

Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* [*Sein und Zeit*] (1927 de, 1962 en)

Reading notes by Alexander R. Galloway

Not for citation or publication!

How to Read *Being and Time* in four weeks:

Week 1	Chapters 1-7, 9, 12 (pp. 19-63, 67-71, 78-86)	The question of Being; <i>Dasein</i> as Being-in-the-world
Week 2	Chapters 14-18, 22-27 (pp. 91-122, 135-168)	Worldhood; spatiality; Being-in-the-world; the “they”
Week 3	Chapters 28-38 (pp. 169-224)	Understanding; projection; idle talk; falling/throwness
Week 4	Chapters 39-42, 50-53, 60, 62, 64 (pp. 225-244, 293-311, 341-348, 352-358, 364-370)	Care; Finitude; Death; Being-towards-death

Note: page numbers refer to the Macquarrie & Robinson translation.

WEEK 1--THE QUESTION OF BEING; *DASEIN* AS BEING-IN-THE-WORLD

Being – a general, abstract notion of being (the “ontological”)

- as universal (22)
 - “But the ‘universality’ of ‘Being’ is not that of a *class* or *genus*” (22)
 - being universal does not mean it is clearly known. “It is rather the darkest of all” (23)
 - ** “‘Being’--that is not God and not a cosmic ground. Being is farther than all beings and is yet nearer to man than every being, be it a rock, a beast, a work of art, a machine, be it an angel or God. Being is the nearest. Yet the near remains farthest from man” (“Letter on Humanism,” 234) **
- the “indefinability of Being” (23).. i.e. it can not be defined in a traditional way because that would involve making ontological claims about it (being *is* X) “The indefinability of Being does not eliminate the question of its meaning; it demands that we look that question in the face” (23) – i.e. H is not denying that it *is* indefinable.
- as self-evident (23)
- exceptional nature of being, as not the same as other entities: “Being, as that which is asked about, must be exhibited in a way of its own, essentially different from the way in which entities are discovered” (26)
- the question that must be formulated: (he never really poses the question, only repeats it as sentence fragments that are similar but never the same) “Do we in our time have an answer to the question of what we really mean by the word ‘being’?” (19) (i.e. he never states the question itself, only a question about

the status of the question)

“*the question of the meaning of Being*” (19) “the meaning of this question” (19):
i.e. the meaning of the meaning of Being??

“*what is asked about is Being*” (25)

“the meaning of Being” (26, 31) – so does this mean that “meaning” is more important than being??

existence [Existenz] (the “ontical”) – the actual kind of Being comported by Dasein. (32)

- *existentialia* (70) dasein’s “characters of being”
 - the “who” (71)

existentia: means *presence-at-hand* (67) – this is *not* what Dasein is.

- categories (70) – in the language of the ancients (Aristotle): “the entities we encounter in the world”
 - the “what” (71)

existentiell a characteristic that is categorical or ontical

existentiale a characteristic that is ontological

Dasein (“being-there”) – existence

- Dasein is ontically distinctive in that:
 - “Dasein exists” (78)
 - It is an entity that “gets its essential character from what is inquired about—namely, Being” (27)
 - “each of us is himself” this entity (27)
 - “includes inquiring as one of the possibilities of its Being” (27)
 - ** “it is ontically distinguished by the fact that, in its very Being, that Being is an *issue* for it” (32) **
 - this is the kind of being that can about its own being – see the notion of the “personal” below
 - “Dasein understands itself in its Being ... It is peculiar to this entity [Dasein] that with and through its Being, this Being is disclosed to it [Dasein]. *Understanding of Being is itself a definite characteristic of Dasein’s Being.* Dasein is ontically distinctive in that it *is* ontological” (32)
 - [Note influence here of Husserl’s concept of consciousness as *intentionality*, i.e., consciousness *of* something, as opposed to Descartes’ worldless *res cogitans*.]
 - “Dasein always understands itself in terms of its existence—in terms of a possibility of itself: to be itself or not itself” (33)
“*The ‘essence’ of Dasein lies in its existence*” (67)
- Dasein is always “personal”
 - This is about the “who” (71, 79)
 - See p. 27n1
 - Dasein is mine. Must always be “I am” or “you are” (68, 150)

- Dasein as “man” (241-242)
 - equipment is not a question of Dasein (but rather a question of presence-at-hand)
 - but this must *not* be confused w/ the “human” or the “subjective.” Dasein is not H’s substitute umbrella concept for consciousness, spirit, etc.
 - [The Soylent Green theory of Being: “Dasein is people.”]
- average everydayness (69)

Interpretation

- a seeking (24) that is guided by what is sought. Intuition/induction (25)
 - 61-62
 - understanding (120, 188)
-

Time

“Time must be brought to light—and genuinely conceived—as the horizon for all understanding of Being and for any way of interpreting it. In order for us to discern this, *time* needs to be *explicated primordially as the horizon for the understanding of Being, and in terms of temporality as the Being of Dasein, which understands Being*” (39)

- this is a turning point. In Kant space and time are equally important. H says, no, time is the most important.
- Q: but time as a “horizon,” i.e. a space?

phenomenology (as “phenomenon” + “logos”)

“**phenomenon**” as that which shows itself (51)

phenomena “are the totality of what lies in the light of day of can be brought to the light” (51)

contrasted with

- Semblances: when an entity “show[s] itself as something which in itself it is *not*” (51)
- Appearings: like a symptom.. something which does show itself, but in doing so indicates toward something else which is not shown. A “not-showing-itself” (52)

Logos as “discourse”

“discourse ‘lets something be seen’” (56). It is a “*letting-something-be-seen*”

phenomenology – “‘To the things themselves!’” (50)

“‘phenomenology’ means...to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself” (58)

Dasein is “mine” .. “We are ourselves the entities to be analyzed” (67)

Being-in-the-world (78)

“Being-in is not a ‘property’ which Dasein sometimes has and sometimes does not have... Taking up relationships toward the world is possible only *because* Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, is as it is.” (84)

WEEK 2--WORLDHOOD; SPATIALITY; BEING-IN-THE-WORLD; THE “THEY”

Worldhood

- “my” world?
 - “‘world’ may stand for the ‘public’ we-world, or one’s ‘own’ closest (domestic) environment” (93)
- environment
- things, the pragmata.... **Equipment**
[i.e. this is part of Heidegger's theory of technology]
 - Present-at-Hand [*vorhanden*]
 - a technical, disinterested examination of the pragmata; the object is “neutral” to us and thus NOT part of Dasein's solicitude/care.
 - this is symptomatic, for Heidegger, of the forgetting of Being. Thus is the part of the positivistic/metaphysical tradition that Heidegger is against.
 - Ready-to-Hand [*zuhanden*]
 - use without theorizing/reflecting. The intuitive. Media as extension of man.
 - “*Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorically.*” (101)
 - conspicuousness and obtrusiveness. To disclose (102-104)
 - i.e.: when a tool *breaks*, it stops being ready-to-hand and becomes present-at-hand.
 - “If it is to be possible for the ready-to-hand not to emerge from its inconspicuousness, the world *must not announce itself*. And it is in this that the Being-in-itself of entities which are ready-to-hand has its phenomenal structure constituted” (106).
- “**Being-in-the-world**, according to our Interpretation hitherto, amounts to a non-thematic circumspective absorption in references or assignments constitutive for the readiness-to-hand of a totality of equipment” (107).
 - importance of *absorption*
- readiness-to-hand, presence-at-hand, the worldhood of the world (121)

Signs

- (H is trying to get beyond a notion of a sign as indicating or showing)
“*A sign is something ontically ready-to-hand, which functions both as this definite equipment and as something indicative of the ontological structure of readiness-to-hand, of referential totalities, and of worldhood*” (114)
Thus, signs are equipment, but in so being they open us up to some larger context of relations, some larger world. i.e. a sign tells you something about a larger state of affairs.

Critique of Descartes' notion of extension (as the basic ontological definition of the world) (122-134)

- basically H says you can't get anywhere if you start w/ the notion of extension. That leads you to substance. But you still can't say anything about Being that way.
- Descartes is thinking ontically (in a limited way), but never ontologically.

Spatiality

- The “proximal” (135)
- place and belonging (136)
- a region (136)
- a personal geometry, not a Euclidean geometry
 - “The ‘above’ is what is ‘on the ceiling’; the ‘below’ is what is ‘on the floor’; the ‘behind’ is what is ‘at the door’; all ‘wheres’ are discovered and circumspectively interpreted as we go our ways in everyday dealings; they are not ascertained and catalogued by the observational measurement of space” (136-137).
 - “The ‘environment’ does not arrange itself in a space which has been given in advance” (138)
 - “To encounter the ready-to-hand in its environmental space remains ontically possible only because Dasein itself is ‘spatial’ with regard to its Being-in-the-world” (138)
 - i.e. this is an inversion of Descartes' logic which starts w/ spatiality (extension) and then posits substance and existence from that
- de-severance / de-distancing “amounts to making the farness vanish--that is, making the remoteness of something disappear, bringing it close. Dasein is essentially de-severant: it lets any entity be encountered close by as the entity which it is” (139). -- a logic of selection?
 - “*In Dasein there lies an essential tendency towards closeness*” (140)
- directionality (143)

Chap IV -- on the being of the “**they**”: “*who* it is that Dasein is in its everydayness” (149)

- The They [*Das Man*]
 - the impersonal singular pronoun. ex: “one does x”
 - this is an *inauthentic* mode of existence for Heidegger. it refers to habit/cliche, as in “this is what *one* does”
 - [similar to how Tiquun uses the French “ON” to refer to a somewhat ominous and impersonal social subject.]
- the *Self*: “Dasein is an entity which is in each case I myself; its Being is in each case mine” (150)
- others (154, 160), not objects of concern, but *solicitude* (157)
- an ethical relation/communion (154, 162)
- the social, the public (164-165)
- “The Self of everyday Dasein is the *they-self*, which we distinguish from the *authentic Self* ... As they-self, the particular Dasein has been *dispersed* into the ‘they’, and first must find itself” (167)
 [The “they” is H’s way of understanding the social and socialization of people. This isn’t exactly the same as ideology, but it’s close.]

Reiner Schürmann's character sketch, after a visit to Heidegger's Freiburg house (not the hut) in 1966:

I have just returned from Heidegger's house. It was a real late-afternoon reception about the mystery of being....To begin with the folkloric aspect of the visit, I had my fill and more: a pious inscription above the door to the house ("God bless you..."); a small man, who looked like a peasant, let me in and ushered me nearly without saying a word into a room that looked rather like a blockhouse; two glasses and a bottle on a small tray; and, especially, a two-hour long discussion which ended up, at least outwardly, in complete darkness. I knew that among things country he had a fondness for those that are traditional: his writings speak of the pitcher of cool water, of the peasant's rough hands, of mud-caked clogs, and such. I now know that he also likes discussions in the dark. However, the man is so shrewd, and, above all, he has such a listening ability...that it felt like my meager schoolboy questions were received by warm and reassuring hands.¹

1 Reiner Schürmann, "Reiner Schürmann's Report of His Visit to Martin Heidegger," *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 19:2-20:1 (1997): 67-72, p. 69.

WEEK 3--UNDERSTANDING, PROJECTION, IDLE TALK, FALLING AND THROWNNESS

Chap V -- on the being of the “there” (after sections on the “who” and the “they”)

A. the *existential* constitution of the “there” -- the *ontical*

*note: he says attunement, thrownness, etc are all part of the “existential structure.” but it's not about the quotidian level of existence, it's about the basic (we might say “essential”?) aspect of the ontical -- even if some of the terms *seem* more ontological in nature (example: thrownness).*

- “there” as state-of-mind [*Befindlichkeit*], mood, attunement [*Stimmung* as “tendency,” “mood” or “attunement”] (172)
- **thrownness** [*Geworfenheit*] (174) -- the “that it is” of the entity. this is the “*facticity of its being delivered over*” (174).
 - facticity does NOT mean facts, or factuality. it is a claim about existence, the fact *that* something came to be is its “facticity.” Facticity is the thrownness of human existence. you can not “behold” an object and see its facticity; you can only acknowledge “that it is.”
- fear (179-182)
- **understanding** (182) and the Being-possible / potential (183)
reminder: Husserl's notion that consciousness is always *intentional* consciousness
note: definitely connections here with Deleuze
 - “the understanding has in itself the existential structure which we call ‘**projection**’” (184-185)
 - projection “throws” before itself a possibility (i.e. like casting a flashlight in front of you.. it never is “grasped,” but always remains cast forward) (185)
 - understanding = Dasein knowing what it is capable of (184)
 - understanding/projection as potentiality-for-Being (183, 186)
 - [It's a kind of echo of thrownness. Dasein is thrown into existence, but then Dasein is also a projection or throwing into possibility. (185)]
 - “In its projective character, understanding goes to make up existentially what we call Dasein’s ‘*sight*’” (186)
 - interpretation: “[The] development of the understanding we call ‘interpretation’... In interpretation, understanding does not become something different. It becomes itself.” (188)
 - Q: this is thinking? Doing philosophy?
 - Meaning, as a sameness/maintenance within Dasein (192-193)
“*only Dasein can be meaningful or meaningless*” (193)
[Note: can connect here to “sense” in Deleuze.]

Heidegger's mini section on language, discourse, and communication

- Assertion
 - as unity of (1) pointing out, (2) predication, and (3) communication (199)
 - Q: is this his dismissal of scientific thought?
- Discourse, language (203-)
- hearing/hearkening (as hearing+understanding) and keeping silent (207-)
 - we never hear a pure noise, never simply “complexes of sounds,” never a “multiplicity of tone data,” never pure sensations -- we always hear specific ready-to-hand sounds
 - note: total incompatibility with Deleuze!
- note: this is where Derrida goes for this “Heidegger's Ear” essay

B. the *everyday* being of the “there” -- i.e. the quotidian

[Q: so do we need a third category? ontological, ontical, and *quotidian* (or “average everydayness”)?]

- Idle talk/gossip [*Gerede*] (211) -- this is a type of falling.. i.e. “small talk” would be better translation? H says this is *not* pejorative.
 - [quote from p 17 of "Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?"]
- Curiosity (214)
- Ambiguity (217)
- **falling** [*Verfallen*] -- territorialization? The “actual”?
decay, decline, collapse, slouch, turn away
 - “Forgetting the truth of Being in favor of the pressing throng of beings unthought in their essence is what ensnarement [*Verfallen*] means in *Being and Time*” (“Letter on Humanism,” 235). so falling is the opposite of “ecstatic existence” (as standing out in Being).
 - “In falling, Dasein turns away from itself” (230).
 - the disclosed
 - slouching/in a slump.. collapsing into an inauthentic state. Energy drained. Regressing.
 - Falling away from the essence? Into the social, for example?
 - Laying there, in a certain way.. “being alongside” (237)
 - Not negative. No repentance/sin model .. i.e. you can’t rid yourself of falling (220)
 - “tranquillizing” and “alienating” (222)
 - Dogma, in a rut, the routine, becoming a creature of habit, repetition
 - It’s a “downward plunge,” a falling of Dasein *further into* itself: “Dasein plunges out of itself, into the groundlessness and nullity of inauthentic everydayness” (223)
- **falling vs thrownness?** -- deterritorialization? The potential?

- A projecting.. see also (185)
- Energy up. Actively putting yourself into the situation (becoming).
Casting a light forward

Summary definition of Dasein, given all the terms thus far: “*Dasein's 'average everydayness' can be defined as 'Being-in-the-world which is falling and disclosed, thrown and projecting, and for which its ownmost potentiality-for-Being is an issue, both in its Being alongside the “world” and in its Being-with Others’*” (225)

Summary definition of Dasein, given the principle that “Dasein is in the truth”

- 1) Dasein as *disclosedness in general*--care is how the structure of Being is disclosed and made explicit to us
- 2) Dasein as *thrownness*--that this disclosedness is factual, i.e. that it is about a definite world and along side other definite entities.
- 3) Dasein as *projection*--but not merely factual, we can also understand our own authentic being, that is, our potentiality/possibility for being.
- 4) Dasein as *falling*--yet Dasein is still “lost in its 'world.’” In our very projection, we reveal our own specificity, our own finitude. Only the omniscient and the absolute would avoid falling.

Thus Heidegger's ethical mandate:

- it is necessary that we defend truth (265)
- “Truth (uncoveredness) is something that must always first be wrested from entities. Entities get snatched out of their hiddenness. The factual uncoveredness of anything is always, as it were, a kind of *robbery*. Is it accidental that when the Greeks express themselves as to the essence of truth, they use a *privative* expression-- - ?” (265)
 - this means: truth is a part of ontology.
[Contrast with Badiou, for whom truth is always a step *diverging* from being.]
 - “Dasein is equiprimordially both in the truth and untruth” (265)
 - “all truth is relative to Dasein’s being” (270)
 - but this is not “subjective” truth. It’s just that Daseins are the things that actually experience truth..

WEEK 4--CARE; FINITUDE; DEATH; BEING-TOWARDS-DEATH

Chap VI -- On Care

This incorporates everything said so far about Dasein. He calls this “Dasein’s ontological structural whole” (237)

- **anxiety** [*Angst*] (227-228) -- “anxiousness as a state-of-mind is a way of Being-in-the-world” (235)
 - note: this is explicitly NOT a theory of drives (Freud) or desire (Deleuze). see p. 227.
 - the “*fleeing* of Dasein in the face of itself” (229), as “Dasein's falling into the 'they' and the 'world' of its concern” (230)
[Contrast with Deleuze's “line of flight”]
 - Q: but what exactly are we anxious about?
A: “*That in the face of which one has anxiety is Being-in-the-world as such*” (230). Thus the simple facticity of Dasein's appearing is what produces anxiety.
 - the ‘nowhere’ becomes manifest. You are anxious about ‘the world as such’, anxious about “the *possibility* of the ready-to-hand in general” (231).
 - Related to fear, but without an object? “the threat itself is indefinite” (232)
 - “What oppresses us is not this or that, nor is it the summation of everything present-at-hand; it is rather the *possibility* of the ready-to-hand in general; that is to say, it is the world itself” (231)
 - “anxiety discloses Dasein *as Being-possible*” (232) i.e. it reveals life as fragile and important to nurture and protect.. hence care?
 - anxiety is also a theory of individuation: we are *solus ipse*.. to be “itself alone” means also to be “itself lonely”
 - *Being-free* 232, 237
[We see here the influence on existentialism... but this is not itself an existentialism? See 233)]

- **Care/Concern/Solicitude** [*Sorge*] (237) **

[“taking care” -- it's important to read this along side Foucault and Stiegler (“Prendre Soin”).]

- When it’s Being-alongside the ready-to-hand, care = concern (237)
- When it’s the Dasein-with of Others, care = solicitude (237)
- *Being-ahead-of-itself* (236). Dasein is always thinking ahead.
Anticipation/worry. Being cognizant of what is about to happen
- Care is immanent 237, 238.. i.e. care is not an affect or a trait of Dasein. It

is definitionally part of Dasein

- *Cura* and origin myth of homo/man (242)
 - Spirit, body, but also third term in between: care.
the point here being that while God might give man his spirit and nature/earth might give him his body, there is still a missing third term, during the period in between spirit and body...and this is the term of one's life, the term of care.
 - *Cura shapes* it; *cura holds* it just as long as it is in this world (243)
 - thus *Cura* is associated with the *finitude* of man, his “*temporal sojourn in the world*” (243)

Reality/realism/idealism

- When things and substantiality becomes the meaning of being (245)
Q: is this bad for H?
- “Reality as a problem of Being, and whether the ‘external world’ can be proved” (246-252) -- mostly grappling w/ Kant’s critique of idealism
- on being and truth (256-). Truth is uncoveredness (aletheia)
 - being-true mean being-uncovering (262)

The Possibility of the Whole; Finitude; the “not-yet”; Death

Death: “The end is impending for Dasein. ... *Death is something that stands before us-- something impending*” (293-294)

“Death is the possibility of the absolute impossibility of Dasein” (294)

- thus an “existential” contradiction: the only way in which man's finitude can be made absolute, can be made whole, is at the moment of death. The completion of Dasein, is the end of Dasein.
- a connection back to anxiety (295). thus, anxiety comes from factual thrownness, but also from the *end goal* of factual thrownness, i.e. death. We are thrown in and we will be thrown out.
- a connection back to care.
- falling as a microcosm of dying in general (295)
 - “Our everyday falling evasion *in the face of death* is an *inauthentic Being-towards-death*” (303).

the “not-yet” (288, 293, 303) versus the “ahead of itself”

[Q: i.e. is Dasein essentially (1) a lack that is catching up, or (2) an entity that projects?]

Q: If the everyday falling leads us to inauthenticity, how to project an *authentic* Being-toward-death?

A: Dasein does not guarantee authenticity, but it does guarantee *possibility* (305). and this possibility, while ontologically oriented toward death, is also held in suspension, otherwise it would be a question of “bringing about one's demise” (305). we must “*put up with* it [death]” as a possibility, we must “anticipate” it (306)

Death is non-relational, it is purely individual, it is the most “mine” (308)

Summary of the *authentic* Being-towards-death ** (311).

Conscience (314)

The Call (317)

Guilt (325)

Resoluteness (343)

Situation (346)