, is the fact that it involves a category mistake in which one fails to “treat Dasein *as* Dasein and instead treat[s] it like something present-at-hand or ready-to-hand.” However, Freeman takes this kind of behavior to indicate that Dasein has also failed to *recognize* the other as Dasein—a position that is inconsistent with the many forms of abuse—such as rape and torture—in which the other’s humanity is implicitly acknowledged yet subsumed to behavior in which that humanity is used as a tool for the abuser’s pleasure. This issue was examined in greater detail in chapter 6.

3. It is here that Heidegger claims that their “description and classification lie outside the limits of this investigation,” BT 123/115.

4. Elliston, “Heidegger’s Phenomenology of Social Existence,” 67.

5. *Ibid.*

6. Theunissen, *The Other*, 191–92.

7. *Ibid.*

8. Klaus Hartmann, “The Logic of Deficient and Eminent Modes in Heidegger,” in *Studies in Foundational Philosophy* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 1988), 130–31.

9. Ibid., 131.

10. Ibid., 134.

11. Hartmann argues that Heidegger's claims about derivative status, in the case of the encounter with things, simply relies on his assertions regarding the priority of the "pragmatic world view," whereas a Hegelian or "speculative (logico-transcendental) account" is not "only posited" and therefore "might have satisfied the interests of a unitary theory" (ibid., 138). Comparing the relative pros and cons of Heideggerian and Hegelian methodology is beyond the scope of this discussion, but needless to say, Heidegger believes that his phenomenological descriptions of the everyday way of being make a greater claim to legitimacy than bald assertion, allowing him to characterize the everyday as having a certain normative default status—his *existentials* designate a range of possible *existentiell* manifestations, of which some—the "everyday"—are considered normal and others deficient.

12. Hatab, *Ethics and Finitude*, 144–45.

13. One could argue that there is a type of human deficiency that is closer to the stone's worldlessness than the animal's—in which the other's claims completely fail to register as such. In these cases—in sociopathy, for example—the individual is not held to be deficiently responding to a normative claim that he implicitly acknowledges but is recognized to be in some sense incompletely human since he has no access to this claim or its normative force. Thus William S. Hamrick claims that "empathy, like the solidarity to which it contributes, is normative to the extent that its total absence is inhuman" ("Empathy, Cognitive Science, and Literary Imagination," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 31, no. 2 [2000]: 118).

14. Joel Shapiro describes such discrepancy as a type of "existential-ontological bankruptcy" in "Heidegger's Virtue Is Knowledge: Being-With and Solicitude in Section 26 of *Being and Time*," *Philosophy Today* 38 (1994): 402.

15. Raffoul, *Heidegger and the Subject*, 351.

16. A common accusation leveled against Heidegger is, so to speak, the flip side of the authenticity/inauthenticity coin—namely, the view that "for Heidegger, authentic existence remains a private world, structured by Dasein's concern for its own Being. The negativity and isolation associated with Dasein's achievement of authenticity excludes a positive existential mode of being-with-others in *Being and Time*" (Frie, *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity*, 84). For some of the earliest formulations of such a critique, see Karl Löwith, *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969); and Ludwig Binswanger, *Grundformen und Erkenntnis menschlichen Daseins* (Zürich: M. Niehans, 1953). I will be arguing against this interpretation in following sections.

17. Theunissen, *The Other*, 189. See also Philipse, for example: "It seems, then, that Heidegger's existentials of *das Man* in *Sein und Zeit* has two aspects that cannot easily be reconciled. On the one hand it is a fundamental structure of everyday life that is constitutive of the cultural public world; it is the mode of Being in which we live 'proximally and most of the time.' On the other hand, Heidegger's description of *das Man* is loaded with negative connotations" ("Heidegger and Ethics," 451).

18. Rudi Visker, “Dropping—The ‘Subject’ of Authenticity: *Being and Time* on Disappearing Existentials and True Friendship with Being,” in *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, ed. Simon Critchley and Peter Dews (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 79, queries: “Is there no way then for *Being and Time* to keep to the promise of its opening pages where it was suggested that everydayness need not be inauthentic. . . ? What elements in *Being and Time* are responsible for its apparent failure to stick to this promise, for the fact that throughout the book more often than not everydayness is simply equated with the inauthentic?” Visker appears to consider the position I am advocating—namely, that the responsibility for this failure lies in Heidegger’s tendency to move toward understanding such relations as a simple dualistic opposition between two possible aspects, rather than adequately maintaining his initial insight into their nature as a continuum. In Visker’s case, however, these aspects are “truth” and “untruth”: “What if ultimately the responsibility lies with the way Heidegger here conceives of a-letheia as a simple opposition between truth and untruth. . . ?” (ibid.).

19. Theunissen, *The Other*, 193.

20. Dreyfus, *Being-in-the-World*, 144

21. This unavoidably public dimension of the self is perhaps what Simon Critchley is attempting to capture with his notion of an “originary inauthenticity” (“Enigma Variations: An Interpretation of Heidegger’s *Sein und Zeit*,” 169), but his use of “inauthenticity” here simply propagates a dualistic interpretation of what is a continuum phenomenon.

22. Visker, “Dropping—The ‘Subject’ of Authenticity,” 80.

23. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Jane Rubins, “Appendix: Kierkegaard, Division 2, and Later Heidegger,” in *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger’s *Being and Time*, Division 1* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991), 333.

24. Ibid., 333–34.

25. Ibid., 334.

26. Taylor Carman, “Must We Be Inauthentic?” in *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, ed. Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000), 14.

27. Ibid., 19.

28. Mensch, *Ethics and Selfhood*, 111.

29. Bernhard Waldenfels, *Antwortregister* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1994), 357.

30. Tengelyi, *The Wild Region in Life-History*, 120.

31. Ibid., 120, 131.

32. Emmanuel Levinas, “Peace and Proximity,” in *Basic Philosophical Writings*, ed. Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 168. For further discussion of the role of the third and the relationship between ethics and justice in Levinas, see Robert Bernasconi, “The Third Party: Levinas on the Intersection of the Ethical and the Political,” *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 30, no. 1 (1999); Diane Perpich, “A Singular Justice,” *Philosophy Today* 42 (1998); and William Paul Simmons, “The Third,” *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 25, no. 6 (1999).

33. Axel Honneth, “On the Destructive Power of the Third: Gadamer and

Heidegger's Doctrine of Intersubjectivity," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 29, no. 1 (2003): 13. Honneth notes that both Gadamer and Löwith emphasize the danger of such universalizing for distorting or concealing the genuine intersubjective encounter: "The idea that the greatest danger to any real intersubjectivity consists in the destructive power of reflection presents the most obvious type of connection between the two." The difference between them, however, lies in their views on the significance for the formation of interpersonal relations of the third-person reflexive stance and the generalized norms arising therefrom: "While the former seems always only to recognize in reflexive acts the negative side of distanciation or externalization, Löwith sees structured within them the chance for a decentering of the 'I,' which presents a necessary presupposition for intersubjective interaction" (*ibid.*, 16). As I am hoping to show, both moments are essential dimensions of the intersubjective relationship for Heidegger as well.

34. Tengelyi, *The Wild Region in Life-History*, 126.

35. Sikka, "Kantian Ethics in *Being and Time*," 310, 311.

36. Tengelyi, *The Wild Region in Life-History*, 122.

37. Robert Dostal claims that "the very term with which Heidegger designates both forms of positive solicitude is not adequate to the phenomenon. 'Leaping' (*Springen*) mitigates against togetherness and mutual reciprocity. The verb suggests that one leaps ahead, or in place of, or even behind. Leaping is a decisive action that requires great exertion; 'being together' is contrary to it" ("Friendship and Politics: Heidegger's Failing," *Political Theory* 20, no. 3 [1992]: 407). Nevertheless, I believe the term is simply meant to evoke the particular ecstatic intentionality that characterizes Dasein's way of being qua transcendence.

38. Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," in *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 1993), 260.

39. Walter Brogan, "The Community of Those Who Are Going to Die," in *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, ed. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 243.

40. See, for example, P. Edwards, "Heidegger and Death as 'Possibility,'" *Mind* 84 (1975). Charles Guignon characterizes death as "an event which is 'not yet,' but is nevertheless constantly *there* as a life-defining possibility: the possibility of running out of possibilities, of being 'at the end'" ("Philosophy and Authenticity: Heidegger's Search for a Ground of Philosophizing," in *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, ed. Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000], 88). Tina Chanter similarly interprets Heidegger's notion of death in terms of demise, calling being-toward-death an orientation to "the end of life" (*Time, Death and the Feminine*, 31). Peter Gratton, "Heidegger and Levinas on the Question of Temporality," *Journal of Philosophical Research* 30 (2005), examines Levinas's critique of Heidegger on the role that being-toward-death plays in his understanding of time.

41. On this point see Matthew Burch's illuminating discussion in "Death and Deliberation: Overcoming the Decisionism Critique of Heidegger's Practical Philosophy," *Inquiry* 53 (2010). Havi Carel, "Temporal Finitude and Finitude of Possibility: The Double Meaning of Death in Being and Time," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15 (2007), similarly rejects the tendency to under-

stand Heidegger's existential notion of death in terms of our ordinary use of the term and suggests that death be understood in terms of both possibility and temporality limits.

42. We can recognize a significant difference between Levinas and Heidegger on this point, since Levinas argues that for Heidegger, it is *power* that constitutes being: being is defined in terms of my "abilities to be." Levinas, on the contrary, emphasizes passivity and exposure. Thus even the nothingness of death, in Heidegger, is thought in terms of Dasein's possibilities—in this case, the possibility of impossibility. Further, Levinas argues that taking up this possibility is a fundamentally solitary act for Dasein. Thus Heideggerian philosophy only heeds the voice of *anonymous* Being—not the ethical claim of the Other—because it represents existence as possibility in the face of limiting non-possibility, but it leaves this existence itself fundamentally unquestioned and unjustified. These criticisms cannot be addressed here—though I hope to have shown that Dasein's struggle to be itself is not so anonymous as Levinas suggests. See Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, section 3: "The Ethical Relation and Time." See also the helpful discussion in Iain Thomson, "Rethinking Levinas on Heidegger on Death," *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 16 (Fall 2009).

43. Haugeland, "Truth and Finitude," 65.

44. See Buckley, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility*, 171, on this point.

45. Simon Critchley claims, for instance, that according to Heidegger "the fundamental experience of finitude is non-relational, and all relationality is rendered secondary because of the primacy of *Jemeinigkeit*" ("Enigma Variations: An Interpretation of Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*," 169). Lawrence Vogel similarly claims that "the fact remains that authentic being-with-the-other is characterized by indirectness. In other words, the authentic self is achieved without the positive cooperation of 'Dasein-with.' Authentic Dasein is not constituted through relation with the other" (*The Fragile "We,"* 84).

46. Rebecca Kukla, "The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience," *Continental Philosophy Review* 35 (2002): 10.

47. Eric Sean Nelson, "Difficult Alterity: Death, Individuation, and the Social in Heidegger," presentation at the 38th Annual North American Heidegger Conference, New Orleans (May 2004), 5.

48. Buckley, *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility*, 202.

49. Kukla, "The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience," 7.

50. See, for example: Philippe, "Heidegger and Ethics," in which he claims that "Heidegger proclaimed free individual decisions as the ultimate ground of ethics. He is a moral sceptic within the foundationalist tradition, because free decisions cannot justify moral rules" (468). Others who accuse his philosophy of decisionism and/or moral nihilism include Bourdieu, *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*; Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, trans. Frederick G. Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990); Löwith, *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism*; Ernst Tugendhat, *Self-Consciousness and Self-Determination*, trans. Paul Stern (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1986); Wolin, *The Politics of Being*;



and Young, *Heidegger, Philosophy, Nazism*. For a refutation of this common view, see Burch, “Death and Deliberation.”

51. Buckley argues that “authenticity is not something to be achieved, but rather something that one ‘undergoes’” (“Martin Heidegger: The ‘End’ of Ethics,” 203).

52. Llewelyn, *The Middle Voice of Ecological Conscience*, 81.

53. Kukla, “The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience,” 1.

54. *Ibid.*, 4.

55. *Ibid.*

56. See Raffoul, *Heidegger and the Subject*, 225, on this point.

57. Bernhard Radloff, “Heidegger’s Retrieval of Aristotle and the Relation of Volk and Science in the Rector’s Address of 1933,” *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 1 (2003): 11. See also Achim Oberst, “Heidegger’s Appropriation of Aristotle’s Δυναμικὸν / Ενεργεια Distinction,” *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 78, no. 1 (2004).

58. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 203.

59. Kukla, “The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience,” 18.

60. *Ibid.*, 9.

61. Crowell, “Facticity and Transcendental Philosophy,” 116.

62. One could perhaps argue that such a call can only have come from oneself because the “anticipatory” dimension of authenticity radically individualizes Dasein (down to its “solus ipse”) while the “resolute” dimension is necessary for Dasein to reconnect to the world and others. On this reading, anticipation temporarily dissolves the connection to world and others—thereby making it impossible, it seems, for another Dasein to trigger the isolating or “anticipatory” dimension of authenticity. For a discussion of this reading see Thomson, “Rethinking Levinas on Heidegger on Death.” But it is important to be clear that the radical individuation of authenticity refers to a condition revealing both the contingency of one’s specific innerworldly relationships and the self-responsibility called for in the face of one’s having-to-be. This individuating moment does not isolate one from the constitutive role that world and others play in that having-to-be, however, but brings them to light as what they are for the first time. It is only for this reason that a relationship with another Dasein could succeed in prompting me to enter this condition.

63. Kukla, “The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience,” 16, 17–18.

64. In “Ambiguous Calling? Authenticity and Ethics in Heidegger’s *Being and Time*,” *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 39 (2008), Tanja Staehler cautions interpreters against taking such talk of the “friend” too seriously when examining Heidegger’s notion of the call of conscience, since his references are extremely sketchy and do not, she argues, show a “necessary connection between the two phenomena” (304). In the absence of a thorough analysis of how such a concept would fit in the structure of *Being and Time* as a whole, we cannot understand the uncanny and “otherworldly” voice of conscience in terms of the voice of some “friend” without seriously misunderstanding Heidegger’s meaning. However, in light of the work of preceding chapters demonstrating the role of

others as co-constitutors of the world, it becomes clear how the silent call of the other can also be “uncanny.”

65. See, for example, Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*; and Mensch, *Ethics and Selfhood*.

66. See also Critchley, “Enigma Variations,” 173: “On my picture, conscience would be the ontic testimony of a certain splitting of the self in relation to a *Faktum* that it cannot assimilate, the lifeless material thing that the self carries within itself and which denies it from being fully itself. It is this failure of autarky that makes the self relational. The call of conscience is a voice within me whose source is not myself, but is the other’s voice that calls me to responsibility. In other words, ethical relationality is only achieved by being inauthentic, that is, in recognizing that I am not the conscience of others, but rather that it is those others who call me to have a conscience.”

67. As Crowell notes of the hearing that corresponds to this silent “perceptibility”: “The word he uses here is *Vernehmlichkeit*. To perceive in this way—*vernehmen*—is indeed to hear, but it is a hearing whose acoustic dimension is subordinated to a responsiveness to meaning” (“Subjectivity: Locating the First-Person in Being and Time,” 445).

68. See, for example, Frie, *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity*, 80–82.

69. Theunissen, *The Other*, 191.

70. Zahavi, *Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*, 135.

71. *Ibid.*

72. *Ibid.*

73. Martin Heidegger, “Building, Dwelling, Thinking,” in *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 351.

74. Heidegger, “Letter on Humanism,” 220.

75. Kenneth Gallagher, “Intersubjective Knowledge,” in *Essays on Other Minds*, ed. Thomas O. Buford (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1970), 393.

76. *Ibid.*, 392.

77. Martin Heidegger, “Anaximander Saying,” in *Off the Beaten Track*, trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 242. Further citations of this work will be given in the text and referenced as “AS.”

78. Reiner Schürman, *Heidegger on Being and Acting: From Principles to Anarchy*, trans. Christine-Marie Gros (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 248.

79. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger’s “Being & Time,”* 407.

80. Fred Dallmayr, *The Other Heidegger* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), 122.

81. See Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 23–29: there Derrida discusses Heidegger’s treatment of the Anaximander fragment, examining the notion of “granting the other presence” in terms of Derrida’s notion of the “gift.” For helpful commentary, see John Protevi, “Derrida’s Reading of the ‘Anaximander Fragment,’” *Philosophy Today* 38 (1994).

---

## Bibliography

- Anderson, Thomas C. *Sartre's Two Ethics: From Authenticity to Integral Humanity*. Chicago: Open Court, 1993.
- . "The Obligation to Will the Freedom of Others, According to Jean-Paul Sartre." In *The Question of the Other: Essays in Contemporary Continental Philosophy*, edited by Arleen B. Dallery and Charles E. Scott, 63–74. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- Armour, Leslie. "Descartes and the Ethics of Generosity." In *The Bases of Ethics*, edited by William Sweet, 79–102. Milwaukee, Wis.: Marquette University Press, 2000.
- Armstrong, D. M. *A Materialist Theory of the Mind*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Baker, Lynne Rudder. *Persons and Bodies: A Constitution View*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Ballard, Bruce W. *The Role of Mood in Heidegger's Ontology*. New York: University Press of America, 1991.
- Barnes, Hazel. "Sartre on the Emotions." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 15 (1984): 3–15.
- Bauer, Nancy. "Being-With as Being-Against: Heidegger Meets Hegel in *The Second Sex*." *Continental Philosophy Review* 34 (2001): 129–49.
- Beach, Dennis. "Is There a Grammar of Authenticity?" *Philosophy Today* 46, no. 1 (2002): 70–77.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Translated by Bernard Frechtman. New York: Citadel, 2000.
- Benso, Silvia. "Of Things Face-to-Face with Levinas Face-to-Face with Heidegger." *Philosophy Today* 40, no. 1 (1996): 132–41.
- Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Translated by F. L. Pogson. Charleston, S.C.: Nabu, 2010.
- . *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Mabelle L. Andison. New York: Citadel, 1992 [1946].
- Bermúdez, José Luis. *The Paradox of Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- Bernasconi, Robert. "What Is the Question to Which 'Substitution' Is the Answer?" In *The Cambridge Companion to Levinas*, edited by Simon Critchley and Robert Bernasconi, 234–51. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- . “The Third Party: Levinas on the Intersection of the Ethical and the Political.” *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 30, no. 1 (1999): 76–87.
- . “On Deconstructing Nostalgia for Community Within the West: The Debate Between Nancy and Blanchot.” *Research in Phenomenology* 23 (1993): 3–21.
- Bernsen, Niels Ole. *Heidegger's Theory of Intentionality*. Translated by Hanne Vøhtz. Odense: Odense University Press, 1986.
- Binswanger, Ludwig. *Grundformen und Erkenntnis menschlichen Daseins*. Zürich: M. Niehans, 1953.
- Birmingham, Peg. “Logos and the Place of the Other.” *Research in Phenomenology* 20 (1990): 34–54.
- Blackburn, Simon. *Ruling Passions: A Theory of Practical Reasoning*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Blattner, William D. “The Primacy of Practice and Assertoric Truth: Dewey and Heidegger.” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 231–49. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Blum, Roland Paul. “Emmanuel Levinas' Theory of Commitment.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 44, no. 2 (1983): 145–68.
- Boedeker, Edgar C., Jr. “Phenomenological Ontology or the Explanation of Social Norms? A Confrontation with William Blattner's *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism*.” *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 84, no. 3 (2002): 334–44.
- Bok, Hilary. *Freedom and Responsibility*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Bollnow, Otto Friedrich. “Marcel's Concept of Availability.” In *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*, edited by Paul A. Schilpp and Lewis E. Hahn, 177–203. LaSalle: Open Court, 1984.
- Borgmann, Albert. “Heidegger and Ethics Beyond the Call of Duty.” In *Appropriating Heidegger*, edited by James E. Faulconed and Mark A. Wrathall, 68–82. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*. Translated by Peter Collier. San Francisco: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Brandom, Robert. “Heidegger's Categories in *Being and Time*.” In *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*, edited by Hubert Dreyfus and Harrison Hall, 45–64. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.
- Brée, Germaine. *Camus and Sartre: Crisis and Commitment*. New York: Delta, 1972.
- Breuer, Roland. “Bergson's and Sartre's Account of the Self in Relation to the Transcendental Ego.” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 9, no. 2 (2001): 177–98.
- Brogan, Walter. “The Community of Those Who Are Going to Die.” In *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, edited by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew, 237–48. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- . “Da-sein and the Leap of Being.” In *Companion to Heidegger's "Contribu-*

- tions to *Philosophy*,” edited by Charles E. Scott, Susan Schoenbohm, Daniela Vallega-Neu, and Alejandro Vallega, 171–80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Brueckner, Anthony. “Two Transcendental Arguments Concerning Self-Knowledge.” In *New Essays on Semantic Externalism and Self-Knowledge*, edited by Susanna Nuccetelli, 185–200. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003.
- Buckley, Philip R. “Martin Heidegger: The ‘End’ of Ethics.” In *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, edited by John J. Drummond and Lester Embree, 197–228. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002.
- . *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1992.
- Burch, Matthew. “The Existential Sources of Phenomenology: Heidegger on Formal Indication.” *European Journal of Philosophy* (forthcoming).
- . “Death and Deliberation: Overcoming the Decisionism Critique of Heidegger’s Practical Philosophy.” *Inquiry* 53 (2010): 211–34.
- Busch, Thomas. “Ethics and Ontology: Levinas and Merleau-Ponty.” *Man and World* 25 (1992): 195–202.
- . “Sartre on Surpassing the Given.” *Philosophy Today* 35, no. 1 (1991): 26–31.
- Cadava, Eduardo, Peter Conner, and Jean-Luc Nancy, eds. *Who Comes After the Subject?* New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Callan, Eamonn. “Patience and Courage.” *Philosophy* 68 (1993): 523–39.
- Carel, Havi. “Temporal Finitude and Finitude of Possibility: The Double Meaning of Death in *Being and Time*.” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15 (2007): 541–56.
- Carman, Taylor. “First Persons: On Richard Moran’s *Authority and Estrangement*.” *Inquiry* 43, no. 3 (2003): 395–408.
- . *Heidegger’s Analytic: Interpretation, Discourse, and Authenticity in “Being and Time”*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . “Was Heidegger a Linguistic Idealist?” *Inquiry* 45: “Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*” (2002): 205–16.
- . “Must We Be Inauthentic?” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 13–28. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- Carruthers, Peter. *Phenomenal Consciousness: A Naturalistic Theory*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Catalano, Joseph S. “Successfully Lying to Oneself: A Sartrean Perspective.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 1, no. 4 (1990): 673–93.
- . *A Commentary on Jean-Paul Sartre’s “Being and Nothingness”*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Cavell, Stanley. *The Claim of Reason: Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Cerbone, David R. “Proofs and Presuppositions: Heidegger, Searle, and the ‘Reality’ of the ‘External’ World.” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 259–78. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.

- Chanter, Tina. *Time, Death, and the Feminine: Levinas with Heidegger*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Charmé, Stuart Zane. "Sartre's Images of the Other and the Search for Authenticity." *Human Studies* 14 (1991): 251–64.
- Ciaramelli, Fabio. "Levinas's Ethical Discourse Between Individuation and Universality." In *Re-Reading Levinas*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and Simon Critchley, 83–105. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Richard A., ed. *Face to Face with Levinas*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986.
- Cohon, Rachel. "The Roots of Reasons." *Philosophical Review* 109, no. 1 (2000): 63–85.
- Compte-Sponville, André. *A Small Treatise on the Great Virtues*. Translated by Catherine Temerson. New York: Henry Holt, 2001.
- Cook, Mark. *Perceiving Others: The Psychology of Interpersonal Perception*. New York: Methuen, 1979.
- Critchley, Simon. "Enigma Variations: An Interpretation of Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*." *Ratio* 15, no. 2 (2002): 154–75.
- Critchley, Simon, and Peter Dews, eds. *Deconstructive Subjectivities*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Crowe, Benjamin D. "Resoluteness in the Middle Voice: On the Ethical Dimensions of Heidegger's *Being and Time*." *Philosophy Today* 45, no. 3 (2001): 225–41.
- Crowell, Steven. "Reason and Will: Husserl and Heidegger on the Intentionality of Action." In *Heidegger-Jahrbuch 6: Heidegger und Husserl*, edited by Rudolf Bernet, Alfred Denker, and Holger Zaborowski, 249–68. Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 2012.
- . "Phenomenological Immanence, Normativity, and Semantic Externalism." *Synthese* 160 (2008): 335–54.
- . "Phenomenology and the First-Person Character of Philosophical Knowledge." *The Modern Schoolman* 74 (2007): 131–48.
- . "Sorge or Selbstbewußtsein? Heidegger and Korsgaard on the Sources of Normativity." *European Journal of Philosophy* 15, no. 3 (2007): 315–33.
- . "The Cartesianism of Phenomenology." *Continental Philosophy Review* 35 (2002): 433–54.
- . "Does the Husserl/Heidegger Feud Rest on a Mistake? An Essay on Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology." *Husserl Studies* 18 (2002): 123–40.
- . "Facticity and Transcendental Philosophy." In *From Kant to Davidson: Philosophy and the Idea of the Transcendental*, edited by Jeff Malpas, 100–121. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . "Is There a Phenomenological Research Program?" *Synthese* 131 (2002): 419–44.
- . "Kantianism and Phenomenology." In *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, edited by J. J. Drummond and L. Embree, 47–67. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002.

- . *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths Toward Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2001.
- . "Subjectivity: Locating the First-Person in *Being and Time*." *Inquiry* 44 (2001): 433–54.
- . "What Gives? Getting over the Subject." *Continental Philosophy Review* 33 (2000): 93–105.
- . "Spectral History: Narrative, Nostalgia, and the Time of the I." *Research in Phenomenology* 29 (1999): 83–103.
- . "The Project of Ultimate Grounding and the Appeal to Intersubjectivity in Recent Transcendental Philosophy." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7, no. 1 (1999): 31–54.
- . "There Is No Other: Notes on the Logical Place of a Concept." *Paideuma* 44 (1998): 14–29.
- . "Neighbors in Death." *Philosophy Today* 41 (1997): 209–18.
- . "Being Truthful." In *The Truthful and the Good: Essays in Honor of Robert Sokolowski*, edited by John J. Drummond and James G. Hart, 17–37. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1996.
- . "The Mythical and the Meaningless: Husserl and the Two Faces of Nature." In *Issues in Husserl's "Ideas II"*, edited by Thomas Nenon and Lester Embree, 81–105. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1996.
- . "Solipsism: Modalities of the Strange." In *The Prism of the Self*, edited by Steven Crowell, 13–29. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1995.
- . "Dialogue and Text: Re-Marking the Difference." In *The Interpretation of Dialogue*, edited by Tullio Maranhão, 338–60. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- . "Meaning and the Ontological Difference." *Tulane Studies in Philosophy* 32 (1984): 37–44.
- Crowell, Steven, and Jeff Malpas, eds. *Transcendental Heidegger*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Crozier, W. Ray. "Self-Consciousness in Shame: The Role of the 'Other.'" *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 28, no. 3 (1998): 273–85.
- Dahlstrom, Daniel. *Heidegger's Concept of Truth*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . "Heidegger's Concept of Temporality: Reflections on a Recent Criticism." *Review of Metaphysics* 49 (1995): 95–115.
- Dallmayr, Fred. *The Other Heidegger*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Darnell, Michelle R. "'Being-Looked-at: Ontological Grounding for an Ethics' in *Being and Nothingness*." *Sartre Studies International* 10 (2004): 15–24.
- Darwall, Stephen. "Respect and the Second-Person Standpoint." *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA* 78, no. 2 (2004): 43–59.
- . "Two Kinds of Respect." *Ethics* 88 (1977): 36–49.
- Davidson, Donald. "How Is Weakness of the Will Possible?" In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 21–42. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . "Knowing One's Own Mind." In *Mind and Cognition: A Reader*, edited by William Lycan, 383–94. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999.

- Denis, Lara. "Kant on the Perfection of Others." *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 37, no. 1 (1999): 21–41.
- Dent, N. J. H. *The Moral Psychology of the Virtues*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Depraz, Natalie. "The Husserlian Theory of Intersubjectivity as Alterology." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 8 (2001): 169–78.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- . *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Dostal, Robert J. "Time and Phenomenology in Husserl and Heidegger." In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, edited by Charles Guignon, 141–69. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Friendship and Politics: Heidegger's Failing." *Political Theory* 20, no. 3 (1992): 399–423.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. "Comments on Cristina Lafont's Interpretation of *Being and Time*." *Inquiry* 45: "Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*" (2002): 191–94.
- . "Phenomenological Description Versus Rational Reconstruction." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 55 (2001): 181–96.
- . "Could Anything Be More Intelligible than Everyday Intelligibility? Reinterpreting Division I of *Being and Time* in the Light of Division II." In *Appropriating Heidegger*, edited by James E. Faulconed and Mark A. Wrathall, 155–74. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "Responses." In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 305–41. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "Responses." In *Heidegger, Coping, and Cognitive Science: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 2*, edited by Mark A. Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 313–50. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "The Primacy of Phenomenology over Logical Analysis." *Philosophical Topics* 27, no. 2 (1999): 3–24.
- . *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division 1*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Jane Rubins. "Appendix: Kierkegaard, Division 2, and Later Heidegger." In *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division 1*, 283–340. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Charles Spinosa. "Coping with Things in Themselves: A Practice-Based Phenomenological Basis of Robust Realism." *Inquiry* 42, no. 1 (1999): 49–78.
- Drummond, John J. "The Case(s) of (Self-)Awareness." In *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*, edited by Uriah Kriegel and Kenneth Williford, 199–220. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006.
- . "Respect as a Moral Emotion: A Phenomenological Approach." *Husserl Studies* 22, no. 1 (2006): 1–27.



- . “Self, Other, and Moral Obligation.” *Philosophy Today* 49 (2005): 39–47.
- . “Pure Logical Grammar: Anticipatory Categoriality and Articulated Categoriality.” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 11, no. 2 (2003): 125–39.
- . “Aristotelianism and Phenomenology.” In *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy*, edited by J. J. Drummond and L. Embree, 15–45. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002.
- . “Moral Encounters.” Paper presented at the Husserl-Archief and the Hogaer Instituut voor Wijsbegeerte, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium, April 28, 1998.
- . “Moral Objectivity: Husserl’s Sentiments of the Understanding.” *Husserl Studies* 12 (1995): 165–83.
- Edie, James M. “The Question of the Transcendental Ego: Sartre’s Critique of Husserl.” *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 24, no. 2 (1993): 104–20.
- Edwards, P. “Heidegger and Death as ‘Possibility.’” *Mind* 84 (1975): 548–66.
- Elliston, Frederick A. “Heidegger’s Phenomenology of Social Existence.” In *Heidegger’s Existential Analytic*, edited by Frederick Elliston, 61–77. New York: Mouton, 1978.
- . “Husserl’s Phenomenology of Empathy.” In *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals*, edited by F. A. Elliston and Peter McCormick, 213–31. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Falvey, Kevin. “Memory and Knowledge of Content.” In *New Essays on Semantic Externalism and Self-Knowledge*, edited by Susanna Nuccetelli, 219–39. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003.
- Fleischer, Margot. *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers “Sein und Zeit”: Aporien, Probleme und ein Ausblick*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1991.
- Føllesdal, Dagfinn. “Absorbed Coping, Husserl, and Heidegger.” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 251–57. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- Frank, Manfred. “Identity and Subjectivity.” In *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, edited by Simon Critchley and Peter Dews, 127–48. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Frankfurt, Harry G. *The Reasons of Love*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Freeman, Lauren. “Recognition Reconsidered: A Re-Reading of Heidegger’s *Being and Time* §26.” *Philosophy Today* 53 (2009): 85–99.
- Frie, Roger. *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity in Modern Philosophy and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.
- Gabriel, Leo. “Marcel’s Philosophy of the Second Person.” In *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*, edited by Paul A. Schilpp and Lewis E. Hahn, 295–311. LaSalle: Open Court, 1984.
- Gallagher, Kenneth. *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1975.

- . “Intersubjective Knowledge.” In *Essays on Other Minds*, edited by Thomas O. Buford, 371–95. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- Gallese, Vittorio. “Intentional Attunement: Neural Correlates of Intersubjectivity.” Paper presented at the *Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity, Objectivity* conference held at the Center for Subjectivity Research, University of Copenhagen, September 23, 2006.
- Gasché, Rodolphe. “Tuned to Accord: On Heidegger’s Concept of Truth.” In *Heidegger Toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930’s*, edited by James Risser, 31–51. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Gates, Darin Crawford. “Ontological Disclosure and Ethical Exposure: Heidegger and Levinas on Meaning, Subjectivity and Non-Indifference.” *Philosophy Today* 45, no. 4 (2001): 319–34.
- Gibbons, Sarah L. *Kant’s Theory of Imagination: Bridging Gaps in Judgement and Experience*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Gilbert, Margaret. *Sociality and Responsibility: New Essays in Plural Subject Theory*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.
- Glenn, John D., Jr. “Marcel and Sartre: The Philosophy of Communion and the Philosophy of Alienation.” In *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*, edited by Paul A. Schilpp and Lewis E. Hahn, 525–52. LaSalle: Open Court, 1984.
- Goldberg, Sanford C. “What Do You Know When You Know Your Own Thoughts?” In *New Essays on Semantic Externalism and Self-Knowledge*, edited by Susanna Nuccetelli, 241–56. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003.
- Goody, Esther N., ed. *Social Intelligence and Interaction*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gordon, Haim. *The Heidegger-Buber Controversy: The Status of the I-Thou*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2001.
- Gorner, Paul. “Heidegger’s Phenomenology as Transcendental Philosophy.” *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 10, no. 1 (2002): 17–33.
- Gratton, Peter. “Heidegger and Levinas on the Question of Temporality.” *Journal of Philosophical Research* 30 (2005): 157–68.
- Greenspan, Patricia. “Emotional Strategies and Rationality.” *Ethics* 110 (2000): 469–87.
- Greenspan, P. S. “Guilt and Virtue.” *Journal of Philosophy* 91, no. 2 (1994): 57–70.
- Greisch, Jean. “The ‘Play of Transcendence’ and the Question of Ethics.” In *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, edited by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew, 99–116. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Guignon, Charles. “Philosophy and Authenticity: Heidegger’s Search for a Ground of Philosophizing.” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 79–101. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1983.
- Gunther, York H., ed. *Essays on Nonconceptual Content*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003.
- Haar, M. *Heidegger and the Essence of Man*. Translated by Will McNeil. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Translated by

- Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nichol森. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.
- . *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Translated by Frederick G. Lawrence. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.
- Hamrick, William S. "Empathy, Cognitive Science, and Literary Imagination." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 31, no. 2 (2000): 116–30.
- Hancock, Curtis L., and Anthony O. Simon, eds. *Freedom, Virtue and the Common Good*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.
- Harrison, B. "Heidegger and the Analytic Tradition on Truth." *Topoi* 10 (1991): 121–36.
- Hartmann, Klaus. *Studies in Foundational Philosophy*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 1988.
- Hatab, Lawrence J. "Dasein, The Early Years: Heideggerian Reflections on Childhood." Presentation at the 38th Annual North American Heidegger Conference, New Orleans, May 2004.
- . *Ethics and Finitude: Heideggerian Contributions to Moral Philosophy*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.
- Haugeland, John. "Letting Be." In *Transcendental Heidegger*, edited by Steven Crowell and Jeff Malpas, 93–103. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- . "Two Dogmas of Rationalism." Unpublished paper presented at the Mellon Seminar, Rice University, November 2005.
- . "Truth and Finitude: Heidegger's Transcendental Existentialism." In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 43–77. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "The Intentionality All-Stars." In *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind*, 127–70. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . "Objective Perception." In *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind*, 241–66. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . "Truth and Rule-Following." In *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind*, 305–61. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . "Understanding: Dennett and Searle." In *Having Thought: Essays in the Metaphysics of Mind*, 291–304. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . "Dasein's Disclosedness." In *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*, edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Harrison Hall, 27–44. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.
- . "Heidegger on Being a Person." *Nous* 16 (1982): 15–26.
- Havas, Randall. "The Significance of Authenticity." In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 29–42. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*. Translated by Daniel O. Dahlstrom. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- . "Anaximander Saying." In *Off the Beaten Track*, translated by Julian Young

- and Kenneth Haynes, 242–81. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *The Essence of Human Freedom: An Introduction to Philosophy*. Translated by Ted Sadler. New York: Continuum, 2002.
- . *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle*. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- . *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001.
- . *The Zollikon Seminars (1959–1969)*. Translated by Franz Mayr and Richard Askay. Edited by Medard Boss. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2001.
- . *Ontology—The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- . “On the Essence of Ground.” In *Pathmarks*, translated and edited by William McNeill, 97–135. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Translated by Richard Taft. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- . *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant’s “Critique of Pure Reason.”* Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- . *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- . *Einleitung in die Philosophie*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996.
- . *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- . *Basic Writings*. Edited by David Farrell Krell. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- . “Building, Dwelling, Thinking.” In *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, 343–64. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- . “Letter on Humanism.” In *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, 213–66. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- . “Origin of the Work of Art.” In *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, 139–212. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- . *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*. Translated by Theodore Kisiel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- . *The Principle of Reason*. Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- . *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- . *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*. Translated by Michael Heim. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- . “The Question Concerning Technology.” In *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, translated by William Lovitt, 3–35. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

- . *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana State University Press, 1982.
- . *Heraclitus Seminar, 1966–1967 with Eugen Fink*. Translated by Charles H. Seibert. Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1979.
- . *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- . *What Is Called Thinking?* Translated by J. Glenn Gray. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Heil, John. "Privileged Access." *Mind* 97 (1998): 238–51.
- Heinz, Marion. "The Concept of Time in Heidegger's Early Works." In *A Companion to Martin Heidegger's "Being and Time,"* edited by J. Kockelmans, 183–207. Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology and University Press of America, Washington, D.C., 1986.
- Hengehold, Laura. "'In That Sleep of Death What Dreams. . .': Foucault, Existential Phenomenology, and the Kantian Imagination." *Continental Philosophy Review* 35 (2002): 135–59.
- Heter, T. Storm. "Authenticity and Others: Sartre's Ethics of Recognition." *Sartre Studies International* 12 (2006): 17–43.
- Hodge, Joanna. *Heidegger and Ethics*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Hoffman, Piotr. "Death, Time, History: Division II of *Being and Time*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, edited by Charles Guignon, 195–214. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Honneth, Axel. "Self-Reification: Contours of a Failed Form of Self-Relationship." Paper presented at the *Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity, Objectivity* conference held at the Center for Subjectivity Research, University of Copenhagen, September 23, 2006.
- . "On the Destructive Power of the Third: Gadamer and Heidegger's Doctrine of Intersubjectivity." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 29, no. 1 (2003): 5–21.
- . "Recognition: A Clue for Social Theory Today." "Ethics, Politics and Society" lecture series presentation, Rice University, 2002.
- . "Grounding Recognition: A Rejoinder to Critical Questions." *Inquiry* 45 (2002): 499–520.
- . *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Translated by Joel Anderson. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996.
- Hughes, Cheryl L. "The Primacy of Ethics: Hobbes and Levinas." *Continental Philosophy Review* 31 (1998): 79–94.
- Hulse, Donovan, Cynthia N. Read, and Timothy Schroeder. "The Impossibility of Conscious Desire." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (2004): 73–79.
- Hume, David. "Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals." In *Virtue Ethics*, edited by Stephen Darwall, 63–102. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. Translated by J. N. Findlay. Edited by Dermot Moran. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- . *Cartesian Meditations*. Translated by Dorion Cairns. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999.

- . *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book*. Translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1998.
- . *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*. Translated by John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1991.
- . *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: Second Book*. Translated by R. Rojcewicz and F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1989.
- . *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Edited and translated by David Carr. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- . *Formal and Transcendental Logic*. Translated by Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Hutcheson, Francis. *On the Nature and Conduct of the Passions*. Manchester: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Hyslop, Alec. *Other Minds*. Boston: Kluwer Academic, 1995.
- Jambor, Mishka. "Sartre on Anguish." *Philosophy Today* 34, no. 2 (1990): 111–16.
- Janicaud, Dominique. "The Question of Subjectivity in Heidegger's *Being and Time*." In *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, edited by Simon Critchley and Peter Dews, 47–57. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Johnston, Adrian. "The Soul of Dasein: Schelling's Doctrine of the Soul and Heidegger's Analytic of Dasein." *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 3 (2003): 227–51.
- Johnstone, Henry W., Jr. "The Uniqueness of the Person." In *The Problem of the Self*, 75–98. University Park: Penn State University Press, 1970.
- Jopling, David. "Levinas, Sartre, and Understanding the Other." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 24, no. 3 (1993): 214–31.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Practical Reason*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Käufer, Stephan. "Schemata, Hammers, and Time: Heidegger's Two Derivations of Judgment." *Topoi* 22 (2003): 79–91.
- Kawall, Jason. "Other-Regarding Epistemic Virtues." *Ratio* 15, no. 3 (2002): 257–75.
- Kerby, Anthony Paul. "Gadamer's Concrete Universal." *Man and World* 24 (1991): 49–61.
- Kisiel, Theodore. *The Genesis of Heidegger's "Being & Time"*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Klemm, David E. "Levinas' Phenomenology of the Other and Language as the Other of Phenomenology." *Man and World* 22 (1989): 403–26.
- Korsgaard, Christine M. *The Sources of Normativity*. Edited by Onora O'Neill. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Krell, David Farrell. "Hegel and Heidegger as Critics." *The Monist* 64, no. 4 (1981): 481–99.
- Kriegel, Uriah, and Kenneth Williford, eds. *Self-Representational Approaches to Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006.

- Kukla, Rebecca. "The Ontology and Temporality of Conscience." *Continental Philosophy Review* 35 (2002): 1–34.
- Lafont, Cristina. "Was Heidegger an Externalist?" *Inquiry* 48, no. 6 (2005): 507–32.
- . "Replies." *Inquiry* 45: "Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*" (2002): 229–48.
- . *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*. Translated by Graham Harman. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Entre Nous: On Thinking of the Other*. Translated by Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- . *Otherwise than Being: Or Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.
- . "Essence and Disinterestedness." In *Basic Philosophical Writings*, edited by Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi, 109–27. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- . "Is Ontology Fundamental?" In *Basic Philosophical Writings*, edited by Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi, 1–11. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- . "Meaning and Sense," In *Basic Philosophical Writings*, edited by Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi, 33–64. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- . "Peace and Proximity." In *Basic Philosophical Writings*, edited by Adriaan T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley, and Robert Bernasconi, 161–69. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- . *Outside the Subject*. Translated by Michael B. Smith. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- . *Existence & Existents*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1988.
- . *Collected Philosophical Papers*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- . "Diachrony and Representation." In *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- . "Time and the Other." In *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987.
- . *Totality and Infinity*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- Lingis, Alphonso. "Objectivity and Justice: A Critique of Emmanuel Levinas' Explanation." *Continental Philosophy Review* 32 (1999): 395–407.
- Llewelyn, John. "Levinas and Language." In *The Cambridge Companion to Levinas*, edited by Simon Critchley and Robert Bernasconi, 119–38. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Emmanuel Levinas: The Genealogy of Ethics*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *The Middle Voice of Ecological Conscience*. New York: St. Martin's, 1991.
- Löwith, Karl. *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism*. Translated by Gary Steiner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

- . *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Luchte, James. "Makeshift: Phenomenology of Original Temporality." *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 3 (2003): 252–57.
- Lycan, William, ed. *Mind and Cognition: A Reader*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. "The Nature of the Virtues." In *Virtue Ethics*, edited by Stephen Darwall, 144–67. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- . *After Virtue*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
- Malpas, Jeff. *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006.
- . "Space and Sociality." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 5, no. 1 (1997): 53–79.
- Mansbach, Abraham. *Beyond Subjectivism: Heidegger on Language and the Human Being*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2002.
- Marcel, Gabriel. "The Existential Background of Human Dignity." In *The William James Lectures 1961–1962*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- . *Man Against Mass Society*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1952.
- Marconi, Diego. "On the Mind Dependence of Truth." *Erkenntnis* 65 (2006): 301–18.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*. Translated by T. A. Carlson. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1998.
- . "The Final Appeal of the Subject." In *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, edited by Simon Critchley and Peter Dews, 85–104. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- McAfee, Noëlle. "Abject Strangers: Toward an Ethics of Respect." In *Ethics, Politics and Difference in Julia Kristeva's Writing*, edited by Kelly Oliver, 116–34. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- McConnell, Terrance. *Gratitude*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.
- McCumber, John. "Essence and Subversion in Hegel and Heidegger." In *Writing the Politics of Difference*, edited by Hugh J. Silverman. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- McDonald, Dana Noelle. "Moving Beyond the Face Through Eros: Levinas and Irigaray's Treatment of the Woman as an Alterity." *Philosophy Today* 42 (1998): 71–75.
- McMullin, Irene. "Articulating Discourse: Heidegger's Communicative Impulse." *Southwest Philosophy Review* 22 (2006): 173–83.
- Mensch, James R. *Ethics and Selfhood: Alterity and the Phenomenology of Obligation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- . "Givenness and Alterity." *Idealistic Studies* 33, no. 1 (2003): 1–7.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by C. Smith. New York: Routledge Classics, 2002.
- Metzinger, Thomas. "The Subjectivity of Subjective Experience: A Representationalist Analysis of First-Person Perspective." In *Neural Correlates of Consciousness*, edited by Thomas Metzinger, 285–306. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.



- Miceli, Maria, and Cristiano Castelfranchi. "How to Silence One's Conscience: Cognitive Defenses Against the Feeling of Guilt." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 28, no. 3 (1998): 287–318.
- Mohanty, Jitendranath. *The Self and Its Other*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *The Possibility of Transcendental Philosophy*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1985.
- Moran, Dermot. *Edmund Husserl: Founder of Phenomenology*. New York: Polity, 2007.
- . "Heidegger's Critique of Husserl's and Brentano's Accounts of Intentionality." *Inquiry* 43, no. 1 (2000): 39–66.
- Moran, Richard. *Authority and Estrangement: An Essay on Self-Knowledge*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Morris, Phyllis Sutton. *Sartre's Concept of a Person: An Analytic Approach*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976.
- Morrison, James C. "Husserl and Heidegger: The Parting of the Ways." In *Heidegger's Existential Analytic*, edited by Frederick Elliston, 47–59. New York: Mouton, 1978.
- Morrison, Ronald P. "Kant, Husserl, and Heidegger on Time and the Unity of 'Consciousness.'" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 39, no. 2 (1978): 182–98.
- Mulhall, Stephen. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Heidegger and "Being and Time"*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Nagel, Thomas. *The Possibility of Altruism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Translated by Robert Richardson and Anne O'Byrne. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Natorp, Paul. *Allgemeine Psychologie nach kritischer Methode*. Tübingen, 1912.
- Nelson, Eric Sean. "Difficult Alterity: Death, Individuation, and the Social in Heidegger." Presentation at the 38th Annual North American Heidegger Conference, New Orleans, May 2004.
- Noddings, Nel. "Caring." In *Justice and Care: Essential Readings in Feminist Ethics*, edited by Virginia Held, 7–46. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1995.
- Nulty, Timothy J. "Davidson and Disclosedness: An Analysis of Heideggerian and Davidsonian Truth." *Idealistic Studies* 33, no. 1 (2003): 25–38.
- Oberst, Achim. "Heidegger's Appropriation of Aristotle's Δυναμικὸν / Ενεργεια Distinction." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 78, no. 1 (2004): 25–53.
- Okrent, Mark. "Equipment, World, and Language." *Inquiry* 45: "Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*" (2002): 195–204.
- . "Intending the Intender (Or, Why Heidegger Isn't Davidson)." In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 279–301. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "Intentionality, Teleology, and Normativity." In *Appropriating Heidegger*, edited by James E. Faulconed and Mark A. Wrathall, 191–206. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *Heidegger's Pragmatism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988.

- Olafson, Frederick A. *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics: A Study of Mitsein*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *What Is a Human Being? A Heideggerian View*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1987.
- O'Malley, John B. "Marcel's Notion of a Person." In *The Philosophy of Gabriel Marcel*, edited by Paul A. Schilpp and Lewis E. Hahn, 275–93. LaSalle: Open Court, 1984.
- O'Murchadha, Felix. "Reduction, Externalism and Immanence in Husserl and Heidegger." *Synthese* 160 (2008): 375–95.
- Ortega, Mariana. "When Conscience Calls, Will Dasein Answer? Heideggerian Authenticity and the Possibility of Ethical Life." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 13 (2005): 15–34.
- . "Dasein Comes After the Epistemic Subject, But Who Is Dasein?" *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (2000): 51–67.
- O'Shaughnessy, Brian. "Searle's Theory of Action." In *John Searle and His Critics*, edited by Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick, 271–87. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- O'Shea, James R. "The Needs of Understanding: Kant on Empirical Laws and Regulative Ideals." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 5, no. 2 (1997): 216–54.
- Overgaard, Morten. "On the Naturalizing of Phenomenology." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3 (2004): 365–79.
- Pendlebury, Michael. "Making Sense of Kant's Schematism." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55, no. 4 (1995): 777–97.
- Peperzak, Adriaan. "Levinas' Method." *Research in Phenomenology* 28 (1998): 110–25.
- . "The Other, Society, People of God." *Man and World* 29 (1996): 109–18.
- , ed. *Ethics as First Philosophy*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *To the Other: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas*. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1993.
- . "Levinas on Technology and Nature." *Man and World* 25 (1992): 469–82.
- . "The One for the Other: The Philosophy of E. Levinas." *Man and World* 24 (1991): 427–59.
- Perpich, Diane. "A Singular Justice." *Philosophy Today* 42 (1998): 59–70.
- Philipse, Herman. "Heidegger and Ethics." *Inquiry* 42 (1999): 439–74.
- Pietersma, Henry. "What Happened to Epistemology in Our Tradition?" *Review of Metaphysics* 59 (2006): 553–76.
- . *Phenomenological Epistemology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Pippin, Robert. "On Being Anti-Cartesian: Hegel, Heidegger, Subjectivity and Sociality." In *Idealism as Modernism*, 375–95. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Pöggeler, Otto. *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking*. New York: Humanity Books, 1994.

- Praetorius, Nini. "Intersubjectivity of Cognition and Language: Principled Reasons Why the Subject May Be Trusted." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3, no. 2 (2004): 195–214.
- Protevi, John. "Avoiding a Superficial Reading: Derrida's Reading of the 'Anaximander Fragment.'" *Philosophy Today* 38 (1994): 88–97.
- Proust, Joëlle. "Action." In *John Searle*, edited by Barry Smith, 102–27. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Radloff, Bernhard. "Heidegger's Retrieval of Aristotle and the Relation of Volk and Science in the Rector's Address of 1933." *Philosophy Today* 47, no. 1 (2003): 3–22.
- Rae, Gavin. "Sartre & the Other: Conflict, Conversion, Language and the We." *Sartre Studies International* 15 (2009): 54–77.
- Raffoul, François. *Heidegger and the Subject*. Translated by David Pettigrew and Gregory Recco. New Jersey: Humanities, 1998.
- . "Otherness and Individuation in Heidegger." *Man and World* 28 (1995): 341–58.
- Raffoul, François, and David Pettigrew, eds. *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Ratcliffe, Matthew. "Heidegger, Analytic Metaphysics, and the Being of Beings." *Inquiry* 45 (2002): 35–58.
- Reid, James D. "Ethical Criticism in Heidegger's Early Freiburg Lectures." *Review of Metaphysics* 59 (2005): 33–71.
- Richardson, John. *Existential Epistemology: A Heideggerian Critique of the Cartesian Project*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Richardson, William J. *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Rodemeyer, Lanei. "Dasein Gets Pregnant." *Philosophy Today* 42 (1998): 76–84.
- Römpf, Georg. "Fremde Subjektivität als fremde Gegenwart—die Erfahrungsstruktur des Anderen in temporaler Formulierung." In *Husserls Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1992.
- Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg. *Mind in Action*. Boston: Beacon, 1988.
- Rorty, Richard. "Wittgenstein, Heidegger, and the Reification of Language." In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, edited by Charles B. Guignon, 337–57. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rosenthal, D. M. "Higher-Order Thoughts and the Appendage Theory of Consciousness." *Philosophical Psychology* 6 (1993): 155–66.
- Russell, J. Michael. "Reflection and Self-Deception." *Research in Phenomenology* 11 (1981): 62–74.
- Sabini, John, and Maury Silver. "In Defense of Shame: Shame in the Context of Guilt and Embarrassment." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 27, no. 1 (1997): 1–15.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. Translated by Quintin Hoare. New York: Verso, 2010.

- . “Intentionality: A Fundamental Idea of Husserl’s Phenomenology.” Translated by Joseph P. Fell. In *The Phenomenology Reader*, edited by Dermot Moran, 382–84. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . “The Transcendence of the Ego.” Translated by Forrest Williams and Robert Kirkpatrick. In *The Phenomenology Reader*, edited by Dermot Moran, 385–407. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. Translated by Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer, and Terry McWilliams. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- . *Anti-Semite and Jew: An Exploration of the Etiology of Hate*. Translated by George J. Becker. New York: Schocken Books, 1995.
- . *Existentialism and Human Emotions*. New York: Citadel, 1995.
- . *Notebook for an Ethics*. Translated by David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . *What Is Literature? and Other Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- . *The Emotions: Outline of a Theory*. Translated by Bernard Frechtman. New York: Kensington, 1975.
- . *Search for a Method*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- . *Being and Nothingness*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.
- Schalow, Frank. “Kant, Heidegger and the Performative Character of Language in the First Critique.” *Epoché* 8, no. 1 (2003): 165–80.
- . “Repeating Heidegger’s Analysis of Everydayness: The Question of Being and the Latent Concern for Materiality.” *Philosophy Today* 46 (2002): 274–83.
- Schaper, Eva. “Kant’s Schematism Reconsidered.” *Review of Metaphysics* 18 (1964–65): 267–92.
- Schatzki, Theodore R. “The Temporality of Teleology: Against the Narrativity of Action.” In *The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, edited by Burt Hopkins and Steven Crowell, 123–42. Seattle: Noesis, 2005.
- . “Where Times Meet.” *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy* 1 (2005): 191–212.
- Scheler, Max. *Problems of a Sociology of Knowledge*. Translated by Manfred S. Frings. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- . *The Nature of Sympathy*. Translated by Peter Heath. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Schmitz, Kenneth. “Transcendentalism or Transcendentals? A Critical Reflection on the Transcendental Turn.” *Review of Metaphysics* 58 (2005): 537–60.
- Schroeder, William Ralph. *Sartre and His Predecessors: The Self and the Other*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Schürman, Reiner. *Heidegger on Being and Acting: From Principles to Anarchy*. Translated by Christine-Marie Gros. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Schutz, Alfred. *On Phenomenology and Social Relations: Selected Writings*. Translated and edited by Helmut R. Wagner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

- Scott, Charles E. "Introduction: Approaching Heidegger's *Contributions to Philosophy* and Its Companion." In *Companion to Heidegger's "Contributions to Philosophy,"* edited by Charles E. Scott, Susan Schoenbohm, Daniela Vallega-Neu, and Alejandro Vallega, 1–14. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- Scott, David. "The 'Concept of Time' and the 'Being of the Clock': Bergson, Einstein, Heidegger and the Interrogation of the Temporality of Modernism." *Continental Philosophy Review* 39 (2006): 183–213.
- Searle, John. "Meaning, Mind and Reality." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 55, no. 217 (2001): 173–79.
- . "The Limits of Phenomenology." In *Heidegger, Coping, and Cognitive Science: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 2,* edited by Mark A. Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 71–92. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . *The Construction of Social Reality.* New York: Free Press, 1995.
- . "Response: The Background of Intentionality and Action." In *John Searle and His Critics,* edited by Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick, 289–99. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- . "Collective Intentions and Actions." In *Intentions in Communications,* edited by P. Cohen, J. Morgan, and M. E. Pollack. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.
- . *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind.* Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Shapiro, Joel B. "Heidegger's Virtue Is Knowledge: Being-With and Solitude in Section 26 of *Being and Time.*" *Philosophy Today* 38 (1994): 400–418.
- Sheehan, Thomas. "A Paradigm Shift in Heidegger Research." *Continental Philosophy Review* 32, no. 2 (2001): 1–20.
- Sherman, David. "Camus' Meurault and Sartrean Irresponsibility." *Philosophy and Literature* 19, no. 1 (1995): 60–77.
- Sherover, Charles. "Founding an Existentialist Ethic." *Human Studies* 4 (1981): 223–36.
- Shockey, B. Matthew. "Heidegger's Descartes and Heidegger's Cartesianism." *European Journal of Philosophy* 20, no. 1 (2012): 285–311.
- . "Heidegger, Lafont and the Necessity of the Transcendental." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 34 (2008): 557–74.
- Shoemaker, Sydney. "First-Person Access." In *The First Person Perspective and Other Essays.* Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sidgwick, Henry. *The Methods of Ethics.* Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1981.
- Sikka, Sonia. "Kantian Ethics in *Being and Time.*" *Journal of Philosophical Research* 31 (2006): 309–34.
- . "How Not to Read the Other: 'All the Rest Can Be Translated.'" *Philosophy Today* 43 (1999): 195–205.
- Simmons, William Paul. "The Third." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 25, no. 6 (1999): 83–104.
- Slote, Michael. *Morals from Motives.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Solomon, Robert C. *The Passions.* Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.

- Spader, Peter H. *Scheler's Ethical Personalism*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- Sprigge, T. L. S. "Is Pity the Basis of Ethics? Nietzsche versus Schopenhauer." In *The Bases of Ethics*, edited by William Sweet, 103–25. Milwaukee, Wis.: Marquette University Press, 2000.
- Staehtler, Tanja. "Ambiguous Calling? Authenticity and Ethics in Heidegger's *Being and Time*." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 39 (2008): 293–313.
- Stein, Edith. *On the Problem of Empathy*. Translated by Waltraut Stein. Washington: ICS, 1989.
- Steinbock, Anthony. "On a Phenomenology of Hope." Presentation at the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, Boston, November 2003.
- . *Home and Beyond: Generative Phenomenology After Husserl*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1995.
- Stewart, Jon. "Merleau-Ponty's Criticism of Sartre's Theory of Freedom." *Philosophy Today* 39, no. 3 (1995): 311–24.
- Stoll, Donald. "Heidegger, Levinas, Derrida: Forgetting and Remembering the Jews." *Philosophy Today* 43, no. 4 (1999): 336–47.
- Strawson, Galen. "Real Intentionality." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3 (2004): 287–313.
- Stroud, Barry. "The Background of Thought." In *John Searle and His Critics*, edited by Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick, 245–58. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Taminiaux, Jacques. *Heidegger and the Project of Fundamental Ontology*. Translated and edited by Michael Gendre. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Tani, Toru. "Inquiry into the I, Disclosedness, and Self-Consciousness: Husserl, Heidegger, Nishida." *Continental Philosophy Review* 31 (1998): 239–53.
- Taylor, Charles. "Engaged Agency and Background in Heidegger." In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, edited by Charles Guignon, 202–21. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Tengelyi, László. *The Wild Region in Life-History*. Translated by Géza Kállay and László Tengelyi. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2004.
- Theunissen, Michael. *The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre and Buber*. Translated by Christopher Macann. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1984.
- Thomson, Iain. *Heidegger, Art, and Postmodernity*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- . "Rethinking Levinas on Heidegger on Death." *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 16 (Fall 2009): 23–43.
- . "Heidegger's Perfectionist Philosophy of Education in *Being and Time*." *Continental Philosophy Review* 37, no. 4 (2004): 439–67.
- Timjes, Peiter. "Gagarin and the Homeland, Heidegger versus Levinas." *Concordia* 28 (1995): 81–95.
- Tudor, Steven. *Compassion and Remorse*. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

- Tugendhat, Ernst. "Heidegger's Idea of Truth." In *Critical Heidegger*, translated and edited by Christopher Macann, 227–40. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *Self-Consciousness and Self-Determination*. Translated by Paul Stern. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1986.
- . *Der Wahrheitsbegriff bei Husserl und Heidegger*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.
- Van Buren, John. "The Ethics of *Formale Anzeige* in Heidegger." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (1995): 157–70.
- . *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Vessey, David. "Gadamer's Account of Friendship as an Alternative to an Account of Intersubjectivity." *Philosophy Today* 49, no. 5 (2005): 61–67.
- Visker, Rudi. "In Respectful Contempt: Heidegger, Appropriation, Facticity." In *Appropriating Heidegger*, edited by James E. Faulconed and Mark A. Wrathall, 137–54. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "Dropping—The 'Subject' of Authenticity: *Being and Time* on Disappearing Existentials and True Friendship with Being." In *Deconstructive Subjectivities*, edited by Simon Critchley and Peter Dews, 59–83. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Vogel, Lawrence. *The Fragile "We": Ethical Implications of Heidegger's "Being and Time"*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1994.
- Volpi, Franco. "Dasein as Praxis: The Heideggerian Assimilation and the Radicalization of the Practical Philosophy of Aristotle." In *Critical Heidegger*, edited by Christopher Macann, 27–66. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Von Herrmann, Friedrich-Wilhelm. *Hermeneutic und Reflexion*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.
- . *Subjekt und Dasein*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1974.
- Wakefield, Jerome, and Hubert Dreyfus. "Intentionality and the Phenomenology of Action." In *John Searle and His Critics*, edited by Ernest Lepore and Robert Van Gulick, 259–70. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. "Levinas and the Face of the Other." In *The Cambridge Companion to Levinas*, edited by Simon Critchley and Robert Bernasconi, 63–81. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Order in the Twilight*. Translated by David J. Parent. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1996.
- . *Antwortregister*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1994.
- Weatherston, Martin. *Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant: Categories, Imagination, and Temporality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Wellman, Christopher Heath. "Gratitude as a Virtue." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 80 (1999): 284–300.
- Welton, Donn. *The Other Husserl*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Whitney, Peter. "Sartre's Phenomenological Description of Bad Faith: Intentionality as Ontological Ground of Experience." *Philosophy Today* 24, no. 4 (1980): 238–48.
- Wilkins, Adam. "Justice and Action in *Otherwise than Being*." *Philosophy Today* 45 (2001): 105–9.

- Williams, Bernard. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- . *Problems of the Self*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Williams, Robert R. *Hegel's Ethics of Recognition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Wolin, Richard. *The Politics of Being*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Wood, Allen W. *Kant's Ethical Thought*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wood, David. *Time After Time*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- . *Thinking After Heidegger*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Wrathall, Mark A. "Heidegger, Truth, and Reference." *Inquiry* 45: "Symposium on Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language and World-Disclosure*" (2002): 217–28.
- . "Background Practices, Capacities, and Heideggerian Disclosure." In *Heidegger, Coping, and Cognitive Science: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 2*, edited by Mark A. Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 93–114. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . "Heidegger and Truth as Correspondence." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7, no. 1 (1999): 69–88.
- Wyschogrod, Edith. "Language and Alterity in the Thought of Levinas." In *The Cambridge Companion to Levinas*, edited by Simon Critchley and Robert Bernasconi, 188–205. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Emmanuel Levinas: The Problem of Ethical Metaphysics*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000.
- Young, Julian. "What Is Dwelling? The Homelessness of Modernity and the Worlding of the World." In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 187–203. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . *Heidegger, Philosophy, Nazism*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Zahavi, Dan. "Internalism, Externalism, and Transcendental Idealism." *Synthese* 160 (2008): 355–74.
- . "Intentionality and Experience." *Synthesis Philosophica* 20, no. 2 (2005): 299–318.
- . *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005.
- . "How to Investigate Subjectivity: Natorp and Heidegger on Reflection." *Continental Philosophy Review* 36 (2003): 155–76.
- . *Husserl's Phenomenology*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- . "First-Person Thoughts and Embodied Self-Awareness: Some Reflections on the Relation Between Recent Analytical Philosophy and Phenomenology." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 1 (2002): 7–26.
- . "Beyond Empathy: Phenomenological Approaches to Intersubjectivity." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 8, no. 5–7 (2001): 151–67.
- . *Husserl and Transcendental Intersubjectivity*. Translated by Elizabeth A. Behnke. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001.



- . *Self-Awareness and Alterity: A Phenomenological Investigation*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1999.
- . “The Fracture in Self-Awareness.” In *Self-Awareness, Temporality and Alterity*, edited by Dan Zahavi, 21–40. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1998.
- . “Phenomenal Consciousness and Self-Awareness: A Phenomenological Critique of Representational Theory.” *Journal of Consciousness Studies: Controversies in Science & the Humanities* 5 (1998): 687–705.
- Zahavi, Dan, and Joseph Parnas, “Conceptual Problems in Infantile Autism Research: Why Cognitive Science Needs Phenomenology.” *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 10, no. 9–10 (2003): 1–19.
- Zimmerman, Michael E. “The End of Authentic Selfhood in the Postmodern Age?” In *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity: Essays in Honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus, Vol. 1*, edited by Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas, 123–48. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000.
- . *Eclipse of the Self: The Development of Heidegger’s Concept of Authenticity*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1981.



---

## Index

- Anaximander Fragment, 229, 259n38, 268n81
- Angst*, 206–10, 236n6; and individuating role of, 8, 53; as mode of disclosure, 82, 110, 203–4, 214, 249n17; worldlessness of, 110–11, 251n43
- anonymity: of the a priori categories, 7, 10, 232; of the call of being, 258n17, 266n42; and discourse, 176, 178; of encounters with others, 38, 62–63, 76, 160, 164; and inauthenticity, 53, 193, 205, 211; in Kant's moral theory, 149–50, 156; and open intersubjectivity, 138–39; of time, 105; of worldly norms, 3, 7, 32–33, 55, 58, 139, 166, 172 (*see also* averageness; *das Man*); of the *Zuhanden*, 256n36
- apodicticity, 56
- appropriateness: as intersubjective norm, 132–35, 165, 175–76, 182; and mindless coping, 48–49, 55; ontological imperative to, 199–201, 216; and the other, 182, 191, 215, 233–34; and self-understanding, 84, 135, 201, 215, 233–34
- a priori, the, 3, 10, 68, 75–104, 232, 250n32, 251n40, 260n53; status of being-with others, 7, 10, 62–63, 87, 137–38, 140, 231 (*see also* being-with: Sartre's critique of)
- Aristotle, 79, 92, 94, 215–16, 255n22
- articulation of intelligibility, 170–74, 178–79
- attunement: and *Angst*, 110, 204, 206–10 (*see also* *Angst*); as mode of disclosure, 24–26, 106, 110, 116, 169; and other Dasein, 161, 176, 178, 190; transformations of, 178, 261n61
- Augenblick*. *See* time: *Augenblick*
- authenticity: and *Angst*, 206–9; and being-toward-death, 204–5; and conscience, 210–27; individuating role of, 39, 53, 59, 111, 206–9, 224–25, 231, 254n15, 263n16, 267n62; middle voice structure of, 101, 214–16, 267n51; role in intersubjectivity, 73, 111, 145–47, 154–56, 182, 202–3, 206–9, 220–25, 266n45 (*see also* leaping-ahead); Sartrean conversion as, 73, 248n17; and self-responsibility, 53, 55, 155–56, 203–4, 215–21, 233; structural status of, 37, 109–15, 154, 194–97, 224–25, 246n8; and temporality, 110–15, 209–10, 254nn9–10, 260n44. *See also* inauthenticity
- availability. *See* *Zuhanden*
- averageness, 9, 32–35, 37–40, 45, 53, 58, 69, 164–67, 193–96. *See also* *das Man*
- Beauvoir, Simone de, 187
- Befindlichkeit*. *See* attunement
- beholdenness, 79, 93
- being (concept of), 21–22
- being-for-itself, 73
- being-in-itself, 73, 91
- being-in-the-world: Dasein's structure as, 15–19, 25–30, 33, 89–90, 93–94, 206–7, 217; other Dasein as, 30, 87, 141, 148, 153–54, 218; role of being-with in constituting, 11, 61–62, 85–86, 111, 137, 141–42, 168, 207; shared through discourse, 168–77; temporal structure of, 102, 105, 116, 120, 123–24, 129, 161
- being-toward-death, 53, 82, 152, 159, 202–5, 209–10, 265n40

- being-with (*Mitsein*): as acknowledgment of other's particularity, 3, 11, 38, 76, 104, 139–42, 162–67, 219, 250n28 (*see also* Dasein-to-Dasein encounters); as a priori category, 7, 10, 76, 78, 85–90, 231; as dependence, 162–64; and discourse 170, 173–78, 203, 222–23; as distinguished from inauthentic fallenness, 108–14, 194, 197, 203; and the *Mitsein/Mitdasein* distinction, 136–37, 154, 184, 208, 253n8; Nancy's development of, 63–64, 239n23, 246n7; as ontological structure of Dasein, 7, 10, 29–34, 58–59, 93–94, 114, 208–9, 250n28; as participation in public norms, 7, 33–38, 154, 163–68, 209, 256n36; Sartre's critique of, 10, 60–62, 137–38, 231; and solicitude, 142–47, 184–87, 219; and temporality, 115, 124, 126, 232, 253n6. *See also* *das Man*; discourse; leaping-ahead; leaping-in; solicitude
- Bergson, Henri, 252n5, 255n26
- Blattner, William, 105–9, 114, 126–30, 173–76, 253n6, 254n15, 261nn57–58
- Brandom, Robert, 165, 260n47
- breakdown, 27, 56–57, 81–83, 249n17, 249n24, 251n43
- Burch, Matthew, 245nn41–42, 265n41, 267n50
- care, 9, 17, 33–35, 40, 49–57, 82–85, 233–34, 237n6 (*see also* mineness); deficient modes of, 187–92 (*see also* inauthenticity); specific to other Dasein (*see* solicitude); temporal structure of, 105–40
- Carman, Taylor, 197, 249n17, 261n64
- Cartesianism, 4–21, 39–41, 70–71, 151, 176, 235n2, 236n8, 237n8
- categorical intuition, 91–93, 95
- categories. *See* a priori, the circumspection, 24–25, 190
- co-constitution of world, 87, 124–40, 168–70, 185, 256n37
- cogito*, 4, 16–18, 204
- communication, 12, 170, 173–82, 223–28, 261n57, 261n62, 261n67 (*see also* discourse)
- concrete encounters with others. *See* Dasein-to-Dasein encounters
- conscience (call of), 55, 101, 181, 203–4, 210–19; the other's role in, 219–27, 233, 267n64, 268n66
- consciousness, 235n1; Husserl on, 19, 23, 118; of internal time, 118, 244n33. *See also* Dasein; self-awareness
- constitution. *See* co-constitution of world
- contingent necessity, 76, 89–92. *See also* a priori, the
- conversion (Sartre's notion of), 73, 246nn17–18
- coping, 46–48, 55, 57, 81, 172, 189, 190, 197
- Crowell, Steven, 22, 57, 92, 219, 245n41, 252n2, 259n36, 268n67
- curiosity, 103, 110, 213, 223
- Dahlstrom, Daniel, 112–14, 255n25
- Darwall, Stephen, 155–57, 160, 257n6
- Dasein (concept of), 3, 6, 9, 13–19, 21–24, 235n1. *See also* being-in-the-world
- Dasein-to-Dasein (concrete) encounters, 150–68, 182–83, 232; and authenticity, 3, 207, 224–26, 228; and categoriality, 88–93; as constitutive of world, 139–40, 201, 221, 232; and inauthenticity, 193; Sartre on, 58–76. *See also* being-with; heedfulness; solicitude
- das Man*, 32–39, 172, 178, 193–96, 263n17. *See also* being-with: as participation in public norms; publicity
- datability. *See* time: datability
- death, 205–8, 265nn40–41, 266n42. *See also* being-toward-death
- decisionism, 214, 266n50
- Descartes, Rene. *See* Cartesianism
- Dilthey, Wilhelm, 35, 53, 254n16
- disclosure, 23–28, 43–45, 82–84, 110, 116, 169; truth as, 77–79, 252n3. *See also* attunement; discourse; understanding
- discourse, 12–13, 110, 116, 128–29, 168–83; authentic modes of, 203–4, 210–25 (*see also* conscience, call of). *See also* communication
- distanciality, 33–35, 45, 54, 166. *See also* averageness; *das Man*

- Dreyfus, Hubert, 9, 35–37, 45–50, 55, 172–74, 197, 241n30, 255n25
- Drummond, John, 155–58
- duration. *See* time: spannedness
- ecstatic nature of time. *See* time: ecstatic
- embodiment, 18, 47–49, 148–49, 233, 238n18, 244n33
- empathy, 5, 167–68, 249n24, 263n13
- enpresenting. *See* time: present, the
- entanglement. *See* falling; inauthenticity
- epoché*, 22, 91, 240n27
- ethics, 133, 144–48, 199–201, 216–19, 233, 250n31, 266n50
- everydayness, 33–38, 53–55, 73, 194–98, 263n11, 264n18. *See also* averageness
- existential analytic, 10, 18, 87–94, 157, 232
- existentials, 30, 216; as categories, 85, 104, 139, 232; discourse as, 110, 169; falling prey as, 109–11, 194; and phenomenology, 23, 263n11; relation to existentiell manifestation, 187–88, 263n11. *See also* being-with; project; thrownness
- externalism, 181, 238n12
- external world (problem of), 4–6
- facticity, 28–29, 88–94, 106, 152, 250n30, 252n2; role of in Sartre's account of intersubjectivity, 10, 66–76. *See also* thrownness
- fallenness. *See* inauthenticity
- falling, 37, 109–11, 195, 196–98, 205–8, 230
- first-person perspective, 9, 39–57, 244n33. *See also* self-awareness
- Fleischer, Margot, 112–13, 125–26, 253n9, 255n25
- Fürsorge*. *See* solicitude
- futurity. *See* time: future, the
- handiness. *See* *Zuhanden*
- Hartmann, Klaus, 187–92, 250n33, 263n11
- Hatab, Lawrence, 190, 249n24, 250n31, 261n59
- Haugeland, John, 83–85, 109–10, 172–74, 206, 243n12, 248n8
- hearing, 101, 181, 212–16, 220–25, 268n67
- heedfulness, 130–42, 153, 157–63, 175–77, 198–202, 214, 227–34
- Hegel, G. W. F., 60, 90, 236n7, 250n33, 257n2, 263n11
- horizon, 19, 78, 100–103, 138, 238n12, 248n4; temporality as, 89–92, 103–8, 115–16, 119–23, 135, 209–10
- Husserl, Edmund, 236n7, 237n7, 243n14, 244n33; and the a priori, 10, 89–93, 104, 232, 250n32, 251n40I; on intentionality, 18–19, 237n11, 238n12, 238n18; on intersubjectivity, 136–39, 256n36; and phenomenology, 13, 18–24, 56–57, 65, 240n27, 250n33; relation to Heidegger, 3–4, 13, 18–24, 56–57, 245n41; Sartre's critique of, 60–62, 67; on temporality, 118, 244n33
- idealism, 65–66, 79–80, 83, 89, 96, 171, 253n6
- idle talk, 179–82, 198, 213, 223–25, 228
- inauthenticity, 192–98; and averageness, 35, 130 (*see also das Man*); and being-with, 12, 36, 109–11, 194, 263n16, 268n66 (*see also das Man*); leaping-in); as distinguished from everydayness, 37–38, 109–11, 194–98, 264n18, 264n21; as distinguished from falling, 196–98; and Kant's noumenal/phenomenal distinction, 154; and language, 181–82 (*see also* idle talk); and loss of possibilities, 35–36, 193, 198, 211; as ontological misunderstanding, 37, 164, 193–94, 204–5, 233; as self-forgetting, 53, 206, 210–11, 216; and temporality, 107, 111–15, 126, 131, 136–40
- individuation, 8, 39–40, 53, 151–53, 267n62. *See also* authenticity; mineness
- intelligibility. *See* discourse; meaning
- intentionality, 23, 40–57, 243n12, 244n28, 244n32, 261n60; Husserl on, 18–19, 89–95, 237n11, 238n12, 238n18
- intention in action, 46–48
- internal time consciousness, 118, 244n33

- interpretation, 94, 172–73
- intersubjectivity, 3–5, 237n7, 265n33;  
Heidegger on: *see* being-with; Husserl on, 136, 138, 256n36; Levinas on, 156–60, 199–201, 216, 222, 247n9, 259n32, 259n36, 259n38; Sartre on, 10, 60–63, 66–77, 247n15, 247n17, 248nn18–19
- intuition, 97–102, 104, 251n49; categorical, 91–96; temporality and, 77, 89, 97, 101–2, 104, 232
- Jemeinigheit*. *See* mineness
- Jeweiligkeit*. *See* time: *Jeweiligkeit*
- justice, 200–201, 224, 226, 229–30, 264n32
- Kant, Immanuel: and the a priori, 3, 10, 79, 89–92, 95–101, 104, 260n53; Heidegger's differences from, 6, 18, 20, 149–50, 217, 237n8; moral theory of, 12, 144–50, 154–56, 159, 217
- Kisiel, Theodore, 245n42, 254n16, 258n14
- Kukla, Rebecca, 208, 212, 215
- Lafont, Cristina, 170–72, 179, 181, 248n4, 260n53, 261n67
- language. *See* communication; discourse
- Lask, Emil, 92
- leaping-ahead, 143–45, 181, 184–85, 202–3, 214–19, 223–30, 257n3
- leaping-in, 143, 184–93, 202, 220, 230, 257n3, 262n2
- Leib*. *See* lived body
- Leibniz, Gottfried, 131, 151, 236n2
- letting be (*Seinlassen*), 78, 101, 226
- leveling down, 34–35, 107
- Levinas, Emmanuel: foundational role of ethics for ontology, 222, 255n28, 259n36; intersubjectivity and, 156–60, 199–201, 216, 247n9, 259n32, 259n38; notion of selfhood, 117, 252n55, 254n17, 266n42
- lifeworld, 18
- lived body (*Leib*), 18, 238n18, 244n33
- Locke, John, 41, 43
- look, the (Sartre's notion of), 67–75, 247n14, 248n19
- love, 71, 226–27, 230, 257n3
- matter, 25, 43, 49–51, 175, 234. *See also* attunement; care; mineness
- meaning, and authenticity, 207–9, 251n43; of being, 22, 88, 240n25, 241n33, 246n8; intersubjective status of, 31–35, 140–41, 162, 174–78, 185; Nancy on, 64–65, 239n23; phenomenology and, 13, 19–22, 240n27, 244n14, 249n16; primary vs. secondary forms of, 28–29, 45; temporality and, 134, 140–41, 162, 232; world as context of, 11, 15–17, 26–29, 165–66, 170–74, 200–201; world-responsivity of, 77–80, 88–90, 93. *See also* discourse; significance
- measure, measure-taking, 54, 121, 129–35, 141–42, 160–61, 165, 200–202. *See also* norms; temporality; reckoning
- Mensch, James, 161, 164, 199
- middle voice, 101–2, 179, 213–14, 216, 226, 252n55
- mineness (*Jemeinigheit*): and individuation, 53–55, 193, 206, 232; and normativity, 45–54, 134–36, 164–67, 199; of the other, 58, 63, 136, 150–55, 164–65, 183, 232; and self-awareness, 39–40, 43, 50–57; as self-responsibility, 53–58, 149, 155, 204–6; and solipsism, 58, 153, 159–60, 246n1
- Mitdasein*. *See* being-with
- Mitsein*. *See* being-with
- modal indifference, 194–95. *See also* everydayness
- mood. *See* attunement
- Moran, Richard, 52
- Nancy, Jean-Luc, 63–66, 239nn22–23, 246n8
- Nazism, 36
- normativity: and authenticity, 208–16, 218–19; of Dasein's way of being, 50–55, 134–35, 198–201, 233 (*see also* mineness); of ethical encounter, 146–48, 190, 199–201, 233, 249n24, 263n13; of intentionality, 45–50, 55; intersubjective origins of, 129–33, 139–42, 158, 165, 178, 232, 265n33; of discourse, 170–72, 176, 179, 182, 261n64; of phenomenology, 13, 21–22, 240n25, 263n11; of public mean-

- ing, 32–36, 54–55, 130–35, 163–66  
(*see also das Man*); and truth, 78–85, 252n3
- objective presence. *See Vorhanden*
- occurrent things. *See Vorhanden*
- Okrent, Mark, 120, 130, 171–72
- Olafson, Frederick, 5–6, 102, 123, 147–48, 165, 254n10
- ontic-ontological relationship, 56–57, 88–94, 251n41; in being-with, 10, 31, 59–63, 70, 75–76, 88–90, 250n31
- ontology, 20–21, 64, 88–90, 239n23
- originary temporality. *See time: originary temporality*
- particularity. *See individuation*
- past. *See time: past, the*
- person-thing distinction, 12, 18, 86–87, 144–50, 153–59, 184–85, 256n1
- phenomenology, 65, 238n19, 239n23, 245n42, 249n16, 250n33, 251n41, 263n11; and the first-person, 42, 46, 56, 157; Heidegger's relation to Husserl, 13–14, 18–23, 56–57, 88–92, 240n27
- possibility, 25–28, 69–70, 93, 262n68, 266n42; and authenticity, 202–5, 225–27, 265nn40–41; inauthentic loss of, 35, 192–93, 198, 211
- pragmatism, 80, 117, 127, 130, 171–72, 238n18, 255n27
- present. *See time: present, the*
- present at hand. *See Vorhanden*
- problem of other minds, 4–6, 15, 19, 37–38, 61, 65, 240n27
- project (Heidegger's notion of), 24–28, 78, 105–7, 110, 120, 209, 216
- protention. *See time: protention*
- publicity: of meaning, 31–33, 58, 71, 170–72, 178 (*see also averageness; das Man*); of time, 116–18, 121, 124–31, 232
- ready-to-hand. *See Zuhanden*
- realism, 10, 79, 82, 94, 253n6
- reckoning. *See time: reckoning*
- recognition: Hegel's theory of, 257n2.  
*See also Dasein-to-Dasein encounters; respect; solicitude*
- respect: Heidegger's appropriation of Kant's theory of, 144–45, 149–50, 154–55, 159 (*see also person-thing distinction*); recognition vs. appraisal respect, 145, 155–58, 257n6. *See also solicitude*
- responsibility. *See mineness; self-responsibility*
- retention. *See time: retention*
- Ricoeur, Paul, 250n28, 260n44
- Sartre, Jean-Paul: critique of Heideggerian being-with, 10, 59–63, 64–65, 78, 137–38, 231; critique of being-with as a priori category, 87–90, 94, 100, 104; influence on Levinas, 246n9; theory of intersubjectivity, 10, 60–63, 66–77, 247n15, 247n17, 248nn18–19
- Schatzki, Theodore, 121, 255n21, 255n27
- schema, 94, 98, 102–4
- Schutz, Alfred, 153
- Searle, John, 9, 45–50, 55, 81, 261n60
- Seinlassen*. *See letting be*
- self. *See Dasein; mineness*
- self-awareness, 39–57, 243n9, 244n33, 245n34, 247n16; higher order theories of, 40–42, 44. *See also Dasein; first-person perspective; mineness*
- selfhood. *See Dasein; mineness*
- self-responsibility: 58, 85, 135, 149, 152; and authenticity, 53, 155, 204, 216–18, 267n62; and inauthenticity, 35, 211; of other Dasein, 165–66, 182, 203; and philosophical methodology, 20, 22, 56
- sequential time. *See time: sequential time*
- shame, 67–68, 74, 76
- Shoemaker, Sydney, 40–41, 52
- significance: 131–36; as dimension of temporality, 116–18, 121, 123–24, 128–29, 200, 232; and inauthenticity, 196, 198; and language, 170–73 (*see also communication; discourse*); loss of in *Angst*, 82, 207–9; world as arena of, 16, 26–28, 141–42, 171, 221. *See also meaning*
- social relations. *See being-with*
- solicitude (*Fürsorge*), 11, 142–45, 201, 249n24; as continuum, 12, 257n3.  
*See also being-with, leaping-ahead, leaping-in*

- solipsism: of Cartesianism, 62, 151; of Heideggerian mineness, 3, 58, 62, 151–53, 159–60, 207–8; of Husserlian intersubjectivity, 6, 19, 21, 136; of theories of empathy, 6
- spannedness. *See* time: spannedness
- Strawson, Galen, 45, 244n28, 244n32
- subjectivity (Heidegger's reconception of), 4–6, 13–18, 21–24, 39–40, 93–94, 104–6, 236nn7–8, 237n7, 258n17. *See also* care; Dasein; mineness
- Taminiaux, Jacques, 151, 153
- Taylor, Charles, 80–81, 249n16
- temporality. *See* time
- Tengelyi, László, 89, 92, 199–200
- Theunissen, Michael: on Sartre, 71, 75; on Heidegger, 85–86, 124, 186, 195, 224, 227, 257n3
- thing in itself, 96
- third, the (Levinas's notion of), 200, 264n32
- Thomson, Iain, 246n44, 246n8 (ch. 3), 251n41, 266n42, 267n62
- thrownness, 24, 30, 106
- time: *Augenblick*, 110, 115, 210; datability, 116–32; ecstatic nature of, 90–92, 107, 115–36, 142, 148–54, 161, 229; future, the, 105–14, 117–22, 161–62, 252n5; *Jeweiligkeit*, 152, 164; now, the, 105–8, 115–33, 136–37, 139–41, 159, 182, 229; originary temporality, 105–9, 111–27, 130, 136, 253n6, 254n15, 260n44; originary temporality of other Dasein, 136, 139–43, 161–63, 232, 256n37; past, the, 105–8, 116–18, 121–22, 160–61; present, the, 105–6, 108–12, 115–19, 121–22, 127, 158, 229–30; protention, 118; reckoning, 127, 129–35, 158, 175, 190–91 (*see also* measure, measure-taking); retention, 118, 121; sequential time, 105–8, 123–24, 126–29, 132, 159, 205, 254n15; spannedness (duration), 116–19, 121–22, 124, 129, 229, 232; vulgar time, 107, 115, 123, 127, 143, 161, 181, 184; world time, 113, 122–29, 194; world time as intersubjective accomplishment, 108–9, 124–29, 134, 139–40, 175, 181, 200, 232
- transcendence (selfhood as), 16, 23, 43–44, 97, 100, 102, 204, 265n37; Sartre on, 70–72; temporality and, 118–19, 135, 139, 153, 232
- transcendental ego. *See* transcendental subject
- transcendental philosophy: and categoriality, 92–93; Heidegger's transformation of, 13–14, 20–21, 56, 215, 245n41, 249n16, 263n11; in Husserl, 13, 20–21, 250n33, 256n37; and Kant, 20–21, 89, 92, 95, 260n53
- transcendental subject, 23–24, 151, 157; Husserl on, 18, 19, 22, 24, 136, 256n32
- truth, 77–80, 83–84, 165, 240n25, 248n6, 252n3, 264n18
- Tugendhat, Ernst, 77–78, 91–93, 139, 252n3, 256n37
- understanding (Heidegger's notion of), 25–29; authentic mode of, 204–6, 211; and discourse, 168, 170–78, 182; and intentionality, 50; as mode of disclosure, 116, 169–70, 245n42; and temporality 105–6, 120–21
- Vorhanden* (occurrent, objective being): as distinguished from Dasein being, 85–87, 142, 147, 189–90; and ethics, 147, 249n24; ontological status of, 80–81, 124, 249n17
- vulgar time. *See* time: vulgar time
- world (Heidegger's notion of), 15–17, 26–27; and intersubjective encounters, 30, 141–42, 154, 221; and significance, 132–35, 171
- worldlessness: of animals, 188, 263n13; in authenticity, 207–8, 221, 251n43
- world time. *See* time: world time
- Zahavi, Dan: on intersubjectivity, 138, 224–25, 227, 256n37; on self-awareness, 42, 56, 242n3, 243n11, 245n34, 256n36
- Zuhanden* (available, handy being): as distinguished from Dasein being, 85–87, 142, 189–90, 249n24; ontological priority of, 80–81, 124, 256n36; and temporality, 123–24



---

## About the Author

Irene McMullin is a senior lecturer in the School of Philosophy and Art History at the University of Essex.