

UNDERSTANDING HEIDEGGER'S CONCEPTION OF BEING: A SCIENTIFIC CASE STUDY

Syed Alam Shah*
M.Sadiq Ali Khan**

Abstract

Being the philosopher of first rank, Heidegger challenged the western traditional philosophy as a whole. While, his originality and philosophical depth lies within his philosophical interpretation and depth analysis of the sense of Being.¹ In order to construe Heidegger's notion or way towards Being, it would be indispensable to go into depth of sense thoroughly. Following this, we would like to formulate our analysis of sense of Being round the certain points. We would discuss Heidegger's path towards understanding the sense of Being; his notion of destruction of traditional and western ontology.²

Heidegger's challenge to western ontology is a radical analysis of Human existence, through which he would rejuvenate his conception of Being in his early work *Sein und Zeit*. In one of the section of Being and Time; the destruction of ontology, he proposes the novel interpretation of History of western philosophy with reference to (the question of meaning of) Being.³ However, the term destruction does not mean a solely negative assault. But it rather recommends discovering and opening the manifold alternatives, and whole course rooted in the history. This rediscovered history would lead the fresh intellect to revisit the sense of Being in its historical background.

Background exposition of sense of Being

The decisive stage in Heidegger's challenge to the traditional wisdom ushers when Heidegger opens himself to reinterpretation of the early Greek Thought and praises it in his work on the Notion of Being. He believes that the Early Greek Wisdom is original and creative when it deals with the conception of Being. The pre-Socratic thinking does not confuse the horizon of being by segregating it into subjective or objective domains. For Heidegger, this aforementioned division came later in the history of wisdom. For instance, Romans blurred the meaning of *Physis* (being) as *natura* (nature or material world in terms of physical change and organic birth). This misinterpretation of *Physis* as *natura* obscures the meaning and originality of being.

* Syed Alam Shah, Assistant Professor, Dept of Philosophy, University of Karachi, Karachi, Pakistan

** Sadiq Ali Khan, Assistant Professor in Computer Science Department University of Karachi, Pakistan

¹ Read on the question of meaning and Sense of Being, Sorren Overgaard, *Husserl and Heidegger on Being in the World*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands 2004, pp 69-73. See Heidegger on the question, meaning and sense of Being: Six Problems, in Herman Philipse, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Being: A Critical Interpretation*. Princeton University Press, 1998. pp. 31-44.

² Read on the destruction of traditional ontology, *ibid*, 95-99.

³ See this discussion particularly on the question and meaning of Being in Caputo, John's research Article "Question of Being and Transcendental Phenomenology: Reflections on Heidegger's relationship to Husserl." *Research in Phenomenology* 7, (1977): pp. 84-105. See also Stanly Rosen. *Question of Being. Reversal of Heidegger*, St. Augustine Press, April 30, 2002, [pp. 367].

The early Greek thinking constitutes the meaning of being with reference to logos. For early Greeks; logos congregates entities natural or supernatural together into the world of meaning. Thus, something coming into being or passing away is the process not by Physis as nature, but by logos as the primordial source of its being. So, being and appearing are not antagonistic. As for Parmenides, revealing of being is appearing and therefore, being and knowing are identical. Furthermore, knowing is the essential human activity which uncovers the beings. Hence, being uncovering is to reveal the truth (meaning) of being. It implies that happenstance of truth is rooted into the human activity. However, it should not be confused with (property of) statement or proposition, totally immersed in the subjective mind (subjectivity).

On the other hand, the truth of things lies in things being revealed to knowing as a human activity provides the reason that things (entities) are hidden until they are made manifest to us. This unconcealedness depicts the fact that things are known only by way of uncovering. However, Being enlightens beings by hiding itself (its truth). Being concealing is being revealing of beings as well.

For Heraclites, Physis (Being) hides itself, because, it loves to keep itself clandestine. For Heidegger, truth of this gigantic saying has been entangled throughout western philosophical tradition. Even it is verified up to the present day philosophy that the Being is utterly concealed. Heidegger maintains that Plato himself failed to expound the notion of Being properly. Plato subjected things (entities) to malafide segregation in terms of each things to have its own *eidos* i.e. whatness by their diverse visibility. This Platonic Reductionism relegated Being to beings. For Heidegger, this malafide reductionism segregated the world into the world of form (foundational world) and physical or material world. Former belongs to fixed and changeless *eidos* and later belongs to the senses. It follows that, Platonic dualism turns into obscurantism since it implies that no real thing appears or gains its being in either world of form or in physical world. Therefore, Heidegger believes that truth would never uncover itself because of forgetfulness of the notion of BEING in the field of Being.

Furthermore, Heidegger holds that by understanding the Platonic wisdom, we essentially construe the notion of truth in a very traditional way. For instance, Truth is nothing more than consequence of the correspondence between assertion and pure idea. However, this 'between' depicts that the apparent thing only participates in the circumspection of correspondence between psychic assertion and pure idea. Following this argument, it turns out that pure idea and segregated world of foundations dominate and determine our world. And it detaches (human beings) to the real world in which they have basis of dwelling.

Even Christianity failed to withhold the correct notion of Being. For Christianity GOD as being the divine source of all beings is primordial. Yet, divinity itself is not being. Scholastic thinkers thought that divinity is the only a highest being. For Heidegger, Christianity is not based on rational faith, but a dogmatic faith. Therefore, neither it could lead us to progress in the understanding of Being, nor it had any exerting sway on western intellectual tradition. Yet, Christian theology dealt with the very basic questions concerning being and creation *ex nihilo* which later led to the idea of nothingness. The idea of nothingness, on the other hand, was antithetical to the well-formulated principle

that nothing comes out of nothing. So, following this, our intellectual tradition presumes that nothing is totally detrimental to being; which could not be conceived within and in relations to the field of being.

However, this medieval philosophy failed to bring us to a novel thinking on the question, meaning, or truth of Being. It only revolved around the platonic and Aristotelian tradition. Therefore, philosophy perpetuated its journey towards the world of beings rather than Being of beings. So, Heidegger conceives that BEING has been forgotten constantly throughout the tradition.

Even in the modern intellectual tradition, Philosophers failed to carry further the idea of question, meaning and truth of Being. Later, Descartes ⁴ attempted to take this problem through certainty, however, his intellectual project relegated his philosophy to the isolated thinking substance (subject), totally detached from the world in which he (presumably) dwells. Cartesian detached and isolated subject, *res cogitans* encounters and undercover the beings as objects round his self.

This subject/object dualism led philosophy towards subjective (idealistic) objective (world of science and technology) directions. The schema of objective side i.e. world of science and technology are co relevant and interdependent. And the schema of subjective side, on the other hand, holds idealism as the source of expounding reality of world or objects of the world through spirit functioning into the human body.

After the demise of Idealism, modern existentialism established its roots blurring philosophy to anthropology. As some philosophers critically analyze the Heidegger's Being and Time placed into the paradigm of anthropology. However, this is not correct idea. Heidegger is existential phenomenologist and philosopher, rather than anthropologist.

Nietzsche's philosophy is the final stage of this historical development. Philosophy of Will to Power stands as a significant work of Nietzsche, which subordinates all values and ends to the power of willing. The self-justifying will leads to his notion of Eternal Return being the cosmic scale as a machine revolving cyclically. Nietzsche calls it the age of power. Since, this philosophy of will to power ⁵ and doctrine of eternal recurrence, according to Heidegger, is a determining factor beyond the ethos of age.

This age has not only enslaved nature but human being itself. In learning and teaching how to control the powers of nature, it has not only destroyed the human world but his understanding of truth, meaning and Being as well. Enframing beyond technology, men desires the absolute mastery of energies and forces of nature, enslaving technology for the well-fare of human beings. However, Heidegger thinks that this age is not human friendly, rather it has leveled down the human life, and Gods, and on the other hand it has absconded to a gloomy world. For Heidegger this history is not confined to years, decades and centuries but two thousand years starting with Early Greek thinking

⁴ See Descartes in *Meditations On the First Philosophy*. NuVision Publications, LLC, Sioux Falls, USA, 2008.

⁵ See this in *Philosophy: History and Problems*, Samuel Enoch Stumpf and Jamer Fierer, Published by McGraw-Hill, 2008, pp. 325-334.

accompanying Plato, Aristotle, ending with Nietzsche's will to power, and atomic i.e. nuclear age.

While looking and analyzing this history, Heidegger finds egocentric humanism as the source of forgetfulness of Being *Seinsvergessenheit* that has been constituting two thousand years history. Following this history we have reached to Heidegger's notion of Being, and its forgetfulness in the traditional philosophy.

Understanding Heidegger's notion of Being:

Heidegger's famous work is *BEING AND TIME*, which consists of two major parts. Each part contains (supposedly) three divisions. However, he ventured to get only first two divisions published. Other parts and the first division of the part one remained unpublished. This unfinished project would have been *TIME AND BEING, KANT AND ARISTOTLE*. Nevertheless, Heidegger has been preoccupied with the unfinished project working throughout his manifold writings and lectures in prewar and postwar periods. This is how Heidegger has attempted his *Being and Time* to come up with lengthy designations. The division one deals with the "Preparatory Fundamental Analytic of Dasein and the division two contains "Dasein and Temporality." ⁶

The initial understanding of the Being is succinctly portrayed by Heidegger in these words. "Our aim in the following treatise is to work out the question of the sense of being and to do so concretely." ("Die konkrete Ausarbeitung der Frage nach dem Sinn von "Sein" ist die Absicht der folgenden Abhandlung." *Sein und Zeit*.) ⁷ Further he believes that Traditional ontology has overlooked the sense and the meaning of Being, by "...dismissing it as overly general, indefinable, or obvious." ⁸ This is what he understands that the notion of Being would be clarified with understanding of the difference of Being to its beings i.e. entities. For him, "Being is not something like a being." "'Sein' ist nicht so etwas wie Seiendes." ⁹ So, "Being is what determines beings as beings, [that]...beings are already understood..." [With reference to Being]. ...das Sein, das, was Seiendes als Seiendes bestimmt, das, woraufhin Seiendes, mag es wie immer erörtert werden, je schon verstanden ist," ¹⁰

In order to construe the Being, Heidegger would like to illuminate the question, meaning and truth of Being through expounding the "sense" of Being (*Sinn des Seins*). Here the term sense translates as making something "...intelligible..." "Verständlich," ¹¹ However, for Heidegger this intelligibility of Being should not be confused with concepts and categories applying to beings or entities. Since, Being is "... pre-conceptual, non-propositional and hence pre-scientific." ¹² In his fundamental ontology, Heidegger tries to explicate understanding of the sense of Being different from the way

⁶ See Heidegger Martin, *Being and Time*, op cit. p

⁷ *Sein und Zeit*, p. 1.

⁸ *Ibid*, pp 2-4.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid*. 6.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p.151.

¹² *Ibid*, pp. 8-9.

we know the methods of,” ...logic, theory and specific ontology,”¹³ or any other act of demonstration and reflective reasoning. At the very same time, Heidegger realizes that understanding truth of Being requires accessibility to entities’ (beings). Conversely, interpretation is the only true source of expounding the true meaning of Being via beings. Therefore, he would imply the methodology for deeply understanding the sense of Being is “...phenomenological description.... [which he calls ...] interpretation.” *der methodische Sinn der Phänomenologischen Deskription ist Auslegung,*¹⁴

In this framework, Heidegger tries to “...reawaken the question....” and to explore “.... What is meant by Being?”¹⁵ He thinks that “... Being has fallen into oblivion.” See, *Essence of Truth*. ET section 6. Heidegger holds that:

The concept of “Being” is most universal one, as was also realized by Aristotle, Thomas and Hegel; and its universality goes beyond that of any “genus”. At the same time it is obscure and indefinable; “Being can not be comprehended as any thing that is (Seindes); it can not be deduced from any higher concepts and it cant not be represented by any lower ones; “Being is not a some thing like a being, a stone, a plant, a table, a man. Yet “Being” seems somehow an evident concept. We make use of it in all knowledge, in all our statement, in all our behavior towards ourselves. We are used to living in an “understanding of Being” (Seinverständnis) but hand in hand it goes the incomprehensibility of what is meant by “Being”.¹⁶

We have made this point already clear that with reviving the sense of Being, Heidegger has deviated from his predecessors on the revival “...about the question of meaning of Being....”¹⁷ According to Heidegger:

They reflected upon the things encountered in the world that could be seen and thus known. And the thing that was perceived and about which statements could be made in various relevant aspects i.e. by way of “categories”, was their program.¹⁸

While discussing the question of being, it is seems possible in Heideggerian framework to have partial experience of Being if not whole of Being. This is absolutely problematic in Heidegger to how one [human Dasein] can have a grasp of total passage of reality i.e. infinite. In other words, human Dasein is a finite entity who can have partial experience of beings, but not Being as a whole. However, Heidegger makes all possible attempts to ensure his philosophy of Being. The nature and characteristics of Being as such, thus could be pointed out, in a metaphorical way as well.

¹³ Ibid, p. 12.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 37.

¹⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Existence and Being*, ed. Werner Brock (Indiana University: Regnery/Gateway, Inc., 1979) p.26.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 27, *Being and Time*, pp. 2-4.

¹⁷ Martin Heidegger: *Existence and Being*. Op cit. p. 27.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 27

What is Being: Exposition of Fundamental Traits of Being in Heideggerian Framework

The Heidegger's ultimate objective of writing 'Being and Time' was to bring Human being to the experience of Being as a true Being. Heidegger designates Human being as a Being-there (Dasein). Dasein is essentially transcendent being which takes Dasein further away from his everyday dealings. However, he does not and can not retire from his being in the world until death reaches as a final destining for it.

We would discuss here the Being of beings; an ontological difference; primordial relationship between Being and Dasein, and Being and entities. However, in order to understand ontological difference between Being and beings, we would try to explore the basic facets of Being as fourfold or foursome i.e. das ding [the thing] in the perspective of Earth, Sky, Divinities and Mortals. This discussion would lead us to the manifestation of Being through spatio-temporal symmetry (how for abstract it may be).

The ultimate objective is to have experience of Being. While to carry through such an objective, is to explore the nature of Being. Heidegger argues that Being can be understood only through primordial relationships between Being and Human being-there; and the unified belonging-togetherness of Being and entities. On the other, Former unified relationship represents identity between Being and Human existence. While the later, unified relationship is articulated as one of the difference. For Heidegger, later is founded on the former, but not vice versa. This old-age doctrine of identity and difference is indispensable beyond understanding the nature of Being and making of human being distinctive in the complexities of entities and the world as a whole.

Heidegger attempts to get us towards Being through pointing out its essential characteristics. However, certain designations of Being would not deliver us the meaning of a Being as a whole.

Disposition of Being

In order to look in to the nature of Being, Heidegger excavates a specific German term. The German term "Geviert" is contextualized with reference to Being. Veir stands next to Geviert, which is translated as number four [4]. However, Heidegger uses the term Geviert which stands for foursome,¹⁹ or fourfold as quadrate²⁰. As Richardson writes'

When Heidegger speaks of Being of things as essentially as gathering process, we understand Being in the sense of ^oyG, which off course, is to be understood as the original one. The puzzling part of the essay,

¹⁹ Vencent, vycinas, Earths and Gods: An Introduction to the philosophy of Martin Heidegger (the Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1961, p224

²⁰ Cf. William j. Richardson, Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought, fordham university press, 2003 p570 see. Also, Johnson j. Puthenpurackal, Heidegger: through authentic Totality to total authenticity. (Leuven: keuven university press, 1987, p158.

3. Ibid pp 70-71 (Adda Hi'o chha aahy? Chha khy refer kio athaw?)

however, lies in the fact that Heidegger sees in this one fourfold polyvalence.²¹

This fourfold is indispensable source of reaching to understand Being as Being. But still Heidegger considers that in order to reach to the field of Being, one must spell out the notion of “das Ding” a thing. Every thing is construed in the field of its own being. However, thing does not manifest its own being without primordial reference to foursome i.e. Earth, Sky, Divinities and Mortals. Heidegger views thing in relation to its essential structure which manifest a thing. Furthermore, thing makes its essential structure manifest through fundamental facets of Being. These fundamental facets are foursome aspects of Being. Thus, we understand thing in unified relation to foursome earth, sky, divinities and mortals.²²

Since, former two aspects (earth and sky) of Being, signify the constituent components of Being as nature. Whereas, later two aspects amount to “... divine and human components of Being respectively.”²³ for instance, things we know exist, either on earth, or in Sky, or in relation to Sky. And we attribute ourselves to divinities and will die one day as facing ownmost possibility of Death representing one’s finitude. Therefore, Heidegger thinks that it is the four facets of Being which exist in unified relationship. In this fourfold unity of relationships, things, organic or inorganic, living or dead, natural or supernatural, immortal or mortals, things present at hand or ready to hand make themselves manifest to us. Further, the unity of fourfold as fundamental facets of Being constitute the beings of things and entities. This unity of fourfold exhibiting in thing, is indeed “... thinging of thing.”²⁴ Furthermore,

The unity of the fourfold is the flourishing. ... the thing stays- gathers and unites- the fourfold. The thing things world. Each thing stays the fourfold into a happening of the simple one hood of world²⁵

In these four facets of Being, we have to observe why these elements are the indefensible source of understanding beings in the unity of relations based on Being. For instance, Earth is the basic root of kingdoms of Plants, Animals and that of Minerals respectively. However, naturally occurring entities or artifacts belong to Earth as well as Sky. The sky basically constitutes roots of planetary movement, solar system, galaxies, milky ways and above all, sun’s shining directly to earth or through moon. History of Being, or historicity of Dasein belongs to the unity of earth and the sky with reference to the time as the primordial source of Daseins’ being in the world in der welt Sein.²⁶

However, we have observed that Heidegger has not given much time in discussing the third facet of Being. He has not discussed Goethite²⁷ at the grass root level. By

²¹ William J. Richardson, Heidegger, Op.cit. p. 527.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Heidegger, martin. Vorträge und Aufsätze, 4, Auflage (Pfullingen: Neske, 1978). p. 170. See also, martin Heidegger, Poetry, language, thought, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), p. 178.

²⁵ Ibid, p.178

²⁶ Being and Time, op cit. p. 78

²⁷ See, J. M. Damske, “Heidegger’s Quadrate and revelation of Being”, Philosophy Today, 71963 p. 25, fn. 8.

discussing divinities (Goettlichen) he does not refer the concept to christen theology or angelology, nor does he pass it to God in Paganism. Heidegger's indifference to theological sphere of divinities shows his interest is secular rather than a propagation of a religious notion of Goethite. Nevertheless, Heidegger hijacks the idea to his notion of phenomenological interpretation of Being. This notion brings us to the light of Being through opening to the experience of beings (entities) or naturally occurring objects or artifacts in der welt. Thus divinities are the symbols of divine (that appear and conceal themselves at every moment of experience) which inculcates human experience of divine in the sense of knowing the beings in the world.

Heidegger argues that the fourth facet of Being is prior to all three discussed above. He believes that mortality belongs to human beings. It is very important to distinguish here Heidegger's concept of death and demise with reference to Human beings and Animals. For Heidegger, idea of mortality does not lie with Animals. According to him, Animals do not die but "... they perish..."²⁸ whereas, Human being are capable of death, because they die. This does not mean that death is the end of their earthly life, but death is essentially death itself (mortals will die death for the sake of death (finitude)²⁹ only because there is no life after death) emphasis added. So, Human beings are only mortals in the sense that they are able to understand their finitude. In this way, Mortals are able to make "... presencing to Being as Being..."³⁰ in their unified relationships.

On the other hand, it should not be misconstrued that the idea of four (Vier) stands for four different beings (ontically). Because, these facets of Being are not causally held, nor are they concretized into as being ontically derived. Furthermore, they transcend the field of beings (Seinden) as such. For that reason, the facets of Being are moments (as temporal aspects) of Being in terms of shaping, giving meaning, expression, order and symmetry to a thing which appears to our vision in space. Thus, the foursome, "... is the articulation of Being itself."³¹

The basic question as to how Being manifests itself is pertinent now. If Being is non-conceptual or different from entities, then what is the source of defining fundamental features of Being. Here, Heidegger gives as an abstract snap shot of the Being, metaphorically, if not concretely.

Understanding Innermost Structure of Being:

In Being and Time Heidegger has raised the question of Being; but he failed to expound the fundamentals of Being itself. In the same realm of thinking, he prioritized existential analytic of Dasein who is the experience of Being.³² However, in his later works he

²⁸ See, Sein und Zeit, p. 247 and Being and Time, p. 291

²⁹ See Heidegger on the concept of Death, in Being and Time, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, Basil Blackwell, 1962. p. 279.

³⁰ Heidegger, martin. Vorträge und Aufsätze, 4, auflage (Pfullingen: Neske, 1978). pp. 143-145, and see also, Basic Writings pp. 327-329

³¹ James M. Damske, Being, Man and Death: A Key to Heidegger, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970 p. 151 see also Vincent Vycinas, p. 231

³² See on this view Cohen, Richard A. Dasein is Responsible for Being. "Dasein's Responsibility for Being." Philosophy Today 27, (Winter 1983). pp.317-325.

attempted to work out manifold designations and characterizations of Being. Since, it is highly difficult to manifest the Being through concepts, terms and elementary expressions, or absolute abstractions. Therefore, Heidegger takes the support of metaphors, figures, or imaginary symbols to evidence his elaboration of Being.

Heidegger believes that Being is an intermediary. It enters the field of beings, thereby manipulating beings to the concrete share of relationships among them. In this sense, Being mediates between beings. However, something (being) mediated is entitled as being-mediated. This argument depicts the fact that Being itself is not mediated, either through beings or entities, nor it is dependent on such mediation. Rather, Being itself is independent of such mediating mediation. Following this, it is evidenced that, Being is immediate. For, it facilitates beings to mutually work out their relationships in the field of Being. Being is always going-forth in terms of making beings to present themselves in relations to each other. Being is an emergence, making beings to appear themselves and manifesting each other in their concrete mutual relationships. Being is an opening up to beings to concretize them in the region of Being.

In this way Being is an immediate by itself in the sense that it is not enlightened by something other than itself. While, Being is able to illuminates beings (other than itself) to the light of other beings. However, Being first illumines itself to the being which is able to understand itself as being. Consequently, Being makes its way through the being i.e. Dasein (being there) which is enabled to experience all primordial or equiprimeordial relationships between beings occurring in the field of Being. In the same argumentation, Being-immediate is utterly eventual in the sense that Being is ultimately "... inaccessible."³³ As William Richardson further writes:

Being, [though unapproachable] the open itself, as source of this mediation, is itself not mediated, rendered present by reason of another. It is the "im-mediate." The point seems to be a double one: that Being, as the source of presence by which beings are present to each other and to There-being (Dasein), is absolutely ultimate and needs no further mediation between itself and beings which it renders present (it is immediate mediation between them); that it is because Being is im-mediate that it is inaccessible. Emphasis added.³⁴

In this paragraph, Richardson has looked upon inapproachability of the Being circumspectively. If, Being is located within a particular time, it would be no more Being, but an entity like chair, tree, and mountain etc. Hence, entities or beings are always new or old, but they can not be novel and original eternally. For Heidegger, Being is always new and original in terms of invigoration, it was, it is and it will be presenting itself through beings every novel moments of time. Therefore, Being is new and original as "... ad-vent."³⁵ In presencing itself, it is always coming. This implies

³³ Heidegger, M. *Erläuterungen zu Hölderlin's Dichtung*, 5. Auflage (Frankfurt am main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1981 pp. 59-60, see as well, William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, pp.423-424.

³⁴ William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, p.424

³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 424.

that Being is always coming over to or "... advancing towards...."³⁶ Dasein. Richardson further defines Heideggerian notion of Being in these words:

Being abides, it is not a mere entity that simply endures but a coming that is always new, always origin-al. ... this permits us to understand the essentially temporal character of Being. Because, Being is a continual coming to beings, it is older then the time-spans (Zeiten) that are measured by beings such as man, people and things.³⁷

Beings' continual coming to beings demonstrates that Being is always original and youngest, it rejuvenates itself every moment in its temporality. Therefore, Being is neither older than time, nor is it restrained to the time-extent as well. This coming of the Being towards making presence of beings to us would never get aged long eternity. It would invigorate itself in every future spans of time in the presence with reference to the past. Being makes not only beings to present themselves, but also makes its progress of history³⁸ as always novel and original or primordial.

However, for Heidegger Being which is always new and original must be be-spiriting.³⁹ Nonetheless, this notion of be-spiriting nature of Being as spirit should not be confused with Hegel's concept of Being as a spirit reincarnating through human reason. The be-spiriting nature of Being is not like a Christen God. Rather, it is totally concerned with the symmetry of beings to come together, and associate themselves with other beings in the congregation of Being's be-spiriting field. As Richardson describes:

This be-spiriting spirit is the unifying unity that holds sway over all and lets the whole ensemble of beings appear in its collectedness, drawing all beings-that-appear into the unity of its Omni-presence.⁴⁰

Heidegger has used some signs and metaphors for making Being understandable. For instance, He believes that be-spiriting nature of Being is to schematize patterns of relationship among beings. But, this is done in a very thoughtful way. The ability of situating beings symmetrically is like spirits' thinking.⁴¹ And such symmetry of relationships among beings is like thought itself. Richardson further describes the nature of such relationship as law-abiding: for he says,

Closely allied to Being as spirit is the designation of Being as law. For the unified pattern of presence which spirit arranges by thought becomes a matrix of relationships in the open by reason of which beings can encounter each other.⁴²

³⁶ Ibid, p. 424.

³⁷ Ibid, pp. 424-425.

³⁸ HD, pp 57, 61, 73.

³⁹ Ibid p 57.

⁴⁰ William J. Richardson, Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought, op cit. p. 425, see also Omni-presence, cited by him from HD pp. 58-59.

⁴¹ Spirit is thinking for Heidegger, looks somewhat strange, however, this should not be taken in a very literal sense. Heidegger, uses some metaphors to make us construe what he understand Being.

⁴² William J. Richardson, Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought, op cit. p.426.

The designation of Being as law regulates the schematization of beings in their unified and gathering relationships. And it simultaneously makes human entities joyous by associating and opening it to "... all (beings) that is noble and benign in life."⁴³ therefore, Being is gladsome (das Heitere)⁴⁴ It is like light which enlightens men's vision and enables him to uncover beings in their truth i.e. unconcealing them. By such a character Being is able not only to preserve but lookout and uphold all beings in unity. This implies that Being gives itself to beings in terms of delivering its power as Holy⁴⁵ underlying beings. Why Heidegger entitles Being as Holy is because Heidegger regards Being as older than the gods. It is Being which underlies every god, things, entities, human beings and all whatever exists. Thus, Heidegger eschews from attributing the property of holiness to any Single most God of divine books.

... the holy is not holy because it is divine but divine is divine because, it is holy in a way proper to itself...⁴⁶ Being is not only that by which gods are but that by which they are holy.⁴⁷

[Heidegger further writes in the same paragraph that] ... Being is the Holy because it is a continual coming and endless origin, hence itself ... wholesome hail. From another point of view, it is wholly in so far as it is unapproachable because of its very immediacy.⁴⁸

Heidegger defines Being in two ways. First, Being lets the being of Dasein to open itself to its surroundings by coming to it. Though, this coming of Being to Dasein would break down all the patterns of its every day life happenstance. Yet, it strengthens it to encounter the world of its own surrounding freely. Second, Being is holy as "...eternity of eternals," (Herze Ewigheit)⁴⁹ So, Being is the inmost foundation of all beings in their presence in original time. Being is not only the eternal source of all eternity it is the original source of primordial time of all whatever exists as well.

For Heidegger, Being is the source foundation of all beings, entities, human beings, gods (either monotheistic or polytheistic) and all whatever exists. However, it should be kept in mind here that Heidegger does not mean Being is totally a hidden source. Rather, he believes that Being is a primordial source. Thus, Being reveals itself to beings by giving itself to beings. However, Being only conceals itself by unconcealing in the moment of revealing to beings. As Richardson writes:

What is important to realize as that the source as such is self-concealing. We have seen already the reason: in giving rise to what springs from it, the source does not lose itself in it but remains itself as source, hiding itself in what has sprung from it, withdrawing into

⁴³ Ibid, pp. 444-445

⁴⁴ Ibid, p.444. See also Erlaeuterungen zu Hoelderlins Dichtung (HD) op cit. where the word has been translated as serene (serenity) p.18

⁴⁵ Ibid. p.424

⁴⁶ Ibid, p.58

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 61

⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 71

obscurity- and all this in order to remain completely itself, source and nothing more.

We observe here that Being is enigmatic as being associated with inscrutability in itself at the time of its withdrawal. However, Heidegger believes that it is indispensable for beings to come to surface through hidden sphere of Being as mystery. In this way, Being is the source and origin (Upspring) in that it perpetuates by giving itself to beings. Nevertheless, by giving itself to beings, It surpasses itself as underlying ground of all existence. Consequently, Being becomes the ground of giving rise to beings. By concealing itself beyond all existence, it becomes the primordial source of every being. in this way, Being holds on to itself, sustains and preserves itself as the original source of beings who drive their existence from the primordial ground.

Thus, for Heidegger, Being the basis of all beings is indeed, an open field and expansive region. This liberal field is the source of gathering together of beings not only among themselves but also with Being itself. In this regard, every being remains preoccupied with itself and with other beings as well. This open domain is indeed free and liberal source of all beings to work out their relationships with each other, or to remains self-centered within. However, Heidegger might say that Being is to bring all beings together in order to form a unique foundation of their schematized relationships among themselves in particular, and with Being in general.

The use of metaphor of Being as Expanse by Heidegger is a significant term. According to this metaphor, Being assembles all beings in its gathering process, through which it expands itself to beings and makes them manifest. Thus, the expansion of Being is horizontal in the sense of time and space. The primordial openness (that brings all beings together to exist in themselves and among themselves) is spatial as well as temporal.⁵⁰ However, this gathering-process is not done in an unorganized or unschematized way. Rather, Being situates every being in the unified whole symmetrically. Thus, collectedness of all beings springs from the original process of gathering process, that lie in the ability of Being. Consequently, Being as a original source of collectedness of beings enlightens beings in their beings. It lets them lie forth in unconcealment as themselves⁵¹ by making them present.

By concealing itself, Being simply hides itself as the original source of gathering together of beings simply. Heidegger considers Being as simple and unconstituted. By regarding Being as simple, He goes further to describe Being as one and unique. It is one and the only means that one is immediate; hence, it is not constituted by anything equivalent to entities or beings as such. Rather, it is most universal of all, and everything exists by its power of mediating, be-spiriting, be-holding, unifying, organizing every entity into unified horizon, and above all gathering together of all entities via their

⁵⁰ Heidegger has pointed out the primordial openness as Being as expanse which is gathering process to bring beings together in its spatio-temporal horizon. See, Heidegger: *Gelassenheit*, 6, Auflage (Pfullingen: Neske, 1979), pp. 38-42, see also, Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. J.M. Anderson and E.H. Freund (London: Harper Torchbooks, 1969), pp. 65-69.

⁵¹ See, Martin Heidegger, *Einfuehrung in die metaphysik*, 4, Auflage (Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer, 1976), pp. 95,103,123 see its translation, Martin, Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Ralph Manheim (London: Yale University Press, 1959).

beings as expanding into spatio-temporal order. However, Being as simple and unconstituted is one uniquely presented to Human Dasein. Being as one and simple is essentially related to Dasein.⁵²

Being remains concealed, but is effectively penetrated to beings in order to make them appear. Simultaneously, Being is blissful to man, because Human Dasein is the only entity which carries Being in its appropriation. Whereas, same bliss does not lie with objects, or entities other than Dasein. In this way, Being always appeals to man, and gives itself to beings through Human beings. Therefore, Heidegger would describe Being in twofold relationship or Being belonging-together in terms of ontological difference.

Ontological Difference:

In order to understand fully the nature of Beings' relationships with beings, it is indispensable to look into how Heidegger has worked out this notion with reference to an age old principle of identity and difference. In this regard, Heidegger describes this relationship either as an identity or a difference. Former is the relationship between Being and Dasein, and the later relationship is concretized between Being and entities. For Heidegger, later part of relationship is primordially ordained with former one. In other words, the relationship of Being with entities is not equivalent to but dependent on the relationship between Being and Dasein. Therefore, Heidegger would bring Being's belonging-together with Dasein under the title of equally appropriative and primordial principle of Identity. Heidegger recognizes the relationships between Being and entities under the title of ontological difference between Being and beings. [This we have already discussed, yet there is a need to correctly establish the ontological difference in order to get rid of the ambiguity or obscurity, and the confusion between Being and beings as follows.

The relationship as Identity:

Heidegger understands that the relationships between Being and Dasein are essentially established on the principle of identity. For him, the principle of Identity suggests that every being is identical with itself in its self-sameness. In other words, every being is same in self, and with itself. First, every being is being in itself, thus, it is the similarity that brings being to itself as itself. This identity is indeed, beings' unity with itself, which is totally dependent upon Being as a whole. Therefore, "... principle of identity speaks of Being of beings which holds beings in their unity and identity."⁵³

⁵² See this discussion in *Der Feldweg*, 6: by Martin, Heidegger. Auflage (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978, pp. 3-4.

⁵³ Martin Heidegger, *Identität und Differenz*, (ID) 6 Auflage (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1978, pp. 10-13 see also its translation, *Identity and Difference*, (IAD) trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: Harper and Row, 1969. pp. 23-26

However, Heidegger goes further by affiliating his idea of identity with that of Parmanydean fragments,⁵⁴ in which Parmanyds writes "Thinking and Being are same." As, Parmenides holds the idea that Being of Dasein is essentially thinking, and the thinking itself revolves around the Being which concretizes its relationships with beings and Daseins in the world. For Parmanyds, "To gar auto noein estin to kei einai" translated in English, it reads as "Thinking and Being (Dasein) are same."⁵⁵ With reference to this Parmanydean Fragment, Heidegger holds that original meaning of words might have vanished Yet, he brings forth the sense of words used in the Fragment, such that 'einai' is 'physis' which stands for power-abiding. Following this translation, einai would mean, for Heidegger, Anwesenheit⁵⁶ in German. The term noein means that ... "receptive coming to stand."⁵⁷

Furthermore, Heidegger describes the meaning of auto (same) with reference to einai (Being) and then noein (thinking, man). This would imply that Thinking or man⁵⁸ is similar (same) to Being. This translation not only shows something as Gleichgueltigkeit (equality) or Einerleiheit (Indifference), but also it stands for Zusammengehorigkeit (Belonging-together) as well.⁵⁹ Following this, Heidegger holds that thinking, since the earliest times, has been preoccupied with the principle of identity. Hence, the principle of identity leads us to the idea of man as thinking being whose being is equal to the Being as a whole. In this way, "... thinking and Being...." [Are same] by "... Being belonging-together in the same and by virtue of the same."⁶⁰

For Heidegger, this belonging-together should be taken in twofold aspects. One meets with Being and unity or system under casual laws that make up all connections (necessary or contingent) of beings in unity. This would imply that Being is the cause of all beings to exists. This takes the belonging-together in terms of Onto-theology, which characterizes beingness of beings. In this connection, there would come heirarchy, or gradation of Being into beings emanating from the highest order Being on the top.

Second aspect, belonging-together is not taken in terms of unity or system of relationships between beingness of beings and that of beings, and Being. Rather, it is described as the relations of the related with others as the same. This would further, imply that there is sign of relationship in a very appropriating order. The related one would enter into the relations of the other through appropriating each other. In the later

⁵⁴ See Heideggers' refrerring his argument to the Parmanyds' Fragments in Einfuehrung in die Metaphysik (EM) p. 104, see also George j. Seidel, Martin Heidegger and the Pre-Socrates (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 159.

⁵⁵ See, Einfuehrung in die Metaphysik, 4. Auflage, (TUEBINGEN: Max Niemeyer, 1976. P. 104, see, an introduction of metaphysics trans. Ralph Manheim (London: Yale university press. 1959, p. 136.

⁵⁶ Which means Being as a finite presence, see EM p. 46 IM, pp. 60-61.

⁵⁷ EM p. 105 IM, p.138

⁵⁸ Man as thinking self should not be confused with Descarteian or Kantian views of self; however, no doubt, Heidegger believes that man is thinking being. But, he doesn't mean that man is only a rational being, simultaneously he believes other aspects of human are equally primordial in totality, such as being passionate, and sensitive or emotional.

⁵⁹ EM, p. 106, IM, p. 138

⁶⁰ IAD,p.27.

sense, Being's relation with man is possible through Ereignis (appropriation).⁶¹ However, in the former sense, it looks as if the relationship between Being and man lies in the realm of causality. In other words, Being's relationships with man in the former sense appear as a causal or accidental in the realm of belonging-together.

Here, Heidegger wants to prove that not only Being holds man, but at the same time, man also holds the Being in the realm of equal belonging-together. Consequently, Heidegger, under the title of Principle of Identity, would bring us to the central significance of man in the totality of significance (in his early work). Man is different from other beings in the totality of beings. For instance, man is able to understand, and think about Being, he realizes his ability of reaching closer to the Being. Therefore, man is a dweller (in terms of dwelling near to Being), thinker (of) and comprehender of Being in the truth of Being. Man (Dasein) is the shepherd⁶² of Being.

In the same realm of thinking, Heidegger would say that man faces Being every moment, and he is always open to it always.⁶³ Therefore, he is always oriented to Being. The orientation of man towards Being is the Phenomenological tendency in man towards Being. However, Being strengthens human Dasein to listen to and respond⁶⁴ to the Being. [this dialogical aspect of man is] his, "... responding to Being..." "... A belonging to Being prevails within man, a belonging which listens to Being because it is appropriated... to Being."⁶⁵ In this way, not only Being's belonging to man, but man's belonging to Being are articulated. Both are beholding each other identically.

However, Being proclaims man to have experience of Being through its Being presencing. Because, man possess the ability of claring the what, how, and why of Being. In this way, Being delivers itself to man in order to make itself present. As Heidegger, puts it in these words:

... Being itself belongs to us; for only with us can Being be present as Being, i.e., become present. Therefore, man and Being are appropriated to each other. [And] they belong to each other.⁶⁶

Heidegger believes that the appropriation lets both Being and man to enter into the threshold of each other. Herein, Being and man shower Zueignen (dedicating) and

⁶¹ Heidegger's most enigmatic Manuscript entitled "Beitrage zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)" was written by him from 1936-1938. This led Heidegger's stage shifting from the project of Sein und Zeit's Hermeneutics phenomenology of Dasein to an aspect of Mediating on the event of Appropriation [das Ereignis] as the happening of "be-ing" (Syne) itself. See this discussion in Richard F.H. Polt, *The emergency of Being: On Heidegger's Contribution to the Philosophy*. Cornell University Press, 2006. p. 1.

⁶² In his later works, Heidegger calls Dasein as a shepherd of Being, who is able to safeguard Being. See Pattison George. *The Later Heidegger*, Published by Rutledge, 2000, p. 4.

⁶³ However, ontologically there is no self and no world distinct and separate. Rather Dasein exists as in der welt sein in the way do other Seindes beings do not. See, *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity in modern philosophy and psychoanalysis* by ROGAR FRIE. Romann and Littlefield publishers. 1997.

⁶⁴ The acts of listening and responding are phenomenological dialogical aspects of Dasein. This idea would lead us to the call of conscience and the guilt, as dialogical aspects to verify the truth of Being and that of Dasein itself, in Heidegger's *Being and Time*. We would discuss this idea in our final chapters.

⁶⁵ ID, p. 18 IAD, p. 31.

⁶⁶ ID, pp. 19-20. IAD, pp. 13, 32, 33.

Vereignen (Appropriating) on each other. By way of sketching the line of distinction between man and other entities, Heidegger prioritizes man and Beings' relationships. For, Heidegger understands that man belonging together to Being is of a primordial nature. This belonging together would not only help distinguishing man and other entities, but also make a way to understanding the innermost nature of beings, other than Being.

Therefore, for Heidegger, what is the real nature of beings, would only be understandable on the basis of primal relationships between Being and Dasein. Because, the belonging-together of man with Being, is primordially appropriative through which we are able to architecturize the other aspect of Beings' relationships with beings (entities) in difference.

Understanding the difference between Being and beings:

Heidegger has been trying to work out meaningful relationship between Being and Human Dasein thoroughly. He further looks into the matters which are paradigmatically schematized within primordial relationships between Being and beings. However, this would demonstrate one of the difference, rather than identity. For him, Being is always Being of beings. This exhibits the main reason for difference between Being and beings. However, it should be noted here that Heidegger realizes the difference⁶⁷ as most significant of all differences hitherto withheld by philosophers in the history of intellect. This difference stands between das Sein and that of Seindes (Being and beings). The nature of every Seindes (beings) must be construed in relation to Being.

Furthermore, it is indispensable to work out that the relation between Being and beings as a primordial one. No doubt, for Heidegger, Being is not beings, nor is the case vice versa. Nevertheless, Being can not be understood without beings, nor can beings be understood without primordial analysis of Being. Following this, it proves that Being does not and could not exist independent of beings in its absolute loneliness. And simultaneously, beings do not have their separate existences as independent reality. In this regard, Heidegger says "... Being is never without beings...." Because, "... [The] truth of Being...."⁶⁸ lies in its beings. So, Being can not be without beings and beings are not without Being.⁶⁹ The ontological difference is an original difference as difference. For instance, ontological difference between Being and beings is not only rational or reasonable, but a real and original difference as difference.⁷⁰

Heidegger equivalently regards the forgetfulness of Being and that of Ontological Difference. He believes that traditional philosophy has not only forgotten the question,

⁶⁷ For Heidegger, it is ontological difference which has been forgotten in since traditional philosophy to the time of modern metaphysics.

⁶⁸ Heidegger Martin, *Was Ist Metaphysik?* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975), p. 46 see, also Heidegger Martin, *Existence and Being*, ed. Werner Brock (Indiana: Regnery/Gate Inc., 1979) p. 354.

⁶⁹ Further discussion has been carried through other works of Heidegger, such as *Was Heisst Denken?* (What is called Thinking?), 3, Auflage (Tuebingen:Max Niemeyer, 1971) p. 144, *Being and Time*, *What is Metaphysics*, etc.

⁷⁰ On this discussion, see Caputo, John D. *Heidegger and Aquinas: An Essay on Overcoming Metaphysics* (New York: Fordham University Press 1982), pp. 147-184.

meaning and truth of Being, but also the Ontological difference between Being and beings.⁷¹

Furthermore, Being belongs to beings in terms of difference as difference. This implies that Being sends itself to beings, and reaches them to disclose themselves. It implies that there is *Das Zwischen*⁷² (between) which Being stands as different from beings. Here, Heidegger inquires what this *Das Zwischen* meant. Heidegger believes that when we begin our enquiry into what this difference implies for Being and beings, we encounter original difference in front of us. The term 'between' shows that Being is dynamic, healthy, and always young in its eternity, presence and futuristic. Thus sending of Being itself to being is because, Being is not static, or like Aristotelian Unmoved Mover, or still God of Philosophers. The transitive and active Being is the primordial ground of all beings in terms of coming over (*Ueberkommen*).⁷³ The coming over nature of Being demonstrates that Being never stays silent, but it always and every moment appeals to Human *Dasein*. It calls him to recall Being and recollect the truth of Being. In this sense, Being is always young and dynamic in its reaching, sending, calling, appealing to Human *Dasein* to understand the Nature and essentiality of Being.

In the same realm of thinking, it must also be understood that *Ueberkommen* does not mean that Being situates itself into beings, and runs off its original situation. Rather, Being remains dynamic and actively transitive in its original place. In *Ueberkommen* Being gives itself over to beings in order to reveal them in their true nature. The process of coming over and revealing makes it possible for beings to manifest themselves in acquiring their presence. Beings acquire their presence through their *Ankunft*⁷⁴ (beings arrival to Being). This is a two way dynamism, one, by Beings' coming over to beings; and other, the beings' arrival to Being. However, Being would go beyond any concrete manifestation, because, it will hide itself by unconcealing beings. Therefore, Heidegger believes that concealment of Being lies in the unconcealment of beings. In this process of concealing/unconcealing Being and beings are either to meet together or to turn away from each other. Heidegger calls it process of perdurance⁷⁵ (*Austrage*)

The process of perdurance, for Heidegger, is very significant. Because, he believes that claring of Being only comes through beings. The ontological difference makes the process of perdurance possible by differentiating between coming-over of Being and that of arrival of beings. The concept of *das Zwischen* i.e. between Being and beings would clarify Beings' coming over to beings arrived at. Thus, Heidegger's idea of perdurance depicts the criteria of revealing-concealing process between Being and beings. In this way, Being and beings are circling around each other (*Uneinanderkreisen*).⁷⁶

⁷¹ See this discussion in Holzwege Martin Heidegger, 5. Auflage (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1972), p. 336.

⁷² See, Identity and Difference. [IAD], p.154, ID, p. 63.

⁷³ This term has been translated overwhelming also, see IAD, p. 17.

⁷⁴ See IAD, p 17, see word 'Commen' translated as come-on as Being enlightens to beings in its *Ueberkommen*.

⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 17.

⁷⁶ ID p. 60. IAD p. 69.

Following this argument, Heidegger goes further saying that Beings and beings' clearing (Lichtung) comes with Being to provide ground to beings. In as much as, beings are grounded in Being;⁷⁷ and Being gives itself as the original difference historically as revealing/concealing. Heretofore Heidegger reaches to the point that Being is the primordial underpinning or the foundational principle that bears tripartite facets in terms of physical, divine and human. Heidegger believes that the twofold belonging-together between Being and man and that of Being and entities are originally grounded into the ontological difference. However, Heidegger holds that Being is not the same as human beings are, rather, Being is different from man. Nevertheless, Being stands in relation to man in order to appropriate each other. In this way, the appropriative relationships between man and being would be the source foundation of all sorts of relationships.

However, Dasein would remain still curious to have full experience of Being. But the thoroughgoing experience of Being slips into unhealthy grasp of Being as hiding itself while revealing other beings. So, Being is always mysterious to Human Dasein, which he desires to open himself to it [Being]. On the other hand, Being reveals itself to Human Dasein by manifesting and strengthens human experience to have grasp of Being. Otherwise, no human experience works without manifestation of Being.

For this reason, Being always is essentially active and transitive in relation to man. For instance, Being gives itself in the perpetual process of revealing/concealing, presencing/abesencing, or withdrawing. This process belongs to Being's manifestation through its spatial and temporal postures. Because, Heidegger conjuncts his conception of Being to Time essentially. For He thinks that time is the horizon which makes Being to manifest itself through spatio-temporal history. Thus, Being gives itself to beings in term of unifying itself to them in spatio-temporality symmetrically.

Temporality and Historicity in Relation to Being:

In our pervious discussion we have gone through the manifold views regarding Being in Heidegger's Philosophy. For instance, we discussed the concept of Gaben (giving) of Being which makes Being as Anwesen (presencing) in relation to what is das Anwesende i.e. present. In this framework, Being lets what is present to be open (in the process of) presencing of Being. Heidegger calls it letting-presencing (Anwesenlassen).⁷⁸ The Geben of Being is meant by Heidegger that Being always lets something (or whatever to be present) to be free to open or unfold itself. So, the idea of Geben and Anwesen are both equivalent terms. Furthermore, Heidegger believes that the nature of Geben is to clarify the notion of Being when it conceals itself by coming over (Ueberkommen) to entities and reveals beings by the way of (An-kommen) coming- on or (An-kunft) Arrival of beings to Being.⁷⁹ Heidegger goes further to describe Geben as

⁷⁷ ID, p. 61 IAD, p. 70.

⁷⁸ See Heidegger M. *Zur Sache des Denkens*, 2 Auflage (Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer, 1976) p. 5. See also, Heidegger M. *On Time and Being*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). p. 5. (SD, TB).

⁷⁹ We have already discussed this idea. However, it is indispensable to discuss this idea again in relation to temporal manifestation of Being as such.

the essence of Being, because Being conceals itself in giving, and the concealment of Being is not some accidental attitude in Being, but a innate character of Being.⁸⁰

Heidegger describes the *Geben* as sending of Being itself to beings. As Puthenpurackal writes, "In sending itself, Being withdraws; in giving itself Being withholds; in presencing itself Being absences; in revealing itself, Being conceals."⁸¹ For Heidegger, the sending and giving of Being is historical, while we call it history of Being. Here Heidegger circumvents any notion of Epochal, the term used by Husserl with reference to his notion of bracketing. He turns towards describing *Seingeschichte* (history of Being) as *Geschick von Sein* (sending of Being). The idea of *Geschick von Sein* to beings is epochal i.e. historical in the sense that Being's sending of itself is effective throughout epochs. Heidegger uses the Greek term hold-back ('Apache') as Being holds itself back by withholding beings.⁸²

It is indispensable here to discuss the notion of *Seingeschichte* with reference to Time⁸³ as constituent of temporal symmetry of Being. The idea of entity to be present belongs to presencing. However, the presencing mode of being belongs to extending (*Richen*) as well, what Heidegger calls three modes of Time. In this framework, *das Gewesen* (what-has-been) mode of time belongs to past.⁸⁴ *Das Gewesen* mode of time is not absolute absence; rather it belongs to presence necessarily. This implies that presencing is always and already extended to *das Gewesen* mode of time, whereas, presence is unable to detach itself from its what-has-been mode of a time. Simultaneously, future which-is-not-yet is reached by presencing through extending. Heidegger calls extending mode of time; the fourth dimension of a true time. Somewhere, he has calls it simultaneous time (*das Gleich-Zuspiel*).⁸⁵

The real time is recognized with the fourth dimension of time. However, time is ecstatic in terms of what-has-been, stands beyond itself, and turns into moments of 'nows', making parts of present and then what is not yet is merged in to presence. Therefore, time gives itself presencing into abesencing, and unifies all ecstatic of time into single most unity, which Being is responsible for. Thus, presencing always remains absorbed with/in what-has-been, and what-is-not-yet (as the modes of abesencing).

Following this argument, Heidegger goes further in describing the true nature of original time. He believes that Being in *Gaben* "... gives true time...." And an opening and

⁸⁰ Read further the idea of *Gaben* in *Vier Seminare* BY Martin Heidegger. (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977). p. 101. (VS)

⁸¹ Puthenpurackal Johnson J. Heidegger: through Authentic Totality to Total Authenticity (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987). p. 180.

⁸² See this discussion in *Early Greek Thinking*, trans. D.E krell and F.A. Capuzzi, (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 26 (EGT)

⁸³ see Heidegger on the concept of time, in "becoming Heidegger: on the trial of his early writing. 1910-1927. Edited by Theodore J. Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2007, see particularly pp. 196-213.

⁸⁴ It is not merely that-which-is-past (*das Vergangene*) but it concerns man, while it (*das Gewesen*) is presence in its absence.

⁸⁵ See Heidegger M. *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, 6 Auflage (Pfullingen: Neske, 1979), p. 213. See also, Martin Heidegger, *On the Way to Language*, tras. P.D. Hertz (New York: Harper Row 1971), p. 106.

concealing, time extends to beings. So, extending itself is nothing more than giving in which "... giving of giving is concealed in true time."⁸⁶ In this sense, Time is as extending process whereas, Being ventures to send itself to beings extended in time again, thereby making its own history possible. Being's sending always demonstrates itself through realm of openness, which Heidegger calls Being sending in the *Bereich des Oeffnen* (the realm of open).

In this way, Being and Time remain unified to the realm of univocal integrity. Being always portrays or enlightens through sending itself via time. So, it turns out that Being is temporal through its presencing. Henceforth, presencing itself is temporal (historical) aspect of time. Furthermore, in order to clarify this point, we would return to our old appraisal of Being revealing is concealing. Thus, Being is temporal in presencing through absencing or withdrawing. Heidegger holds that Being sending is nothing more than temporal aspect of Being sending itself as presencing. In this regard, Being proves to be epochal historically, and temporal in its power of *Gabe*. While, Being stays in the paradigm of presencing/absencing procedure as finitude, because, Being is historical and its history shows itself as the manifestation of finitude (Being finite in its temporality). We would further discuss that the Heidegger's notion of Being is not only temporal but is also spatial symmetrically.

Being in its spatial symmetry:

As we have already discussed the notion of fourfold in Heidegger. It is indefensible to review this concept with reference to how Being demonstrates itself in/through spatiality of space. While, space can not be historical as the time is historico-apochal. Nevertheless, space always spaces, means that space conjures up events, facts and human happenstance in its simultaneity. Heidegger believes that Being carries with itself its four facets, such as Earth, Sky, Divinities and Mortals (human). The four facets of Being as the evidence for Being's spatial dimension. The fourfold bears no utter idiosyncrasy, rather it is unified in single most totality. For Heidegger, fourfold constitutes the "... worlding of the world."⁸⁷ So, he writes:

This gathering [of fourfold facets] ... letting-stay, is the thinging of thing. The unitary fourfold of the sky and earth, mortals and divinities, which is stayed in the thinging of the things, we call the world. Thinging things are things ... [which constitute the world].⁸⁸

So, Heidegger argues that world and things are relevant to each other in bearing each other. With this, worlding of the world turns into one fold unity. Where as, we find a concealing and unconcealing process enacted throughout spatial facets. Hence,

⁸⁶ See, *On Time and Being*. op cit. p. 16

⁸⁷ VA, *Vortraege und Aufsätze* p. 172, *Poetry, Language and Thought*, p. 179. It should be noted here that Heidegger, in his later works prioritizes *Welt und Ding* (World and Thing), instead of using terms like Being and beings, whereas, when he applies the ontological difference, he likewise, uses it in between world and thing, instead of Being and beings.

⁸⁸ *Poetry Language and Thought*, pp. 199-200. VA, p. 174, US, p. 22

Heidegger uses the Term Being (Sein) with marking a cross over it.⁸⁹ However, cross upon the term Being does not mean anything negative in Heidegger's notion of Being. Rather, it shows the sign of concealing, or hiding the posture of Being. In contrast to this sign, Heidegger would use the term Being without any cross upon it in terms of unconcealing or Being as revealing.

In this framework, the unity of foursome in to one fold would demonstrate the history of Being as worlding process of the world in the spatial symmetry. Therefore, Heidegger regards the history of Being as time/space symmetry.

⁸⁹ See further [Being marking a cross upon it] in Heidegger M. *Zur Seinsfrage*, 3. Auflage (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1967, pp. 34-35. See also *Question of Being*. p. trs. William Kluback and J.T Wild pp. 89-90.