UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree	Year	Name of Author
M Phil	2005	LEONARD, S. M.

COPYRIGHT

This is a thesis accepted for a Higher Degree of the University of London. It is an unpublished typescript and the copyright is held by the author. All persons consulting the thesis must read and abide by the Copyright Declaration below.

COPYRIGHT DECLARATION

I recognise that the copyright of the above-described thesis rests with the author and that no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

LOANS

Theses may not be lent to individuals, but the Senate House Library may lend a copy to approved libraries within the United Kingdom, for consultation solely on the premises of those libraries. Application should be made to: Inter-Library Loans, Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

REPRODUCTION

University of London theses may not be reproduced without explicit written permission from the Senate House Library. Enquiries should be addressed to the Theses Section of the Library. Regulations concerning reproduction vary according to the date of acceptance of the thesis and are listed below as guidelines.

A.   Before 1962. Permission granted only upon the prior written consent of the author. (The Senate House Library will provide addresses where possible).

B.   1962 - 1974. In many cases the author has agreed to permit copying upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.

C.   1975 - 1988. Most theses may be copied upon completion of a Copyright Declaration.

D.   1989 onwards. Most theses may be copied.

This thesis comes within category D.

☑ This copy has been deposited in the Library of ___UCL___

☐ This copy has been deposited in the Senate House Library, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

Death and *Das Man*: Authenticity in Heidegger's
Being and Time

Sarah Leonard

UMI Number: U594107

Dissertation Publishing

Abstract

This dissertation is an examination of Heidegger's account of authenticity in *Being and Time* within the context of his phenomenological project of a fundamental ontology of being. The role of authenticity within Heidegger's unfinished fundamental ontological project of the meaning of being is related primarily to two major concepts: death and *das Man* (the They). Heidegger starts by investigating the phenomena of our average everyday existence in order to determine the existential-ontological structures that underlie and make possible our being. The question of being towards which Heidegger is directed requires an analysis of the only being that understands what it means to be, human being (Dasein). Dasein is the only available access we have to the understanding of being, and thus it is necessary to undertake an analysis of both Dasein's understanding and its own being. To understand Dasein as a whole, however, we must also take death into account. As a being that projects its possibilities, Dasein is only a totality when its possibilities end with death. However, everyday Dasein, as absorbed in the They, has an inauthentic attitude towards death and its own being, and does not understand its being as it really is. Being-towards-death is an ontological structure that, when lived authentically, allows Dasein to grasp itself as a whole. This thesis will review the place of these ideas in *Being and Time*, as well as address criticisms of Heidegger's work in order to determine whether we can ultimately accept his account of authenticity.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my supervisor, Dr Sarah Richmond, for her invaluable help with this dissertation. Her immense knowledge and helpful encouragement made this work possible.

Thanks also to my entire family for their support—financially, psychologically and otherwise—and for encouraging me to pursue philosophy. Special thanks to my grandfather for inspiring me to take up philosophy in the first place.

Finally, thanks to Erik Gjesfjeld and Rachel Lin for proofreading and commiseration.

Note on References

All references to *Being and Time* are given in the form (SZ x), where x is the

original page number from the 7th German edition (1953) of *Sein und Zeit*. The

translation used is Joan Stambaugh's 1996 version. Other works are cited in the

usual way. All italicized words in the citations from *Being and Time* are Heidegger's

originals, not the addition of the author.

1. Why Authenticity?

As a philosopher, Heidegger's main concern was the question of being. His major work, *Being and Time* (1927), was an attempt to delineate a fundamental ontology of being. This attempt leads Heidegger into an analysis of the nature of human being (*Dasein*), in which authenticity plays an essential role. In his account of authenticity, Heidegger is greatly influenced by Nietzsche, Kierkegaard and Husserl, but unlike these other philosophers, he makes authenticity an integral part of a larger ontological context. The concepts of death and the They (*das Man*) can also be traced as parallels to similar concepts in the works of these philosophers. To understand the significance of the account of authenticity and inauthenticity in *Being and Time*, it is necessary to focus on the context of the broader ontological project that Heidegger is addressing. This dissertation will survey the question of being before taking up the being of *Dasein* and its ways of being both authentic and inauthentic. The first step is an examination of the general concept of authenticity and its philosophical antecedents in more detail.

1.1 A Definition

What does it mean to be authentic? The Oxford English Dictionary defines authenticity as being "being in accordance with fact, being true in substance, being genuine, real or actual." In everyday life, there are two ways of thinking of authenticity. The first applies to objects, and we generally think of authenticity as genuineness or correspondence to what is true or valid. For example, a painting by Picasso is said to be authentic if it is genuine, if it is the true and original artwork. In this case, the painting is authentic because it was created by the artist whose name is

attached to it: the painting is an authentic Picasso precisely because it was painted by Picasso. Similarly, a restaurant that claims to serve 'authentic' Indian cuisine means that their food corresponds to what is truly and actually eaten in India. In this everyday sense of authenticity, we mean that something is real, that it is not a counterfeit or an imitation. The second sort of authenticity applies to people, but is related to the first definition. This is a more modern usage of the term, and it involves the idea of the authentic individual as sincere or honest. With this usage there is an implication of the absence of deception, where "outward behaviour is consistent with public declarations," (Golomb 1995, 8) and there is often a sense of the authentic individual as as being 'true to oneself,' or being what one really is. Authenticity in terms of the self can be philosophically problematic and draws attention to questions of selfhood and identity, as well as ethical issues. What does it mean for the inauthentic individual not to be himself? Is it even possible to be something other than what one really is? How ought one to live in order to be authentic?

'Authentic' is the usual translation of the German term *eigentlich*, and most commentators and scholars of Heidegger's thought tend to use this word. However, it is important to note that *eigentlich* comes from the root *eigen*, meaning 'own;' thus, being authentic has in the German a certain sense of ownness or mineness, a sense that is unfortunately lost in the English translation. By ownness, Heidegger is referring to that which belongs to an individual alone, undiluted by influence from the inauthentic public sphere. Heidegger is emphasizing, in his account of authenticity, the importance of that aspect of the self that can be seen as 'pure' individuality. Unfortunately, 'authentic' has the connotation of "actualizing a concrete possibility of itself that is in some sense its 'real' self, as when we speak of

7

finding one's goal in life, one's true calling, etc." (Boedeker, 96) Some commentators have attempted to solve the problem of translation by offering alternate versions: Dasein's 'being authentic' as 'taking ownership of itself,' (Boedeker, 80) or 'authenticity' as 'owned existence.' (King, 40) The problem with this translation is the unwieldiness of the phrasing, as well as the translation of 'inauthenticity' as 'disowned existence' or 'self-disownership' carrying with it the problematic implication that inauthentic Dasein chooses the state of inauthenticity. I believe that 'authentic' will suffice as a translation of *eigentlich*, as long as the reader keeps in mind the sense of ownness that Heidegger has in mind, and disregards the connotations mentioned above.

1.2 Situating Authenticity Within the Philosophical Tradition

Issues concerning authenticity and the self have been a subject of philosophical inquiry since the ancient Greek injunction to "Know thyself," although it was only taken up extensively and given a central philosophical role with the advent of existentialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Indeed, authenticity in this form is a major concern of existentialism, broadly conceived as the tradition beginning with Kierkegaard and Nietzche, up to twentieth century figures such as Sartre and Camus. There are aspects of the concept of authenticity in all of their works, and in some sense Heidegger can be included in this group, although he himself disliked the label of existentialism. Although the emphasis and form of each philosopher takes a different approach to authenticity, all are concerned with what it means for the self to be true to itself. A frequeuntly recurring theme is the idea of the authentic self transcending societal values, and in this sense, authenticity also deals with ethics and intersubjectivity. Heidegger was also writing

from within the phenomenological tradition Heidegger brings all of these various ideas into his account of authenticity, and is himself greatly influenced by other philosophers in the tradition, especially Kierkegaard, and to a lesser extent, Nietzsche.

1.2.1 Nietzsche

There are several concepts in Nietzsche's thought that can perhaps be seen as precursors to Heideggarian authenticity, although it is important to note that these are not being presented as influences Heidegger draws directly from Nietzsche, but rather as a way of showing that something parallelling authenticity is present in Nietzsche's work. Certainly, Heidegger was familiar with Nietzsche's thought, and published a book on Nietzsche later in his career, as well as discussing him in *What is Called Thinking?* (Mulhall 2001, 300) However, for the purposes of this paper, I will consider Nietzsche only within the context of *Being and Time*. Heidegger mentions him three times in *Being and Time*, although these references are rather off-hand and are not explicit references to any of the concepts that could be considered precursors of authenticity. The role Nietzsche plays in influencing Heidegger is perhaps not as important as Kierkegaard's, but some commentators, such as Zimmerman, have drawn attention to it.

The concepts of will to power, the *übermensch* and the herd are probably the most similar aspects of Nietzsche to Heideggerian authenticity. The *übermensch* is an individual who rises above the common mass of humanity, the herd, and wills a new set of values to himself: "The man who breaks their tables of values, the breaker, the lawbreaker; yet he is the creator." (Nietzsche 1966b, 23) The process of creation by which the ubermensch creates new standards and values for himself involves

9

what self is that

overcoming the self as a product of the herd in order to become a self that is responsible only to itself and its own values, through the will to power. (Golomb 1995, 70) In doing so, the ubermensch recognizes the finitude of his own existence and that this life has only a contingent basis. In contrast, the common masses do not exercise their will to power for the purpose of creating new values, but instead passively accept their values as being handed down by God or society. The herd was Nietzsche's disparaging term for the group of mass humanity, whose members do not think for themselves and "accept...whatever is shouted into [their] ears by someone who issues commands—parents, teachers, laws, class prejudices, public opinions." (Nietzsche 1966a, 110) The herd accepts its values and morals solely on the basis of the 'thou shalt,' it does and believes the things that 'one does' or 'one believes' in a certain situation. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche describes the will to power as the will to overcome: "A tablet of the good hangs over every people. Behold, it is the tablet of their overcomings; behold, it is the voice of their will to power." (Nietzsche 1966b, 58) The will to overcome can be interpreted as a will to overcoming both the values imposed by the herd, but more importantly, to overcoming the self's own immersion in this environment and thus rejecting the elements of the self that result from this absorption. (Golomb 70) Zarathustra tells those who seek to become *übermensch*: "You have long belonged to the herd. The voice of the herd will still be audible in you. And when you will say 'I no longer have a common conscience with you,' it will be a lament and an agony...Can you give yourself your own evil and your own good and hang your own will over yourself as law? Can you be your own judge and avenger of your law?" (Nietzsche 1966b, 62-63)

Heidegger's thought displays several parallels to these Nietzschean concepts. The *übermensch* can be seen as parallel to the authentic individual who frees himself from the meanings given to him by the They (*das Man*), and with authentic resoluteness faces the finitude of existence and the lack of individual possibilities; there are also similarities between Nietzsche's will to power and authentic Dasein's resoluteness as the choice to remove oneself from the influence of the public. The *übermensch*, however, does not necessarily free himself from Heideggarian inauthenticity, but from the morals and values of society. It is still possible for the *übermensch* to be inauthentic, in Heidegger's terms, because self-overcoming does not necessarily involve overcoming the inauthentic self; since Nietzsche never addresses the question of being, he does not say anything about the *übermensch* overcoming the way of being of the herd. The passive acceptance embodied by the herd is similar to Dasein's inauthentic everyday life, where values and meaning are accepted as they are handed down by the They. Both accounts emphasize the lack of creativity and responsibility that exemplify humanity and our everyday lives, and indeed Nietzsche's statement "No shepherd and one herd! Everybody wants the same, everybody is the same," (Nietzsche 1966b, 18) parallels the average everydayness of inauthentic Dasein.

While it seems that Heidegger may have appropriated and adapted certain concepts from Nietzsche, there are still insurmountable differences between the two. Nietzsche places an emphasis on originality, in that the *übermensch* must create new and unique values in contrast to the uniformity and sameness of the herd. Heidegger, on the other hand, does not claim that authenticity requires this sort of originality; the authentic individual takes up the same possibilities as others, but in a way that is directed towards his finitude. Theoretically, each Dasein could become authentic

(although this is extremely unlikely), but Nietzsche's stress on originality suggests that the *übermensch* can only be manifested in a few individuals. Despite these obvious parallels, Heidegger still includes Nietzsche in the group of philosophers who have forgotten Being, insofar as Nietzsche's account is an ontic-existentiell one that neglects the question of the fundamental ontological-existential constitution of Dasein. (Golomb 1995, 82; Zimmerman 1981, 95) As Philipse says, "Whereas Nietzsche rejected transcendence and celebrated the vitality of life in this world, Heidegger believed that human existence is meaningless unless it is related to transcendent Being." (Philipse 1998, 286). That is, Nietzsche focused on a specific anthropological account of humanity, while Heidegger was concerned with the ontology of being that underlies humanity. Nietzsche's concern with the specific characteristics of a particular situation characterizes ontic-existentiell accounts, whereas Heidegger's attempt to give a picture of the existential characteristics that underlie the existence of all human beings is ontological-existential. Nietzsche was not interested in giving ontological explanations, and for this reason Heidegger says that Nietzsche fails to address the question of the meaning of being. (Zimmerman 1981, 95)

1.2.2 Kierkegaard

Another philosopher who greatly influences Heidegger's account of authenticity is the Christian existentialist Kierkegaard, although Heidegger's account is not itself explicitly Christian. Heidegger mentions Kierkegaard three times in *Being and Time*, exclusively in footnotes, but with clear admiration for his explanation of the concept of Angst, or anxiety: "Kierkegaard got furthest of all in the analysis of the phenomenon of *Angst*" (SZ 190 n. 4) and "More is to be learned

philosophically from his 'edifying' writings than from his theoretical work—with the exception of the treatise on the concept of *Angst*." (SZ 235 n. 6) The treatise to which Heidegger refers is *The Concept of Dread* (sometimes translated as *The Concept of Anxiety*), and it is from this work that Heidegger borrows a great deal of his own account of Angst. His account of inauthenticity is also influenced by Kierkegaard's discussion of the public in *The Present Age*, (Hall 1984, 199), as well as by Kierkegaard's other works, including *The Sickness Unto Death, Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, and *Fear and Trembling*.

There is a great deal that can be said about the relationship between Kierkegaard and Heidegger, especially concerning Angst, but due to constraints of space, I shall limit myself to a brief overview of the major points. In *The Concept of Dread*, Kierkegaard discusses Angst in conjunction with original sin, the idea of falling which Dreyfus contends Heidegger attempted to secularize in his account of falling prey. While Kierkegaard describes sinfulness as the distraction of everyday life that prevents us from hearing the call to absolute Christian commitment, Heidegger puts forth a secularized version in which falling prey, as absorption in the everyday world, conceals being from us. (Dreyfus 1991, 313) Kierkegaardian Angst is the "reality of freedom as possibility anterior to possibility" (Kierkegaard 1944, 38) in which "the relation of dread to its object [is] to something which is nothing." (Kierkegaard 1944, 39) Angst is anxiety about "one's own potential for existence...one's 'being able' as one's capacity for self-determination," (Magurshak 1985, 172) and as such, one is anxious about nothing, insofar as the possibilities that lie ahead of one can be called 'nothing' in their non-actuality. Kierkegaard speaks of 'spirit' as the synthesis of the psychological and the physical (Dunning 1985, 14), as a defining characteristic of humans that is related to itself and its situation as anxiety

or dread. (Kierkegaard 1944, 40) Spirit is what allows humans to determine their selves through their possibilities. It is clear that Heidegger appropriates this account of Angst almost in its entirety; when he says that "Nothing of that which is at hand and objectively present within the world, functions as what which *Angst* is anxious about," (SZ 186) he echoes Kierkegaard's claim. Similarly, Heideggerian Angst concerns Dasein's being-in-the-world, and its potentiality-for-being, or the possibilities that may come about in the future.

Another idea that Kierkegaard puts forth is the self as lost in the public world, resulting in dread or anxiety, requiring a major commitment that defines one's life, which he calls the 'leap of faith.' Kierkegaard believes that this commitment involves a relation to the absolute The self that has made the leap is similar to Heidegger's authentic self in that it realizes it has many possibilities and the choices that it makes define its life. Both Kierkegaard and Heidegger speak disparagingly of the public. Kierkegaard describes the public as characterized by "detached, superficial knowing and understanding...hand-in-hand with talkativeness, the superficial discussion of anything and everything." (Hall 1984, 192) This is clearly a precursor to Heidegger's discussion of the idle talk, curiosity and ambiguity of the They, although Kierkegaard does not incorporate the public as part of the essential structure of human being. In this sense, Heidegger is right in calling it ontic-existentiell, since it is concerned more with the specific situation of the modern era, rather than as an always already present feature of Dasein. However, both philosophers would concede that an authentic existence would require tearing one's self away from the public. I will discuss in more detail the nature of the relationship between Kierkegaard, Heidegger and authenticity in Chapter 4.

However, as with Nietzsche, Heidegger believed that Kierkegaard was only addressing the ontic-existentiell aspect of existence and that "the existential problematic is so foreign to him that in an ontological regard he is completely under the influence of Hegel and his view of ancient philosophy." (SZ 235 n.6) Kierkegaard himself refers to *The Concept of Dread* as a "psychological deliberation." (Kierkegaard 1944, 21) He did not intend his account of Angst to be an ontological one, but Heidegger faults him for failing to examine the ontological foundations of being, and falling prey to the forgetting of being in the same way as the rest of the philosophical tradition.

1.2.3 Husserl

In some respects, Heidegger can be seen as member of the existentialist tradition, but he is probably more famously associated with phenomenology, a school of thought beginning in the late nineteenth century with Brentano and Husserl, carrying up to the mid-twentieth century, with Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Heidegger was greatly influenced by Husserl, although their views diverged quite early in Heidegger's philosophical career. Heidegger mentions Husserl occasionally in *Being and Time*, but never really explicitly criticizes him or takes up his views in order to refute them. During the period towards the end of his life, Husserl developed material concerning self-responsibility and the life-world, in *Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1936). There is also talk of self-responsibility in the *Cartesian Meditations* (1931). Seeing as Husserl wrote these works after Heidegger had published *Being and Time*, one may ask to what extent he was influenced by Heidegger's work, or vice versa. For Husserl, the life-world (*Lebenswelt*) is "the world pregiven...the world valid as existing for us and to which

we, together, belong, the world as world for all, pregiven with this ontic meaning." (Husserl 1970, 109) The life-world is the world we live in, that is there for each of us, in which everything we do is based, and constitutes the "sole absolute foundation of all our moral, scientific, philosophical, and everyday practices." (Bell 1990, 228) Physical objects, for instance, are only one part of the life-world, which also contains cultural, social, moral and other aspects. This is similar to Heidegger's idea that humans always exist in a world that is always already 'there,' consisting of both physical and social aspects.

There are certainly further similarities between the two concerning the idea of everydayness as being inauthentic. Husserl called this state of average everydayness the natural attitude, and describes it as "straightforwardly living toward whatever objects are given…in normal, unbroken constancy…We, the subjects, in our normal, unbroken, coherent life, know no goals which extend beyond this; indeed we have no idea that there could be others." (Husserl 1970, 144) The natural attitude is a state of naïveté concerning the actual constitution of the world, and in this state the subject fails to see the transcendental nature of the world and its subjective constitution (Buckley 1992, 200) This unquestioning attitude towards the world leads Husserl to develop the phenomenological reduction, or transcendental *epoché*, as a method of escaping the unproven assumptions and conjectures of the natural attitude. The *epoché* requires the exclusion of all principles not founded on absolute evidence from being a basis for philosophical reflection   It involves a purposeful decision to philosophize without careless assumptions or prejudice, basing everything on absolutely certain evidence, and requires an attitude of philosophical self-responsibility. (Husserl 1960, 6) The entire process that Husserl describes, moving from a naïve natural attitude to responsible philosophical awareness, is a precursor to

Heidegger's process of becoming authentic through resoluteness, where authentic Dasein decides to take a stand against falling back into the inauthenticity of the They. However, while the phenomenological reduction requires that Husserl separate the everyday world from apodictic knowledge, the process of being authentic ultimately leads Heidegger to the realization that any apodictic knowledge we have will always be affected by the everyday world. While Husserl saw everydayness as something to be cast aside, Heidegger takes it up as the basis of his existential analysis. However, Husserl, in his marginal notes to *Being and Time*, claims that Heidegger's method retains the problem he himself tried to eliminate through the phenomenological reduction: a fundamental ontology based on everydayness will never attain a "transcendental, philosophical perspective" (Dreyfus & Haugeland 1978, 232) because it has not removed the presuppositions of the natural attitude.

Although the form is similar, Husserl's project is an epistemological one and the phenomenological reduction has an existentiell, rather than an existential, function. (Theunissen 1984, 188) Husserl was concerned with how we come to know and the possibility of apodictically certain knowledge, not with an ontology of being. The self-responsibility that Husserl speaks of in the *Cartesian Meditations* is an epistemological idea of responsibility, where Heidegger's authenticity is a form of ontological responsibility. For Heidegger, epistemology and the study of human cognition are not the fundamental issues of philosophy, especially since he maintains that our primary mode of interacting with the world is practical, rather than cognitive. Although Heidegger may have been influenced by Husserl's phenomenology, he would still considered his project to be lacking a focus on the question of being.

Although there are parallels to authenticity in the works of Husserl, Nietzsche and Kierkegaard, Heidegger's main criticism is their lack of ontological concern; they all ignore the 'question of the meaning of being.' For a proper account of Heidegger's concept of authenticity, it is absolutely necessary to situate it within the context of his project of fundamental ontology. I will now turn to an examination of fundamental ontology and the existential analysis of Dasein.

2. Dasein, Average Everydayness, and Inauthenticity

2.1 An Overview of the Question of Being

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger is attempting to address the question of the meaning of being. What does it mean 'to be'? What is 'being'? Generally, he believes that Plato and Aristotle had a proper understanding of being, but for later philosophy, it "ceased to be heard *as a thematic question of actual investigation.*" (SZ 2) None of the philosophers after Plato and Aristotle cared to pay any attention to what 'being' means, seeing it as a universal and empty concept that everyone supposedly understands already, and for which a definition would be impossible and unneccessary. (SZ 2) This is an enormous mistake, says Heidegger, and has led to a philosophical tradition with an incorrect conception of ontology. He proposes to take up the question of the meaning of being in an attempt to finally give an appropriate and correct formulation of ontology.

The quest to understand the question of the meaning of being leads to Dasein, or human being, since questioning or inquiry is one of the ways in which Dasein can exist. Essentially, since Dasein is able to ask the question, we must first understand the being of Dasein as something that questions, in order to understand the question itself. The fact that only Dasein can ask this question means that it is the only being that understands 'being', the only one with some sort of grasp of what it means 'to be,' which Heidegger calls a pre-ontological understanding of being. In his attempt to unearth the meaning of all being, he uses Dasein as his starting point precisely because "*understanding of being is itself a determination of being of Dasein.* The ontic distinction of Dasein lies in the fact that it *is* ontological" (SZ 12) Dasein is the only entity that has the special characteristic of understanding being. Thus, the first

task in realizing Heidegger's project is the existential analysis of Dasein itself in order to discern its fundamental ontology.

2.1.1 The Priority of Dasein

We should first examine Heidegger's controversial claim that an understanding of Dasein is necessary in order to understand being. The controversy concerns the appropriateness of moving from the question of being to Dasein, and whether the argument Heidegger presents is valid. Heidegger believes that an analysis of the existential structures of Dasein is a necessary first step in addressing the question of being, but many critics question whether this is correct. We will examine various criticisms of Heidegger's argument and see if it can be salvaged.

Heidegger's argument that being can only be understood by an analysis of that which understands being commits what Grossmann calls the 'epistemological fallacy.' This argument is similar to the claim that, for example, in order to understand frogs, we must first understand the being that understands frogs—that before frogs can be analyzed, we must analyze Dasein's understanding. This analogy makes Heidegger's claim seem unreasonable. However, the argument can be made valid if the premise is introduced that there is something special about the relationship between Dasein and being, namely that Dasein's understanding of being somehow influences or determines being. (Grossmann 1984, 153) If Dasein's understanding itself determines being, then this determination must be examined in order to properly understand being. Philipse also refers to this problem inherent in Heidegger's argument, and offers a similar solution that attaches a transcendental theme to *Being and Time*. A transcendental argument has two aspects: first, the claim that some sort of subjective condition is needed in order to experience beings,

then, that these conditions "specify the necessary conditions that these entities must satisfy in order to *be*, in the sense of being accessible to us." (Philipse 1998, 122) Heidegger differentiates between the everyday concept of a phenomenon, as objectively present entities, and the phenomenological concept of a phenomenon as "what already shows itself in appearances prior to and always accompanying what we commonly understand as phenomena." (SZ 31) The phenomenological method requires an examination of the latter type of phenomena, rather than the former. Heidegger calls the Kantian forms of intution, space and time, the phenomena of phenomenology (SZ 31), as that which underlies and presupposes empirical beings, and makes our understanding of them possible. (Philipse 1998, 122) Continuing the parallel with Kant, who held that space and time were the subjective conditions necessary for experiencing phenomena, and that these forms of intuition are the conditions the phenomena must satisfy in order to be available to us, we can attribute to Dasein's understanding of being the role of the condition needed to experience phenomena and to being itself the role of the condition the phenomena must satisfy to be accessible. (Philipse 1998, 122)[1] Frede offers a similar solution to the problem. She believes that Heidegger's argument for the priority of Dasein is valid, since Dasein is the only entry point available from which to begin an analysis of being. Dasein's understanding is the only understanding of being we have, and the only sense of being we can have is therefore affected by our understanding of it. (Frede 1993, 55) Generally, the only way to make sense of Heidegger's argument is to insert the premise that being is directly influenced by Dasein's understanding of it,

---

[1] Philipse speaks of 'subjective' conditions, although this is not really applicable to Heidegger, who attempted to do away with the subject-object distinction. It may be more appropriate to refer to phenomenological phenomena as the *a priori* conditions that underlie objectively present phenomena.

and this being the case, it is obvious that an analysis of Dasein's understanding of being is a necessary first step in understanding being.

Philipse introduces another problem: why should an understanding of the being of Dasein provide a fundamental ontology applicable to all beings? Can the being of Dasein be the same as, for instance, the being of frogs? There seems, at first, nothing inherently special about the being of Dasein that would explain its privileged place as the basis for Heidegger's ontology. Dasein does have certain 'ontical priorities,' or priorities over other beings in its facticity, namely it is concerned with being, including not only its own being, but "the understanding of something like 'world' and the understanding of the being of beings accessible within the world." (SZ 13) Dasein's other ontic priority is its existence, its choice of the possibilities in its life and its "manner of seizing upon or neglecting such possibilities." (SZ 13) This gives priority because no other beings have the ability to determine their being through choice. Philipse does not dispute the ontic priority of Dasein, but questions the assumption Heidegger seems to make that this gives Dasein ontological priority as well: "The ontic privileges of Dasein do not imply its ontological primacy, and from the fact that Dasein is that author of ontology and science it does not follow that Dasein should be its privileged topic." (Philipse 1998, 44) The transcendental theme that Philipse presented earlier, however, serves to explain why Dasein has priority over other beings: since Dasein is that through which being becomes accessible, it only makes sense that the ontology of Dasein is fundamental ontology. (Philipse 1998, 123)

Grossmann points out another assumption that Heidegger makes. Given that knowledge of Dasein's understanding of being is required, he must justify his assumption that because Dasein's understanding is part of what it means to be Dasein,

we must first know what it means to *be* Dasein in order to comprehend the understanding of Dasein. (Grossman 1984, 153) In essence, Grossmann takes issue with Heidegger's claim that to understand part of something, one must understand the whole. This issue can be fairly easily resolved. Things like understanding, questioning, and choosing are "constitutive attitudes of inquiry and are thus themseves modes of being." (SZ 7) The ability of Dasein to ask questions, choose information and gain understanding are ways of being that are characteristic exclusively of Dasein. In order to understand these modes of being, we must understand what it means to be a mode of being of Dasein, which necessitates an understanding of the being of Dasein.

The last issue we will address concerning Heidegger's focus on Dasein is its similarity (or dissimilarity) to Husserl's transcendental ego. Heidegger did not agree with Husserl's idea that the transcendental ego could be reached by bracketing the world, and that apodictic knowledge could only be reached through this ego. The Husserlian transcendental ego is the pure 'I,' detached from the world; Heidegger disagreed that the self could be understood as removed from its world, and also opposed Husserl's intentionality, which held that the primary mode of understanding and interacting with the world is cognition. However, Heidegger had to come to grips with the nature of human being as the entity that has a concern for being, while maintaining the importance of the world, and thus he introduces Dasein. (Frede 1993, 54) Similarly, Philipse acknowledges that Heidegger's priority of Dasein can be seen as parallel to, and a criticism of, Husserl's idea of the transcendental ego. (Philipse 1998, 42) The concept of Dasein, or 'there-being' literally translated from the German, emphasizes Dasein's nature as a being that is in the world. We see the similarities between Heidegger and Husserl in their emphasis on a human being, in

some form, as having priority over other beings. The difference lies in the ability of human being to be detached from its world. Husserl argues that the transcendental ego can exist independently of the world, while for Heidegger there is no possibility of Dasein somehow breaking free from the world, since Dasein's being is always being-in-the-world. Before we can look at being-in-the-world, it will be helpful to examine the phenomenological method Heidegger uses in his analysis.

2.1.2 Heidegger's Method: Phenomenology

Heidegger begins his existential analysis of Dasein with the way it is in everyday life, however, in order to properly understand why Heidegger chooses average everydayness as his starting point, it will be first necessary to give an outline of his phenomenological method. In *Being and Time*'s Introduction, section 7, Heidegger gives an overview of his conception of phenomenology. He is writing in response to phenomenology as developed by Husserl. Athough Heidegger does not explicitly criticize Husserl, and mentions him only a few times in *Being and Time*, Heidegger intentionally deviates from Husserlian phenomenology a great deal, although there remain some aspects that are common to both accounts. We see a deviation from Husserl in Heidegger's notion of phenomenology, the main feature of which is Heidegger's rejection of the phenomenological reduction and transcendental ego. (Kockelmans 1967, 273)

Husserl's phenomenology focuses on 'bracketing' the natural attitude, in which all natural and physical sciences, and indeed the world itself, are put aside and not used as premises for philosophizing. The purpose of this exercise is to set aside all unquestioned assumptions, and to build a philosophy that is built entirely upon premises that are apodictically certain. By bracketing the world, Husserl arrives at a

transcendental ego, but Heidegger rejects the idea that the self can be separated from the world in this manner, considering it to be a form of Cartesianism that Husserl does not escape. Heidegger's concept of pre-ontological understanding means that Dasein always already has an understanding of being even before it develops an ontology. Dasein understands itself first and foremost in terms of the world, as a being that relates to the world that surrounds it. Furthermore, while Husserl sees the self's relation with the world mainly in terms of cognition and perception, as a subject-object relation wherein the 'I' perceives the world, Heidegger believes that Dasein engages with the world in a manner that is principally concerned with living its life in the midst of the world, as is thus caught up with the everyday aspects of this life including mood, cares, and possibilities. (Moran 2000, 228) Cognition is a function that arises on top of our pre-ontological ability to deal with equipment in the world, not as not our primary mode of dealing with the world, as Husserl believed it to be. Dasein encounters beings in the world in a practical way, as objects that are used in order to perform a specific task (the for-sake-of-which). Dasein determines these objects in terms of the role they play in the task it seeks to undertake; for instance, in hammering a nail, we understand the hammer as that which will allow us to pound it into the board, not as a specific instantiation of the concept of 'hammer.'

Up to a point, Heidegger follows Husserl's method in refusing to accept presuppositions about Dasein's being and reality, and rejecting the sciences precisely because they are built upon unquestioned assumptions about being. However, for Heidegger, the issue of presuppositions is complex. Although Heidegger does not use the Husserlian term 'phenomenological reduction' in *Being and Time*, he does use it in the *Basic Problems in Phenomenology*. In this work, however,he uses it

differently to mean the process of "leading phenomenological vision back from the apprehension of a being...to the understanding of the being of this being," (Heidegger 1981, 21) rather than Husserl's process of bracketing the objective world in order to arrive at apodictic truths. However, there is a major difference between Husserl and Heidegger in terms of the rejection of presuppositions. Heidegger speaks, in *Being and Time*, about a destructuring of ontology that involves rejecting the historical account of ontology, "a loosening of the sclerotic tradition and a dissolving of the concealments produced by it." (SZ 22) The philosophical tradition has forced ontological interpretations on us that we are unable to question because we lack a starting point from which to begin. The proper question of being has been unresolved, inadequately formulated, and ultimately forgotten (SZ 21), and as such, someone who wanted to inquire into the the meaning of being has nowhere to start that is not coloured by the assumptions and concealments of previous metaphysics. Heidegger wishes to reject previous accounts of ontology, including those of Kant and Descartes, as well as the current method of treating ontology, because they have failed to take into account the proper question of being. This process seems to follow the Husserlian mode of eradicating assumptions, but Heidegger realizes the impossibility of completely doing away with all presuppositions. Asking the question 'What is being?' itself involves a presupposition that we have some understanding of what it means to be. Any question we ask about being requires an interpretation of being based upon some knowledge that we already possess. As Mulhall puts it, "we must enter the circle by initiating our enquiry on the basis of some pre-conception...and then, when we reach a provisional conclusion, return to our starting point with the benefit of a deeper understanding." (Mulhall 1996, 31) This is the hermeneutic circle, which Heidegger says is the "methodological meaning

of phenomenological description." (SZ 37)   In this sense, then, Heidegger and

Husserl differ greatly. Husserl believes that it is possible to achieve a viewpoint free

from assumptions, while for Heidegger, any starting-point, no matter how

apodictically certain it may claim to be, is never free from presuppositions. The

hermeneutic circle embraces this idea, but does so from a critical perspective.

For Heidegger, phenomenology is a method that "does not characterize the

'what' of the objects of philosophical research in terms of their content but the 'how'

of such research." (SZ 27)   He breaks the word down into its constituents,

phenomenon and logos. Phenomenon means "what shows itself, the self-showing,

the manifest." (SZ 28) The usual or common idea of the phenomenon, as that which

is shown, presupposes a phenomenological concept of the phenomenon. (Dreyfus

1991, 30) Husserl's idea of the phenomenon as an appearance to consciousness,

which indicates the common idea of phenomenon, is dropped by Heidegger. As

shown earlier, the phenomenological phenomenon is that which accompanies and

makes possible our experience of objectively present beings, like the Kantian forms

of intuition, space and time. In the Kantian picture, our experience always takes a

form that is mediated by the presupposition of space and time, although they are not

what one would commonly conceive of as phenomena. Logos is taken by Heidegger

to mean discourse, in the sense of making the object of discourse manifest in speech,

revealing it as itself through discursive communication.   Thus, taken together,

phenomenology refers to "every way of indicating beings as they show themselves in

themselves." (SZ 35) In the context of *Being and Time*, a phenomenon is that which

"does *not* show itself initially and for the most part, something that is *concealed*" yet

"at the same time is something that essentially belongs to what initially and for the

most part shows itself, indeed in such a way that it constitutes its meaning and

ground." (SZ 35) The object of phenomenology is being, as that which has become

covered over yet remains the ground of phenomena in the usual sense.

The proper task of phenomenology is the interpretation of being, by which

"the proper meaning of being and the basic structures of the very being of Dasein are

made known to the understanding of being that belongs to Dasein itself." (SZ 37)

Being is the appropriate subject matter for phenomenology as the thing that underlies

and makes possible experience, but is still concealed and waiting to be disclosed.

The point of entry into the hermeneutic circle must allow for the disclosure of being

in an accurate way that does not incorporate the failings of previous ontologies. In

the philosophical tradition, the state of average everydayness has not been considered

as an object of proper theoretical investigation, and this is one of the reasons it is an

appropriate place to enter the hermeneutic circle, since it is untainted with prior

philosophical conceptions. Furthermore, the nature of average everydayness is such

that it will allow the ontological structures of Dasein to be disclosed through an

examination of ontic aspects. It is worth bearing in mind one point that Mulhall

brings up: Heidegger's choice of everydayness does not imply that this state is

inherently more authentic or more valuable than other modes of being such as the

scientific or theoretical positions. (Mulhall 1996, 19) In terms of methodological

considerations,   however,   he   did   consider   everydayness   to   be   more

phenomenologically significant. Although disciplines such as biology, psychology,

or anthropology can provide various interpretations of Dasein's being, these fields

have arrived at their understandings without examining the existential foundations of

being.   Heidegger believes that "positivistic investigation does not see these

[ontological] foundations and considers them to be self-evident." (SZ 50)   The

sciences can give us an everyday understanding of being, but there is no guarantee

that these fields have derived their pictures of being from the genuine truth about

Dasein rather than from traditional or dogmatic conceptions of human being.

(Mulhall 1996, 18)   In fact, average everydayness is itself characterized by

inauthenticity, and the next section will deal with the relationship between these two

ideas. ·

2.2 Everydayness and Inauthenticity

2.2.1 Everydayness as a Starting Point for Existential Analysis

Existential analysis is the term Heidegger uses to refer to the analysis of the

existential or ontological structures that underlie the being of Dasein.   These

fundamental existential properties define Dasein universally, regardless of its

specific existentiell structure.   'Existentiell', or 'ontic', refers to the specific

"possibility of being of each existing Dasein," (SZ 13) which means the different

possibilities each individual Dasein has, depending on their specific circumstances in

the world. Existentiell properties are not ontologically fundamental because they are

not universal, whereas the existential structures of Dasein belong to each Dasein

regardless of their particular existentiell situation.   However, "the roots of the

existential analysis, for their part, are ultimately *existentiell*—they are *ontic*," (SZ 13)

and "only when philosophical research and inquiry themselves are grasped in an

existentiell way—as a possibility of being of each existing Dasein—does it become

possible at all to disclose the existentiality of existence." (SZ 13) The philosophical

search for the meaning of being is only understood through our existence because it

is a mode of existence. (SZ 12) The question of being is a question that Dasein asks

in its everyday, factual, ontic mode of being, but it concerns existential and

ontological structures. Thus, the possibility of getting at a fundamental ontology must go through an ontic or existentiell route.

The appropriate starting point from which to begin the existential analysis of Dasein must be in the existentiell aspect of Dasein, and it must not be arbitrary or dogmatic. (SZ 16) Every mode of being for Dasein carries with it an implicit pre-ontological understanding of being (Mulhall, 17), so every mode can be seen as a possible starting point. However, the method of entry into the analysis must be such that "the manner of access and interpretation must instead be chosen in such a way that this being can show itself to itself on its own terms. And furthermore, this manner should show that being as it is *initially and for the most part—in its average everydayness.*" (SZ 16) Thus, Heidegger chooses the average everyday existence of Dasein as the entry point for his existential analysis. Generally, however, the state of average everydayness has been considered by philosophers to be an unsuitable basis for ontological considerations.

Heidegger sets out to clarify the existential basis of Dasein and begins with everyday Dasein precisely because traditional philosophy tends to pass over it. As such, the state of everydayness is unlikely to be tainted with the traditional philosophical misconceptions that Heidegger is so anxious to avoid. Philosophy ignores average everydayness because it is ontically closest to us—it is the state accessible to us immediately, yet "what is ontically nearest and familiar is ontologically the farthest, unrecognized and constantly overlooked in its ontological significance." (SZ 43) Our everyday state, as what is immediately accessible, is taken for granted as mere absorption with what is in the world and is overlooked as a source of existential importance. For Heidegger, however, the essential structures of being can be found in everydayness because "Dasein is concerned with a particular

mode of its being to which it is related in the way of average everydayness, if only in the way of fleeing *from* it and of forgetting *it*." (SZ 45) The ontic structures that are present in everyday Dasein are not just another aspect of Dasein, but have similarities to the ontological structure of authentic Dasein (SZ 44). Thus, if Heidegger delineates the structures that are present in average everydayness, he will have a sort of structural framework that is applicable to the ontological structures of Dasein as well.

2.2.2 The Concept of Inauthenticity in *Being and Time*

Heidegger's first mention of inauthenticity in *Being and Time* occurs in Section 9, "The Theme of the Analytic of Dasein." One of the features of being particular to Dasein is its 'mineness' or 'ownness' (*Jemeinigkeit*). This means that Dasein always recognizes itself as having its own being, in contrast to objectively present objects that do not have this understanding. Dasein understands itself as being itself rather than something or someone else, and as having possibilities that belong solely to itself. Authenticity and inauthenticity are two kinds of being related to this characteristic of mine-ness. Heidegger goes into more detail in Chapter II, where he elaborates on the idea that "Mineness belongs to existing Dasein as the condition of the possibility of authenticity and inauthenticity. Dasein exists always in one of these modes, or else in the modal indifference to them." (SZ 53) There is some controversy over this passage and the claim that there seem to be in fact three modes of existence, although Heidegger never really discusses what it means to be indifferent Dasein. This issue will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Heidegger thinks that our average everyday understanding of being is inauthentic and that "Dasein tends to understand its own being in terms of that being

to which it is essentially, continually, and most closely related—the 'world,'" (SZ 15) rather than understanding its being authentically, on its own terms. By everydayness, Heidegger refers to the state that Dasein is in "initially and for the most part," (SZ 16) in which a pre-ontological conception of being is always present. That is to say, in everyday existence, Dasein has some idea of what it means 'to be,' although this idea is not fully made explicit. Averageness is Heidegger's term for the "everyday indifference of Dasein," (SZ 43) meaning the state where Dasein is undifferentiated in terms of its existence—it does not know the difference between authentic and inauthentic existence. In our average everyday lives, we are absorbed with the world, yet we have an implicit idea of being that enables us to understand the world. A proper understanding of why average everydayness is inauthentic requires a closer examination of Heidegger's concept of world and Dasein's being as being-in-the-world.

2.2.3 Being-in-the-world and *Mitdasein*

Chapter III of *Being and Time* contains a discussion of the phenomenon of world. World can be used in a variety of different contexts, both ontic and ontological. In one ontic sense, world is our usual usage of the term: "the totality of beings which can be objectively present within the world." (SZ 64) Ontologically, world can refer to the being of objectively present beings or to a particular region that encompasses many beings; Heidegger gives the example of the 'world' of mathematics referring to a region of all possible mathematical objects. Another ontic meaning, but one with a pre-ontological and existentiell sense, defines world as "that '*in which*' a factical Dasein 'lives.'" (SZ 64) This can refer to the public world or surrounding world in which one carries out one's existence, and we can see this as a

pre-cursor to Heidegger's world of the They (*das Man*). In Chapter IV, Heidegger takes the phenomenon of world and discusses what it means for Dasein to be in-the-world.

Heidegger is offering a formulation of Dasein's relation to the world from an involved rather than a detached perspective. Dasein is always absorbed in the world, and part of this world involves the existence of other Dasein. One's interaction with 'things at hand,' or material objects, implies the existence of other humans. Heidegger gives examples of walking alongside a field which is seen to belong to a specific person, or a book which was sold by another specific person, and so on. (SZ 118) Dasein's encounters with its surrounding physical world always point to the existence of others, and "the world is always already the one I share with the others. The world of Dasein is a *with-world*. Being-in is a *being-with* others." (SZ 118) Dasein is 'thrown' into a world that always refers to others, whether or not they are physically there. Being-with-others is not confined to literally being in the physical presence of others. Even if I were the last person on earth, I would still be-with (*Mitdasein*) others in the sense that all of the physical objects I encounter refer to others, perhaps in a relation of belonging or being made by or even just being available for others to encounter, since " 'things' are encountered from the world in which they are at hand for the others." (SZ 118) This world, populated and influenced by others, is the world in which Dasein always already finds itself, and it is specifically through encounters in the world that Dasein gets a notion of the other. Dasein does not formulate an idea of the other in isolation from the world, simply by examining the self and extrapolating, as Husserl thought was possible. Rather, Heidegger says that "[others] are not encountered by first looking at oneself and then ascertaining the opposite pole of a distinction. They are encountered from the *world*

in which Dasein...essentially dwells." (SZ 119) Furthermore, by 'others,' Heidegger refers to "those from whom one mostly does *not* distinguish oneself, those among whom one is, too," (SZ 118) and there is a sense of an inclusive group to which Dasein belongs. For Heidegger, the physical world and references to other Dasein are inseparable.

Heidegger believes that it is always the case that Dasein is with-others. It would seem that an existence of complete isolation seems to disprove his point. It is possible that an individual could be born and live out his entire life without contact with other humans, so it does not seem necessary, as Heidegger claims, that Dasein's existence need always be with others. However, Heidegger points out that an isolated existence is only an ontic possibility—a factical case of a particular Dasein. Being-with, on the other hand, is an existential-ontological characteristic that pertains to all Dasein, regardless of its factical situation. Being-with applies to the existence of the Dasein alone on a desert island as much as to the Dasein in the midst of a crowd, and "being-alone is a deficient mode of being-with." (SZ 120) It is only because Dasein is with-others that it can be alone : "the other can be *lacking* only *in* and *for* a being-with." (SZ 120) Mulhall points out that the idea of being-with is necessary, because without being-with, it would be impossible for Dasein to encounter others in a comprehensible way. (Mulhall 1996, 66) The condition of our having intelligible encounters with others is having being-with as an existential-ontological structure.

There are various counter-arguments one might propose to Heidegger's claim that Dasein is always with-others. The objects on an uninhabited island do not seem to carry with them the same meanings of others. A person stranded on this island does not see the palm trees as belonging to another person, or the coconuts as picked

by another person; there are no references to others simply because others have never dealt with these particular objects. Heidegger might claim that being-with is still present, since the stranded person brings with him ideas about how to deal with the palm trees and coconuts that were instilled in him during his time in civilization. But what if this isolated individual had been born and spent his entire life on the island, without ever coming into contact with other humans? In this case, it seems, there can be no being-with-others in his interaction with the world because the concept of the other is utterly foreign to him. In this case, how can this individual be said to be alone in a deficient mode of being-with-others? Take the example of a child raised in the woods by wolves: often such children have no comprehension of other individuals and are not capable of intelligible interaction with other humans. Perhaps Heidegger would argue that such children cannot be considered Dasein precisely because they have no sense of being-with-others. However, after being brought into society, these children often learn to communicate with others, at least at a rudimentary level. Either this suggests that being-with-others was always already a part of the child's being, or that it is possible to move from non-Dasein to Dasein. This second possibility raises another set of questions about the distinction between animals and humans: higher primates that learn to communicate through sign language can be seen to have some concern about their own being. Can they be called Dasein?

In any case, Heidegger examines the aspects of the world to which Dasein relates in its average everydayness, and in asking the question "Who is everyday Dasein?," concludes that Dasein, because its being is being-in-the-world, necessarily interacts with others and is influenced and shaped by them. By others he does not mean just other individual human beings, but also the ideas and norms that are

determined by society, which includes the totality of individuals, yet is something more. In Chapter IV of *Being and Time*, he says that since Dasein encounters its own being in a world that is filled with others, and is concerned and absorbed by others and the world rather than its own being, Dasein is not properly itself in this context. Because we are surrounded by others all the time, we are constantly aware of what they are doing, how we differ from them, and in what ways our self might be inferior or just different; this is an existential characteristic of Dasein that Heidegger calls distantiality: "In taking care of the things which one has taken hold of, for, and against others, there is constant care as to the way one differs from then, whether this difference is to be equalized, whether one's own Dasein has lagged behind others and wants to catch up in relation to them...Being-with-one-another is, unknown to itself, disquieted about the care about this distance." (SZ 126) Heidegger says that distantiality comes from the fact that being-with-one-another as such creates averageness, an existential characteristic of the They (SZ 127). The They is concerned with averageness insofar as it deems what is proper and what is allowed for us in our particular society, the norms and customs that define our society. Everything we encounter in our daily lives is the repetition and similarity that orders our lives in which "every other is like the next." (SZ 126) Heidegger refers to public transportation and the use of information services as examples in which this is the case. It is impossible to use either without some clue as to the average actions that one must perform in, for example, riding the train. We must know at some pre-ontological level that it is necessary to buy a ticket, show the ticket, wait for the train, maintain decorum, etc. in order to perform the action of using public transportation. Although this may create averageness it is also important to remember that only through these similarities and shared experiences that intelligibility can exist.

Without the similar experiences and norms that surround public transportation, chaos would result and no shared public meaning would exist. If, as Heidegger claims, all intelligibility comes from social context, then a certain degree of averageness is necessary.

Heidegger concludes that as humans we always find ourselves existing in what can be described as a public context. It is important to note, however, that Heidegger never explicitly uses terms such as 'social context' or 'cultural norms,' and that this is more a matter of interpretation. For instance, Dreyfus in his *Being-in-the-World*, frequently refers to "public norms" (Dreyfus 1996, 151; 153) as the normal ways of acting to which one is expected to conform, dictated by the They. It seems appropriate to attribute a social quality to the world, insofar as for Heidegger intelligibility requires shared meaning. However, calling these shared social meaning norms implies that there is a reference to how one ought to act. Dreyfus' Wittgensteinian interpretation attributes this idea of norms to Heidegger, a claim which I will examine in depth later. In any case, I believe that the world as Heidegger describes it can be safely called a social context, in the sense that it is an intersubjective environment with shared meaning.

2.2.4 The They (*das Man*)

The shared practices that give intelligibility also have a less favourable side. Dasein's concern for things and others in the world means that any difference between Dasein and others becomes evident; Heidegger calls this "constant care as to the way one differs from them…whether one's own Dasein has lagged behind others" (SZ 126) distantiality. The care Dasein has about oneself and others proves to be a dangerous thing, because it allows for Dasein to become subservient to

'others.' By others, Heidegger is referring the idea of the They (*das Man*). He delineates several characteristics that will be helpful to examine in order to give a better idea of this rather vague concept.

The They has several ways of being, which Heidegger calls publicness; these include distantiality, averageness, and levelling down. Distantiality, as mentioned before, consists in the care about the distance between oneself and others. Averageness is, in a factical sense, the idea of propriety and what is allowed. Levelling down occurs when everything primordial and exceptional is squashed down to the level of the average, and then re-absorbed. Taken together, these three characteristics ensure that anything out of the ordinary is brought down to an average level, precisely because Dasein wishes to maintain its sameness to others as much as possible. These aspects of the They have various repurcussions for the being of Dasein, since Dasein is always absorbed within the They. First, it takes Dasein's responsibility for making decisions away—Dasein need not take any responsibilities for its decisions because they can be blamed on the They, since Dasein's choices can be determined only from options that are available from what the They construes as appropriate. What I do in situation can be justified as 'what one does' in such a situation, and this results in a disburdening of Dasein's everydayness—by relieving Dasein of the need to be accountable for its actions and decisions, the They "accommodates Dasein in its tendency to take things easily and make them easily." (SZ 128) Because of this disburdening, Dasein has no real incentive to act in such a way that does not give over all its responsibility to the They, thus perpetuating its domination of the everyday world.

But can the They be more precisely described than through reference to a few of its characteristics? The They is not an objectively present entity, and one cannot

pick out its physical presence because it does not have one. But although it does not have physical objective presence, it is not nothing—it still exists. Heidegger does not really give an adequate explanation of what it is, rather he tries to say what it isn't. The They is not the "objective presence of several subjects," it is not the sum total of various subjects; one could collect every single individual in the entire history of the world, and one would still not have a grasp on the They. At the other extreme, the They could be conceived of as a "universal subject" that reigns over a plurality of subjects. This conception of the They is incompatible with the idea of the subject as Dasein, since it tends to interpret the subject as an objectively present instance of the genus of human being, but the They is not of the same genus as human being, nor is it a characteristic of individual human being. (SZ 128-129) This idea of the They also has ontological roots in the idea of objective presence. However, Heidegger is quite clear that the They is not an objective presence, and he attempts to solve the problem of describing exactly what it is by claiming that the They is an existential, and "belongs as a primordial phenomenon to the positive constitution of Dasein." (SZ 129). It manifests itself in various ways through Dasein. The They is not a being, nor is it a collection of beings. It is a fundamental existential characteristic of Dasein involving the way it interacts with others in the world.

Heidegger claims that Dasein is not its real self when it is immersed in the They. Given that our average everyday life is exclusively comprised of decisions and actions made with the influence of the They, we are not our 'real selves' in this state of average everydayness. Heidegger here differentiates between the everyday, inauthentic They-self of Dasein and the authentic self, which has 'found' itself and explicitly grasped its being. Dasein is 'lost' in the They in its average everydayness, and to be its real self it must extricate itself from the grasp of the They. In Chapter IV,

however, he describes only the characteristics of the inauthentic self. What does it mean to not be one's real self? For Heidegger, it means being in the mode of the They—one's possibilities and responsibilities are given to oneself in terms of the They. For many scholars of Heidegger's thought, including Dreyfus and Rubin, the claim that we are not our real selves in our average everydayness presents a large problem: if all intelligibility is a result of the They, how can Dasein be anything else but inauthentic? Such issues will be addressed in Chapter 4.

2.2.5 Entanglement and Falling Prey

Heidegger examines three existential characteristics of the They that constitute Dasein's being of everydayness: idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity; these characteristics reveal the entanglement of Dasein, or the fact that Dasein is in and together with the world. By idle talk, Heidegger is referring to "the mode of being of the understanding and interpretation of everyday Dasein," (SZ 167) a form of groundless discourse in which the subject of conversation is understood only in a superficial way, but as a universal superficiality that ensures everyone understands what is being said by virtue of this shared averageness. Curiosity is the tendency to see things without interpreting or understanding them; it describes the desire to see new things for the sake of novelty, but without a desire to gain a deeper knowledge than is readily available through cursory examination. Ambiguity involves the inability to "decide what is disclosed in genuine understanding and what is not," (SZ 173) which comes about because everything is accessible to all, and everyone has a superficial opinion about everything (i.e. the product of idle talk and curiosity). It prevents us from seeing things clearly and "passes off talking about things ahead of time and curious guessing as what is really happening, and stamps carrying things

out and taking action as something subsequent and of no importance." (SZ 174) These three characteristics are all intertwined with each other, and from this interconnection we get entanglement. Entanglement in itself, however, is not necessarily a negative thing, despite the language Heidegger uses to describe its · characteristics and the generally disparaging descriptions of being immersed in the They. Heidegger repeatedly claims, however, that these terms should not be taken in a disparaging sense: "the expression 'idle talk' is not used here in a disparaging sense," (SZ 167) and "the inauthenticity of Dasein does not signify a 'lesser' being or a 'lower' degree of being," (SZ 43) although this is difficult to reconcile with the bluntness and negative connotations of the language he uses. There are further implications concerning reasons why we should even attempt to be authentic, given that there is no sort of greater value in being authentic than in remaining entangled in the They. There is a great deal of controversy in the secondary literature about the positive and negative aspects of the They, and I will address this in Chapter 4.

Having already examined entanglement on an ontic-existentiell level, it must now be considered at an ontological-existential level. Falling prey is the existential characteristic of Dasein that corresponds to entanglement. Falling prey means falling prey to the 'world,' away from one's real self, and Heidegger explicitly defines it as "being absorbed in being-with-one-another as it is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity." (SZ 175) Here he brings in the concept of inauthenticity and defines it with reference to falling prey; inauthenticity in this sense is a kind of being-in-the-world that is "completely taken in by the world and the *Mitda-sein* of the others in the they." (SZ 176) This being is absorbed in the world and others around it, and has fallen away from itself and into the world. Claims of this sort are difficult to make sense of, given that the world defines and gives intelligibility to us; how can our

'real' selves exist independently of the world? The structure of falling prey displays various characteristics: temptation, tranquilization, alienation and self-entanglement. Being-in-the-world is tempting because it allows Dasein to take the easy route of having its decisions made by the They and renouncing any responsibility for its own decisions. The tranquilizing nature of the They comes about because "idle talk and ambiguity, having-seen-everything and having-understood-everything, develop 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." (SZ 177) Dasein comes to believe that the They fulfils all of its possibilities, that there is nothing beyond the everyday world to strive for, and thus is content with its situation. Being-in-the-world is alienating insofar as it causes Dasein to think that it understands everything, when in fact it lacks a real understanding of its own potentiality-of-being; the dominance of the They means that "fundamentally it remains undetermined and unasked *what* is then really to be understood...[Dasein] drifts toward an alienation in which its ownmost potentiality-for-being is concealed." (SZ 178) Finally, the alienation of being-in-the-world causes Dasein to revert to self-entanglement, a kind of self-examination in which it tries to force itself into various 'typologies,' intent on fitting itself into a certain group and thus adopting the distinctive characteristics of that group: "This alienation drives Dasein into a kind of being intent upon the most exaggerated 'self-dissection' which tries out all kinds of possibilities of interpretation," (SZ 178) with the end result that Dasein is closed off from its authentic self and trapped in inauthenticity.

Taken together, these four characteristics mean that Dasein has always already lost its real self to the world—this means that from the beginning of its existence Dasein is surrounded by and has surrendered its autonomy and

individuality to the They. Such is the case for every Dasein, everyday, unless it makes the effort to extricate itself, and lead what Heidegger calls an authentic life. However, Dasein is unlikely to break out of its inauthentic state because being-in-the-world and entanglement are both tempting and tranquilizing. The nature of idle talk and ambiguity is such that it makes Dasein feel as if he has seen everything and understood everything—this "self-certainty and decisiveness of the they" (SZ 177) makes Dasein feel as though he is already living a genuine life where all possibilities are open, certain and full (SZ 177). As a result of this tranquilization, Dasein absorbs itself in its activities and the world, constantly making itself busy with something. In the present day we see perfect evidence of this, but Dasein fails to realize that it does not understand the fundamentals about what is really to be understood. In this examination of falling prey we can see the self-obsession and self-examination characteristic of the modern age.

Having laid out the main characteristics of the being of the 'there' by discussing the ontological structure of disclosedness (constituted in attunement, understanding and discourse) and of the everyday way of being (characterized by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity), which shows the movement of falling prey (characterized by temptation, tranquilization, alienation and self-entanglement), Heidegger has provided the phenomenal basis for the totality of the existential constitution of Dasein, but still lacks an existential and ontological basis for this structure. (SZ 180) That is, Heidegger has explained the phenomena that constitute Dasein's being-in-the-world, but he must find the basic ontological structures that unite these phenomena and Dasein's being. Since Dasein is the being that understands its own being, he must find the ontological structure that allows Dasein to disclose its own being to itself. This is part of the task of the existential analytic of

uncovering the ontology of Dasein, and here he searches for the primordial characteristic that discloses Dasein's being to itself. Once this characteristic is found, Heidegger will have attained the "primordial totality of being of Dasein," the existential-ontological basis for the whole of Dasein. A phenomenal origin is necessary for Heidegger's method, and he believes he has found it in the phenomenon of Angst, or anxiety, a form of attunement. There must be something distinctive about anxiety, if it is able to disclose Dasein's being to itself. The phenomenon of entanglement, in which Dasein flees from itself and authenticity, and immerses itself in inauthenticity and the They, is used as the phenomenal basis for his analysis of anxiety. In searching for what discloses Dasein to itself, entanglement does not seem like the appropriate phenomenal foundation since it seems to turn Dasein away from itself rather than bringing Dasein before itself. However, entanglement is suitable for this purpose since, at an existentiell level, it involves a repression and turning away from the self; existentially, this very flight from itself reveals that there is something there to be fled from. Existentielly and ontically, Dasein does not understand from what it is fleeing and appears closed off to itself, but existential and ontological examination allows us to see that precisely because Dasein is brought before itself in this process it is able to flee from itself. Furthermore, entanglement is also an appropriate phenomenal basis because the interpretation is least likely here to "be surrendered to an artificial self conception of Dasein." (SZ 185)

The next chapter will address Heidegger's attempt to delineate the totality of ontological and existential structures that underlie Dasein's being as being-in-the-world- and being-with-others. He has discussed the existentiell and existential

structures that make up the being of everyday Dasein, but they are still very much disparate elements. As we saw earlier, Heidegger wants a cohesive account of Dasein's being, which requires the unification of these distinct aspects. He introduces care as the structural totality of Dasein, and investigates the ontological structures that make it possible for Dasein to understand its being as a totality.

3. Angst, Authenticity and Death

3.1 Angst and Care

Heidegger's preparatory account of the existential analytic has given an account of Dasein as a being that exists in the world, but an analysis that will give the primordial structure that underlies everyday existence is still needed, since Heidegger's primary aim in the analysis of Dasein is that of a fundamental ontology of human being. There is no single primordial ground from which the existential characteristics of Dasein can be derived, but it will be possible to discern several different equiprimordial characteristics that are all equally fundamental and interdependent with each other. Heidegger will show that the "primordial totality of being of Dasein" (SZ 182) is care, and that Angst is the phenomenon through which Dasein can come to understand this totality of being. Authentic existence can only come about through this disclosure.

In order to ascertain the equiprimordial characteristics of Dasein, Heidegger must analyze being-in-as-such, or what it means to 'be in' something. That is, he must explain the 'there' (*Da*) of Dasein, the fact that Dasein always finds itself in the world, in order to understand the being that is in the 'there.' Attunement and understanding are the two equiprimordial ways of being in the 'there,' and constitute the disclosure of being to Dasein. Only attunement and understanding disclose Dasein's being as essentially in-the-world, although Dasein has a tendency to evade this disclosure. Angst is a unique form of attunement because it discloses being-in-the-world in such a way that Dasein can access authentic being. Heidegger will return to the phenomenon of everyday life to apply the concepts of attunement and understanding to Dasein's average everydayness, since this is the thematic point of departure and rightfully it must be integrated with the primordial concepts.

46

3.1.1 Attunement and Understanding

Attunement (*Befindlichkeit*) is another problematic word in terms of translation. Stambaugh, in her translation of *Being and Time*, chooses this translation, but points out that 'disposition' is also an appropriate choice. She opts instead for attunement in order to avoid any 'psychological connotations.' Dreyfus calls it affectedness, and MacQuarrie and Robinson's previous translation of *Being and Time* used 'state-of-mind.' State-of-mind is probably the most inaccurate translation, since attunement is neither a state one finds oneself in, nor anything having to do with the mind. 'Attunement' captures the sense of directedness towards the world that characterizes Heidegger's account.

Attunement is an ontological structure that corresponds, at the ontic level, to the concept of 'mood.' Moods disclose the world to Dasein in a certain way; when I am in a bad mood, for instance, the world seems to me hateful or unbearable, and I direct myself towards the world based on this disclosure. However, "the possibilities of disclosure belonging to cognition fall far short of the primordial disclosure of moods in which Dasein is brought before its being as the there." (SZ 134) Heidegger believes that mood discloses the world in a more fundamental way than our cognition does, and we can see in this claim a clear divergence from the Husserlian picture. Mood, as attunement, discloses Dasein's being to itself as being in the 'there,' but this does not mean that Dasein acknowledges or is even conscious of the disclosure. However, the very fact that Dasein evades the disclosure of its being shows that there is something there to evade, and this is, on an ontological level, the fact that Dasein exists in the 'there', or what Heidegger calls 'thrownness.'

Thrownness is the "*facticity of its being delivered over.*" (SZ 135) Facticity "implies that an 'innerworldly' being has being-in-the-world in such a way that it can

understand itself as bound up in its 'destiny' with the being of those beings which it encounters within its own world." (SZ 56) Objectively present things, however, can have 'brute facts' of their existence, but do not understand themselves as existing within the context of a surrounding world (or indeed understand themselves at all). Thrownness refers to the fact of Dasein's being caught up in the world, that Dasein exists always in a given world with certain pre-determined situations that it finds itself 'thrown' into, and which determine the choices it can make. Mood shows being-in-the-world because it determines to what Dasein directs itself, in that Dasein cares about things in a particular way depending on its mood, and can affect Dasein in such a way as to alter its moods. One's mood "*has always already disclosed being-in-the-world as a whole and first makes possible directing oneself toward something.*" (SZ 137) The evasion that characterizes attunement ontologically does not disclose the thrownness of being directly, but in the fact that Dasein turns away from it. Dasein evades the disclosure of being-in-the-world that moods provide, and this is part of being inauthentic. We can think of thrownness as the way Dasein is in-the-world, disclosed by attunement.

The other structure of being in the 'there' is understanding, the equiprimordial counterpart of attunement. In our everyday life, we think of understanding as comprehending or being able to do something. The existential usage of the term, however, refers to the possibilities that Dasein has in its existence. While attunement disclosed Dasein as thrown into the world, understanding involves grasping this being-in-the-world and realizing that Dasein's possibilities are determined entirely through the world: "as essentially attuned, Dasein has always already got itself into definite possibilities," (SZ 144) but as "understanding, it 'knows' *what* is going on, that is, what its potentiality of being is." (SZ 144)

Understanding projects Dasein into its possibilities and "because of the kind of being which is constituted by the existential of projecting, Dasein is constantly 'more' than it actually is...It is existentially that which it is *not yet* in its potentiality of being." (SZ 145) Dasein's being includes not just its existence in the present moment, but the various possibilities that lie in its future:

Because attunement and understanding are equiprimordial existential structures, they affect each other such that understanding is always attuned and attunement always has understanding. The possibilities that Dasein understands itself to have are always attuned, that is, understood as existing in the context inhabited by Dasein. Conversely, the realization that Dasein is being-in-the-world always has the understanding that, as such, Dasein can project itself into its own possibilities. Mulhall's description of understanding as the active component of being-in is an apt one (Mulhall 1996, 81): attunement gives us the knowledge that we are thrown into the world, and understanding allows us to act on it by allowing us to choose the possibilities that are given to us as being-in-the-world. Attunement and understanding are the existential structures that underlie the unique characteristics of Dasein's being: its concern with its being, and its having its own possibilities. Attunement reveals the being with which Dasein is concerned as being-in-the-world, and understanding discloses Dasein's own possibilities as affected by its being-in-the-world.

Attunement and understanding are existential-ontological structures that make up Dasein's being-there. Heidegger's phenomenological method requires that these primordial structures be used as a guideline for bringing "the everydayness of Dasein into view in a way that is ontologically more primordial." (SZ 166) By the end of Chapter V, Heidegger has laid out the structure of being-in-the-world, of

which attunement and understanding are the existential fundamentals, and the various aspects of entanglement the existential structure of everydayness. However, "the phenomenal *manifoldness* of the constitution of the structural whole and its everyday kind of being can now easily distort the *unified* phenomenological view of the whole as such." (SZ·180) Heidegger has laid out a great number of different aspects of Dasein's being, but as part of the task of fundamental ontology, he must bring these aspects together in order to give an account of the unified totality of Dasein's being.

3.1.2 Angst as a Distinctive Attunement

As with so much of the specialized terminology that Heidegger employs, Angst also presents problems for the translator. Kierkegaard uses the term *Angst*, a word that exists both in Danish and German, which Heidegger adopts. Possibilities that have been used include anguish, dread and anxiety. Of these, anxiety or dread are the best options since they carry with them the idea of directedness towards not-yet actualized possibilities. However, given that angst has been appropriated into the English language and is universally understood, it seems appropriate to leave the word untranslated, as Stambaugh does.

Heidegger takes Angst, or anxiety, as the "phenomenal basis for explicitly grasping the primordial totality of being of Dasein." (SZ 182) At this point, he has the idea that this totality of Dasein's being is care or concern, the fact that Dasein is always concerned with something, whether that be the being of itself, of others, or the surrounding world. It is necessary, however, that he provide a phenomenal basis for this claim; there must be sufficient evidence in Dasein's everyday being that demonstrates care as its ontological totality. Angst is a specific attunement of Dasein

that Heidegger believes has the ability to disclose Dasein's being to itself in a way that other moods cannot, because the various characteristics of Angst demonstrate a "totality of the structural whole." (SZ 190) What Heidegger means by this will become clearer if we examine the phenomenon of Angst in more detail.

Heidegger's account of Angst borrows heavily from Kierkegaard's *The Concept of Dread*.[2] The similarities and differences have been generally outlined in the first chapter of this thesis. This section will examine Heidegger's ideas about Angst in more detail. Angst, as an attunement, is a mood in which Dasein can find itself. Heidegger contrasts Angst and fear to bring out the distinctive characteristics of Angst. Fear is always a fear of specific objectively present beings in the world, and as an attunement it does disclose Dasein's being, since "only a being which is concerned in its being about that being can be afraid." (SZ 141) Angst, on the other hand, is an indefinite anxiety. There is no particular being that can be pointed out as causing the mood. Heidegger believes that this indefiniteness demonstrates that Angst is about being-in-the-world as such. Because "nothing of that which is at hand and objectively present within the world, functions as what Angst is anxious about," (SZ 186) the beings at hand in the world become irrelevant precisely because none of them can be identified as the cause of Angst. Attunement determines the manner in which Dasein directs itself toward the world, and in the case of fear, Dasein becomes concerned with the object considered to be the cause of this fear. Because Angst has an indefinite cause, Dasein ceases to concern itself with the world at hand because none of the objects in the world can be pinpointed as the cause of Angst. Furthermore, because the object of Angst is indefinite, there can be no particular direction from which the threat is seen to approach, because it is already so near to us,

---

[2] Also translated as *The Concept of Anxiety*.

yet nowhere at the same time. That is to say, that which Angst is about is already so close by that we cannot point to where it is—it seems to be part of us already.

Angst is about being-in-the-world as such precisely because it is a nothingness and nowhereness: "The recalcitrance of the innerworldly nothing and nowhere means phenomenally that *what Angst is about is the world as such.*" (SZ 187) The things that make up the world become irrelevant and unimportant because they cannot be designated as the cause of Angst, and so have no relevance to the problem at hand; the only thing that obtrudes into this anxiety is the worldliness of the world. With a lack of concern for objects at hand, "Angst...fetches Dasein back out of its entangled absorption in the 'world.'" (SZ 189) Angst produces a feeling of 'uncanniness,' as Heidegger calls it, equivalent in German to 'not-being-at-home.' The feeling of 'not-being-at-home' that accompanies the lack of concern about the world signifies that Dasein considers its proper place to be in-the-world, interacting with and concerned about beings within the world. This sense of unfamiliarity, when coupled with the lack of concern for the world, implies that Angst is about being-in-the-world, and as an attunement, it discloses to Dasein that its being is always being-in-the-world. As such, "tranquillized, familiar being-in-the-world is a mode of the uncanniness of Dasein, not the other way around. *Not-being-at-home must be conceived existentially and ontologically as the more primordial phenomenon.*" (SZ 189) When Dasein flees from the truth about its being back into entanglement, it thinks it is returning home, to where it ought to be, but this is a misapprehension on the part of Dasein—its 'real' home is authentic existence.

If Angst removes all beings in the world from Dasein's consideration, it also "takes away from Dasein the possibility of understanding itself, falling prey, in terms of the 'world' and the public way of being interpreted." (SZ 187) Dasein cannot

appropriate meaning from the surrounding world and the They anymore, and in this sense it becomes individuated. Recalling that attunement is always accompanied by understanding, "Angst individuates Dasein to its ownmost being-in-the-world which, as understanding, projects itself essentially upon possibilities." (SZ 187-8) The individuation of Dasein, along with the understanding that Dasein is its own possibilities, shows Dasein that its "ownmost potentiality of being, that is, *being free for the freedom of choosing and grasping itself.*" (SZ 188) Angst discloses to Dasein that it must choose its own possibilities—this is part of its being. This process of individualization makes Angst an attunement distinctive from all others, since it is the only one that discloses Dasein's potentiality of being. Furthermore, it "fetches Dasein back from its falling prey and reveals to it authenticity and inauthenticity as possibilities of its being." (SZ 191) The individuation of Angst shows Dasein two possible modes of being: the everyday inauthentic mode, where possibilities are taken over by the They, and the authentic mode, in which Dasein appropriates its possibilities for itself.[3] At this point, however, Dasein is in a sort of limbo, or position of choice, in which it has realized that there are two possible modes of being, but has not yet chosen authenticity. The process of becoming authentic will be discussed later.

One issue we must address is why being-in-the-world causes Angst at all. If Dasein is perfectly at home when absorbed in the world, why does this attunement ever arise? This will, perhaps, become clearer after we have examined conscience in more detail, but we must first look at care in order to bring together the concepts that Angst discloses to us.

---

[3] Heidegger makes conflicting claims about the number of modes of being. At times he says there are two modes of being, authentic and inauthentic, and at other times he argues there are three, and includes the indifferent or undifferentiated mode. I will take this problem up in Chapter 4.

3.1.3 Care and the Totality of Dasein

Heidegger's purpose in the analysis of Angst was to find a way of disclosing "the whole of Dasein in a way that is phenomenally equiprimordial." (SZ 191) With Angst, he believes this has been achieved for a number of reasons: "As attunement, being anxious is a way of being-in-the-world; that about which we have Angst is thrown being-in-the-world; that for which we have Angst is our potentiality-for-being-in-the-world. The complete phenomenon of Angst thus shows Dasein as factical, existing being-in-the-world." (SZ 191) Dasein's being as in-the-world has been demonstrated from a phenomenal basis, Angst, which shows Dasein as factical being-in-the-world, and its position thus is characterized by the existential structures of "existentiality, facticity, and falling prey." (SZ 191) That is, Dasein is characterized as always existing in the world, absorbed and preoccupied with it, and always looking ahead of itself towards its possibilities. (Mulhall 1996, 111) However, as we noted before, Heidegger needs to bring these existential elements together in order to describe Dasein as a unified totality. The synthesis of the ontological factors comes together in the concept of care (*Sorge*).

The existential idea of care is different from our usage of the word in everyday language. Whereas we tend to use it to mean looking after someone or something, Heidegger intends the idea of 'concern about.' In saying that the being of Dasein is care, he means that the being of Dasein is such that it is concerned with its surroundings, objects and other individuals, in such a way that it must always attend to them or deal with them. Care implies that Dasein is affected and influenced by its attitude towards other beings. The idea of care is drawn from the notion that Dasein is "always already *ahead* of itself in its being," (SZ 192) by which Heidegger means that Dasein is always focused upon the existing possibilities that it can choose.

Dasein is always affected by and oriented towards its future possibilities. Furthermore, because Dasein is always in-the-world, it is concerned about the physical objects and individuals that populate this world.

Care, as the "formal existential totality of the ontological structural whole of Dasein," (SZ 192) applies to both authentic and inauthentic Dasein alike. The difference between the two is the way it directs itself towards its possibilities. Inauthentic Dasein takes it~~possibilities~~ *unquestioned understanding of its* possibilities from the They, and must choose from options that are considered to be correct and familiar. The care of everyday Dasein is such that it pays attention only to, as Heidegger says, what is 'real,' while ignoring the existence of its own *interrogating* possibilities, unmediated by the They. Dasein takes care of the world in such a way that it chooses its possibilities from 'what one ought to do' in a specific situation without examining the real possibilities for which it is free, but which may not be prescribed by the They. (SZ 195) It is important to remember that being toward one's possibilities is an ontological existential structure, and so is present even in inauthentic Dasein, although here it is the case that it is modified and takes the form of 'mere wishing.' (SZ 195) Inauthentic Dasein "projects its being toward possibilities which not only remain ungrasped in taking care of things, but whose fulfillment is not even thought about and expected." (SZ 195) Wishing is the inauthentic modification of the existential of projecting itself onto one's possibilities; it differs insofar as authentic projection requires projecting itself onto its possibilities freely.

Although care is a more primordial ontological structure than those discussed previously, it is still comprised of three disparate elements, 'being-ahead-of-oneself-already-in-the-world' and 'being-together-with,' namely the projecting possibilities ahead of one's self into the world, and being together with beings in the world, as

well as its fallenness, that shows it to be absorbed in the They. Heidegger believes that this is a clue that there remain more primordial levels. The hermeneutic method requires that this new information be incorporated into the investigation, which Heidegger does in Division II of *Being and Time*.

3.2 Death

At the end of Division I, Heidegger returns to the issue of the totality of Dasein. Care is itself composed of various structural elements, and in this lack of unity cannot lay claim to the most primordial level of Dasein's being. Care, as concern about possibilities ('being-ahead-of-itself') shows that there is something always 'not-yet' in Dasein's being, but a structural totality of Dasein must somehow account for this "*constant unfinished quality.*" (SZ 236) Dasein is only a whole when its possibilities end with death, but at this point it ceases to exist and cannot understand itself. Heidegger must incorporate death into the existential analysis of Dasein.

Another concern at hand is that the account of Dasein's being has not integrated both authentic and inauthentic existence. The analysis in the first division focused on inauthentic average everydayness, without explicitly dealing with authenticity. The structures that Heidegger has delineated thus far were reached without bringing authenticity into the analysis, and he recognizes that the "ontological characterization of the constitution of existence was flawed by an essential lack. Existence means potentiality-of-being, but also authentic potentiality-of-being. As long as the existential structure of authentic potentiality-of-being is not incorporated in the idea of existence, the fore-sight guiding an *existential* interpretation lacks primordiality." (SZ 233) In essence, the preceding analysis

provided only half of the story. Although Heidegger believed it necessary to begin the analysis with everydayness, a unified account of Dasein's being must incorporate both of its modes of being. This is the task that Heidegger now sets out for himself. Temporality plays a major role in this section, and he intends to demonstrate that it is the "primordial ontological ground of the existentiality of Dasein." (SZ 234) Integrating being-in-the-world with temporality leads Heidegger to death.

3.2.1 The Death Of Dasein

What does it mean for Dasein to die? Certainly it seems that the death of a human being is different from the death of an animal or the destruction of a physical object. The concept of death must first be clarified before Heidegger can use it as the basis for any sort of analysis. He undertakes this clarification in Section 48, in which he contrasts the death of Dasein with other forms of ending or dying.

The first idea he considers is 'outstanding,' meaning "what 'belongs' to a being, but is still lacking." (SZ 242) He gives the example of the remainder of a debt as something outstanding, and when it is paid off, the entire sum is together: "to be outstanding means that what belongs together is not yet together." (SZ 242) This concept, however, belongs to things at hand, and cannot apply to Dasein because "the together of the being that Dasein is 'in running its course' until it has completed 'its course' is not constituted by a 'progressive' piecing-on of beings." (SZ 243) The totality of Dasein cannot be reached by putting bits of it together until wholeness is achieved. Heidegger says that "Dasein always already exists in such a way that its not-yet *belongs* to it." (SZ 243) This sounds paradoxical if we take it in terms of our ordinary understanding of time. How can something *be* that which it *is not yet*? Isn't its 'not-yet' by definition what Dasein *is not* at the present time? This becomes

clearer once we understand Dasein as being-towards-death. Dasein's being is always a becoming, and as such, the 'not-yet' is part of Dasein's being insofar as Dasein existence involves projecting itself forwards onto its possibilities. The idea of, for instance, an outstanding debt has no such concept of not-yet in its being. There are instances of other objectively present objects that demonstrate a kind of not-yet in their being. Heidegger gives the example of the moon in its last quarter. Its not-yet lessens as it turns and more of it becomes visible to us. This is not, however, something inherent in the being of the moon, but rather a characteristic of our perception of the moon. We cannot grasp the whole of the moon when it is not full only because of our inability to perceive the entire thing: "the moon is, after all, always already objectively present as a whole." (SZ 243) This is clearly not the case with Dasein, since the not-yet of Dasein is never real or accessible in the sense that the moon potentially is.

Heidegger then offers the ripening of a fruit as an example of an object who's not-yet is perhaps more analogous to Dasein. The ripeness or unripeness is a way of the being of the fruit itself, not something that can exist separately from it, and in this manner it can be considered similar to the not-yet of Dasein in that it "*is always already its not-yet* as long as it is." (SZ 244) However, the difference consists in the existential difference between Dasein's death and the fruit's ripeness. Heidegger claims that ripeness constitutes a 'fulfillment' of the fruit because it has "exhausted its specific possibilities." (SZ 244) The same cannot be claimed for Dasein, because even with death, Dasein need not have necessarily fulfilled all of its specific possibilities. How can we interpret the 'specific possibilities' of Dasein? There are two options: these could refer to all of the alternative possibilities that Dasein had to reject in order to choose the ones it did, or to the further possibilities it might have

had if death had not ended its existence. Perhaps the best way to understand this is as follows. A fruit has only two ways to be: either it is unripe or ripe. With ripeness, the fruit has both completed all of its possibilities and reached its highest possibility. Heidegger does not mean that Dasein reaches its highest potential with death, since "even 'unfulfilled' Dasein ends." (SZ 244) He seems to mean that death prevents Dasein from fulfilling any further possibilities, but in this case the fruit analogy does not hold, because the fruit has no further possibilities.

Neither is the death of Dasein a 'stopping' or 'finishing.' Stopping can mean different things in different situations: a road stopping differs from a rainfall stopping. When the rain stops, it disappears, but when the road stops, it becomes clearly defined as a specific entity. Finishing similarly can refer to finishing a painting or finishing a race. These concepts can apply only to objectively present objects and cannot give a real conception of Dasein's death. Fulfilment, stopping, finishing and disappearing are not adequate concepts to describe death because they fail to properly capture the not-yet of Dasein's possibilities. Heidegger describes death as a way of being of Dasein in order to capture this essence. As soon as Dasein comes into existence it is always moving towards its death: "just as Dasein constantly already *is* its not-yet as long as it is, it also always already *is* its end." (SZ 245)

Heidegger distinguishes between perishing, death and demise. Perishing is the biological event of "the ending of what is alive," (SZ 247) the point at which the processes of life cease. The death of animals and plants can obviously be called perishing, and it seems so can Dasein, for its death necessarily involves this physiological event where cells die and organs shut down. For Heidegger, although Dasein dies biologically in the same way plants and animals do, "it does not simply perish." (SZ 246) Demise is the phenomenon applicable to Dasein, an "intermediate

phenomenon" (SZ 246) between perishing and death. Because Dasein is concerned with its being, it has knowledge of its own death as the end of its being in a way that animals do not, and thus its death must be differentiated at an ontological level from the perishing of animals. Dying is, for Heidegger, "the *way of being* in which Dasein *is toward* its death," (SZ 247) or what he calls being-towards-death; it is not the usual concept of an entity nearing its end. Clearly, only Dasein can be 'dying.' What, then, is 'death' proper? Heidegger seems to use death in two ways: in the usual sense of death as the end of life, and in an existential way. Some say that we can look at death existentially as Dasein's understanding of its demise (Blattner 1994, 54-55) but this is not correct, since Heidegger designates dying as the understanding of demise. Demise, as an ontic phenomenon, requires an underlying ontological structure. This ontological structure is what Heidegger calls 'death.' Before we deal with Dasein's death in more detail, we must look at what death means for Dasein's possibilities.

3.2.2 Totality and Death

Dasein is always ahead of itself. As long as Dasein exists, there is a certain unfinished quality about it because it will always have more possibilities to project itself upon. This presents a problem for understanding the totality of Dasein. However, when Dasein reaches the point at which there are no longer any possibilities for it, it ceases to be. The end of Dasein is the point at which possibilities end, but after this occurs Dasein is no longer a being and it cannot be understood as a whole. It is a structural characteristic of being that there is an "impossibility of experiencing Dasein ontically as an existing whole and thus of defining it ontologically in its wholeness." (SZ 236) Being-ahead-of-itself is the

reason that we cannot experience the being of Dasein as a whole, and as an existential structure of care, it must be addressed. Death plays a major role in the totality of Dasein.

Dasein can only be understood as a whole when it has been 'completed,' when it has no more possibilities, but "as long as Dasein *is* a being, it has never attained its 'wholeness.' But if it does, this gain becomes the absolute loss of being-in-the-world." (SZ 236) Dasein becomes whole when it dies, but at the moment of death it ceases to be Dasein and "is never again to be experienced *as a being*." (SZ 236) Death is the moment at which Dasein is no longer Dasein and becomes an objectively present being in the world. Clearly, as Dasein ceases to be it can no longer experience anything, and can never experience the totality of its being because of the nature of death. Heidegger wonders if perhaps the death of others can help us to understand the totality of being, but there are a number of factors that prevent this from being the case.

In experiencing the death of another, we do not experience the death 'from the inside' but from our own detached personal perspective. We cannot know what it is like for the person to die. Our experience of the death of the other does not disclose anything distinctive. When someone else dies, those that remain experience his body as a objectively present thing, but also as "something *unliving* which has lost its life." (SZ 238) The body is not merely an objectively present object at hand like a chair or a table, but carries with it the reminder that it was once a Dasein. In this way, death is experienced as a loss, but only as the loss of the other from the world, not the deceased's loss of his own life: "Death does reveal itself as a loss, but as a loss experienced by those remaining behind. However, in suffering the loss, the loss of being as such which the dying person 'suffers' does not become accessible."

(SZ 238-9) The only thing that the death of the other reveals to us are the ways of being that are exhibited by the individuals left behind. This does not provide any sort of ontological or existential insight into the totality of Dasein.

From this idea that Dasein can never experience the death of the other Heidegger draws the idea that there is no representability in death. In other situations, one individual can substitute for another quite easily: "the broad multiplicity of ways of being-in-the-world in which one person can be represented by another extends not only to the used-up modes of public being with one another, but concerns as well the possibilities of taking care of things limited to definite circles, tailored to professions, social classes, and stages of life." (SZ 239) The nature of objectively present objects in the world is such that any Dasein using it can be substituted for another. For instance, I can use a hammer to pound a nail, but I can be just as easily replaced by an another individual performing the task. This also applies to the performance of specific roles: a professor giving a lecture can be replaced by another individual who lectures in his place. This characteristic of representability applies to everything we do in everyday life, except, it seems, death. However, Philipse makes a good point in his claim that functions that involve the body, such as eating or breathing, are similarly unsubstitutable. (Philipse 1998, 360) This may be true, but an activity like eating does not have the same claim to totality that death does. In another sense, even having someone else lecture in my place would be unsubstitutable, since they cannot do my doing of the task. They could give my lecture *for me*, but only I can give my lecture in the sense that my doing a task requires me to do it—in this sense, everything is unrepresentable. Perhaps it is wrong of Heidegger to claim that death is the only thing that is unrepresentable, but the point is that only death satisfies all of the particular criteria to make it a distinctive event. One cannot die someone else's

death for them. It is possible to die for somebody else, i.e sacrificing oneself for another, but this is not what Heidegger means. Even if I die for the sake of someone else, I still die my own death that no one can experience or take away from me. Although I may have removed the immediate possibility of death from the other, he will still have to eventually die his own death. Some commentators, notably Edwards, say this is trite: if I die, of course I die my own death and not someone else's, this is the nature of death or anything else that is a bodily process. Edwards accuses Heidegger of making uninteresting and uninsightful claims about death, but he fails to examine the ontological context within which Heidegger is making these claims. Without relating death to fundamental ontology, Heidegger's views on death can seem nonsensical and obvious. I will take up Edwards' criticisms in more depth in Chapter 4.

How do individuation and unsubstitutability relate to totality? The unsubstitutability of death individuates Dasein, since no one else can die my death for me. But as we saw, this is also applicable in the case of bodily activities. However, as we will see in the following section, death has other characteristics such as certainty and indefiniteness that make it a distinctive phenomenon. While eating or drinking may individuate me in the same way, they do not possess the other characteristics of death that allow us to understand Dasein as a totality. We will now examine being-towards-death in more detail, and what it means to be directed towards one's death in both an authentic and an inauthentic manner.

3.2.3 Being-Towards-Death: Inauthentic and Authentic

Speaking about death can take many forms. We can investigate the biological, psychological, historical and cultural aspects of death, but they are all dependent on an ontological foundation. As with the other phenomena Heidegger has examined, he must determine the existential structure of death, and he begins, in accordance with his method, "by giving...an ontological characterization of the kind of being in which the 'end' enters into the average everydayness of Dasein." (SZ 248) If death or being-towards-death is a mode of being of Dasein, it must be definable in terms of the characteristics of the "fundamental constitution of Dasein" (SZ 249); these are the ideas of being-ahead-of-itself, being-with, existence, facticity, and falling prey.

Previously, Heidegger spoke about death as an unsubstitutable and individualizing possibility. There are other characteristics of death that are equally important and serve to make it a distinctive experience. Death is always certain for Dasein; it is without doubt that all individuals on this planet will die at some point, and it is impossible to try to avert it. He initially defines death as "the *ownmost nonrelational possibility not to be bypassed*." (SZ 251) When Dasein comes into being, it is immediately thrown into this possibility, although it does not yet realize this until Angst discloses "the fact that Dasein exists as thrown being-*toward*-its-end." (SZ 251) The normal mode of dealing with being-towards-death involves fleeing from it, or evading it by refusing to see it as an ownmost, nonrelational, unsurpassable possibility. In keeping with the method used thus far, the average everyday understanding of being-towards-death must be examined in order to determine its existential-ontological structure.

In everyday life, we speak of death in a way that is dictated by our absorption in the They. The attitude of the They towards death is one of detachment or indeterminacy. We are familiar with death through reading stories of deaths in a newspaper or watching them in movies, but this prompts an attitude of detachment, and a vague feeling that although death is a certainty, it is not going to happen right now, to me; as Heidegger says, " 'Death' is encountered as a familiar event occurring within the world...death is understood as an indeterminate something which first has to show up from somewhere, but which right now is *not yet objectively present* for oneself, and is thus no threat." (SZ 253) Everyday Dasein tends to view death as something that happens to others, not grasped in its certainty or individuality, and "dying, which is essentially and irreplaceably mine, is distorted into a publicly occurring event which the they encounters." (SZ 253) One of the main ways of inauthentically dealing with death is the refusal to accept it as certain. It is obviously the case that every Dasein knows that death is inevitable, we all realize this as an indubitable fact, but we refuse to accept it. As Heidegger describes it, "One *knows* about the certainty of death, and yet '*is*' not really certain about it." (SZ 258)

What does it mean to refuse to accept death as certain? Heidegger says "to be certain of a being means to *hold* it for true as something true," (SZ 256) but there are two kinds of certainty: a primordial certainty where being-certain is a kind of being of Dasein, and a derivative certainty in which anything of which we are certain is itself certain. Everyday Dasein's certainty of death covers over death as really is, and "thus the certainty which belongs to such a covering over of being-towards-death must be an inappropriate way of holding-for-true." (SZ 257) While everyday Dasein thinks it is certain of death, it is certain of something that is not true, namely the inauthentic concept of death. In this sense, we might say that inauthentic Dasein is

certain about a misconceived notion of death, not about authentic being-towards-death. If authentic being-towards-death involves the knowledge that one's possibilities are ended with death, even everyday certainty about death should suffice to give Dasein some sort of clue to its being. However, everyday certainty about death is only an empirical certainty, gleaned from one's awareness of the death of others. As an empirical certainty about the *occurrence* of death, it tells Dasein nothing about how death really is. (King 2001, 156) Furthermore, empirical knowledge of death must always be the death of the other, not myself; this perpetuates in Dasein a sense of detachment from death and a failure to accept it as its ownmost possibility. (Demske 1970, 28)

In a similar way, everyday Dasein acts towards death as if it will come 'later.' I do not act with the realization that it is a very real fact that I could die tomorrow; instead, I think of my death as something happening in the future, at some indefinite time. This, says Heidegger, is an attitude that conceals the idea that death is possible at any given moment. Another way of dealing with death perpetuated by the They is the proper behaviour toward death in general: "Even 'thinking about death' is regarded publicly as cowardly fear, a sign of insecurity on the part of Dasein and a dark flight from the world." (SZ 254) For the They, death is not an issue worth considering, especially in a fearful way, and the proper attitude towards death is one of indifference. These aspects of the They's conception of being-towards-death demonstrate the same structure of 'falling prey' that is prominent throughout average everydayness. Indifference and detachment towards death signify Dasein's evasion of the true nature of death, and the idea of death put forth by the They can be seen as concealing the existential characteristics of death: its certainty, mineness, nonsubstitutability, and unbypassability.

The evasion of these characteristics of death constitute the inauthentic, everyday way of being-towards-death. Absorbed in the They, Dasein has its attitude towards death prescribed for it in such a way that it covers up the individuating, certain, indefinite possibilities of death. Why does Dasein evade the true nature of its death in such a manner? The authentic conception of death shows Dasein as it really is, thrown into the They-world, with no possibilities as individual as death. Having seen what inauthentic being-towards-death means, we can surmise that an authentic attitude towards death must refrain from evasion and allow death to be disclosed in a manner that expresses its existential characteristics. Authentic being-towards-death must embrace death as Dasein's ownmost, nonrelational, certain, not to be bypassed possibility in a way that is unencumbered by the influence of the They and free of any evasion or concealment. It is all very well to describe authenticity in this manner, but as an ontic possibility of Dasein, there must be some concrete way of putting it into practice, a specific way of acting or thinking that factical Dasein can carry out authentically. Thinking of death as a possibility seems to suggest death as something not yet actualized, so perhaps the authentic response to being-toward-death involves making the possibility of death an actuality. Not so, says Heidegger: actualizing one's death, for instance, committing suicide, is an inauthentic response to being-towards-death, for in this manner "Dasein would precisely deprive itself of the very ground for an existing being-towards-death." (SZ 260) As Mulhall says, "Suicide is not even a mode of being-towards-death, let alone an authentic one." (Mulhall 1996, 118) Since killing one's self means to remove any way of being at all, it cannot be an authentic response to being-towards-death. Heidegger goes on to say that " 'thinking about death,' thinking about this possibility, how and when it might be actualized" (SZ 260) is not an authentic attitude either.

Expecting death is an attitude that 'weakens' the possibility of death, in that it amounts to "essentially a *waiting for that actualization*." (SZ 262) Suicide, brooding, and expectation are all ways of being that treat death as actuality rather than possibility, and for this reason are inauthentic.

But what does it mean to say death is a possibility? On the face of it, death seems more than possible, it is inevitable—there is no question that this event will come to pass. Heidegger, however, has a somewhat different conception of possibility from the everyday idea of possibility as something that could be actualized but need not necessarily be. In Section 31, he makes some comments on what it means to be a possibility. The usual concept of possibility refers to objectively present objects, wherein "possibility means what is *not yet* real and *not always* necessary." (SZ 143) As an existential concept applied to Dasein, however, it takes on a different meaning. Dasein is always 'being-possible' in that it "is always what it can be and how it is its possibility." (SZ 143) For example, being a teacher or reading a book are ways of being of Dasein. Dasein is a thing that teaches or a thing that reads a book. Its possibilities are all different ways of being. In this same way, being-towards-death death can be called a possibility, since it is a way of being of Dasein. Some commentators accuse Heidegger of using 'possibility' in a sense that ignores its traditional meaning, and he probably ought to have chosen a different term. However, if we understand possibility in an existential sense to mean a way of being, there is not too much of a problem in seeing that being-towards-death is a possibility of Dasein.

Thus, authentic being-towards-death involves understanding death as a way of being of Dasein, and "relate[s] itself to that *death* so that it reveals itself, in this being and for it, *as possibility*." (SZ 262) Heidegger calls this anticipation, but again

he does not use the term in the normal sense of awaiting the actualization of a possibility, but as an approach towards the being-towards-death that increases one's understanding of it as "the possibility of the impossibility of existence in general." (SZ 262) It is contrasted with expectation, a response that involves awaiting the actualization of the possibility, since "to expect something possible is always to understand and 'have' it with regard to whether and when and how it will really be objectively present." (SZ 262) Expectation, in contrast to anticipation, fails to address death in its ownmost, nonrelational, unsurpassable, certain aspects.

In anticipation, as an authentic attitude towards death, Dasein realizes that death is its ownmost possibility, in which it is concerned with its own being, and "in the eminent possibility of itself it is torn away from the they." (SZ 263) It understands itself as concerned with its own being, and "reveals its factical lostness in the everydayness of the they-self," (SZ 264) and the fact that all of its everyday possibilities are determined by the They. Dasein also comes to understand death as its nonrelational possibility, as the one possibility that belongs solely to itself and in this way individuates Dasein. As we have seen, Angst about death causes Dasein to cease taking care of others and things in the world, but this, coupled with the knowledge that Dasein's possibilities are determined by the They, brings with it the understanding that authenticity will require Dasein to take care of the world in a way that projects itself "primarily upon its ownmost potentiality-of-being, rather than upon the possibility of the they-self." (SZ 263-264) Authenticity means Dasein projects itself upon its possibilities with the knowledge that its being is being-toward-death. Understanding death as not to be bypassed means knowing that death cannot be avoided, and gives Dasein a certain kind of freedom from the They, in that it understands that it need not be in the way that the They determines it should.

Authentic Dasein comes to understand that all of its possibilities are transitory, and that death will eventually negate them all. In this way, it realizes that all of its possibilities are contingent, that nothing it does or chooses is necessary. Somehow realizing death is not to be bypassed means that it has "disclosed all the possibilities lying before it, [and] this anticipation includes the possibility of taking the *whole* of Dasein in advance in an existentiell way, that is, the possibility of existing as a *whole potentiality-of-being*." (SZ 264) Finally, understanding death as certain and indefinite means that "Dasein opens itself to a constant *threat* arising from its own there." (SZ 265) Authenticity involves 'cultivating' this unavoidable threat . Taken together, these characteristics of the anticipation of authentic being-towards-death are summarized by Heidegger:

> Anticipation reveals to Dasein its lostness in the they-self, and brings it face to face with the possibility to be itself, primarily unsupported by concern taking care of things, but to be itself in passionate anxious *freedom toward death* which is free of the illusions of the they, factical, and certain of itself. (SZ 266)

This is the ontological description of authentic being-towards-death, but it is necessary that there be an ontic-existentiell possibility of enacting this. Here we see a sort of reversal of Heidegger's method, in which he determines the ontological basis before looking for evidence of ontic phenomena. Presumably, this is because authenticity is infrequent, and we might ask if it is even possible to achieve, if we recall the problem of the cause of Angst and in the next section, the problem of locating the source of the call of conscience. The next section will take into conscience into account as the structure that allows us to become authentic, not just towards-death, but as a whole potentiality-for-being.

3.3 Authentic Potentiality-of-Being

At this point in *Being and Time*, Heidegger has shown us the ontological structure of authentic being-towards-death, but it "means nothing as long as the corresponding ontic potentiality-of-being has not been shown in terms of Dasein itself." (SZ 266) Dasein must be able to put into practice the ontological idea of anticipating one's death authentically, as well as authentically relating to one's being. The first step in determining this is understanding how authenticity is 'attested to,' or how authenticity is made known to Dasein as existentielly possible. Here Heidegger strays away from his discussion of being-towards-death to focus on the means by which Dasein becomes authentic.

3.3.1 Conscience

As we have already seen, Dasein is always absorbed in the world, fallen prey to the They and its public ways of being, and as such is inauthentic because its possibilities are determined by the They, rather than by self-responsibility. Authenticity requires a way of bringing Dasein out of its lostness in the They, and "in order to find *itself* at all, it must be 'shown' to itself in its possible authenticity. In terms of its *possibility*, Dasein *is* already a potentiality-for-being-its-self, but it needs to have this potentiality attested." (SZ 268) There must be some phenomenon that discloses to Dasein the possibility of being authentic, and Heidegger believes that conscience plays this role. In his method of examining conscience as the existential phenomenon that discloses the possibility of authenticity to Dasein, he begins by putting forth an ontological theory before examining the 'vulgar' or everyday sense of conscience. This is a reversal of the earlier method in which he used everyday phenomena as the basis from which further existential and ontological

structures are derived. He performed this same reversal when explicating being-towards-death

Conscience, as Heidegger conceives of it, is a means of disclosure. Even in the everyday sense of the word, something is disclosed to us, although what is disclosed is very different·from what is disclosed by the existential structure of conscience. The existential idea of conscience is more primordial than the everyday, and is what underlies and makes possible our having experiences of conscience in the normal understanding of the word. However, both senses of conscience tell us something, they disclose something to us; Heidegger calls the disclosing act of existential conscience the 'call of conscience.' As a call, conscience must be directed at someone, which in this case is Dasein, lost in the They. The call 'passes over' the part of Dasein that takes care of things and of others in the world, and "because only the *self* of the they-self is summoned and made to hear, the *they* collapses." (SZ 273) As conscience ignores the They, making it seem insignificant, the authentic selfhood of Dasein is summoned from within the They-self. In this way, conscience discloses Dasein's real self as being-in-the-world to itself, and "is the summons of the self to its potentiality-of-being-a-self, and thus calls Dasein forth to its possibilities." (SZ 274)

The nature of the call itself is unusual, because Heidegger says that "the call does not say anything, does not give any information about the events of the world, has nothing to tell." (SZ 273) There is no content in the call, and "conscience speaks solely and constantly in the mode of silence," (SZ 273) but how can such an empty call disclose anything to us at all? The silence of the call is a necessary aspect in allowing Dasein to detach itself from the They. Since there is no content in the call, it cannot be made a subject of 'idle talk,' one of the modes of being of the They that

is inauthentic: " 'It' calls and yet gives the heedfully curious ears nothing to hear that could be passed along and publicly spoken about." (SZZ 277) The emptiness of the call prevents the They-self from appropriating it into the They, and reducing its authenticity by making it public: "it does not call him into the public idle chatter of the they, but *calls* him *back* from that *to the reticence of his existent potentiality-of-being.*" (SZ 277) Furthermore, who is that makes the call? There is an indefinable quality to whatever it is that makes the call, but Heidegger contends that it is Dasein itself that calls. He rejects explanations of the caller as a third party or a sort of psychological process. It is clearly problematic and circular, however, that Dasein both makes and receives the call. For the analysis to be coherent, there must be a duality of Dasein, in which one part understands and is presumably authentic, while the other part remains immersed in the They. If this is the case, we must ask how it is possible for the authentic part of Dasein to reach this state. If the call of conscience is what allows Dasein to become authentic, how did the caller become authentic?

Mulhall offers a modification that he says solves the problem of circularity, but it involves discarding Heidegger's explicit claim that there is no third party involved in the call of conscience. An authentic individual might perhaps disrupt Dasein's absorption in the They by providing the example of an authentic existence that inauthentic Dasein could somehow emulate. (Mulhall 1996, 131-135) Heidegger does say that "Resolute Dasein can become the 'conscience' of others." (SZ 298) However, even if conscience could be understood as a long line of authentic individuals passing on their understanding to willing recipients, there remains the problem of accounting for the authenticity of the first authentic Dasein. Mulhall claims this problem can be solved if we realize that absorption in the They is

not universal and absolute; there will always be some fragment of authenticity in "disregarded texts, moribund institutions or marginalized individuals," because "no community of beings to whom an understanding of their own Being necessarily belongs could utterly lose a sense of themselves as capable of authenticity." (Mulhall 1996, 181) Yet this seems to displace the problem of authenticity onto these texts, institutions or individuals. How did they become authentic? Suppose all of human civilization was wiped out in a nuclear holocaust, with the exception of a few babies. There are no texts left that might provide insight, and no individuals left with the knowledge of authenticity. Against all odds, these babies grow up into adult Daseins; as Dasein, they are with-others, in-the-world, with a pre-ontological understanding of being. By all rights, they are theoretically capable of becoming authentic, but if Mulhall relies on the necessity of a third party to impart this knowledge, there seems no way that they could become authentic. The introduction of a third party as the caller of conscience is not only at odds with Heidegger's own claims, but seems unable to completely eradicate the original problem. The only other possibility is that Dasein always already has a dual structure in which both the authentic self and the inauthentic self exist, but in which the dominance of the They conceals authenticity from the They-self. This leads to the issue of the impetus that allows the authentic self to make the call of conscience. Yet there seems to be no solut/ion to the problem, other than to accept that some Daseins can spontaneously become authentic.

Heidegger says that the call is made by Dasein "in its uncanniness, primordially thrown being-in-the-world, as not-at-home, the naked 'that' in the nothingness of the world." (SZ 276-277) We saw uncanniness previously as revealed by Angst, in which it "confronts being-in-the-world with the nothingness of the

world about which it is anxious in the Angst about its ownmost potentiality-of-being. (SZ 276) Angst reveals the uncanniness to Dasein, and caller of conscience is "*Dasein, finding itself in the ground of its uncanniness.*" (SZ 277) That is, Angst reveals Dasein's being to it as being-in-the-world, and this revelation prepares Dasein for a more primordial understanding of its being as being-guilty. These qualities of the call of conscience, that "the caller is Dasein, anxious in its thrownness...about its potentiality-of-being," and that "the one summoned is also Dasein, called forth to its ownmost potentiality-of-being," and that "what is called forth by the summons is Dasein, out of falling prey to the they," (SZ 277-278) demonstrate that the call of conscience is the call of care. Only because Dasein is characterized by the three-fold nature of care—projection, thrownness, and fallenness—can the call of conscience be possible at all.

Heidegger only addresses the everyday idea of conscience after he has formulated the existential structure of the concept. This is unusual, given the method he has used thus far, but I suspect it is because he has difficulties reconciling his existential conscience with the everyday conception of conscience. In fact, he points out that several features of everyday conscience that are at odds with the idea of conscience that he has advanced; we usually think of conscience as directed towards "a definite deed that has been done or wished for," as a phenomenon of the mind that differentiates between good and evil, and which "pays no attention to the basic forms of the phenomenon." (SZ 290) In realizing this conflict, Heidegger asks "*Must* the ontological interpretation be in harmony with the vulgar interpretation at all? Should not the latter be, in principle, ontologically suspect?" (SZ 289) But is he not turning the method which he has followed up to now on its head? Previously, he asserted the importance of beginning with everyday ideas, as phenomenological basis, from

which the underlying existential structures could be discerned. Why, with the phenomenon of conscience, does he suddenly say that everyday ideas are ontologically suspect? It does not seem methodologically appropriate that he should suddenly abandon the philosophical importance of everyday ideas when they conflict with his ontological formulations.

3.3.2 Guilt

Heidegger has a discussion of guilt in conjunction with the examination of conscience, and makes a closer inspection of what it is exactly that conscience discloses to Dasein. As outlined before, we know that the call means "calling forth the authentic self to its potentiality-of-being, as Dasein, that is, being-in-the-world taking care of things and being-with-others." (SZ 280) The call does not give Dasein any specific existentiell information about its particular factical possibilities; rather, it gives a general idea of the existential structure underlying the possibilities of each Dasein. Given that Heidegger has identified this as the call of conscience, he must address the idea of guilt as that which is disclosed in the call.

In everyday language, guilt is a regret about owing something or being responsible for something, which one's conscience calls to one's attention as a lack, "when something which ought to be and can be is missing." (SZ 283) Heidegger emphasizes that this is the 'vulgar' conception of guilt, primarily because it is involved with taking care of things at hand, and lacking or missing something can only refer to the absence of the objectively present. Everyday guilt has existential guilt as its primordial basis, and supplies the "existential condition of the possibility of the 'morally' good and evil, that is, for morality in general and its possible factical forms." (SZ 286) However, he is not concerned with the common notion of guilt

here, and although he gives a brief summary of what this means, he focuses on the ontological structure of guilt. Existential guilt, since it is the primordial structure of vulgar guilt, must itself be characterized by the idea of 'the not,' (since in order to have everyday guilt, the basic form of it as a nullity must be already present in existential guilt) and he defines it as "being-the-ground for a being which is determined by a not—that is, *being-the-ground of a nullity*." (SZ 283) It is important to remember that this 'not' does not signify a lack of something in the way an objectively present object can be missing.

What does Heidegger mean by ground? Dasein is a ground in that it projects itself upon its possibilities. It is the locus from which and as which it projects its possibilities, and yet because it is always already thrown into the They, its possibilities are never its own: "The self, which as such has to lay the ground of itself, can *never* gain power over that ground, and yet it has to take over being the ground in existing." (SZ 284) Dasein, in being, must always project its possibilities, but these possibilities are determined by the specific situation in which it finds itself, and since it is always thrown into the They, these possibilities it must choose from are never really its own. Thrownness is a nullity, since Dasein's possibilities are not its own. Heidegger's use of the term nullity does not, however, mean he is suggesting that there is something worthless or lesser about Dasein's being; it just means that Dasein's being is characterized by 'nots.' Choosing a possibility means giving up other ones; this abandonment of other possibilities in order to project one's chosen possibilities constitutes a nullity because Dasein "is constantly *not* other possibilities and has relinquished them in its existentiell project." (SZ 285) Falling prey also involves a nullity, since it is a matter of not being authentic. This aspect of the three components of the care-structure demonstrates that "care, as the being of Dasein,

thus means, as thrown project: being the (null) ground of a nullity. And that means that *Dasein as such is guilty* if our formal existential definition of guilt as being-the-ground of a nullity is valid." (SZ 285) So we see that care can be described more primordially as being-guilty, in the existential sense. If conscience is the call of care, then the call can be described as a "summoning to being-guilty," (SZ 287) that involves "a calling forth to the potentiality-of-being that I always already am as Dasein." (SZ 287) Essentially, conscience calls us to understand the nullities that make up the being of Dasein. Because Dasein's being is care, it is always 'guilty.' It can never escape this existential guilt because it is a fundamental structure of its existence, unlike everyday guilt that can be lessened or eliminated by atoning or making reparations. Dasein is always already being-guilty. We see that Heidegger offers a rather unusual concept of guilt, having only the idea of the 'not' in common with our everyday idea of guilt. We might try to understand existential guilt as an attempt to secularize the Kierkegaardian interpretation of the Christian doctrine of original sin, but Dreyfus points out that Kierkegaard believed that "sinfulness is a state of the culture into which we are born; *original sin* is the fact that we actively embrace this state." (Dreyfus 1991, 314) If we understand this to be the case, existential being-guilty is therefore comparable to the state of innocence This apparent reversal of the the concept of guilt suggests that Heidegger's application of 'guilt' to the existential structure bearing its name is perhaps a poor choice. On the other hand, we could consider it to be a further indication of the distortion and concealment characteristic of the They.

The summoning that Heidegger describes means that Dasein chooses "being free for one's ownmost being-guilty. *Understanding the summons* means: *wanting to have a conscience.*" (SZ 288) In the existential sense, wanting to have a conscience

refers to "the readiness to be summoned." (SZ 288) Once the summons or call has been understood, Dasein can direct itself towards its actions with the knowledge that has been disclosed: "Dasein lets its ownmost self *take action in itself* in terms of its chosen potentiality-of-being. Only in this way can it *be* responsible." (SZ 288) Understanding the call of conscience means Dasein understands itself as being-guilty, understanding the nullity of its existence and the true nature of itself as thrownness, projection and falling prey. Once this is recognized, Dasein can reorient itself to its proper potentiality-of-being, and project itself forward into its possibilities with the understanding that it is doing this for its own being instead of the being of the They. Having heard the call, and understanding it, Dasein is not yet authentic. It is perhaps still in an undifferentiated mode of being and being prepared for authenticity, but only with resoluteness does Dasein achieve it.

3.3.3 Resoluteness

Resoluteness is the state where Dasein itself has finally become authentic, the "reticent projecting oneself upon one's ownmost being-guilty which is ready for Angst." (SZ 297) Since resoluteness is essentially an understanding that it is guilty, it must have the corresponding attunement and discourse that accompany any understanding. The attunement present in resoluteness is Angst, as "the disclosedness of Dasein in wanting-to-have-a-conscience." (SZ 297) The discourse involved in resoluteness is 'reticence,' or the silence of the call of conscience. (Mulhall, 129) Resoluteness is the disclosedness where "the most primordial truth of Dasein has been reached, because it is *authentic*." (SZ 297)

These concepts must be applied at an ontic level if authenticity is to be put into practice. Dasein always is, and always will be, thrown into the world. Its being,

as being-in-the-world, means it must care for others and things in the world, regardless of it being inauthentic or authentic. Resoluteness does not imply that Dasein somehow detaches itself from the world. In authenticity,

> the 'world' at hand does not become different as far as 'content,' the circle of the others is not exchanged for a new one, and yet the being towards things at hand which understands and takes care of things and the concerned being-with with the others is now defined in terms of their ownmost potentiality of being a self. (SZ 297-298)

That is, Dasein still exists in the same world, with the same people; and the same possibilities but projects itself in a way that its attitude and understanding of its possibilities are no longer determined by the They. Despite its own authenticity, Dasein still has to be in a world that is dominated by the They, and "understanding this is one of the things resolution discloses, in that resoluteness first gives to Dasein its authentic transparency." (SZ 299) Dasein can never completely escape the influence of the They, but it can project its possibilities in such a way that "Dasein is concerned with its ownmost potentiality-of-being that, as thrown, can project itself only upon definite, factical possibilities." (SZ 299) Heidegger calls the 'there' disclosed in this new resolute way the 'situation.' It is an authentic parallel of the 'Da' of Dasein, but understood in authentic resoluteness rather than through the They.

At this point, Heidegger must bring together the ideas of being-toward-death and being-guilty, which both "invoke different inflections of a single conception of negativity at the heart of human existence." (Mulhall 1996, 138) Being-guilty has shown us that Dasein is always thrown into possibilities that it did not choose, but for which it must exercise responsibility in authentic resoluteness, but, as Heidegger asks, "What is death supposed to have in common with the 'concrete situation' of acting?" (SZ 302) How does the account of authentic being-towards-death as anticipation

given previously come together with the account of authentic potentiality-of-being as resoluteness? Heidegger brings them together in anticipatory resoluteness, which is the totality of authentic Dasein's being. For resolute Dasein to understand its existential guilt, it must also understand that this guilt is a constant feature of its being, up until the moment of its death. The nullity of being-guilty ends only with the nullity that comes with death, the point at which Dasein 'is not': "Resoluteness becomes authentically what it can be as *being-toward-the-end-that understands*, that is, as anticipation of death." (SZ 305) Resoluteness and anticipation are not two separate concepts, but are "two central marks of the conditionedness or finitude of human existence—finitude as mortality and finitude as nullity." (Mulhall 1996, 138) Dasein is only authentic when it realizes that it is thrown into possibilities that are not its own, amongst which it must choose some and abandon others, and that at any moment, Dasein may cease to exist. The proper anticipation of being-towards-death requires the knowledge that Dasein is thrown, projecting, and fallen prey, while the proper resoluteness of being-guilty requires the knowledge that death is certain, unavoidable and individualizing. Mulhall describes anticipation as the "authentic existentiell modification of resolutness." (Mulhall 1996, 138) The anticipation of being-towards-death is the proper way of projecting one's possibilities in such a way that Dasein understands that it is guilty and its being is essentially a nothingness. Anticipatory resoluteness means essentially that Dasein projects itself onto its possibilities knowing that it is being-in-the-world, that its possibilities are determined by its being in the world, but takes them up with an attitude

We will recall that Heidegger's original project consisted of an attempt to determine the totality or unity of Dasein's being, as a step towards outlining a fundamental ontology. Anticipation of being-towards-death was only an ontological

construction, but anticipatory resoluteness gives it an "ontic-existentiell concretization." (King, 206) Anticipatory resoluteness gives existentiell wholeness, but for existential totality, Heidegger will have to look at temporality as the ontological basis of care; this is itself a large topic and for the purposes of this dissertation, I will not go into it. Heidegger has shown how Angst, as an attunement, discloses to Dasein its being as being-in-the-world. The anxiety that this disclosure presents makes Dasein ready to hear the call of conscience summon to it that its being is essentially a nullity. Dasein must face the fact of its existence as thrown into the world, and must project its possibilities with the knowledge that its possibilities are contingent and finite. Nothingness lies at the basis of Dasein's being, and authentic existence lies in accepting this and projecting one's self upon one's possibilities with an attitude of anticipatory resoluteness.

4. Criticisms of Heidegger

Thus far, this dissertation has attempted a systematic commentary of Heidegger's concept of authenticity. We must now turn to a deeper examination of some of the more problematic and controversial ideas in his account, and look at the criticisms some philosophers have put forth, as well as the possibility of defending Heidegger from these critiques. I will focus on three main areas: death, *das Man*, and authenticity.

4.1 Death

We will first look at criticisms of Heidegger's account of death and being-towards death. Two of the main critics of Heidegger's thought in this area are Paul Edwards, in his *Heidegger and Death: A Critical Evaluation*, and Herman Philipse, although he relies heavily on Edwards' own work. Edwards takes issue with nearly everything Heidegger says about death, and his monograph is a scathing condemnation of Heidegger's thought that accuses many of Heidegger's views on death of being trite and uninteresting. One paper claims the rift comes from the fact that they are from two opposing schools of thought, and Edwards' disagreement with Heidegger stems from his tendency towards logical positivism and his refusal to acknowledge the idea of a phenomenological phenomenon as including that which is hidden (Hallman 1985, 301) Hallman points out that while Heidegger uses phenomenology as the appropriate method for his task of fundamental ontology, Edwards is using conceptual analysis in an attempt to clarify Heidegger's thought, and rejects his phenomenology. I believe that many of Edwards' claims are mainly the result of misinterpretation and a failure to address the proper place of death within the context of Heidegger's broader ontological project. Edwards takes

Heidergger's definition of death as the *"ownmost nonrelational, certain, and as such, indefinite and not to be bypassed possibility of Dasein.* As the end of Dasein, *death* is the being of this being-*toward*-its-end," (SZ 258-259) and breaks it down into parts, offering criticisms of each specific concept.

The first aspect of death Edwards addresses is death as nonrelational possibility, which Edwards interprets wrongly as meaning 'all humans die alone.' He himself acknowledges that Heidegger never uses the world 'alone' (*allein*, in German) but says "he uses various expressions which come to the same thing. He constantly speaks of death as a 'non-relational possibility.'" (Edwards 1979, 6) Furthermore, when Heidegger speaks of death as wrenching one away from the They, Edwards translates this as meaning 'from other people,' (Edwards 1979, 6) thus implying that death tears Dasein away, literally, from others, and is a mistranslation of *das Man*. He argue that it is false to claim that all humans die alone, since we can point to examples where people die with others; in a train accident with many fatalities, for example, Edwards says we cannot claim that these people died alone, since there were others present who also died at the same time. Furthermore, if dying alone were to be interpreted as a psychological or emotional state of loneliness or alienation, it is also not always the case that people die alone. Edwards claims "'dying alone' has been redefined so as to be logically equivalent to 'dying,'" (Edwards 1979, 9) but this is a patently false claim, and many people have pointed out that Heidegger never redefines the term nor even uses the word 'alone' in this context (Hinman 1978, 205) When Heidegger says that "all relations to other Dasein are dissolved in [death]," (SZ 250) he is referring to an ontological characteristic of death, that Dasein is concerned only with its own being, and not to the ontic aloneness of one's specific death.

Next, he looks at death as an unsubstitutable or untransferable possibility. For Heidegger, this means death as an individualizing possibility, the one that is most mine and the one possibility where no one can substitute for me. Edwards says it is possible for someone to die for me and gives the example of a hostage dying in another's place, but Heidegger himself explicitly says that this is not what he means, because the person who has had another die for him has not been ultimately delivered from death—at some point each person must die their own death, which no other individual can ever prevent or take upon himself. (SZ 240) For Edwards, the claim that each person must die their own death is a trite grammatical truth, since "the statement that I will die…includes as part of its content that the death I will die is mine." (Edwards 1979, 13) This may be true, but what Edwards fails to take into account is the role this idea has in the context of all one's possibilities being constituted by the They. The mineness of death means it is an individualizing possibility, and upon closer examination of Heidegger's intended context, it becomes evident that this is more than a trite expression of a rule of language. As we saw in Section 3.2.2, Philipse concurs with Edwards, saying that all matters of the body are unsubstitutable in this sense, since no one can eat, breathe or run for me, and therefore this is nothing especially individualizing about death.[4] (Philipse 1998, 360) However, as Hinman points out, things like eating or breathing are not "things which necessarily stand on my horizon; they are not for me necessary 'not yet's,'" (Hinman 1978, 202) and I believe he is correct—physical processes like eating, although unsubstitutable, do not have the same ontological function as death. We must accuse

---

[4] Philipse believes that Heidegger's failure to account for the role of the human body "seriously distorts his analysis of everyday life…[since] my genetic structure, my bodily constitution, and my personal history are determining factors of equal importance." (Philipse 360-361) It is worth noting that our way of interpreting these factors is itself determined by the They, and cannot be said to be independent of any social context.

Heidegger of perhaps omitting to mention the unsubtitutability of bodily functions, but must also remember that part of Heidegger's task is determining the totality of Dasein, and eating does not have claim to the same ontological significance as death. Finishing a meal does not mark the end of Dasein's possibilities in the way that death does. In terms of unsubstitutability, death, on its own, is not unique. In combination with its other characteristics, however, it is a distinctive phenomenon.

Edwards also addresses the concept of being-towards-death. Dying, in the existential sense of the term, is being-towards-death. Heidegger makes a distinction between death and dying, death being existential concept of the end of Dasein (its ownmost, nonrelational, not to be bypassed possibility) and dying, or being-towards-death, being the ontological structure of having a relation towards death. Edwards claims that Heidegger uses death to mean death in the usual sense as well as concern about one's death, (Edwards 1979, 22) and the fact that Dasein is always being-towards-death simply means "first, that human beings die, and second, that unlike plants and animals they know and are, fugitively or nonfugitively, concerned about their death." (Edwards 1979, 21-22) To say that we are dying as long as we live, therefore, simply means that we are always know we are going to die—Edwards claims that Heidegger has redefined 'dying' or being-towards-death to mean concern about death. As such, Heidegger's claim that we are always being-towards-death is another platitude without much philosophical import. Once again, this is a case of Edwards' failure to understand the ontological significance of Heidegger's ideas. Edwards takes dying to mean the period of time between one's 'death-producing event' (the beginning of the thing that is the cause of death, eg. a plane crash or cancer) and one's actual moment of death. (Edwards 1979, 28-29) If this is the case, then it is easy to see how Edwards takes issue with Heidegger's claim that we are

always dying. However, Heidegger is using 'dying' to describe an existential. Being-towards-death is much more than the straight-forward knowledge and concern about death; the term is used by Heidegger to refer to an ontological structure of Dasein, whereas concern about death is an ontic reaction. Being-towards-death means much more than just being concerned with one's death—it is an existential that underlies the being of each Dasein, constantly informing the possibilities it chooses.

One of the most controversial issues in Heidegger's account of death is the idea of death as possibility. Indeed, if this claim is investigated without giving proper attention to its context, it can seem utterly confused. As we saw in the previous chapter of this dissertation, Heidegger distinguishes between two senses of possibility. The ontic sense refers to objects at hand, and involves things that can be actualized: "what is *not yet* real and *not always* necessary." (SZ 143) For instance, the possibility of my eating a banana is an ontic possibility because it is not necessary that I eat it, but it is a real event that can be actualized in the future if I do eventually eat the banana. Possibility as an existential, however, is a way of being that belongs to Dasein's being; the possibilities of Dasein are ways of being that it can choose. Edwards contends that death is a possibility for Heidegger precisely because "death gives Dasein nothing to 'be actualized' and nothing which it itself could *be* as something real," (SZ 262) and this is based on the idea that if something is not actual, it is possible. Edwards calls Heidegger's use of 'possibility' in relation to death "fantastically misleading" (Edwards 1979, 33) because he is not using the term in its ordinary sense, nor in the sense that he himself has advanced. Heidegger defines Dasein's existential possibility as "ways of taking care of the 'world' which we characterized, of concern for others and, always already present in all of this, the

potentiality of being itself, for its own sake." (SZ 143) Possibilities are different ways of being into which Dasein projects itself, involving how it is concerned with the surrounding world, other individuals, and its own being. Edwards, it seems, takes death as a possibility in the ontic sense first mentioned, which is why he cannot make sense of Heidegger's claim. He says "the total absence of experiences and behavior is most emphatically *not* what we mean by 'possibility' in any of its ordinary senses and it is *equally* not what Heidegger himself meant when he introduced the word 'possibility' in his special sense to mean the actions or conduct or mode of life which a person may choose." (Edwards 1979, 33) However, Edwards is conflating the concept of demise, as the event that signals the end of Dasein's possibilities, with being-towards-death as a way of directing itself towards the world. If we understand being-towards-death as Dasein relating itself to the world and others in a way that understands death as individuating, nonrelational, certain and indefinite, then death is a possibility in the existential sense.

Philipse believes Heidegger's claim that the anticipation of death allows Dasein to understand its being as a totality rests on a confusion about wholeness. Philipse distinguishes between two types of wholeness, synchronic and diachronic. Diachronic wholeness includes the temporal whole of something from the moment of its inception to the moment of its destruction, whereas synchronic wholeness is the wholeness of something at one point in time. The example Philipse gives will make this clearer; consider the idea of living in one's house as a whole. If I am living in all the rooms of my house, I am living in the house as synchronic whole. If I lived in the house from the moment it was built until it was demolished by a wrecking ball, I will have lived in the house as a diachronic whole. (Philipse 1998, 369) He believes that when Heidegger speaks of the wholeness of Dasein, he is referring to its

diachronic wholeness, and if this is the case, the problem of wholeness is not unique to Dasein. Any being that persists in time presents this same problem when phenomenogically determining its existence as a whole, because as soon as it ceases to exist, it is no longer a phenomenon available for us. This misunderstands the problem of understanding the whole of Dasein. We cannot understand our own totality because we cease to exist at the moment it is reached, whereas I can study the diachronic wholeness of frogs because I do not cease to exist when the frog does.

If the problem of the totality of Dasein is a problem of diachronic wholeness, then anticipating the possibilities of Dasein seems to require the physical ability to run ahead in time and survey all of one's future possibilities. Since this is impossible, Philipse says, "the sense in which we might grasp our life as a whole by running ahead towards death is to *imagine* how our future life will be," (Philipse 1998, 370) although the information disclosed by this sort of visualization does not provide us with phenomenologically valuable information about the nature of our being. However, Heidegger is not speaking of diachronic wholeness when he introduces the problem of the totality of Dasein. He is seeking a way to determine the whole of Dasein in terms of its ontological structures, by incorporating the 'not yet' into the structure of care. The anticipation of possibilities is an ontological concept, and to think of it terms of the specific possibilities of a particular Dasein is to apply it wrongly, at the ontic level.

4.2 Das Man

Another controversial concept in *Being and Time* is *das Man*. Many commentators disagree over the proper translation of this term, since in English there is no exactly equivalent phrase; throughout this dissertation I have referred to it as

'the They,' in accordance with the idea of *das Man* as an indistinct group and its way of being, as expressed in the such phrases as 'They say we ought to do such-and-such.' This English colloquialism is similar to the French usage of *on* in such contexts, or indeed to the German that Heidegger uses. Dreyfus prefers to translate it as 'the One,' in the sense of 'One does such-and-such.' This translation, however, brings to mind a distinct, possibly divine, entity, and does not solve the problem of ensuring that each Dasein is identified with the They. In keeping with Stambaugh and others I believe that the They is an adequate translation, but it is absolutely crucial when using this term, however, to remember that the They is not a distinct group, since each individual Dasein also belongs to the group. Other possibilities include 'Anyone' and 'Everyman,' although I believe these are less suitable, since they seem to carry with them the connotation of one average individual against which all others are measured. Although averageness is part of the *das Man*, this translation suggests that there is a particular paradigm of Dasein that displays the characteristics of the They.

The problem with the They is the perceived conflict between its positive and negative aspects, which Dreyfus refers to as the difference between conformity and conformism. (Dreyfus 1991, 154) For Dreyfus, conformity, the 'positive' aspect of the They, is the source of all intelligibility in the world because we exist with-others: "for both Heidegger and Wittgenstein, then, the source of the intelligibility of the world is the average public practices through which alone there can be any understanding at all." (Dreyfus 1991, 155) Dreyfus' Wittgensteinian interpretation of Heidegger means that "*das Man* denotes the shared norms that determine both equipmental use and the point of such use which Heidegger calls significance." (Dreyfus 1995, 424-425) The They embodies a set of public rules that govern how

we use things and interact with others. On the other hand, the negative levelling aspect of the They's conformism means that it fosters "generality and banality." (Dreyfus 1991, 328) Conformism indicates Dasein's readiness to accept the They's decision about 'how things ought to be' rather than thinking it out for itself and taking responsibility for its decisions.

Olafson disagrees with Dreyfus' Wittgensteinian interpretation of *das Man*, saying "Heidegger does not cite any real context of shared work or social co-operation." (Olafson 1994a, 57) The Wittgensteinian interpretation means Dreyfus defines the They as the normal user of equipment, (Dreyfus, 141) but his references to cultural norms seems inappropriate. A cultural norm is a standard or typical value upheld by a society, and Heidegger never makes any reference to norms or culture in *Being and Time*. Dreyfus gives the example that 'one pays one's taxes' as a cultural norm—this is the normal thing to do in our society. Yet this seems to imply that not paying one's taxes means one has broken free from the They. However, the individual who refuses to pay his taxes in everyday life is still inauthentic. Defining the They as he does disregards the point that everything we do in our everydayness, whether or not it is what people generally do in a certain situation, still involve absorption in the They.

Olafson emphasizes the importance of negative aspect of the They for Heidegger's project, and his portrayal of it as "an active force making for conformism and discouraging anything that departed from the norms of a thoroughly anonymous social life.' (Olafson 1994a, 58) Dreyfus'contention that the They involves rules for the use of equipment is at odds with Olafson's claim that "*das Man* is at bottom a deformation of *Mitsein*." (Olafson 1994, 59) Characterizing the They as simply shared rules "assimilate[s] other *Daseins* to the ontological status of the

ready-to-hand (*zuhanden*) which is appropriate to the non-*Dasein* entities that we make use of, but not to a *Mitdasein*." (Olafson 1994b, 336) The rules that govern the use of equipment differ greatly from the ways we interact with other Daseins. Furthermore, if Dreyfus' account of the They is correct, authenticity, as detaching one's self form the They, would seem to result in a loss of intelligibility and the inability to interact with the world. (Olafson 1994b, 336) We might respond to Olafson's claim by pointing out that this would be correct if authenticity involved a complete detachment from the They, but Dreyfus points out that this is not what Heidegger intends to say. (Dreyfus 1995, 426) Authentic existence cannot be detachment from the world because resoluteness discloses that Dasein's real being is in-the-world: "resoluteness brings the self right into its being together with things at hand, actually taking care of them, and pushes it toward concerned being-with with the others," (SZ 298) but it does it in such a way that is directed towards its true potentiality-for-being.

It seems as if Heidegger is straddling both sides of the issue, and textual evidence can be found to support both Olafson and Dreyfus. (Carman 1994, 213) Looking at *Being and Time*, we can see that Heidegger seems to vacillate between the idea of the They as a source of shared intelligibility and the They as a levelling public force that removes our self. Many of Heidegger's views in Section 27, where he discusses everydayness and the They, support the claim of conformism: "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." (SZ 126-127) However, this is an ontic characteristic, and takes account of the They solely in existentiell terms. Ontologically, the They levels down and makes everything average. Its tendencies are not confined to the decisions we make in everyday life, but as "an

existential...[and] primordial phenomenon" of Dasein, it obscures the being of Dasein. A description of the They as encompassing the anonymity and herd mentality of mass culture is an ontic explanation. It does not take into account the They as an existential of Dasein that obscures Dasein's being as such. If we understand the They at an ontological level as that which obscures Dasein's being, and at an ontic level as dictating Dasein's behaviour and thought in a certain way, the ambiguities can be resolved.

4.3 Authenticity

The confusion over the true nature of the They leads to conflicting accounts of authenticity, since authenticity is ostensibly the state wherein Dasein has wrenched itself free from its absorption in the They. There is a great deal of discussion about authenticity in the secondary literature, and I shall address some of the main points. The most important issue facing authenticity concerns the contradiction in *Being and Time* over the priority of authenticity. This is also related to the idea of the coherency of authenticity resulting in the incoherency of inauthenticity, as Dreyfus and Philipse maintain.

4.3.1 The Priority of Authenticity

Let us first look at the question of whether authenticity or inauthenticity is more basic. Heidegger makes two conflicting sets of claims. First, he seems to say that authenticity is an existentiell modification of the fundamental inauthenticity of everydayness: "*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,*" (SZ 130) "*Authentic* existence is nothing which hovers

over entangled everydayness, but is existentially only a modified grasp of everydayness," (SZ 179) and "Authentic being-a-self shows itself to be an existentiell modification of the they which is to be defined existentially." (SZ 267) However, he also makes claims that imply that authenticity is more fundamental than inauthenticity: "The they-self is an existentiell modification of the authentic self," (SZ 317) and "Inauthenticity has possible authenticity as its basis." (SZ 259) Elsewhere, Heidegger has a tendency to use language that suggests authenticity is more prior, when he speaks of Dasein 'fleeing' or 'falling prey,' as if inauthenticity is a state into which Dasein falls or to which it flees from its authentic being.

It is obvious here that one's conception of the They will have an impact on which is more basic. Dreyfus, for instance, offers an account of *das Man* that makes inauthenticity more prior; because the They consists of shared public practices that give intelligibility, inauthenticity must be more basic. As he says, "Even authentic Dasein must in some sense do what one does. Perhaps, when *Dasein* experiences anxiety, it finds itself and others unintelligible. But as soon as it resolutely acts on the basis of this anxiety it must do so in conformity with public norms of intelligibility." (Dreyfus 1995, 426) If the world is to be intelligible to authentic Dasein, it must still conform to the They in some sense. If this is true, inauthenticity must be a more basic state, with authenticity as a modification.

Olafson addresses the problem of the priority of authenticity as a conflict between *das Man* and the 'I.' However, his claim that the They is a deformed Mitsein means the question at hand is really whether being-with-others is more basic than authenticity. In saying that the authentic self is more prior to the They, or that the 'I' is more prior to the They, he claims that this 'I' is simply the " 'formally distinct' or individuated character of a single Dasein," (Olafson 1994a, 58) and in

this case, it makes sense to say that Dasein is prior, because there must be a Dasein in the first place, that can be with-others. Heidegger's claim that the authentic self is an existentiell modification of the They simply states, for Olafson, that "we most certainly do not start out in life by standing-on-our-own [being authentic] (and sometimes do not ever really reach that point) even though we are, in the other sense, distinct individuals.'" (Olafson 1994, 58)   The They is therefore prior to the authentic self because we always exist with others that influence us and upon whom we are dependent. I believe that Olafson's version of the They as a form of Mitdasin is not at all what is intended by Heidegger; he reduces inauthenticity to a type of being-with-others in which one acts according to cultural norms and proprieties. To do this is to deny the ontological function of the They in Dasein's being.

Guignon offers a solution to the problem of priority.   He claims that Heidegger's two claims are not necessarily contradictory.   If one examines Heidegger's words carefully, it becomes evident that he says authentic being-a-self is an existentiell modification of the They, and that the They-self is an existentiell modification of the authentic self.   Guignon claims that Heidegger differentiates between the authentic self and the They as existentials, and authentic being-a-self (or authentic existence) and the They-self as existentiell modifications of these existential structures. (Guignon 1984, 329-330) The authentic self, as an existential, is "the 'formal' structure of Dasein's existence as a temporal 'happening.'" (Guignon 1984, 332) He means that Dasein's existence is always being-towards-death, and this "temporal structure of thrown goal-directedness" (Guignon 1984, 332) applies to every Dasein, whether or not they are take it up authentically. The They is also an existential, because Dasein is always thrown into the world and must appropriate its possibilities from within this world, but because the They is always a defining

95

feature of Dasein's being, authenticity (in contrast to the authentic self) can only be "an 'existentiell modification' of our essential being as *both* the Anyone and an Authentic self," (Guignon 1984, 333) in which Dasein directs itself authentically towards the possibilities it is thrown into. The They-self is an existentiell modification of the authentic self in which being-towards-death is taken up inauthentically. This is an interesting interpretation, and would certainly help to resolve Heidegger's contradictory claims, but in Section 27 Heidegger distinguishes between the They-self and "the *authentic self*, the self which has explicitly grasped itself." (SZ 129) This is clearly at odds with Guignon's claim that the authentic self is the structure of Dasein's thrown projection, regardless of its authentic or inauthentic status. I believe that Heidegger meant that authenticity is the existentially prior state, but because it cannot offer a new set of possibilities for Dasein, existentielly it must modify the possibilities it takes up from the They. We can still make sense of the They-self as an existentiell modification of the authentic self, as a way of being that directs its possibilities towards the They, rather than towards its own authentic potentiality-for-being.

4.3.2 Is Inauthenticity Incoherent?

The relation between authenticity and inauthenticity raises the problem of how authenticity is even possible. If inauthenticity is a necessary existential of Dasein's being, how can this ever be overcome? Dreyfus says this is a result of Heidegger's two versions of falling, the structural account and the psychological/motivational account. The structural account involves entanglement in the They; in everyday life, we fall prey to the They and absorb ourselves in the world in terms of it: "Falling prey to the 'world' means being absorbed in being-with-one-

another as it is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity," (SZ 175) and "in falling prey, Dasein turns away from itself." (SZ 185) This is "a structural necessity since Dasein has to take a stand on itself by taking up the for-the-sake-of-whichs provided by the one." (Dreyfus 1991, 227) By the structural account, falling prey is an existential necessity that cannot be escaped. Dreyfus believes that Heidegger also offers a psychological account of falling as fleeing, and that this is fundamentally flawed. In this story, Dasein flees from itself into the They to avoid the knowledge of itself as being-in-the-world: "the absorption of Dasein in the they and in the 'world' taken care of reveals something like a *flight* of Dasein from itself as an authentic potentiality for being itself." (SZ 184) Dreyfus says that "Heidegger thus collapses the distinction between *falling* and *fleeing*. Indeed, he conflates the structural and the psychological." (Dreyfus 1991, 228) It is inaccurate to think of 'fleeing' as a psychological account, since this would be an ontic rather than an ontological account, and Heidegger himself says that "our inquiry must guard against conflating ontic-existentiell characteristics with ontological-existential interpretation." (SZ 184) Dreyfus goes on to say that "Heidegger wants to *derive* falling-away from motivated flight. That is, he wants to *explain* the essential ontological structure of falling-away as a *consequence* of Dasein's *need* to deny its unsettled way of being," (Dreyfus 1991, 229) but the references he gives from *Being and Time* do not, I think, show this to be the case.

Dreyfus claims that the motivated account of fleeing that Heidegger gives in Division II, in conjunction with his discussion on Angst, is a secularized version of Kierkegaard. Fleeing is a parallel to Kierkegaardian sinning, in which Dasein chooses inauthenticity: "In *choosing inauthenticity*, Dasein actively takes over the public practices of flight for-the-sake-of covering up its nullity." (Dreyfus 1991, 315)

Dreyfus repeatedly refers to Dasein as choosing inauthenticity, when Heidegger intends it to be a way of being that Dasein is always already in. We are always already thrown into the They, and authenticity is the mode of being that characterizes our everyday being, unless we hear the call of conscience and make an effort to become authentic. There is no process of choice in becoming inauthentic, and Dreyfus implies that each Dasein goes through Angst and from this viewpoint chooses whether to be authentic or inauthentic: "The alternative to fleeing anxiety is to hold onto it." (Dreyfus 1991, 315) But Heidegger points out that Angst is not something that happens to each Dasein. I think that Dreyfus is describing the idea of fleeing from Angst as a psychological structure of falling, when in fact it is perhaps a more primordial account of fleeing than the one offered as absorption in the They. Dreyfus goes wrong by attributing a voluntary aspect to inauthenticity.

Dreyfus believes that Heidegger's attempt to secularize Kierkegaard's Christian interpretation of falling as sinfulness results in a contradiction: "inauthenticity becomes both inevitable and incomprehensible." (Dreyfus 1991, 334) If absorption in the world is a necessary existential of Dasein, then Dasein is essentially inauthentic; but if authenticity leads to "equanimity, appropriate action, and unshakable joy" (Dreyfus 1991, 334) it is difficult to see why Dasein would fall back into inauthenticity. Dreyfus attributes the problem to Heidegger's failure to completely secularize Kierkegaard's account of anxiety. Kierkegaard has "a Christian conception of the self as needing a meaningful world of its own and commitment as providing it," (Dreyfus 1991, 335) where the anxious individual is reluctant to accept this absolute commitment because of the attendant risks of loss and grief. In the motivation account, however, Heidegger, has dropped this Christian idea of "total commitment and the consequent risk of grief" (Dreyfus 1991, 335) so

his account cannot explain why Dasein tends to flee Angst. Philipse believes that the contradiction arises not because Heidegger secularized Kierkegaard but because he only *pretended* to, as part of his Pascalian strategy. This strategy that Philipse attributes to Heidegger describes an attempt to lead non-believers to Christianity by providing an account solely in secular terms, with a conclusion that is so compelling that it leads them to Christianity. When Heidegger says that we are not our 'real' selves in everyday life he implies that "if we face up to dread, we realize that our worldly life is not our true life, and we will venture the leap to an absolute religious commitment." (Philipse 1998, 372) Attributing the Pascalian strategy to Heidegger, however, seems like a highly dubious approach, given the lack of any textual evidence to support this claim.

4.3.3 Other Assorted Problems with Authenticity

How are we to understand Heidegger's vacillation over whether there are two or three modes of being? We know that there are unquestionably two modes, authentic and inauthentic, but he occasionally claims there is a third mode called indifference or undifferentiation. Part of the problem lies in the fact that Heidegger uses two different terms that mean indifference: *Indifferenz* and *Gleichgültigkeit*. The latter is used in "a merely descriptive and ordinary way, without important consequence either with respect to method or content." (Dostal, 44) *Indifferenz*, however, is the term Heidegger uses when he refers to this vague third mode of being. In Section 12, he says "Dasein exists always in one of these modes, or else in the modal indifference to them," (SZ 53) and in Section 45, "this potentiality-of-being that is always *mine* is free for authenticity or inauthenticity, or for a mode in which of these has been differentiated." (SZ 232) Zimmerman contends that this means

everydayness is an undifferentiated type of existence that can be altered into either authentic or inauthentic being. (Zimmerman 1981, 45) In Section 9, Heidegger says "at the beginning of the analysis, Dasein is precisely not to be interpreted in the differentiation of a particular existence; rather, it is to be uncovered in the indifferent way in which it is initially and for the most part. This indifference of the everydayness of Dasein is *not nothing*; but rather, a positive phenomenal characteristic." (SZ 43) This seems to accord with Zimmerman's contention that everydayness is undifferentiated, yet there are numerous examples in *Being and Time* where Heidegger says that everydayness is inauthentic. I venture to put forth the possibility that indifference or undifferentiation is the way of being Dasein located between inauthenticity and inauthenticity. With Angst and the call of conscience, Dasein is pulled from the They into a way of being where it is no longer concerned with beings in the world. In this mode, it is pulled away from absorption in the They, but has not yet reached the authenticity that comes with being-in-the-world in anticipatory resoluteness. We might think of this undifferentiated mode as a neutral position of choice from which Dasein can choose to heed the call of conscience and become authentic, or to ignore it and return to absorption in the They.

Another issue we might address is Heidegger's problematic claim that inauthenticity is not a lower form of being: "the inauthenticity of Dasein does not signify a 'lesser' being or a 'lower' degree of being," (SZ 43) "neither must the entanglement of Dasein be interpreted as a 'fall' from a purer and higher 'primordial condition,'" (SZ 176) and "the ontological-existential structure of falling-prey would also be misunderstood if we wanted to attribute to it the meaning of a bad and deplorable ontic quality." (SZ 176) One possible reason that Heidegger makes these statements is that normative or valuative claims are ontic concepts. (Llewelyn 1983,

131) To say that authenticity is 'better' than inauthenticity disregards the ontological nature of these modes of being, since valuation is an ontic way of being that does not apply to fundamental ontological structures. But if this is the case, what can the motivation be for choosing to become authentic rather than remaining absorbed in the They? Although Heidegger discusses *how* we can become authentic, he never really addresses the question of *why* we would want to become authentic at all. Perhaps the "unshakable joy" that resoluteness gives the authentic individual is reason enough.

Many of the criticisms directed at Heidegger's account of authenticity, death and the They stem from a confusion between ontic and ontological structures. Generally, these criticisms can be fended off by pointing out the difference between the two. For instance, Edwards' misguided critique is a result of attributing ontic characteristics to the ontological features of death, as well as a failure to understand these concepts in terms of fundamental ontology. However, some of the confusion and controversy that arises over authenticity and the They comes down to Heidegger's terminology and his attribution of unusual and distinct meanings to common words. There are internal contradictions and problems within the project, especially in terms of the positive and negative functions of the They, the priority of authenticity, and Dasein as the caller of conscience. The huge amount of secondary literature published on these themes attests to this, and yet no definitive answers have been given. I believe part of the problem in sorting this out has to do with the fact that Heidegger never managed to write the rest of the work. The part of *Being and Time* we do have is merely a preparatory analysis. Several scholars have pointed out that Heidegger discards various concepts later in his career. Indeed, in the present

form, the concept of the They is unclear and must be worked out. Furthermore, the account of conscience seems untenable unless Heidegger can explain from whom the call comes. Generally, however, the accounts of being-in-the-world and Angst are insightful and have provided a new and helpful way of thinking of our selves and the world.

5. Conclusion

Heidegger never completed *Being and Time*. The published work was meant to be merely the first half of a complete and systematic phenomenological account of fundamental ontology. The first half was described by Heidegger as "the interpretation of Dasein on the basis of temporality and the explication of time as the transcendental horizon of the question of being," (SZ 39) with the unwritten second half to use the findings of the previous section as a guideline for a "phenomenological destructuring of the history of ontology." (SZ 39) As such, the philosopher must keep in mind that the text of *Being and Time* is incomplete, and remember that the work Heidegger provides was not meant to be the entire picture.

It is important to keep this in mind when one looks at the existential analysis of Dasein. *Being and Time* is not solely a work of the ontology of human being, but a first stage in answering the question of the meaning of being. The existential structures of Dasein that Heidegger has set out must be thought of as relating back to this project; he did not set out to analyze Dasein for the sake of understanding human being, but in order to understand being in general. Dasein is the necessary first step in understanding being because it is the only thing that *can* understand being. Heidegger took the unprecedented philosophical step of understanding Dasein as it is in its everyday existence. As human beings, we always exist in the world; while other philosophers thought it was possible to detach one's self from the world as a pure 'I,' Heidegger realized that we are always concerned with the world, and the objects and individuals within it, and oriented his phenomenological investigation towards this realization. From the existentiell structures that make up Dasein's everyday existence, Heidegger sought to determine the underlying existential

structures that make it possible for us to interact with objects and other individuals, and to be individuals that always have possibilities. The essential nature of Dasein as understanding being means that it can always be in a different way than it is, unlike rocks or cats. Part of our understanding of being means that we have knowledge of our finitude, and death is an ever-present concept in our lives. But because Dasein is a social animal, concerned with others, it is absorbed in the public world and adopts the tendency of the public world to cover over being. Dasein is inauthentic in everyday life, but is capable of breaking out of the absorption and concealment of the They, in order to reach authenticity. Angst discloses to Dasein that it is being-in-the-world, and that as a result, it is always thrown into a situation not of its choosing, but from which it must project its possibilities and become itself. The possibilities of inauthentic Dasein are determined by the They, but without the realization of Dasein that this is the case. The only possibility that is properly Dasein's own is death, and authenticity thus requires a specific attitude towards death. The call of conscience discloses to Dasein that its being is care, namely that it is concerned with the world, and thrown into the world, and has possibilities only within the world. Yet the basis of care is a nothingness, as death too is ultimately a nothingness, and authentic Dasein takes up this disclosure and directs itself onto its possibilities in the knowledge that it is possible to be one's real self even in the midst of the concealment and absorption of the everyday world. Authenticity is ultimately the understanding that we are finite beings, with contingent possibilities, and neither our own being or what we do is necessary; rather than turning away from this seemingly disheartening disclosure, authentic Dasein takes it up joyfully and lives a life free from concealment and the dominance of others.

Bibliography

Bell, David. (1990) *Husserl.* London: Routledge.

Blattner, William. (1994) "The Concept of Death in *Being and Time.*" *Man and World*, Vol 27, pp. 49-70.

Boedeker, Edgar C. Jr. (2001) "Individual and Community in Early Heidegger: Situation *das Man*, the *Man*-self, and Self-ownership in Dasein's Ontological Structure." *Inquiry*, Vol 44, pp. 63-100.

Buckley, Philip R. (1992) *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Carman, Taylor. (1994) "On Being Social: A Reply to Olafson." *Inquiry*, Vol 37, pp. 203-223.

Demske, James M. (1970) *Being, Man, and Death.* Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Dostal, Robert. (1982) "The Problem of '*Indifferenz*' in *Sein und Zeit.*" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 43, pp. 43-58.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. (1991) *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Divison I.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. (1995) "Heidegger on *Das Man.*" *Inquiry*, Vol 38, pp.423-430.

Dreyfus, Hubert L & Haugeland, John. (1978) "Husserl and Heidegger: Philosophy's Last Stand." In Murray, M. (Ed.), *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy.* (pp. 222-238) New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dunning, Stephen N. (1985) "Kierkegaard's Systematic Analysis of Anxiety." In Perkins, R.L. (Ed.), *International Kierkegaard Commentary: The Concept of Anxiety.* (pp. 7-33) Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Edwards, Paul. (1979) *Heidegger and Death: A Critical Evaluation.* La Salle, IL: The Hegeler Institute.

Elliston, F.A and McCormick, P. (Eds.) (1977) *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Frede, Dorothea. (1993) "The Question of Being: Heidegger's Project." In Guignon, C. (Ed.) *Cambridge Companion to Heidegger.* (pp. 42-69) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Golomb, Jacob. (1995) *In Search of Authenticity.* London: Routledge.

Grossmann, Reinhardt. (1984) *Phenomenology and Existentialism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Guignon, Charles. (1984) "Heidegger's 'Authenticity' Revisited." *Review of Metaphysics,* Vol 38, pp. 321-339.

Guignon, Charles (Ed.) (1993) *Cambridge Companion to Heidegger.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Harrison. (1984) "Love and Death: Kierkegaard and Heidegger on Authentic and Inauthentic Human Existence" *Inquiry,* Vol 27, pp.179-197.

Hallman, Max O. (1985) "Edwards and Heidegger on the Significance of Death." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology,* Vol 16, pp. 301-306.

Hannay, Alastair. (1982) *Kierkegaard.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Heidegger, Martin. (1981) *Basic Problems of Phenomenology.* (Albert Hofstadter, Trans.) Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Originally published 1927)

Heidegger, Martin. (1996) *Being and Time.* (Joan Stambaugh, Trans.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. (7th German ed., originally published 1953)

Hinman, Lawrence. (1978) "Heidegger, Edwards, and Being-Toward-Death." *Southern Journal of Philosophy,* Vol 16, pp. 193-212.

Husserl, Edmund. (1960) *Cartesian Mediations.* (Dorion Cairns, Trans.) The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Husserl, Edmund. (1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology.* (David Carr, Trans.) Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Originally published 1954)

Kierkegaard, Soren. (1944) *The Concept of Dread.* (Walter Lowrie, Trans.) Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Originally published 1844)

King, Magda. (2001) *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kockelmans, Joseph J. (Ed.) (1967) *Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Its Interpretation.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Llewelyn, John. (1983) "The 'Possibility' of Heidegger's Death." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology,* Vol 14, pp. 127-138.

Magurshak, Dan. (1985) "The Concept of Anxiety: The Keystone of the Kierkegaard-Heidegger Relationship." In R. L. Perkins (Ed.), *International Kierkegaard Commentary: The Concept of Anxiety.* (pp 167-195) Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Moran, Dermot. (2000) *Introduction to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

Mulhall, Stephen. (1996) *Heidegger and Being and Time*. London: Routledge.

Mulhall, Stephen. (2002) *Inheritance and Originality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murray, M. (Ed.) (1978) *Heidegger and Modern Philosophy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. (1966a) *Beyond Good and Evil*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books. (Originally published 1886)

Nietzsche, Friedrich. (1966b) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.) New York: Penguin Books. (Originally published 1883)

Olafson, Frederick A. (1994a) "Heidegger *à la* Wittgenstein or 'Coping' with Professor Dreyfus." *Inquiry*, Vol 37, pp. 45-64.

Olafson, Frederick A. (1994b) "Individualism, Subjectivity, and Presence: A Reply to Taylor Carman." *Inquiry*, Vol 37, pp. 331-337.

Perkins, Robert L. (Ed.) (1985) *International Kierkegaard Commentary: The Concept of Anxiety*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Philipse, Herman. (1998) *Heidegger's Philosophy of Being: A Critical Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, Charles. (1991) *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Theunissen, Michael. (1984) *The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Sartre, and Buber*. (Christopher Macann, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Van Breda, H.L. (1977) "A Note on Reduction and Authenticity according to Husserl." In F.A. Elliston and P. McCormick (Eds.), *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals*. (pp. 124-125) Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. (Reprinted from *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 56 (1951): 4-5.)

Zimmerman, Michael. (1981) *Eclipse of the Self*. Athens: Ohio University Press.