

CHAPTER 1: HEIDEGGER AND PHENOMENOLOGY

Heidegger and phenomenology. In my view, the relation between these two terms of reference has yet to be fully explored in any secondary text. And yet, I contend, this relation is of crucial importance, if we are to proceed towards understanding and developing either. My interest in Heidegger in this chapter lies in examining this relation in some of his texts, in particular “Being and Time”, with a view to trying to explain its initial form, and to show how this relation changed. The reason for doing this is not in order to uncover another form of scholarly approach to Heidegger’s oeuvre, it is rather in order to begin again with phenomenology.

The situation today is that no-one asks about Heidegger’s relation to phenomenology. This is a curious mode of silence, if we consider the following facts.

- 1) In Heidegger’s magnum opus, “Being and Time”, the destruction of ontology, the philosopher’s project of re-evaluating and transforming the western tradition of philosophy, has an explicitly stated methodology: a phenomenological one. In section 7, entitled “The Phenomenological Method of Investigation”, Heidegger writes,

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

With the question of the meaning of Being, our investigation comes up against the fundamental question of philosophy. This is one that must be treated *phenomenologically*.
(Heidegger, 1962:49-50)

It would be hard to accord phenomenology with a more significant status in this work.¹ Phenomenology, in this early masterpiece, is the method necessary in order to perform the destruction of ontology. Heidegger repeats and affirms Husserl's methodological rallying call of '*Sachen selbst*', 'to the things themselves'. Ontology, as the uncovering of the Being of beings, aspires to return the philosophical project to the concrete facts of existence. In order to do so, it must proceed through an analysis of Dasein's existence. Phenomenology is the manner in which philosophy begins to do this.

2) And yet. Something occurs along the path of Heidegger's thinking which decenters an explicit phenomenology to the periphery, if not beyond this to the realm of silence. Phenomenology is abandoned. In Heidegger's "A Dialogue on Language", Heidegger responds to the Japanese enquirer's puzzlement over the

¹ Readers will recall that the work is dedicated to the founder of twentieth century phenomenology, Edmund Husserl.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

‘dropping’ of the words ‘hermeneutics’ and ‘phenomenology’ as follows,

That was done, not – as is often thought- in order to deny the significance of phenomenology, but in order to abandon my own path of thinking to namelessness. (Heidegger, 1971:29)²

The question that I will address in this chapter is how we are to understand the nature of this transformation of the way in which Heidegger positions his thought in relation to phenomenology. How can Heidegger at once affirm phenomenology’s significance and yet distinguish, in his later work, between a phenomenological methodology and his ‘own path of thinking?’ What is the difference between phenomenology and Heidegger’s voyage towards namelessness that the philosopher suggests here? More importantly still, why does Heidegger begin to *make* the distinction between his own thought and the phenomenological methodology he abandoned? What becomes problematic for Heidegger in relation to phenomenology? In other words, we will try to understand the following passage of mystery, written in a late text of Heidegger’s entitled “My Way to Phenomenology”.

And today? The age of phenomenological philosophy seems to be over. It is already taken as something past which is only recorded

²As John Llewelyn writes, ‘if the movement of Heidegger’s reflection is “through phenomenology to thought,” it is “through” in the sense that phenomenology is not left behind. Thought remains a thought of

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

historically along with other schools of philosophy. But in what is most its own phenomenology is not a school. *It is the possibility of thinking, at times changing and only thus persisting, of corresponding to the claim of what is to be thought.* If phenomenology is thus experienced and retained, it can disappear as a designation in favor of the matter of thinking whose manifestness remains a mystery.

(Heidegger, 1962: 82, emphasis added)

In this chapter, the argument put forward is that Heidegger's break with phenomenology occurs within the movement of "Being and Time" itself.³ In particular, I will argue that the privileging of time over space in that text takes Heidegger's thinking to the cusp of breaking with phenomenology. The reason for this is that the way in which Heidegger enacts the privilege of time over space involves *sacrificing* space. In "Being and Time", time privileged involves space denied. But this sacrificial logic of privilege and denial cannot be successful, and this for two reasons. Firstly, to privilege time and to ultimately deny space involves a sacrifice of phenomenology itself. For, as Heidegger himself shows in the early sections of the work, essential to the phenomenological analysis of existence is an uncovering of spatiality. Dasein

appearing- and disappearing.(ref)

³ By using the word 'break' I am relying on the tension between two of its senses, that of the snapping of a given form of continuity on the one hand, and that of a rest or suspension of activity on the other. As Michel Haar writes in Chapter VI of "The Song of the Earth" 'Heidegger's distance from phenomenology

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

exists in the world fundamentally as a being directing and directed in space. Therefore, the later privileging of time over space involves discriminating against and devaluing what had previously been deemed essential to phenomenology. In order to discriminate against space, I argue that Heidegger must break with the phenomenological method, which, as was shown in the quote from section 7 above, he would not avowedly want to do. Secondly, and concomitantly, the essential *spatio-temporality* of human existence entails that the attempt to privilege time over space has phenomenological repercussions which Heidegger cannot control. I will show, in my reading of section 70 of “Being and Time”, that Heidegger’s attempt to privilege time over space relies upon a *spacing* of what is designated as time’s ante-spatial character. In other words, Heidegger’s attempt to privilege time over space involves positing a construction of time that already involves a ‘spacing’. And given the ambition of this section, this ineradicable spacing goes against Heidegger’s wishes. These phenomenological repercussions take place most obviously on the level of language. Heidegger’s attempt to articulate a time free of space involves an irreducibly spatial and temporal vocabulary.

I will argue then that the attempt to privilege time over space in section 70 is illegitimate. After having demonstrated this, I will go on to explore the

never went so far as to reach a point of rupture’ (1990:78).

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

implications for the rest of Heidegger's analysis in that work. Devaluing his important analyses of existential spatiality in the face of time leaves Heidegger with the apparently more primordial phenomenology of temporality and being-towards-death. I will argue that this phenomenology of death itself is problematic in that it entails the possibility of an impossible revelation. Transcendence is named as the 'possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein'.⁴ Named in this way, transcendence must always fall back into immanence, as its unsayable limit. In other words, the transcendence of death lies beyond representation and experience, and as such, 'beyond' phenomenology. This is witnessed in the constant deferral of an answer to whether a *phenomenological* ontology of death is possible in sections 46 to 53 of "Being and Time". Again, I contend that at bottom Heidegger's error lies in eschewing a phenomenological spatio-temporality.

Most fundamentally, Heidegger's error is that of taking space and time to be primordially distinct. In this, Heidegger can be seen to be repeating the analytic emphasis placed upon their *apriori forms* in Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason". For Kant, space and time are apriori forms of perception. By this, he meant that prior to all actual seeing, hearing, touching and so on, our perception is already conditioned by an understanding of the form of the object perceived as

⁴"Being and Time", p294.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

involving both space and time. In other words, space and time do not begin with the object perceived, they are on the contrary the framework by which we perceive. Most significantly, for Kant, space and time are separate a priori forms. One could say that they are in a sense ‘ontologically’ distinct. This distinction allows Kant, most clearly in the first edition of the “Critique of Pure Reason”, to privilege time as the form of inner sense. Time, as the condition of possibility of all representations, has a greater extension than space, which is the form of outer sense alone. Time, as the form of the subject, becomes the transcendental horizon upon which space is grounded. Heidegger repeats this separation or schism between space and time, as well as the privilege accorded to the latter, in “Being and Time”, such that space and time are ontologically distinct orders of being. In simple terms, the structure of this work involves an early emphasis on a phenomenology of space giving way to a later emphasis on *dasein*’s temporal nature. Heidegger refuses to think the possibility of a phenomenological *spatio-temporality*. Instead, he begins by holding that space is a vital aspect of existence, and ends by concurring with the first edition Critique’s contention that time is more primordial still, to the extent that any apparent primordially of space is annulled. By grounding space in time, Heidegger therefore subjects his thought to a subtle repetition of the subjectivism his pre-dualistic ontology of the phenomena had sought to escape.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

I will suggest that perhaps more than anything, the subjectivism which ensures time is given transcendental privilege in “Being and Time” is the motivation for Heidegger subsequently to drop phenomenology. By grounding inner time and historicity in Dasein’s ecstatic temporality, Heidegger repeats the subjectivism Dasein’s Being-in-the-world campaigned phenomenologically against. In seeking a non-subjectivistic ‘ground’ for historicity, Heidegger is led to become suspicious of the notion of ‘phenomenon’ itself.

Therefore, by repeating the Kantian tendency to separate time from space, Heidegger becomes blind to the inevitable spacing involved in any construal of time, and blind moreover to the inevitable temporisation involved in any construal of space. Section 70, as I shall show, bears testimony to the difficulties Heidegger gets himself into by overprivileging an analyticity which separates time from space. That is, the error in Heidegger’s thinking in section 70 is an error derived from an inadequate attention to phenomenology. Or rather, Heidegger neglects to question the Kantian privileges (of the first edition of the “Critique”), blocking his thought to the possibility of thinking phenomenology *differently*.

The problem for Heidegger, as we shall see, is that section 70 is absolutely crucial in terms of the direction of “Being and Time’s” argument. If it is possible to undermine the privileging of time over space in “Being and Time”,

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

the whole project collapses.⁵ The subsequent analysis of temporality and historicity after section 70 will constantly be nagged by a spacing and a spatiality that must be there at its inception. The analysis of spatiality becomes an essential part of a fundamental ontology. As such, the ‘temporocentrism’⁶ of “Being and Time”, its abiding bias, would be challenged. And Heidegger’s desire to ground a notion of historical freedom (or freedom to ‘historise’ – to be a part of history’s unfolding) will take on the mantle of a manifest failure.

*

I will begin by examining how Heidegger introduces and justifies his own methodology. In section 7 of “Being and Time”, Heidegger attempts to provide a determination of what he means by the word ‘phenomenology’ and a preliminary conception of the role it will play in his research. To begin, he states that phenomenology is the *method* by which ontology will be uncovered. The destruction (*Abbau*) of ontology which Heidegger proposes involves ignoring the resources of the tradition of ontology. This eschewal is justified for Heidegger because he thinks it is not possible to derive a methodology from the history of that methodology’s results. The history of ontology has been a history of covering over that which the methods and vocabularies

⁵Didier Franck notes, in “Heidegger et le probleme de l’espace,” ‘if “spatiality” has to intervene in the derivation of inner-time from originary temporality, the whole project called *Being and Time* would thereby be called into question.’ p115

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

employed in order to proceed have attempted to disclose. The history of metaphysics has been the history of an error. Phenomenology, as a *possibility* rather than an actual historical tradition,⁷ will on the other hand allow the Being of beings to be described. Phenomenology will allow, that is, for an understanding of the things themselves which is not buried within the sedimentations of past philosophical movements.

Nor will the understanding of the things themselves be merely *ontic*. Or, as Heidegger puts it, he is not interested in the ‘what’ but the ‘how’ of the objects of philosophical research. He explains the relationship between phenomenology and the object of ontic science as follows,

‘Phenomenology’ neither designates the object of its researches, nor characterizes the subject-matter thus comprised. The word merely informs us of the “*how*” with which “*what*” is to be treated in this science gets exhibited and handled.(Heidegger, 1962:59)

Heidegger therefore uses the phenomenological method in order to get beneath any technical description of objects available through the various sciences. These sciences work on the presupposition of objective being for Heidegger. The ground of this objectivity remains hidden as long as any of these sciences are taken as primordial. Without an ontological ground, the

⁷I take the term from Ed Casey’s book “Getting Back Into Place”.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

different ontic sciences therefore remain ‘free-floating’.

Heidegger proceeds by separating out phenomenology into its two ancient Greek constituents: phenomenon and logos. It is through the exegesis on the former that Heidegger somewhat densely attempts to distinguish between an ontic understanding of the phenomena of objects and an ontological one. He does this by calling the former ‘appearance’ (Erscheinung), and the latter ‘phenomenon’ (Phanomenon). The appearance of objects is derived from their being as phenomena. Heidegger elaborates several modes of derivation of appearance from phenomena, each of which demonstrates itself as a form of concealment or privation of the phenomena itself. I shall not explore these distinctions. What is more important is to understand that for Heidegger, the etymology of the word “phenomenon” suggests the following definition: “that which shows itself in itself”. The phenomenon is therefore not shown to the subject as a mode of subjectivity. That is, uncovering the phenomenon does not directly involve a research into unmediated forms of experience. And on the other hand, the phenomenon is not self-evidently available in the manner of an apparent scientifically grounded transparency. The phenomenon is not, therefore, of the order of *subjective* nor *objective* Being. Heidegger notes that □□□□□□□□□□ is a ‘middle-voiced form’. This reference to a form of

⁷ “Being and Time”, p63

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

grammar that lies *between* the subject and object is therefore ontologically significant. The verbleness of the phenomenon's manifestation is neither active, the work of the subject, nor passive, the work of that which transcends the subject. The phenomenon lies prior to appearances as given to the subject and appearances as ascribed to the object. As such, the phenomenon is anterior to the clefting of a dualistic epistemology. Both pre-subjective and pre-objective, the phenomenon therefore designates the 'how' of how something appears as itself. It contrasts with a mere 'representation' of the percept to the subject, a modality that would always be grounded in subjectivity. All forms of appearance of the object where it appears *as something else* will therefore be deemed derivative upon an originary possibility for the object to appear as itself. The appearance of the phenomenon *as appearance* therefore refers to ways in which the object is given, by external or subjective means, a different designation to the way in which it would appear, if it were to appear as itself. I will provide an excursus on an example of this in the following chapter, which can be mentioned briefly here to clarify the distinction between appearance and phenomenon I take Heidegger to be making.

Reading A.N. Whitehead, I will introduce his idea of the 'fallacy of misplaced concreteness'. This refers to the way in which modern thinking has reified an abstract conception of reference and the percept and therefore displaced what

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

is most concrete. The most concrete is henceforth in modern ontology deemed to be the 'simple' object. The simple object refers to the here and now discrete presence of the object to perception. The object appears as a non-relational entity, independent of its relation to its context in both a spatial and a temporal sense. Whitehead provides a detailed analysis of the procedure whereby the abstract is taken to be most concrete, and suggests ways to return thinking to the object according to a non-abstract framework. The object is not simple in the most concrete sense, for it always involves relationality. Under the influence of Leibniz, Whitehead propounds what can be described as a phenomenology of process, whereby the object is seen to always already refer to the unfolding of its spatio-temporal context and vice versa. I shall examine this argument in more detail in the following chapter.

What it is important to note here is that Whitehead can be seen to be providing just the sort of distinction between appearance and phenomenon referred to in Heidegger above. The appearance of the object as appearance (rather than as itself) is its misconstrual as a 'simple' object. And, with Heidegger, Whitehead provides what can be described as a 'genealogy' of the simple object, locating its emergence in the birth of modern conceptions of space and time. In other words, the object acquires layers of signification sedimentation which *cover over* the manner in which it actually appears as itself. Whitehead's proposed return

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

to the object seen as a process or ‘event’ therefore marks the move back from a derivative and ontic comprehension of the object to its phenomenologico-ontological source. This movement is, if we read what I am calling Whitehead’s ‘phenomenology’ in the light of “Being and Time” section 7, phenomenology’s very necessity. That is, phenomenology is necessary because our conception of the object has become distorted by the appearances given to it by the tradition of metaphysics and the groundless reworkings of ontic science. As Heidegger writes, ‘..just because the phenomena are proximally and for the most part *not* given, there is need for phenomenology. Covered-up-ness is the counter-concept to ‘phenomenon’.’(Heidegger, 1962:60)

Again, it is not to the point of the work of this chapter to examine in detail Heidegger’s mining of the etymological resources of the ‘logos’, save to say that it produces a middle-voiced conception of ‘letting something be seen, in *letting* entities be perceived.’⁸This enables Heidegger to derive the following full-length definition of the phenomenological method: ‘to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself.’⁹Again, appearances both subjectively and objectively sourced are therefore derived from an ontological *between*. The phenomenon appears as itself through an exchange between the immanence of subjectivity and the

⁸Ibid, p58

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

transcendence of the world. The phenomenon is therefore neither the sole work of the subject, a path that would lead to the psychologism phenomenology has always sought to counter, nor the work of external being. The character of this exchange of something like a ‘transcendence within immanence’ is clarified in the ensuing sections, where Heidegger introduces the notion of “Being in the World” (In-der-Welt-Sein)

By this stage in his analyses, it is clear that Heidegger is providing a way out of the dichotomous trap of Cartesian dualism. In Chapter III of Division One of “Being and Time”, Heidegger contrasts the modern ontology of the object and space with the phenomenological ontology which he will set out. He writes, ‘...a discussion of the Cartesian ontology of the ‘world’ will provide us likewise with a negative support for a positive explication of the spatiality of the environment and of Dasein itself.’¹⁰The Cartesian ontology referred to sets out the primordially of the world in terms of *res extensa*. For Heidegger, this ontology is reductive, exemplifying a dualism between extended matter and thinking being which cannot support and clarify the spatiality of Dasein’s relation with the world. The human’s experience of its relation with the world cannot be articulated solely in terms of an interaction between two forms of extension, that of a finite extension (the body) in relation to an indefinite extension (the

⁹Ibid.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

world). Prior to the ‘appearance’ of objects and the seemingly self-evident givenness of physical being, an existential attachment to the world needs to be uncovered. Preceding the external spatiality of extension, something like an ‘intrinsic’ spatiality has to be sought. Only thus could extension and physical/objective/mathematical being be seen to have legitimacy, as a derivation and abstraction from concrete existential relations. In other words, prior to an ontic layer of description, an ontology of space is required. And again, with Heidegger’s method of phenomenological ontology, this analysis is sought through an examination of the spatiality of Dasein, the being who most obviously resists the reduction of being described merely as a physical entity, extended in a world of extension.

In contrast with the object as it appears within Descartes’ thinking, Heidegger’s notion of the phenomenon in a sense occupies a ‘third space’ between subject and object. With this in mind, the Being of beings which manifests itself in the phenomenon, the thing itself and its spatiality, requires fleshing out and determination. Heidegger elaborates this determination in terms of Dasein’s *In-der-Welt-Sein* being ordered and given significance through use and function. In the simplest terms, the object’s ontological significance lies in terms of its functional relation within Dasein’s world. Dasein exists in a world of objects

¹⁰Ibid.pp122-123.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

that signify on the basis of their slot within a totality of functions, what we might call a 'praxis horizon.' Instead of Dasein confronting an object that signifies on the basis of its simple here and now presence, its presence-at-hand (Vorhanden) as for example a simple extended thing, Dasein more primordially encounters objects in the world as 'availabilities' (Zuhanden). Each object-thing is not a 'simple object' in Whitehead's sense; on the contrary, it makes sense only in terms of a background of a task-horizon within which it fits. Heidegger's most celebrated example of this are the meanings ascribed to the hammer and nail in the world of the carpenter. Both are understood most primordially not in terms of their present-at-hand signification, as if they would bestow their value to an outsider in terms of a simple inspection in isolation from the purposes to which they are put. Rather, they signify in terms of their role within the carpenter's work. The hammer and nail allow the carpenter to perform tasks which themselves only make sense in terms of the wider context of the work being undertaken. So, for example, banging this nail into this plank of wood, what we might call a 'local' task, itself only makes sense in terms of the boat the carpenter is building. Each tool therefore signifies on the basis of the tasks to which it is put, and these tasks themselves only signify on the basis of the wider context of the job being done. Instead of an attempt to derive the significance of objects from an atomistic, discrete, present-at-hand snapshot of the tool, the notion of a tool or object as an 'availability' allows Heidegger to

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

think the complex interrelationality of things in the world.

Heidegger holds that Dasein exists in-the-world through a series of contexts analogous to that of the craftsman. Dasein is not given the ontological privilege of an existence *prior* to the worldly significance of context upon context of praxis. Rather, Dasein exists *ecstatically*, as always already embedded within the world. At the same time, the horizon of worldly praxis is already there for Dasein only on the basis of that horizon being shaped *by* Dasein. Objects are 'available' as *ready-to-hand*, a more literal translation of *Zuhandenheit*. The significance of the equipment of the world cannot be separated from the capacities and availabilities of Dasein's ways of being-in-the-world. Again we return to the middle-voiced character of the phenomenon. The object does not bestow its significance in a manner external or extrinsic to human existence. Dasein is not passive in the face of its encounter with the signification of things in the world. And yet Dasein's shaping of these things is not totalizing. For how could Dasein shape the extra-significational materiality of things themselves? The phenomenon therefore appears as itself, through its involvement within the praxis-horizon of Dasein's taskful comportment in the world. The paradigm example of this would be a sculpture in wood or clay, where the materiality of the object is at one and the same time expressive of the work of the hands of the craftsman that worked it.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

Dasein's third space of 'being-in-the-world', prior to the clefting into *res cogitans* and *res corporea* is, as the grammar of the middle voice implies, ontologically pre-dualistic. Dasein enters a world already shaped by human ways of comportment, a world of signification and value that we can call 'strangely familiar'. The familiarity of the world lies in its modes of adaption to human possibilities. Things in the world are primordially 'available', that is they fit into patterns and contexts of action which are the traditions of bodily being Dasein will acquire through practice and habitualisation. The strangeness of the world lies in the fact that it pre-exists any signification Dasein might desire to stamp upon it. Dasein is 'thrown' (Gewurf) into a world that exceeds the signification matrices the individual might want to project onto it. And yet this excessivity is not wholly alien, for it offers itself in ways which will become recognisable to Dasein as it learns the ways of the world.

A key aspect of the prior-ity of the world lies in the way in which the always already established practical horizons of comportment are shaped around a materiality that Dasein cannot comprehend in advance of experimentation. In "Being and Time", Heidegger is reticent in developing the alterity of the object in this direction. It is as if every object, whether equipment or a non-artefactual entity, is accorded the same signification value. Natural entities, potential sources of the sublime, are refused their difference. *But this refusal of an excessive*

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

materiality does not hold throughout the text, for Heidegger writes in section 15,

... “Nature” is not to be understood as that which is just present-at-hand, nor as the *power of Nature*. The wood is a forest of timber, the mountain a quarry of rock; the river is water-power, the wind is wind ‘in the sails’. As the ‘environment’ is discovered, the ‘Nature’ thus discovered is encountered too. If its kind of Being as ready-to-hand is disregarded, this ‘Nature’ itself can be discovered and defined simply in its pure presence-at-hand. But when this happens, the Nature which ‘stirs and strives’, which assails us and enthralls us as landscape, remains hidden.(Heidegger,1962:100)

Despite this brief yet sublime intervention against the functional relativities of the tool, the ‘natural’, as that which is strangely familiar, cannot survive the emphasis on an inclusive ontology of the world that Heidegger sets out. The sublime, as that which stirs, strives, assails and enthralls is ultimately reduced to the status of the ‘not-yet’ available. The worldliness of the world encompasses any possible alterity of the natural, comforting and reducing the possibility of the sublime, that which would exceed the limits of the world. The world is therefore hardly shaken or solicited by nature rearing its face as briefly as it

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

does in this passage. In the third chapter, the possibility of an exteriority and a materiality that lies beyond the remit of the subject will be explored and named as ‘worklessness.’ The determining force of use and function, as the dominant mode of articulation of the interrelationality between Dasein and the world, silences modes of being that are extra-functional. There is no space in “Being and Time” for an enthrallment not re-appropriated in terms of function. Nor is there any space in this work for any less dramatic forms of extra-functional being-in-the-world: contemplation, absorption, meditation, rapture.

Despite this limitation, it is nonetheless true that the phenomenological ontology of worldliness in sections 14 to 24 of “Being and Time” provides a rich resource for thinking non-dualistically about Dasein’s spacing of the world and the world’s spacing of Dasein. In addition to what has been outlined above, we should note that these sections also incorporate the notions of the ‘here’ and ‘there’, and the idea of place or region as the encompassing horizon for Dasein’s practical comportment in the world.

However, with all these terms in mind, one could criticise the phenomenological work Heidegger performs here on the basis of an absence of an irreducible temporality at work in these aspects and terms of worldliness and worldhood. For instance, the notion of ‘here’ and ‘there’ necessarily involves more than just a spatial proximity or distance. For if there were no *temporal*

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

distance between the near and far, the spacing between them would be pressured by the threat of collapse.¹¹The reverse problem occurs, in my view, in Division II of “Being and Time”, where a phenomenology of temporality encounters difficulties on the basis of an attempt to think time’s irreducibility. In both cases, I hold that an irreducible *spatio-temporality* of Dasein’s Being-in-the-world gets distorted as it is first of all pushed through the filter of a pure existential spatiality, and secondly reduced into the extrapolations of an ‘ecstatic’ temporality. Heidegger commits the methodological (and therefore ontological) error of believing that space and time can be treated separately. In the latter part of “Being and Time”, this leads to the isolation and privilege granted to the ultimate form of ecstatic temporality, being-towards-death.

*

Before approaching the impossible phenomenology of death, that ‘ahead of which’ that resists manifestation, in my view, in terms of a phenomenological showing ‘as itself’, it is necessary to review how Heidegger tries to persuade the reader against the obviousness of phenomenological spatio-temporality. For this purpose, I now turn towards the work of section 70 of “Being and Time”. It is in this section that Heidegger attempts to assert the ontological primordially of time over space, thereby repeating the privileged

¹¹This idea is developed in terms of the death of architecture wrought by the institutionalisation of other

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

transcendental role of time in Kant, which Heidegger will come subsequently to recognise as a recrudescence of the subjectivism he sought to undermine.

In this section, entitled, ‘The Temporality of the Spatiality that is Characteristic of Dasein’ (*Die Zeitlichkeit des daseinsmässigen Räumlichkeit*), Heidegger makes clear the hierarchical relation he wants to install between temporality and spatiality,

Dasein’s constitution and its ways to be are possible ontologically only on the basis of temporality, regardless of whether this entity occurs ‘in time’ or not. Hence Dasein’s specific spatiality must be grounded in temporality. (Heidegger, 1962:418)

I shall begin to explore this transcendental privilege by constructing Heidegger’s phenomenological justification of it. Heidegger holds that only with the threefold ecstatic play of Dasein’s temporal structure as care (*Sorge*) can spatiality be made available. He writes,

Because Dasein as temporality is ecstatico - horizontal in its Being, it can take along with it a space for which it has made room, and it can do so factually and constantly. (Ibid:420)

Heidegger is claiming that the space that Dasein is presented with has no in-itself *qualia*, is not ‘simply located’, rather it is significant only in relation to the

modes of communication and information transfer in Paul Virilio’s “The Lost Dimension”.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

dyadic series of 'here' and 'there', or the 'near' and 'far'. Moreover, Heidegger wants to claim that the 'here-there' relation itself is 'grounded' in Dasein's anticipatory temporal horizon. Heidegger in effect is arguing that one is 'here', on the way to the region 'there' (negotiating a specific course across the praxis horizon) only on the basis of a temporal structure which is always already there. One is 'here' in a specifiable relation to any number of regions only on the basis of the present being the locus of time stretching across from the preceding moments (Husserl's 'retention') and into the openness of projective possibility ('protention'), a stretching whose momentum is always futural; one is always *here*, having been *there*, always *on the way elsewhere*. Heidegger suggests that what is present, the matter of how the present *presents* itself, is to be thought of in terms of an exhaustively temporal relationality, '*Only on the basis of its ecstatic-horizonal temporality is it possible for Dasein to break into space.*' (Ibid:421)

In Heidegger's view, the world, *prima facie* structured by spatial relations, manifold extensionalities, is in fact ordered more primordially by Dasein's projective temporal character, and at the limit, (subverted) by being towards death. The 'here' and 'there' dyadic structure of Dasein's orientation in the world uncovered by Heidegger's phenomenological analysis is itself disclosed and structured by Dasein's three-fold ecstatic temporality. The temporal *distentia* founds the spatialising *dispersion* (*Zerstreuung*). Only because Dasein

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

exists outside of itself *in time* can it emerge as open to the modalities of space.

This phenomenological justification of time's primordially over space is evidently problematic. The phenomenological array of terms Heidegger employs to describe worldliness are obviously taken from a spatio-temporal lexicon. To be 'here' on the way 'there', to be in this region of 'nearness', against the background of the far, and above all, to exist *ec-statically* - these references are clearly distorted and reduced when read in terms of a more primordial and solely temporal reference. It is as if Heidegger commits his own version of what the next chapter will call the 'fallacy of misplaced concreteness.' He seems to abstract from the spatio-temporal matrix of the body's relation to place, as if a deeper layer of significance could be uncovered beneath the interleaving of space and time. In other words, a transcendental privilege accorded to time appears to be at work which distorts the conclusions Heidegger draws from his phenomenological analysis. As Maria Villela-Petit argues, that in terms of the section's heading, 'The Temporality of the Spatiality that is Characteristic of Dasein',

..Heidegger was trying to eliminate the possibility of adding to this title an 'and reciprocally' which would make it possible to write another paragraph entitled: 'Die Räumlichkeit der daseinsmässigen Zeitlichkeit.' It was precisely the possibility of just such a

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

reciprocity which it was important for Heidegger to exclude.

(Villela-Petit,1991:118)

A spatiality of Dasein's temporality would disrupt the possibility of founding inner-time (Innerzeitlichkeit) and historicity (Geschicht-lichkeit). Here then is one of the supreme tensions present in "Being and Time": on the one hand, Heidegger wants to surpass or subvert the legacies of a cartesian ontology that will not allow thinking to access the phenomena of existence. The notion of 'ecstasis' allows Heidegger to demonstrate the Dasein exists as embedded within the world. The early sections on Dasein's spatiality demonstrate that Dasein has no ontological privilege over the world; that Dasein is shaped by a world itself shaped according to Dasein's ways of being. The 'middle-voice' of phenomena therefore occupies what I have called a 'third space' between the subject and the object.¹² In other words, "Being and Time" distinguishes itself out of all the texts of Western philosophy through a profound attention to the spatiality of being. Heidegger's temperocentrism falls into the seductive trap of conceiving 'a place that is not a place' (*loco con loco*).¹³ On the other hand however, Heidegger wants to assert the ontological primacy of time (and

¹² The middle voice of existential phenomenology is most marked in the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. For instance, in "The Visible and the Invisible", he writes, '...my body does not perceive, but it is as if it were built around the perception that dawns through it.' (Merleau-Ponty:1962,9)

¹³ I take this last reference from David Farrell Krell's book "Architecture: Ecstasies of Space, Time and the Body". The original formulation was made by St. Augustine in the "Confessions".

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

therefore, inner-time and historicity) over space. Heidegger can then develop a conception of the authentic (*Eigentlich*) acting individual whose freedom lies in becoming individualised as a historical being contributing to the future of the community. He does this by repeating the Kantian move of ascribing to time the form of the subject. Dasein's ecstatic temporality is taken to be the transcendental horizon from which Dasein's spatiality of dispersion will emerge. As such, only Dasein's ecstatic temporality will be taken to have the ontological significance of Care (*Sorge*), hence foreclosing the possibility of a middle-voice of ecological conscience.¹⁴The rich resources of a phenomenological ontology of Dasein's spatiality are henceforth completely undermined.

The phenomenological illegitimacy of privileging time over space has a repercussion at the level of language in section 70. At the end of the section, Heidegger attempts to make the obverse point to the one he makes at its commencement. That is, he wants to expand upon the ways in which Dasein, as temporally grounded across (and ontologically prior to) space, nevertheless becomes fixated or 'dependent' upon space. Dasein's everyday inauthentic temporality, as 'essentially falling', as a mode of losing oneself in the present of concern amidst and towards *objects* of concern, 'makes intelligible' Dasein's

¹⁴John Llewellyn's book "The Middle-Voice of Ecological Conscience" is a sustained attempt to think how

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

spatialising comprehension of the world. Dasein always interprets the world in wholly spatial ways, and this Heidegger explains is because of the nature of Dasein's temporal character. Hence we might say that Dasein's ontic refusal of an ontological comprehension, a failure to maintain an understanding of *Sorge* as 'grounded' in temporality, is itself ontologically 'grounded'. Dasein forgets its own resolutely temporal character, according to its essential tendency to become absorbed and de-individualised in the everyday. Only by becoming an *authentic* historical individual can Dasein uncover its Being-in-the-world as most primordially temporal, not spatial. For Heidegger, the ontic inauthentic interpretation results in

..the well known phenomena that both Dasein's interpretation of itself and the whole stock of significations which belong to language in general are dominated through and through by 'spatial' representations.(Ibid:421)

Here one might imagine Heidegger was thinking of the work of Bergson, especially "Time and Free Will" where Bergson examines the tendency in both philosophy and everyday life of *spatialising* time, of constructing temporality on the unacknowledged basis of a spatial frame. The spatialisation of time hence consists of transposing spatially-based predicates into an account of

a chiasmic reading of Levinas and Heidegger can lead to ascribing an ethical relation to non-human others,

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

temporality, without registering this transposition or outlining its legitimacy. As Ed Casey writes,

Whenever we think of time as a stringlike succession, we spatialise it, giving to it- supposedly an exclusively mental concern- predicates such as “continuous” and “linear”, which we borrow surreptitiously from the “external” world of space (a world into which we just as surreptitiously reimport these same predicates in order to reinforce its externality).(Casey, 1993:9)

It is just such a string of subreptions that Heidegger sought to avoid in separating space from time in section 70. However, Heidegger’s desire to avoid one conception of time leads to him misrepresenting the phenomenological significance of his alternative. The illegitimacy of the argument in section 70 at the level of language can now be stated. In each instance previously in the section where Heidegger attempts to cleft time from space and construct a ‘grounding’ relation between them, his temperocentrally motivated thinking becomes most plagued by ‘spatial representations’ that work to articulate his concepts. To take just two sentences already cited

Because Dasein as temporality is **ecstatico-horizonal** in its Being,
it can take along with it a space for which it has **made**

be they animals or inanimate natural beings.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

room..'(Heidegger,1962:420) 'Only on the **basis** if its ecstatico-horizonal temporality is it possible for Dasein to **break into space.**'

(Ibid:421)

Of course, it is not surprising that a phenomenological distortion of Dasein's spatio-temporal existence feeds into subreptions at the level of language. Returning to the concrete facticity of existence implies a return to the how that concrete facticity is *expressed*.¹⁵ I contend that in each of the two quotations, the moment of Dasein's 'irruption into space' enabled and made possible by the horizon of temporality, is figured and articulated according to a construction of temporality that is *already spatialised*. Temporality, as the 'ground' of spatiality, mimes or repeats a space prior to space, a pre-spatial spatiality or a *loco con loco*. As Krell writes,

In the designated section 70 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger tries to show how temporality "founds" the human experience of space.

However, the "founding function" of time itself rests on a

¹⁵That Heidegger was yet to fully affirm the significance of everyday speech in "Being and Time" is evident towards the end of section 7. Heidegger writes,

With regard to the awkwardness and 'inelegance' of expression in the analyses to come, we may remark that it is one thing to give a report in which we tell about *entities*, but another to grasp entities in their *Being*. For the latter task we lack not only most of the words but, above all, the 'grammar'. (Heidegger,1962:63)

It is in part this avoidance of everyday speech and grammar as given that allows Heidegger to underestimate the fundamental spatio-temporality of experience.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

traditional architectural metaphors of foundation and construction-in space...Heidegger's own language disrupts what his analysis wants to say, namely that space invariably reverts to time in human experience..(Krell,1997:43-44)

It is hence somewhat striking that in noting Dasein's tendency to spatialise time *after* the last cited sentence of Heidegger's, in the passage above, that Heidegger clearly repeats 'time and time again' the 'error' in his own exposition. This error can hardly be defended by a description of the section as a text where Heidegger himself testifies to the intractabilities of escaping the given paradigms of Dasein's ontic language.¹⁶In each section of the work, is it not Heidegger's aim always to think the ontic in relation to its dissimulated ontological ground? Hence we might say that it is section 70's purpose to position the spatialised present in relation to the temporality that 'grounds' it. Unfortunately, in terms of his explanation of why Dasein is apt to err in not regarding this 'grounding' relationship, Heidegger must resort to 'spatial representations' in order to install the 'ground'.

But is this failure a failure of language, an inadequacy of Heidegger's such that

¹⁶This is where I part company with Krell. I think Krell is being overgenerous with Heidegger when he continues, 'His own choice of words...compels him to admit that language itself is permeated by "spatial representations"'.(Krell,1997:44) It does not make sense to argue, as Krell does, on the one hand that 'Heidegger's own language disrupts what he wants to say', and on the other to hold that Heidegger is fully aware of the spatialised nature of his *own* language. At the end of section 7, it is clear that when Heidegger is discussing "spatial representation", he is referring to Dasein's tendencies, and not to his own

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

he could not develop a ‘purely’ temporal ontological lexicon (or a failure of grammar?), or is it a failure within Heidegger’s construction of the ontological ground, a failure wrought by the transcendental privilege inscribed within it? I contend that the latter is the case. On the one hand, Heidegger sought to separate time from space in order to develop a notion of temporality that is not plagued by spatial representations, in other words to develop a non-linear temporality. However, by eschewing the representation of time as a line, Heidegger merely covers over the way in which ‘ecstatic temporality’ itself involves spacing, in language and as a phenomena. Heidegger failed to see that the ineradicable spacing of time need not be reducible to the linear.

The phenomenologico-linguistic illegitimacy of Heidegger’s argument purporting to ground space in time has a further significant consequence. Dasein’s spatiality, one can readily agree, is ecstatic. It is self-evident that we commonly experience ourselves in daily tasks as absorbed into those tasks. As I sit typing this chapter into the computer, I am most of the time not aware of an experiential gap between the screen, the keyboard, and my fingers that punch the keys. In Merleau-Ponty’s words, ‘Our organs are no longer instruments; on the contrary, our instruments are detachable organs.’(Merleau-Ponty, 1964:178) That is, our everyday experience of the world is one whereby a distinction

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

between ourself as subject and the world as object breaks down, or is rather a possible reflective moment that is always already preceded by worldly absorption. However, the ‘there’ of ecstatic existence has its necessary corollary, the ‘here’. Absorption implies that the ‘here’ becomes the absent pole of the couplet.¹⁷ It is arguable that Heidegger’s early phenomenology repeats and installs this experience of corporeal absence at the level of thought. By grounding space in time, Heidegger enables Dasein to be conceived as most primordially outside itself in non-corporeal terms. It is not my task to explore this absence or sublimated role of the body in Heidegger’s early phenomenology. However, the avoidance of an engagement with the body through a transcendental privilege accorded to time seriously impairs Heidegger’s ability to resolve problems in ontology bequeathed by Kant, as we shall see. For the moment, I will merely cite several texts which elaborate the point. Erwin Straus writes,

The *Da* in which, in Heidegger’s own words [*Anspruch*], our being is thrown, is our corporeality with the structure of the world which corresponds to it.” In other words, with a view to getting rid of the dualism of mind and body (which is certainly one of the principal objectives of the fundamental ontology of *Sein und Zeit*),

¹⁷Drew Leder has written a book about the unrepresented half of this dyad, entitled “The Absent Body”.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

was it really necessary for Heidegger to subordinate the spatiality inherent in corporeality to ecstatic temporality?(Villela-Petit, 1991:119)

We may cite also Ed Casey, 'We are ahead of ourselves not just in time (as Heidegger emphasizes in his notion of anticipatory, ecstatic temporality) but also in space.'(Casey, 1993:84)

or finally the work of David Levin,

..Heidegger attempts to think the thrownness, the attunement, the binding, and the beholdenness of *Dasein* in the dimensions of time, history, and tradition; but he does so *without* taking up the question of the body, even though- as I am wont to believe- it is by virtue of the body, the body first and foremost, that *Dasein* is claimed and appropriated, bound and beholden, and decisively *thrown* into the ecstasy of an original attunement, in relation to time, history, and tradition. It is because *Dasein* is embodied that it finds itself ecstatically decentered in a threefold field of time, a repetition of history, and a living tradition.(1984:173-4)

It is now well known that Heidegger's evident discomfort in

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

transcendentalising ecstatic temporality over Dasein's spatiality in section 70 led to him replacing this operation with the notion of *Zeit-Raum* ('Timespace') by 1935 when he wrote the *Beiträge zur Philosophie*. Hence we do not need to posit the much later time of 1952 when Heidegger wrote "On Time and Being" as the occasion when Heidegger finally exposed these particular tensions in his earlier text. This text, we might nonetheless remind ourselves, included the following terse admission, "The attempt in "Being and Time", section 70, to derive human spatiality from temporality is untenable.' [*Unhaltbar*] (Heidegger,1962:23) In the following chapter, I will show that the move from "Being and Time" to the texts written after it repeats a similar transition in Kant, between the first and second editions of the "Critique of Pure Reason". In particular, Kant's addition of the 'Refutation of Idealism' and the 'General Remark on the System of Principles' both insert a block to a privilege accorded to time as the form of inner sense and thereby the essential condition for all possible representation.

*

Heidegger's phenomenology of finitude, contained for the most part in the first chapter of the second division, becomes more significantly problematic in the light of the illegitimate temporal grounding of space that has been noted above. However, even on its own terms, it is to be expected that death lies in at least a

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

relation of tension with Heidegger's existential phenomenology. For if death is a phenomenon, it is the strangest sort. I shall now examine briefly the sections of this chapter, in order to show that Heidegger's difficulties in expounding a phenomenology of death and dying are understandable, given the strangeness of the phenomenon of death (if it can be said to be such). This argument will allow me to begin to think finitude, as a phenomenon, differently. Again, this difference will involve returning the phenomenology of existence to its spatio-temporal roots.

Heidegger's problem, in the light of the above commentary on section 70 of "Being and Time", is that the most primordial register of Dasein is alleged to be temporality. Of course, so far, apart from the illegitimacy of installing this horizon as transcendental in relation to Dasein's body and spaces, it is not obvious that Heidegger's account of temporality is problematic in itself. The problem explored above of space and time being 'out of joint' is not to be construed in terms of problematising ecstatic temporality per se. Indeed, at no point would I wish to argue against the conceptual productivity inherent in the notion of 'ecstasy' itself. However, by examining how Heidegger tries to think the phenomenon of death, Dasein's temporality itself becomes problematic. And the site of this problematic must be ultimately articulated in terms of the legitimacy of Heidegger's phenomenological method itself. For if Heidegger's

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

phenomenology cannot think death as a phenomenon, this difficulty cannot be put at death's door. Rather, death itself must be thought differently.

The problem of Division two's first chapter is easy to set up. We recall that phenomenology, as determined through the etymological findings of section 7, involves the following definition: *to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself*. In terms of the world of functional objects, a pre-subjective and pre-objective uncovering of Dasein's involvement in the world is straightforward to supply. But how can Dasein's 'involvement' with death be shown in an analogous manner as a letting appear as itself? Death of course can be conceptualised, theorised, described from the point of view of an external event, but how is *dying* itself to be allowed to appear as itself, in the non-dualistic terms of the middle-voiced that-which-happens? No one has articulated the impossibility of a phenomenology of dying more profoundly than Georges Bataille,

..death, in fact, reveals nothing. In theory, it is natural, animal being whose death reveals Man to himself, but the revelation never takes place. For when the animal being supporting him dies, the human being himself ceases to be. In order for Man to reveal himself ultimately to himself, he would have to die, but he would have to do it while living- watching himself ceasing to be. In other

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

words, death itself would have to become (self-) consciousness at the very moment that it annihilates the conscious being.(Bataille, 1990:18)

For Bataille, death cannot be known *immediately*. One lives death through a subterfuge, the sacrifice of the other. In Bataille's terms, sacrifice is a phenomenon which exists in ritual form and, in western cultures, as the work of tragedy in literature, film and so on. Heidegger, on the other hand, does not so readily accept the impossibility of an existential phenomenology of death. Sections 46 to 53 attest to the difficulties he thereby puts his thinking through. The heading for section 46 is 'The Seeming Impossibility of Getting Dasein's Being-a-whole into our Grasp Ontologically and Determining its Character.' By being-a-whole, Heidegger is referring to the ultimate limit of Dasein's ecstatically temporal character. As existing futurally in the present, the 'ahead of which's' ultimate limit is of course that of death. If Dasein can think itself in terms of its ultimate demise, Heidegger's contention is that the human can individualise its own destiny and become a historical being. As such a being, Dasein would have what Heidegger calls 'freedom towards death'¹⁸That nothing is resolved finally about the phenomenon of death and dying is evident on the last page of the chapter (thirty pages later), where Heidegger writes, 'The

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

question of Dasein's authentic Being-a-whole and of its existential constitution still hangs in mid-air.'

After dismissing the significance of the other's death for me, and this because the other's death implies a loss that can have no relation to the experience of dying itself, Heidegger proscribes the possibility of experiencing dying by way of Bataille's subterfuge. Heidegger writes,

By its very essence, death is in every case mine, in so far as it 'is' at all. And indeed death signifies a peculiar possibility-of-Being in which the very Being of one's own Dasein is an issue. In dying, it is shown that mineness and existence are ontologically constitutive for death. (Heidegger, 1962:284)

As I am arguing, Heidegger's sacrifice of the sacrifice, of making the 'Batillian' move towards *dramatising* the other's death, is the moment when all hope for his phenomenology of dying breaks down, given the terms in which the 'phenomenon' and 'finitude' have been defined. This is at the least regrettable, for in my view it leaves Heidegger with no capacity to appreciate the power of tragedy. And with no 'theory' of tragedy, Heidegger fails to think death.¹⁹Every

¹⁸Being and Time" p311

¹⁹For Bataille, the death of the other *is* experienced *as dying*, and this is because of a process of identification with the other (rather than a Heideggerian distance). Bataille writes, 'In tragedy, at least, it is a question of our identifying with some character who dies, and of believing that we die, although we are alive.' (Bataille, 1990:20)

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

moment of the chapter is witness to a kind of slippage of failures, whereby Heidegger tries one approach to a solution only to concede defeat. The solution, of thinking Dasein as a totality, becomes deferred to a moment of thinking that is never realised. For instance, in section 47, after having denied the potentiality for a phenomenology of dying to be uncovered through the other's death, Heidegger concludes that a 'purely existential' conception of the phenomenon must be attained, or else his project would fail.²⁰ In the following section, Heidegger distinguishes a sense of the 'not yet' character of death from that required for an existential phenomenology of dying. He argues that the 'not yet' thought in terms of something still outstanding, like for instance the 'not yet' of the unripened fruit, cannot be the sense sought after, for to think of dying as a state that can be reached is to treat death in an ontologically inappropriate manner. Thinking phenomenologically about death as something 'still outstanding' involves the 'ontological perversion of making Dasein something present-at-hand.'(Heidegger,1962:293) Instead, Heidegger suggests that the 'not yet' character of death is experienced as something 'impending' (Bevorstand). In order to distinguish different possibilities of the impending, Heidegger specifies the impending not yet-ness of dying as the 'possibility of no-longer being able to be there.'(Ibid:294)

²⁰"Being and Time" p284

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

As enmired in everyday absorption in the world, Heidegger argues that Dasein is not explicitly aware of the end of existence as a possibility. The lack of awareness is not completely concealed however, for it surfaces as a mood or attunement (*Bestimmung*). He writes,

Dasein does not, proximally and for the most part, have any explicit or even any theoretical knowledge of the fact that it has been delivered over to its death, and that death thus belongs to Being-in-the-world. Thrownness into death reveals itself to Dasein in a more primordial and impressive manner in that state of mind we have called “anxiety”.(Ibid:295)

Anxiety therefore reveals the essential everyday concealment of the death of Dasein. As a mood expressed towards the future, anxiety conceals the *dying* that is proper to ecstatic temporality. As Heidegger says, ‘Factically, Dasein is dying as long as it exists..’(Ibid:295). Dying is concealed, in Dasein’s inauthentic everyday worldliness. This raises the question of whether an *authentic* attitude towards the dying- within-life proper to ecstatic temporality and care is possible. Heidegger asks, at the end of section 52, ‘can Dasein maintain itself in an authentic Being-towards-its-end?’(Ibid:304)

At this point, Heidegger’s attempt to provide a solution to a phenomenology of dying becomes acutely asymptotical. Death ‘reveals’ itself as the impossible, as

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

the possibility of the impossible. In other words, dying cannot reveal itself as such, and this impossibility just is the manner in which death is experienced within Dasein's ecstatically temporal unfolding. Heidegger writes,

The closest closeness which one may have in Being towards death as a possibility, is as far as possible from anything actual. The more unveiledly this possibility gets understood, the more purely does the understanding penetrate into it as the possibility of the impossibility of any existence at all. Death, as possibility, gives Dasein nothing to be 'actualised', nothing which Dasein, as actual, could itself be. It is the possibility of the impossibility of every way of comporting oneself towards anything, of every way of existing. (Ibid:307
Emphasis in original)

Death, as that which happens to others, cannot be of interest to a phenomenology of dying, for the sense of loss involved always happens to those who did not die. The loss of 'death' is not equivalent to the loss of 'dying'. On the other hand, Heidegger's careful analysis shows what was clear from the outset, that thinking dying as a 'phenomenon' must involve impossibility. But 'impossibility' in Heidegger's sense of the 'possibility of the impossible' *cannot be understood as another modality of the phenomenon*. The impossible impending death, that manner in which dying is lived, cannot reveal

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

itself, let alone reveal itself as such. Dying only expresses itself in anxiety. But a phenomenological analysis of anxiety will not of itself contribute towards a phenomenology of dying, for it is merely a *symptom* of dying's phenomenal deficit.

Therefore, Heidegger's phenomenology of dying is shown, in his own words, as impossible. In this case, it is not dying which must be refuted, for how could it? Rather, what has been uncovered is the limit of Heidegger's thinking of finitude. Dying can only be presented to Dasein as that beyond the possible. But as that which cannot reveal itself as such, a *phenomenology* of death must involve death falling back into immanence, at which point its significance 'as such' is lost. Heidegger's thinking of the finite becomes *indefinite*, unthinkable. Impossible. Ontological difference, construed as the difference between immanence and transcendence, is, in "Being and Time", sacrificed for the sake of a failed attempt to construct a phenomenology of dying. This sacrifice is carried out for the sake of a glorified ontological significance bestowed upon a possible subjectivity. Dying presents itself as the transcendent, as that beyond all possibility and project. As such, it simply cannot make itself manifest to Dasein, even in the terms of an impending 'not yet'. In order for dying to maintain its transcendence, it would have to be thought as the other side of immanence as its obverse inverse, not as that which falls back within the terms

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

of immanence. In other words, what would be required would be a *transcendence within immanence*, to use again a locution that will become increasingly important in this thesis. Transcendence within immanence does not entail that the former is somehow contained within the latter, for such containment would again reduce the former into the terms of the latter. The ‘within’ does not signify *inclusion*; it is rather the presence of difference within the present. Transcendence within immanence marks the moment where the present is thought as differing from itself according to ontological difference. This difficult point will become clearer in the following chapters.

Dying therefore would have to present itself as a transcendence maintained within immanence, as the death present as the difference within life, rather than being that which collapses in the face of the subject’s presence. As such, dying would become the mystery of the limits of being, the mystery of transcendence itself. It precisely would not be the measure of ‘ownness’, authenticity, and being-as-a-whole. The crucial point to be made is that dying, thought of as transcendence within immanence, is no longer the privilege of an hypothetically authentic subjectivity. Dying must be renamed *as finitude*.²¹ Ontological difference, the question of naming transcendence’s relation to immanence, no

²¹It is clear that this is what occurs to Heidegger after “Being and Time”, when the subjectivism of Being-towards-death is renamed as Dasein’s ‘mortal’ character, a mortality that is no longer self-appropriable. By the time of the Geviert texts, mortality rests within an interplay with the elements and the divinities. As such, a phenomenology of Dasein’s finite, spatio-temporal ecstatic being is made available.

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

longer turns on the *subject*, as it does in “Being and Time”. The transcendent names not the limits of Dasein’s being, but rather the limits of immanence itself. As such, transcendence names the limits of finitude. Transcendence is therefore excessive to the subject, and as such no longer thinkable on its terms. The difficulty to be faced and articulated is that although transcendence and immanence lie beyond each other’s limits, they are mutually constitutive. If this thought becomes possible (rather than being impossible), we will no longer need to equate this limit of finitude with a phenomenology of dying. And in this way, I suggest that dying could be made present as the tragedy of existence, without either the need for subterfuge or an heroic construction of subjectivity.

For the moment, it is important to note that dying cannot be considered as a *phenomenon*. And yet the phenomenology of Being-towards-death is crucial for Heidegger in terms of a sustained distinction between an inauthentic, absorbed everyday anonymity (of *das Man*) and a authentic self-possession. Being-towards-death, as a realised possibility of the impossible, determines Dasein’s capacity to become a historical individual, free to transform the collective’s future in the present of decision. As such, it is important to take issue with the following claim against Heidegger made by Alphonso Lingis,

Heidegger recognized the having to die with all our own forces to be our very nature, but he equated it, dialectically- and to us,

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

incomprehensibly- with the resolute and caring hold on things and on the world. (Lingis,1994:24)

Being-towards-death, as that which determines Dasein's possibility of becoming its own free historical being, is precisely not a resolute caring hold upon things and on the world. The see-saw effect of section 70 is to demonstrate that Dasein's temporality is more fundamental than its spatial dispersion in the world. Authenticity becomes available to Dasein only on the basis of a *suspension* of holding onto the world. The world, and Dasein's historical position within a given world-community, can only be transvalued and transformed on the basis of the world-as-given being relinquished. The Kantian privilege accorded to time as the form of inner sense becomes reworked, in "Being and Time", as the possibility of Dasein transforming the given, as that which is represented by spatial dispersion in the world.

But this transformation is impossible, because dying cannot be the basis for a resolute grasp of Dasein's being-as-a-whole. Heidegger, in this early work, commits something like a hubris of finitude. His hopes for establishing a notion of political freedom based on a phenomenological ontology of death die still-born in the first chapter of Division two. He will not begin to try and install being-towards-death at the ground of political freedom again.

*

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

Earlier, the ‘phenomenon’ in Heidegger’s etymologically generated determination was described as a ‘transcendence-within-immanence’. It is now possible to begin to determine how Heidegger’s thinking of the phenomenon *fails* in terms of the phenomenon being that which incorporates this ontological difference. Heidegger’s error is Kant’s first-edition error in “The Critique of Pure Reason”, that of marking an ontological distinction between space and time, at the same instant privileging the latter over the former. Heidegger’s difficulty in attempting a phenomenology of dying is that he takes finitude to be a purely *temporal* phenomenon. In this thesis, I will argue that it is absolutely illegitimate to make any such ontological distinction between space and time. Space and time are inextricably interwoven, from the point of view of a phenomenological ontology. Being-towards-death cannot therefore act as the ground of auto-appropriation and authenticity. Finitude reveals itself in the object, as a spacing of time and a timing of space. The object, if one is permitted to talk in such abstract terms, attests to a fundamental reversibility between space and time. Using A.N Whitehead, I will show in the next chapter that a phenomenological ontology of the spatio-temporal object allows the object’s transcendence within immanence to be presented. The object presents itself as a percept in the here and now. But this *hic et nunc* singularity individualises itself on the basis of that of the object which does not present itself in the present. In other words, the object presents itself as itself in the

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

present, and *at the same time* transcends this present through an alterity that is always already co-implicated.

This thinking of the spatio-temporal object's transcendence-within-immanence itself raises a question, that becomes the question of the third chapter: how do we think the *subject* in relation to the object's transcendence-within-immanence? That is, how is the subject implied within an ecstasis that is no longer merely *temporal*? How can we begin to think a spatio-temporal phenomenologico-ontological ecstasis of the subject? A phenomenology which must, by its spatio-temporal character, release itself from transcendentalism.

In this third chapter, I will only manage to begin to answer the question by a process of reduction. I will only be able to say how we do *not* begin to think such an ecstasis of the subject. This argument by exclusion involves a return to Heidegger. The significance of the return to Heidegger lies in the fact that it is strongly arguable that after the failings of "Being and Time", which, as I have shown, Heidegger was aware of soon after its publication, he does return to the phenomenon as a spatio-temporal being. Hence, his thinking of the work of art, of the Greek temple, of the bridge, the jug and so on all involve phenomena whose evident spatiality itself lies in relation to a temporality and a historicity. As I shall argue in that chapter, these spatio-temporal evocations involve a displacement of immanence itself, from Dasein towards that which

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

transcends it. As such, the *work* of Dasein itself gets reduced to a nullity.

Only then, after the ‘subject’ and the ‘object’ have been shown to involve a spatio-temporal phenomenological ontology, can their interlacing be brought together. In the fourth chapter, a positive conception of the subject’s spatio-temporal ecstasy will be presented, through a reading of the thinking of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. By this stage, a distinction *between* the subject and the object will itself be seen to be committing the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. Of course, as I have shown, an ontology that privileges an originary schism between subject and object is precisely the position Heidegger sets out to challenge in “Being and Time”. As I have also shown however, his transcendental privileging of time over space leads to a more primordial pre-subjective pre-objective middle voiced phenomenology breaking down.

Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology will therefore allow my project to return to the early insights into the nature of the ‘phenomenon’ in “Being and Time”, whilst at the same time absolutely rejecting the subsequent transcendental privilege of time over space which sunders the value of those insights in that work. In the fifth chapter, I challenge a ‘purely’ poetic reading of Merleau-Ponty’s chiasmic phenomenological ontology. I argue that it is vital to see that the intertwining of that which is commonly named as the ‘object’ or the ‘world’ and the subject implies questions of community and belonging. As such, I

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

locate a politics of difference at the core of Merleau-Ponty's ontological work.

So much for a plan of what is to come. For the moment, it is time to return to the first questions of this chapter. In the light of the argument thus far, what can be said about Heidegger's relation to phenomenology, and what can be put forward as reasons for his abandoning of its imperative in order to follow his own path? I suggest the following as guidelines for a more sustained reflection that will take place elsewhere:

1) As I pointed out through the use of citation, Heidegger never rejected the notion of the phenomenological method as the *possibility* (Möglichkeit) of and for *thinking*, from "Being and Time" section 7 all the way to 'My Way to Phenomenology'. I contend that Heidegger held onto this formulation precisely because he never wanted to contest the distinction he made between *appearance* and the *phenomenon* he made in section 7. After "Being and Time", Heidegger began, after his profound engagement with early Greek thinking, to establish a more specific historical engagement with ontology. Appearance becomes thought in terms of the framing (Gestell) of modern calculative technological representation. The phenomenon, by implication, persists as that which must be uncovered against this historicised mode of appearance.

2) However, Heidegger does abandon the phenomenological method as an

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

explicit dynamic of his thinking and as a term used as a fundamental of his language. Why this abandonment takes place remains, even in the light of the preceding argument, extremely difficult to ascertain. For it is clear that the work of art, the temple, the bridge, the jug and so on involve a work of signification that bears phenomenological *motifs* at the least. And, as the first point just made has shown, an appearance-phenomenon distinction is always implicit within Heidegger's thinking. Perhaps Heidegger began to associate the evident failure of his phenomenology of dying with as a failure of the phenomenological method itself. Moreover, it is possible that Heidegger began to associate phenomenology as ineradicably bound up with a transcendental subjectivity, a binding that itself could have been questioned had Heidegger allowed his phenomenology of Dasein's ecstatic character to be *spatio-temporal*. For, as I have begun to show, a spatio-temporal ecstasy involves a *transcendence within immanence*, whereas an ecstatic temporality must suffer the fate of falling back into the form of subjectivity. As such a spatio-temporal ecstasy, the limits of Dasein's finitude are circumscribed by an alterity which cannot be reclaimed through the hubris of being-as-a-whole. Finitude is no longer equated with subjectivity and an impossible phenomenology of dying. Phenomenology, in allowing the phenomenon to be thought of as *both* immanent *and* transcendent, is released from the horizon of a transcendental subjectivity as it is released from privileging time as the form of inner sense. This releasement would be the

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

form of a return to thinking ontological difference, as that which marks the limits of the finite and immanent, always in relation to an irreducible and paradoxically constitutive transcendence.

In summary, one can say that a phenomenology that does not suspend or withdraw itself through enacting a sacrifice of space for the sake of time is the issue. If we go back to sections 14 to 24 in “Being and Time”, we find much by way of a phenomenology of space. But the eventuality of Heidegger’s privileging time over space fifty sections later means that we have to find another route to the phenomenological redemption of space. For a redemption of space in phenomenology would have to entail that it cannot be reduced into or grounded by time and temporality. To achieve this, it is necessary to see that for the *early* Heidegger at least, space and time are oppositional to each other; Heidegger does not allow for the possibility of a phenomenological *spatio-temporality*. This foreclosure is demonstrated by the basic structure of the book. In “Being and Time”, Heidegger begins by emphasising the spatial character of Dasein’s existence, only later to emphasise the temporal character of that existence. Moreover, as has been said, in this book Heidegger distrusts the very grammar which he is forced to use - as if at the base of this distrust is a distrust for an ineradicable spatio-temporality. Henceforth, at no point in “Being and

Chapter 1: Heidegger and Phenomenology

'Time' does Dasein live spatio-temporally. Therefore, the suggestion is that space can be redeemed in phenomenology by contesting the Heideggerian oppositional relation between space and time. If spatio-temporality can be thought in phenomenological terms, the option to privilege one over the other can be eschewed. This is what I attempt to achieve in the following chapter, beginning by looking at Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason".

Most significantly of all, in terms of the future of thinking, is the following consideration, which will be present in all of the following chapters. A spatio-temporal phenomenology, as one which *incorporates* ecstasy as a spacing of time and a timing of space, itself involves the rejection of a transcendental privilege accorded to time as the form of the subject. The transcendental horizon of time as the form of inner sense henceforth becomes seen as that which forecloses the possibility of thinking ontological difference. And yet, dropping the privilege accorded to the form of inner sense does not of necessity involve dropping the subject. On the contrary, only through a *phenomenological* ontology can the possibility of thought be upheld. For we still live in an era dominated by appearance. That is, we still live under the sway of a seemingly ineradicable schism between an 'ontology' of the subject and an 'ontology' of the object.