The Genesis of Existentials in Animal Life

Heidegger's appropriation of Aristotle's Ontology of Life[1]

Christiane Bailey
Université de Montréal

> "Life" refers to a *mode of being*, indeed a mode of *being-in-a-world*. A living thing is not simply at hand [*vorhanden*], but is in a world in that it has its world. An animal is not simply moving down the road, pushed along by some mechanism. It is in the world in the sense of having it."
>
> Heidegger, *Die Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie*

Although Aristotle's influence on young Heidegger's thought has been studied at length, such studies have almost exclusively focused on his interpretation of Aristotle's ethics, physics and metaphysics. I will rather address Heidegger's appropriation of Aristotle's ontology of life presented in the *De Anima* and the *De Motu Animalium*. Focusing on recently published or recently translated courses of the mid 20's (mainly SS 1924, WS 1925-26 and SS 1926), I will show that *Being and Time*'s existential structures – *Befindlichkeit*, Understanding and being-with-one-another through language[2] – arose from his close reading of Aristotle's ontology of life. As Heidegger insists, the *De Anima* has nothing to do with psychology or anthropology, but is a general ontology of life, it is "the first phenomenological grasp of life which led to the interpretation of movement and made possible the radicalization of ontology".[3] By showing what this statement means, I will uncover an important aspect of young Heidegger's thought left unconsidered: namely, that *Dasein*'s existential structures originate in Aristotle's ontology of animal life.

§1. Reading *Befindlichkeit* as *diathesis* and *Sorge* as desire

The first existential structure—*Befindlichkeit*—translates Aristotle's notion of *diathesis*, disposition or "disposedness" [4] and comes from Heidegger's reading of Aristotle's analysis of the passions, or affects (*pathe*): "The affects (*pathe*) are not mental states, but refer to the *disposition of the living in his world* [*Befindlichkeit des Lebenden in seiner*

---

1 This paper has been presented at the Heidegger Circle 2011, in Milwaukee (Wisconsin).

2 "*Rede"* is usually rendered as "discourse" or "speech", but I use "language" in order to pick up the fact that this existential structure must be taken as communication (*Mitteilung*) in the largest possible sense (SZ, 162). Sometimes, a fourth existential is added – fallenness (*Verfallenheit*). I did not include it in my analysis because this ontological structure seems much more inspired by Luther and Augustine than by Aristotle. But, as Sommer notes in his analysis of the theological source of *Being and Time*, "one must understand that *Geworfenheit* first and foremost points toward the natural state of animals." See C. Sommer, *Les sources aristotéliciennes et néo-testamentaires de Être et temps*, 41: « il importe avant tout de saisir que la *Geworfenheit* fait signe vers l'état naturel de l'animal ».

3 GA 22, 182. All references to Heidegger's work will be given in the original edition [GA: Gesamtausgabe, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main] followed by the volume number with the exception of *Sein und Zeit* (SZ) and of the *Natorp-Bericht* (NB). Page numbers refer to the original German editions. When available, I have used the English translation (sometimes modified). See bibliography for further details.

4 *Befindlichkeit* could be translated as "disposition" (Kisiel), as "disposedness" (Dahlstrom), as "affectivity" (Dreyfuss) or as "attunement" (Stambaugh). I follow Kisiel because "disposition" is usually used to render the Greek *diathesis*. I will sometimes use neologisms like "finding-oneself" or "to find oneself" in order to keep the German *sich befinden*.

Welt], how he stands to something, how he lets something affect or concern [*angehen*] him" (GA 18, 122).

From this we see first that the neologism "*Befindlichkeit*" had already been coined by Heidegger in Summer 1924 and that it refers to the same phenomenon as in *Being and Time*, the only difference being that it did not solely apply to human beings, by to animals as well – it is presented as a fundamental structure of living beings themselves.[5] *Befindlichkeit* belongs to any being endowed with perception: it refers to the fact that a living being always finds itself [*befindet sich*] pleasantly or unpleasantly disposed toward what it perceives in the world. Heidegger obtained this crucial point from reading Aristotle: perception is not only openness to the world, but also to ourselves. In finding-oneself well or badly disposed, there is disclosedness of both the world and oneself:

> "By the very fact that a living being discloses a world, the Being of this being is also disclosed to it. It knows about itself even if only in the dullest way and the broadest sense. Along with the disclosure of the world, it is disclosed to itself [*Damit, daß es seine Welt entdeckt, ist aber das Sein dieses Seienden selbst entdeckt. Es weiß um sich selbst, wenn auch nur im dumpfesten und weitesten Sinne. Mit der Entdecktheit der Welt ist selbst ihm selbst entdeckt*]." (GA 22, 208)

Following Aristotle, Heidegger will say in his SS 1926 that "where there is perception of something, self-orientation in a world, there is *lupe te kai hedone* (pain and pleasure), feeling oneself *attuned* in such and such a way, feeling well or ill, and thus also being open to, being on the lookout for: *orexis* [desire] (*cf.* DA, 413*b*23)" (GA 22, 185-6). Desire belongs even to the most primitive animal because perception and appetite are equiprimordial powers: "Where there are feelings of pleasure and pain, there must be desire" (DA, 434*a*1).[6]

As we know, Heidegger renders *orexis* as *Sorge*, care.[7] This puzzling translation makes sense only if we understand living beings in their intentional character. Intentionality must not be understood as the structure of consciousness or reason (as Husserl and Scheler have done), but as the basic structure of life itself, it is – as Heidegger says in 1923 – a "volitional being-out-for-something and going toward it: *orexis* (desire)" (GA 63, 70). Life is always related to something, striving for something, oriented toward something. That "toward-which" life is oriented is never a mere object, but always something that has some sort of significance, of importance for the living being – since, as Aristotle says, no animal moves by itself toward or away from something unless he has the desire to (DA, 432*b*17-29). It is precisely this idea that made possible Heidegger's radicalization of ontology: life's mobility is always a concerned mobility; *Lebensbewegtheit* is always a *Besorgensbewegtheit*

---

[5] It has sometimes, but rarely been highlighted that *Befindlichkeit* isn't a structure proper to human beings. To my knowledge, Sommer is the only one to have done it in French. In English, Krell underlined it in his *Daimon Life* and, recently, Dahlstrom had also recognized that *Befindlichkeit* isn't peculiar to human existence, but suppose that it is the case of other existentials: "Disposedness is an apt translation of *Befindlichkeit* since its scope is not limited to human beings. […]. Even though we only understand the way other animals are disposed through analogies with our own disposedness, it is precisely our ease in doing so – something that cannot be said of the other basic existentials: understanding, talking, lapsing – that is distinctive of this existential." (*Heidegger's concept of truth*, 297).

[6] Aristotle, *De Anima*, 434*a*1. Hereafter, DA.

[7] For example, SZ, 171. See McNeill, W., *The Glance of the Eye*, 2: "Heidegger translates the Greek *oregontai* (from *orexis*, usually rendered as "desire") by *Sorge*. "Care" is of course the term used in *Being and Time* to designate the being of *Dasein*, the being of that entity that we ourselves are. Existing as care, *Dasein* […] is always already stretched out ahead of himself: it is essentially futural." As, in Aristotle, *epithumia* and *thumos* are species of irrational desire, *Hang* and *Drang* are species of care "that has not yet become free": in propensity and urge, the "being-ahead-of-oneself oriented towards something" has lost itself in a "just-always-already-alongside" (SZ, §41, 196).

(NB, 44). The movement of a living being is always the movement of desire, or in Heidegger's language, the movement of care. In order to explain this intentionality of living beings, Heidegger will, in his SS 1925 lecture course, give the example of the snail:

> "We can say that the snail at times crawls out of its shell and at the same time keeps it on hand; it stretches itself out to something, to food, to some things which it finds on the ground. Does the snail thereby first enter into a relationship of being to the world? Not at all! Its act of crawling out is but a local modification of its already-being-in-the-world. Even when it is in its shell, its being is a being-outside, rightly understood. It is not in his shell like water in the glass, for it has the inside of its shell as a world which it pushes against and touches, in which it warms itself and the like. […] The snail is not at the outset only in its shell and not yet in the world, a world described as standing over against it, an opposition which it broaches by first crawling out. It crawls out only insofar as its being is already to be in a world. It does not first add a world to itself by touching. Rather, it touches because its being means nothing other than to be in a world." (GA 20, 223)

In his comment, Jean Greisch will consider the ascription of a world to the snail as a "lame analogy" for the snail does not exist, but merely lives.[8] Obviously, Greisch is reading Heidegger in the light of his later work. However, in the context of SS 1925, there is absolutely no reason to suppose that existence is, in one way or another, the condition of possibility of having a world.[9] Quite the contrary! Heidegger clearly states that, from the moment this world-relationship is manifest in a being, we must attribute to it the structure of *Dasein*: if water were in the glass in such a way that it could have a relationship to the glass – that it could, for example, find it too hot or feel too cramped in it – then we would "have to say even of water that it has the mode of being of *Dasein*, it is such that it has a world" (GA 20, 223). Since *Existenz* was not a condition of possibility of facticity, but only a possibility that arises from factical life itself, there is no reason to read the attribution of a being-in-the-world to animals as a mere metaphor. Moreover, in the same lecture course, Heidegger will say that all animals have a form of *Befindlichkeit*, however obscure:

> "A stone never finds itself [*ein Stein befindet sich nie*] but is simply on hand [*vorhanden*]. A very primitive unicellular form of life, on the contrary, will already find itself, where this disposition can be the greatest and darkest dullness [*wobei diese Befindlichkeit die größtmögliche und dunkelste Dumpfheit sein kann*], but all that it is in its structure of being essentially distinct from merely being on hand like a thing." (GA 20, 352)

Is this really surprising? Any being endowed with perception will not only be open to a world around itself, but to itself as well in the sense that in perceiving the world as pleasing and unpleasing, "it finds itself (*befindet sich*) in this or that way" (GA 20, 352), pleasantly or unpleasantly disposed toward what it perceives. Life is given as "mine" in the simple fact of experiencing pleasure and pain: "The affective as such already has the character of having-itself" (GA 18, 247). To neglect this "mineness" of life in animals under the assumption that

---

8 Greisch, J., *Ontologie et temporalité*, p. 127.

9 "We designate as *Existenz* the *ultimate basic possibility* in which *Dasein* genuinely is" (GA 18, 43). As Kisiel explained, SS 1925 is a "pre-existential" version of *Being and Time.* This means that "*Existenz*" was used in a restricted sense pointing only to *Dasein*'s ownmost possibility (Cf. Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, 496). This is clear in the *Natorp-Bericht* where existence is only a *possibility* which arises from factical life: "'Facticity' and 'Existence' do not mean the same thing, and the factical character of this being of life is not determined by existence. The latter is only one possibility that temporalizes itself and unfolds itself in the being of life we have described as 'factical'." (NB, 25-27, tr. *Supplements*, 120).

it is so vague and general that it appears as a dumbness or bewilderment is to omit the fact that Heidegger chose precisely the expression "*sich befinden*" to avoid any self-reflexivity (GA 20, 352) and the fact that, even in the case of human *Dasein*, openness to oneself is essentially characterized by non-transparency, it is precisely this *Diesigkeit* which makes a hermeneutics of factical life necessary (GA 61, 88).

As will argue Heidegger, "*aesthanesthai* should not be understood in the narrow sense of perception, but as awareness in the sense of *having-there the world*" (GA 18, 198). Animals are open to the world in the sense that they "have" a world.[10] Having a world means being involved in it, caring about it, being concerned by it. This world is nothing like an objective reality: "The world, in the character of *hedu* and *luperon*, of pleasing and unpleasing is non-objective; animals do not have the world there as objects. Rather, the world is encountered in the mode of the uplifting and the upsetting" (GA 18, 48). The way in which the world is there for animals depends on the degree in which an animal is awake or closed up in itself, but regardless of degree, "the possibility that the world matters to a being depends on this peculiar openness" (GA 18, 52). Even if this *Erschlossenheit* of the lives of animals can be so dim and obscure that it appears, in lower animals, as a *Dumpfheit*, the fact remains that all animals participate in what will become the first existential structure of *Dasein—Befindlichkeit.*[11] But what about the second key component of Being-in-the-world? What about understanding (*Verstehen*)?

§2. Understanding: *aisthesis* as *aletheuein* and *krinein*

"Understanding," as Heidegger insists in 1926, must be taken "not in a specific theoretical sense, but in a practical one: to understand doesn't mean to know something, but to know your way around something, to know how to do something" (GA 22, 207). Only if we recognize that orientation within the world, dealing with something, coping with something is already a form of understanding can we grasp why Heidegger, in his early works, also granted a form of understanding to animals:

> "Understanding belongs to the mode of Being of animals. To say that something is understood means that it is manifest in its being such and such: it is no longer concealed. In understanding, there is something like truth, aletheia: that which is unconcealed, not covered over, but on the contrary, uncovered." (GA 22, 207-8)

Understanding is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon. Aristotle identifies several degrees or modalities of understanding at the very beginning of *Metaphysics*: *aisthesis*, *mneme*, *emperia*, *techne*, *episteme*, *sophia* (GA 22, 25; 208). If *aisthesis* is named as the first level of understanding, it is because perception is the basic form of disclosing upon which all the other forms of understanding are based: "being perceived seems to be the most immediate way of uncovering something, the most obvious and manifest truth" (GA 34, 165). *Aisthesis* is the most primitive form of *aletheuien*, "because it discloses the world, though indeed not in speech and assertion" (GA 22, 186), it is a form of uncovering that lets something be "known" in a certain sense.

This cognitive dimension of perception, this discrimination (*krinein*), explains why Aristotle will say that perception cannot easily be classified as either irrational or rational (DA, 432*a*30): "the *aisthesis* of the animal already has the character of *krisi*s, even in *aisthesis,* in normal perception, something is highlighted in relation to something else" (GA 19, 39). In natural perception, we do not perceive a multiplicity of sensory qualities, but

---

[10] "Having," says Heidegger, is "a pale expression for being-aware-of" (GA 18, 244).

[11] "*Dumpfheit* is already a finding-oneself [*Sich befinden*]" (GA 63, 180n).

rather *things*: "Originally, one does not hear noises, but the creaking wagon, the tram, the motorcycle, the north wind. To 'hear' something like a 'pure noise' already requires a very artificial and sophisticated attitude" (GA 20, 368). Because of the synthetic nature of perception, we always perceive *something as something*. What we perceive is already significant: it makes sense (GA 21, 121).

> "We always see the world in an *as*. If I see something in the distance then I do not see something indeterminate there. Instead we take it initially and mostly *as* something. This determinate, basic character of the world becomes accessible only on the basis of a definite manner of perceiving, *krinein*" (GA 17, 294).

This synthetic nature of perception is what the young Heidegger called "the 'as' of significance" (GA 58, 114) or "critical-as," (GA 17, 31) which will later be renamed "hermeneutical-as" (SZ, 158). [12]

§3. Memory, experience and *phronesis*

Because perception is by itself a form of *synthesis* and *krinein*, Heidegger will attribute, following Aristotle, a form of understanding to animals. But we now have to consider the fact that animals are not confined to mere *aisthesis*, many are also endowed with *memory*. This decisive faculty allows animals to retain past images or representations (*phantasia*) and remember that what appears good may well be only apparently good. Memory-driven experience (*emperia*) makes animals more intelligent and more cautious (*phronimoteron*) and therefore more difficult to trap and deceive (MP, I, 1). Animals endowed with memory are more able to anticipate what's coming, they are "more capable of circumspection (*Umsicht*)":

> "What is characteristic in *aisthesis* is that the beings which are disclosed are there in the present along with the living thing. If the living being were determined by *aisthesis* alone, then its world would extend only insofar as it sees, smells, etc. at any given moment. The living thing would be restricted to the sphere of what is immediately present-at-hand [*Vorhandene*n]. Once it has *mneme*, however, the living thing becomes, in certain sense, free [*frei*], no longer bound to the beings currently given in perception. In this way, the living being dominates a broader scope of the world, which becomes and stays available to it [*So beherrscht das Lebende einen weiteren Umfang der Welt, der für es verfügbar wird und bleibt*]. Its being-in-the-world no longer requires ever new perceptions; on the contrary, when it finds itself within the same position in a world-nexus [*Weltzusammenhangs*], it already knows how matters are arranged. The living beings that have *mneme* are *phronimotera*, "more prudent," they are "more able to see around [*Umsichtiger*]": they do not live in the moment anymore, but in a whole which they dominate [*einem beherrschten Ganzen*]. As *phronimotera*, they are also *mathetikera,* able to learn, they are "more teachable." They thereby increase the scope of what they understand and know [*verstehen und kennen*]" (GA 22, 209).

This description of the gradual transition from a primitive life to a life endowed with memory and anticipation is the description of the transformation of a life entangled in the

[12] Signification, as Kisiel rightly pointed out, is not peculiar to man: « Whether human or animal, the world is always (constantly) there to be encountered, not necessarily as "objective reality," but for the most part in being enhancing or repressing, advancing or obstructing, attracting or repelling, and so on. » *Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time,* 295.

immediate moment into a life possessing a *real temporal dimension*: an animal with memory lives in a totality it "owns" in a certain sense.

The fact that forms of prudence and foresight belong to animals has not received sufficient attention in Heidegger scholarship. We take for granted that *phronesis* is one of the highest possibilities of human life, one animals would be deprived of. Only if we understand *phronesis* in its broadest sense—as a certainty of orientation [*Sicherheit der Orientierung*]—can we understand "that animals also have a kind of *phronesis*" (GA 18, 235)[13]. This ability to orient oneself with skill and competence does not imply that these "modes of self-orienting become explicit" (GA 19, 129). *Phronesis* is not a "practical reasoning," a deliberation weighing the consequences of action, but rather an *Augenblick*. For Heidegger, *phronesis* is closer to *aisthesis* than to *logos*, it is a "glance of the eye," a "look around" [*Um-sicht*] that makes possible *Umgang*, dealing with the surrounding world.[14]

Umgang is the term used by Heidegger to translate Aristotle's notion of *kinesis kata topon*, the motion peculiar to animals.[15] As "being-able-to-move-by-themselves from place to place," animals already have a sense of where they are going (GA 18, 238). Whether they fly, run, swim or crawl, animals move themselves *toward something*. This "something" they are striving for must therefore be given to them in one way or another *as desirable or undesirable* because, as Aristotle said, "no animal moves except by compulsion unless it has an impulse toward or away from something" (DA, 432*b*18). Without desire, the movement of animals would never be a voluntary movement.

> "Aristotle shows that what triggers the movement is not mere consideration, the pure observation, of a desirable object. It is not the case that the living being first observes things disinterestedly, merely looks in a neutral attitude, and then moves toward something; on the contrary, *orexis* is its fundamental mode of being." (GA 22, 309)

Animal perception is always action-oriented, always imperative or prescriptive. This is precisely the meaning of the practical syllogism used by Aristotle in the *De Motu Animalium* to explain animal behaviour. What is needed in order to explain animal motion is (1) a desire and (2) something perceived as desirable. From there, the motion of an animal will naturally follow like the conclusion of a logical syllogism from its premises. According to Aristotle's logic of desire, to perceive something pleasant is to perceive it *as desirable*, as something *to pursue*. As soon as an animal desires something and sees it, it will go after it. The fact that animals may be able to remember that what appears good is actually not (that it is just an apparent good, a *phainomenon agathon*) explains why some animals will be granted a form of *phronesis*: "Hence, some animals are classified as prudent (*phronimos*), those which, in all matters relating to their own lives, have a clear ability to predict" (NE, 1141*a*25-28).

§4. *Phone* and *logos* at the basis of being-with [*Mitsein*]

We have seen that the first two existentials, *Befindlichkeit* and understanding, find their origins in animal life. However, Heidegger adds a third existential: discourse (*Rede*) or

---

[13] GA 18, 235 [158]: "animals too possess a *phronèsis* in a certain sense: *phronèsis* here, as orienting-oneself [*Sichorientieren*], as *aisthesis*; here, *phronèsis* is not determined by *nous*, not in the genuine sense."

[14] Even if it is not strictly wrong to associate *phronesis* with a form of deliberation and reasoning, Heidegger claims that the intellectualization of *phronesis* misses the fact that *phronesis* is an *aletheuein* without *logos*. Indeed, it is closer to perception than to reasoning: *phronesis* is a glance at what is so, but could always be otherwise, a vision which opens the concrete situation (GA 19, 163-4). "*Phronesis* makes available the situation and is only possible because it is primarily an *aisthesis*; a pure and simple glance at the moment" (NB, 42).

[15] WS 22/23, 8[26]: "*kinesis kata topon* : *Umgang, Bewegung in seiner Welt*."

language (*Sprache*). This structure is not an independent one, but is equiprimordial with the first two (SZ, §34). One could wonder why this third structure comes into play since Heidegger made very clear in the preceding section that understanding doesn't need any articulation in speech by showing the derivative nature of statements (SZ, §33). So, why suddenly make discourse and language a basic existential structure? This has always been a puzzling move in *Being and Time*. If we assume that language is peculiar to man, we are facing an awkward alternative: either affection and understanding are not originally co-extensive with language or animals aren't ontologically constituted by *Befindlichkeit* and understanding.

But a closer look at the *function* of this third existential shows that the translation of "*Rede*" by "discourse," can be misleading. To speak is not to make judgements and statements about the world: *speaking is basically speaking with one another* (*Miteinanderreden*) (SZ, 165). Only if we understand language as speaking to one another can we understand the justification of this third existential structure: Heidegger's purpose is to show that *Dasein* is always *Mitdasein*, that being-in-the-world is always being-in-the-world-with-another. We can see this more clearly by looking at the first articulation of this structure that we find in the 1924 lecture course on the *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*: Heidegger is here reinstating the idea that human beings are political animals (*zoa politika*), they live with one another.[16]

As Sheehan and others have shown, *semainein* and *hermeneuien* are not, for Aristotle, proper to humans. In *Politics*, Aristotle says that sounds produced by animals are signs (*semeion*) of their pleasure and pain and that they use their voice (*phone*) to communicate these affections to each other (1253*a*8-14). Aristotle does not only refer to involuntary cries of pain and pleasure—although those are obviously significant in that they express the dispositions of animals—but argues that they can *intentionally communicate something to another*. With their voices, animals not only communicate feelings of pain and pleasure, but also the coming of a predator or the location of food. As Aristotle will say in *The Parts of Animals*, birds use their voice to communicate among themselves (*pro hermeneian alloesis*) and to teach something to one another (660*a*17-*b*2). What they communicate is nothing like a "propositional content", but it is still meaning (*Sinn*), something that can be understood (SZ, 324).

As Heidegger insists, however, the language of animals has nothing to do with apophantic statements: by warning his fellows of a predator's approach, the crane does not make a statement about the world, but seeks to bring other animals to a particular disposition (fear), in order to encourage certain behaviour (flight). In other words, as Kisiel remarks, the language of animals *is essentially rhetoric*.[17] Heidegger will criticize very early the tendency to think language on the basis of statements, insisting that language is not primarily composed of true or false propositions, but essentially aims *at doing something or at making others do something*. Animal voice "gives no report about the being-at-hand of what is pleasing: but rather this indication and crying out is in itself an *enticing* or warning. Enticing and warning have in themselves the character of *addressing itself to...*" (GA 18, 54)

---

[16] "Aristotle endeavours to show that life is already constituted through *phone*; that, furthermore, what is living in this way has a being that is fundamentally determined as a being-with-one-another, and that animals are already, in a certain way, *zoa politika* (1253*a*10). Human beings are only *mallon zoon politikon* than are, by example, bees" (GA 18, 50).

[17] Kisiel, *Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, 295: "The animal encounters its environing world in terms of pleasure and pain. It gives voice to this in a kind of 'animal rhetoric' which entices or warns. Luring and alluring signs seek to bring the other animal into the same disposition, threats and warnings would deflect it form a certain disposition".

> "Enticing and warning as *repelling* and *attracting* have in their ground *being-with-one-another*. Enticing and warning already show that animals are with one another. Being-with-one-another becomes manifest precisely in the specific being-character of animals as *phone*. It is neither exhibited nor manifested that something as such is there. Animals do not subsequently come along to ascertain that something is present: they only indicate it within the orbit of their animalistic having-to-do. Since animals indicate the threatening, alarming and so on, they signal in this indicating of the being-there of the world, their own being in the world" (GA 18, 54).

This last point is of capital importance: the animal indicates not only that it finds itself in a world, but also *how* it finds itself in the world. Animals communicate with each other and with us, even if they do not have, strictly speaking, *logos*.

§5. *Proairesis* as the distinctive feature of human life

If existential structures (*Befindlichkeit*, understanding and being-with through language) characterize animal life as such – if, in other words, « the being-possibility of animals has of itself reached this mode of being, having perception of what constitutes well-being and being-upset, being-oriented toward this and indicating this to one another » (GA 18, 46) – what is distinctive about human life? "What, Heidegger asks in SS 1926, is the specifically human mode of Being?" (GA 22, 311). As we know, he does not agree with Aristotle for human excellence rests not in contemplative life but in practical life – or, to be exact, in a certain kind of practical life: *zoē praktike meta logou* (GA 18, 98-105). Man is the only animal capable of decision (*proairesis*), of resolute action (GA 18, 99; GA 22, 187): "Humans have the possibility of understanding the *orekton*, the desirable, as the basis of their action and the motive of their decisions" (GA 22, 311).

Why is man the only living being "able-to-resolve-itself" (GA 18, 254-56)? The answer given by Aristotle will be crucial for Heidegger: man is the only living being capable of resolution because he alone has the understanding of time: "Humans because they possess an *aisthesis chronou* ['sense of time'], can presentify *to mellon* ['the future'] (433*b*7f.) as the possible and as that for the sake of which they act" (GA 22, 311). Of course, animals also act, but they cannot *not act*, not pursue what is given as desirable whereas man, because he has the peculiar ability of "anticipating something as the basis of his action", can decide not to pursue what is immediately pleasant and genuinely decide the course of his life.

To be sure, there will be nothing left in *Being and Time* of this genesis of existential structures in animal life, as few traces remain of Aristotle's major influence on *Sein und Zeit*. If Heidegger will eventually claim that animals have no world, not even an *Umwelt* (GA 40, 54), the recent publication and translation of earlier lecture courses shows that this constitutes a reversal in his way of thinking. On his way toward *Being and Time*, Heidegger thought that "the essential is missed if we do not see that the animal has a world" (GA 80, 179). If, then, Heidegger refused to adequate "*Dasein*" with "man" in *Sein und Zeit*, it is not only to dissociate himself from the tradition, but because *Dasein* did not solely designate human beings: an animal too is "a being for whom living, being-in-itself, matters to it in some way" (GA 18, 51), it is a "being to which we must attribute, in a formal way, the kind of being which belongs to *Dasein*" (GA 20, 223).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle, *De Anima*, trans. J.A. Smith, in *Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon, New York: Random House, 1941.

Aristotle, *De Motu Animalium*, trans. M. C. Nussbaum, Princeton UP, 1978.

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J.A. Smith, in *Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon. New York: Random House. 1941.

Greisch, J., *Ontologie et temporalité*, Paris, PUF, 1994.

Heidegger, M., [GA 58], *Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* (1919/20), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1992.

Heidegger, M., [WS 1922-23], *Übungen über Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles (Nikomachische Ethik VI; De anima; Metaphysik VII)* in *Heidegger-Jahrbuch 3, Freiburg/Münschen,* Karl Alber, 2007.

Heidegger, M., [GA 17], *Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung* (1923-24), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994 (trans. R. Rojcewicz, *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle: Initiation into Phenomenological Research*, Indiana UP, 2008).

Heidegger, M., [GA 62], *Phänomenologische Interpretationen ausgewählter Abhandlungen des Aristoteles zu Ontologie und Logik* (1922), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2005.

Heidegger, M., [NB], *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles* (*Natorp Bericht*, 1922), in *Dilthey-Jarhrbuch* 6, 1989 (trans. J. van Buren in *Supplements: From the Earliest Essays to "Being and Time" and Beyond*, SUNY, 2002).

Heidegger, M., [GA 63], *Ontologie (Hermeneutik der Faktizität*) (1923), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1988 (trans. J. van Buren, *Ontology: Hermeneutics of facticity*, Indiana UP, 1999).

Heidegger, M., [GA 18], *Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie* (1924), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2002 (trans. R. D. Metcalf and M. B. Tanzen, *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, Indiana UP, 2009).

Heidegger, M., [GA 19], *Platon: Sophistes* (1924-25), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1992 (Trans. R. Rojcewicz and A. Schuwer, *Plato's "Sophist"*, Indiana UP, 1997).

Heidegger, M., [GA 80], *Wilhelm Diltheys Forschungsarbeit* (1925), in *Dilthey-Jahrbuch*, 8, 1992, 143-180 (tr. “Wilhelm Dilthey's Research and the Struggle for a Historical Worldview” in *Supplements: From the Earliest Essays to "Being and Time" and Beyond*, SUNY, 2002).

Heidegger, M., [GA 20], *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (1925), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994 (transl. T. Kisiel, *History of the Concept of Time*, Indiana UP, 1985).

Heidegger, M., [GA 21], *Logik: Die Frage nach der Wahrheit* (1925-26), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1995 (trans. T. Sheehan, *Logik. The Question of Truth*, Indiana UP, 2010).

Heidegger, M., [GA 22], *Die Grundbegriffe der antiken Philosophie* (1926), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1993 (Trans. R. Rojcewicz, *Basic Concepts of Ancient Philosophy*, Indiana UP, 2008).

Heidegger, M., [SZ], *Sein und Zeit*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1986 (trans. J. Macquarrie and E., *Being and Time*, New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

Heidegger, M., [1935], *Einführung in die Metaphysik* (1935), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1983.

Kisiel, T., *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

McNeill, W., *The Glance of the eye. Heidegger, Aristotle and the Ends of Theory*, SUNY, 1999.

Sheehan, T., "*Hermeneia* and *Apophansis*: The early Heidegger on Aristotle" in F. Volpi, *Heidegger et l'idée de la phénoménologie*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1988, 67-80.