

This is a preprint copy of a paper that was published in
[*Continental Philosophy Review* 45 \(2012\): 77-100.](#)

The final publication is available at link.springer.com:
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11007-011-9209-2>

Disentangling Heidegger's Transcendental Questions

By Chad Engelland,
John Carroll University

In the confusion and lack of discipline in today's "thinking," one needs an almost scholastic formulation of its ways in the shape of characterized "questions."

—MARTIN HEIDEGGER¹

In the last decade, Steve Crowell, Daniel Dahlstrom, Jeff Malpas, and others have given much attention to the *transcendental motif* in Heidegger.² They focus on the transcendental as what is most fruitful in his thought. While their work is dogged by Heidegger's own later criticisms of transcendental thinking, several features of this reading are worth highlighting. First, *Being and Time*, in which species of transcendental thinking proliferate, figures prominently as their point of departure; for these scholars, it is a work of continued relevance. Second, Heidegger's transcendental thinking engages other philosophical traditions; for them, he still has something to say within the conversation that is philosophy, for he does not simply bypass or reject its history. Third, the seminal insight of Heidegger's transcendental approach is the "space," "disclosedness," or "topos" of meaning and being. Some want to see the persistence of the transcendental motif in his later thinking, despite his protests. For the transcendental motif, Kant naturally suggests himself as the nodal point for the inquiry.

¹ Heidegger (1989, p. 74/51-2).

Independent of the transcendental motif, Thomas Sheehan has attempted a *demythification* of Heidegger's lasting topic, the *Seinsfrage*, in order to institute a new paradigm in Heidegger research geared to the matter itself. Aristotle's understanding of *psyche* as "a *paschein ti*, a transcendental openness-to-receive" provides the inspiration for this approach.³ Sheehan applies what he calls "Heidegger's razor" to the *Contributions* and indeed Heidegger's thinking as a whole. The razor says, with Heidegger, that the multiplication of names does not undermine the simplicity of the matter or its questioning. Hence, Sheehan attempts to "demythify" Heidegger by tracing back the "apocalyptic language" of the esoteric writings to the demystified topic, namely, "the openness opened up by our essential finitude."⁴ Sheehan formulates Heidegger's fundamental question as follows: "What is responsible for the *correlation* between an entity's givenness and the dative of that givenness?"⁵ The published investigations of *Being and Time*, then, are preparatory. They display on the one hand the phenomenological interpretation of being as givenness and on the other the dative of that givenness as the open comportment called Dasein.⁶ Heidegger's fundamental question concerns the reciprocal relation of the two.

The transcendental approach rightly keeps to the domain disclosed in *Being and Time*, but it does not fully clarify how the transcendental motif, which becomes the subject of Heidegger's criticism, is related to his later thinking. In the introduction to *Transcendental Heidegger*, Crowell and Malpas observe that "while the idea of the transcendental is explicitly disavowed in Heidegger's later thought, there still seems to be an important sense (thought one

² Crowell (2001, 2007), Dahlstrom (2001, 2005), and Malpas (2006, 2007). A more historical approach to these themes can be found in Tom Rockmore (2000).

³ Sheehan (2001a, p. 8). See Aristotle (*De Anima*, 424a1 and 429b24-25).

⁴ Sheehan (2001b, p. 200).

⁵ Sheehan (2001a, p. 7).

⁶ Sheehan (2001a, p. 9).

that remains in need of clarification) in which that thinking retains a broadly ‘transcendental’ character.”⁷ Many of the contributors to that volume identify remnants of the transcendental that persist in the later Heidegger; for example, Crowell identifies the commitment to thinking about the space of reasons, and Dahlstrom the interplay of Dasein and being.⁸ Malpas’s suggestion calls for particular attention. He distinguishes two senses of transcendence; on his view, the later Heidegger suppresses one while retaining the other. He writes, “Heidegger’s abandonment of the transcendental is thus an abandonment of the preoccupation with transcendence, not an abandonment of the topology that is itself a crucial element in the idea of the transcendental and that is even present, I would suggest, in Kant.”⁹ Like Sheehan, Malpas sees openness as the enduring theme in Heidegger, but he emphasizes its transcendental origin. He also identifies the problem with transcendence: it has two senses. “The problem with the transcendental, then, is that in spite of its already topological orientation, it is nevertheless predicated on a way of understanding being that is already disjunctive, already threatens the unity of being’s occurrence.”¹⁰ His shortcoming, however, is that he does not distinguish the preparatory question, focused on transcendence, from the fundamental question, focused on the topology of being. As a consequence, the telegraphed shift from one question to the other, built into the very framework of *Being and Time*, appears as the abandonment of transcendence rather than its completion. From this perspective, the topological residue of the transcendental seems unrelated to the issue of transcendence and the problematic of *Being and Time*. The work of these scholars

⁷ Crowell and Malpas (2007, p. 1).

⁸ Crowell (2001, pp. 9-10 and 222-243). Dahlstrom (2007, p. 69). Dahlstrom elsewhere expands his list of transcendental “vestiges” (2005, pp. 45-51).

⁹ Malpas (2007, p. 130).

¹⁰ Malpas (2007, p. 133).

makes much needed progress, but until Heidegger's transcendental questions are disentangled, transcendental philosophy will appear to be little more than a momentary phase in his thinking.

The demystification project clarifies Heidegger's fundamental question across the rich diversity of its forms, but it does not adequately formulate *Being and Time*'s preparatory question and relate it to the fundamental question. Sheehan puts the preparatory question of *Being and Time* as follows: "What is the dative of such givenness?"¹¹ Heidegger sees the preparatory question as the way to arrive at the site of the fundamental question, but this simple formulation leaves its motivational importance in the dark. As a consequence, the preparatory question appears incidental and the critical juncture of his path of thinking remains obscure. Distinguishing the senses of the transcendental operative in Heidegger provide the resources for puzzling out these issues.

While writing *Being and Time*, Heidegger has two transcendental questions, a preparatory one about the timely openness of Dasein, and a fundamental one about the temporal reciprocity of that openness and being. Once he was within the transcendental domain, thanks to the success of the preparatory question, he can see the inadequacy of its terms for formulating the fundamental question. He thereafter must sustain this ambiguity: to recommend the preparatory question and its transcendental character in order to grant entry to its domain and yet to deny the adequacy of the transcendental for formulating the fundamental question. This joint affirmation and denial of transcendental philosophy makes sense only in light of a distinction between his two questions. My aim, then, is not to criticize the transcendental and demystification projects but instead to amplify, integrate, and extend their insights. The

¹¹ Sheehan (2001a, p. 8).

importance of the transcendental questions in Heidegger's clarified path of thinking will then come to the fore.

To this end, I must introduce an array of distinctions. In the ambit of *Being and Time*, Heidegger employs three senses of transcendence. The first is the “*transcendence of Dasein's being*,” the subjectivity of the subject as that entity open to entities within the world. This sense recalls and surpasses Kant but also Aristotle and Augustine. The second is the *transcendence of being*, which Heidegger calls the “*transcendens pure and simple*.” This sense recalls and surpasses the Aristotelian tradition. Finally, the “*transcendental horizon*” of time is that in terms of which the particular transcendence of Dasein and the universal transcendence of being are related.¹² It is the horizon for the questioner who is Dasein and the questioned that is being; it specifies the site, field, domain, or openness of philosophy. This sense was only obscurely, if at all, glimpsed by Kant. The first is the target of his preliminary or preparatory question; the second is the target of the traditional question of being; the third is the target of his fundamental question, the *toward-which* or *horizon* of being. The first sense corresponds to divisions one and two of the published *Being and Time* (SZ I.1-2); the second sense is subordinated to the third and both correspond to the unpublished third division (SZ I.3). The three senses of transcendence are deeply entwined with the division of questions and the very structure of *Being and Time*.

The introductory matter of *Being and Time* introduces a two-part work with three divisions each, and yet the work which follows includes but two divisions of the first part (SZ

¹² “Die Transzendenz des Seins des Daseins...,” “*Sein ist das transcendens schlechthin*,” “... Zeit als des transzendentalen Horizontes der Frage nach dem Sein.” *Sein und Zeit* (Heidegger, 2001, pp. 38-9/62-3), hereafter SZ. The phrase, “subjectivity of the subject,” occurs at SZ, p. 24/45. Citations refer first to the German followed by the English pagination (G/E). I have modified all translations to translate uniformly Heidegger's triple, “*Seiendes*,” “*Sein*,” and “*Seyn*,” with “entity,” “being,” and (hyphenated) “be-ing,” respectively. In the 1930s, Heidegger introduces “be-ing” because he thinks “being” is understood by the philosophical tradition as the entityness of the entity. The term, “be-ing,” accordingly targets what Heidegger originally meant by the term, “being,” namely givenness as such. Additionally, I translate the key terms, “*Zeitlichkeit*” and “*Temporalität*,” by “timeliness” and “temporality,” respectively.

I.1-2, not I.3 or II.1-3). From the first, systematic part, only two out of the three divisions appear, and these divisions first pose (SZ I.1) and then answer (SZ I.2) the preparatory question about Dasein. The third, unpublished division (SZ I.3) was to have posed and answered the fundamental question about the meaning of being: “In the exposition of the problematic of temporality the question of the meaning of being will first be concretely answered” (SZ, p. 19/40). The introduction accentuates but one question, the fundamental question about being’s meaning; emphasis is placed on Dasein as the means to formulate the fundamental question, but the specific question about Dasein itself is not formulated. Consequently, the work appears to have only one question which it never gets around to asking. Commentators mishandle the problematic in various ways; they fail to distinguish and relate the preliminary question about Dasein and the fundamental question about the meaning of being. The analytic becomes misunderstood as but an anthropology and his question about the meaning of being in general becomes anthropological or purely aporetic.¹³ Disentangling Heidegger’s two transcendental questions is the key to making sense of his program.

Along with the three senses of transcendence and the two principal transcendental questions, another distinction is necessary. The insufficiency of the preparatory question, an insufficiency indicated in its very “preparatory” character, differs in kind from the insufficiency of the transcendental formulation of the fundamental question. While writing *Being and Time*, Heidegger already knew the preparatory question was only a way, but he did not yet realize that the fundamental question was finally more than could be said in transcendental terms. The

¹³ To take three important commentators as examples: Michael Gelven (1989), citing a passage from the later Heidegger, does not distinguish the questions (pp. 18-19). Richard Polt (1999) registers the difference between SZ I.1-2 and SZ I.3, but he also suggests that a shortcoming of SZ I.1-2 is that it does not answer the question assigned to SZ I.3 (pp. 36 and 25, respectively). Hubert Dreyfus (1991) distinguishes them but does not relate them; he counts as anathema to the hermeneutic of Dasein that it should disclose anything like *the* horizon for the question of being, and so he says there can be no reversal from the first to the second question (pp. 12 and 38-9).

failure to keep these two insufficiencies distinct leads to misunderstandings about the genuine difference between Heidegger, early and late, a difference in terminology but not of domain to be thought. The way to the domain of thought, early and late, is transcendental (SZ I.1-2). Only later did he realize that the transcendental is not able to name all that shows up within that domain (SZ I.3).

This study of the interrelation of Heidegger's two principal questions is divided as follows. First, I identify his two questions as they emerge in dialogue with Husserl and as they are formulated most clearly in the book on Kant. Then I examine *Being and Time* and his efforts to formulate the preparatory question in division one (SZ I.1), his efforts to give a preliminary answer in division two (SZ I.2), and finally his efforts, which belong to the unpublished third division (SZ I.3), to reverse the preparatory question into the fundamental question. I reconsider the transcendental question in view of his later criticisms of it. He charges that transcendental philosophy is a-historical, because its focus on research and projection neglects the thrownness characteristic of fundamental moods, and he comes to doubt that Kant knew *anything* about what *Being and Time* calls the temporality of being. Accordingly, Heidegger later regards the "transcendental" division between system and history, SZ I and II, as problematical, and he relocates the historical highpoint from Kant to the Presocratics. The question of SZ I.3 remains the lasting topic, but SZ II comes to be folded into it. A key part of my strategy is to respect the divisions of *Being and Time* even while reading his other works; this amounts to a kind of *topography* of Heidegger's questions.

1. IDENTIFYING THE QUESTIONS

Transcendental phenomenology recovers the possibility of ancient ontology, but it does so by neglecting the being of the transcendental ego. In contrast to the Neo-Kantian epistemologists, Husserl and Scheler are noteworthy in their concern for ontology, but neither gives a satisfactory account of the being of the human being as the dative of manifestation. Heidegger would very much like to pose again the ancient question about being but he must first appropriate phenomenology in such a way that he clarifies the being of the dative of manifestation, the transcendental ego. The necessity for asking the preliminary question is to remedy a lack in phenomenology itself, which reveals an even greater lack in the modern epistemological tradition. This is how Heidegger sees things in the summer semester 1925 lecture course in which he clearly distinguishes between the preparatory and the fundamental question.

Husserl's transcendental phenomenological reduction uncovers a "veritable abyss" between the absolute being of consciousness and the adumbrated being of reality.¹⁴ What the phenomenological reduction reveals is a radical distinction in being. Husserl writes and Heidegger quotes, "The system of categories most emphatically must start from this most radical of all distinctions of being—being *as consciousness* and being as 'transcendent' being '*manifesting*' itself in consciousness."¹⁵ For Husserl, this distinction is founded on the basic difference in givenness: consciousness is given without adumbration and transcendent entities are given with adumbration. Heidegger appropriates this phenomenological difference while transforming its terms. Specifically, he agrees that each of us is a dative of manifestation, but he is bothered by the paradoxical fact that the dative of manifestation for the being of entities is also

¹⁴ Husserl (1998, p. 111), quoted by Heidegger (1979, p. 158n2/114n2).

¹⁵ Husserl (1998, p. 171). Heidegger (1979, p. 157/114).

an entity. In his terms, each of us, Dasein, is both ontological and ontic. This peculiar conjunction becomes his focus, and he purifies the Husserlian distinction with the following question about the unity of the human being:

How is it at all possible that this sphere of absolute position, pure consciousness, which is supposed to be separated from every transcendence by an absolute gulf, is at the same time united with reality in the unity of a real human being, who himself occurs as a real object in the world?¹⁶

He takes as his task thinking through this paradoxical conjunction, and it is this problematic that provides the immediate context for appreciating his formulation of the transcendental question: How must this entity, Dasein, be, in order to be open to all entities? Husserl did not realize that intentionality “must revolutionize the whole concept of the human being,” as Heidegger would say in 1928.¹⁷ We are not one natural kind among many, for we are as *opened* to things.

Heidegger does not just want to remedy this lack of philosophical anthropology in Husserl. He also wants to continue on the path, which Husserl and Scheler have already blazed, and work out the “system of categories” or the question of being itself. Such a question concerns, among other things, basic distinctions in being. The dialogue with Husserl, then, yields two neglected questions: “*Two fundamental neglects pertaining to the question of being can be identified. On the one hand, the question of the being of this specific entity, of the acts, is neglected; on the other, we have the neglect of the question of the meaning of being itself.*”¹⁸ In Heidegger’s own terms, there is a question about Dasein and a question about the horizon of being as such, though their inter-relationship in this text is somewhat unclear. On the one hand,

¹⁶ Heidegger (1979, 139/101).

¹⁷ Heidegger (1978, p. 167/133). The preparatory question thus targets what Crowell identifies as the decisive difference between Husserl and Heidegger (2002, pp. 123-140).

¹⁸ Heidegger (1979, p. 159/115).

they are two expressions of one fundamental question;¹⁹ on the other, they are independent of each other.²⁰

The preparatory question about Dasein fulfills a need Heidegger expressed in 1924 to pose the question about the meaning of being in a concrete and not merely formal way. To do so, he realized that he needed to enter into the right domain by means of specific preparation: “Rather the task is to understand that this putting of the question concerning the meaning of being itself requires an elaboration, an elaboration of the ground [*Boden*] upon which the interrogation of entities as to their being is at all possible. We need to uncover and elaborate the *milieu* in which ontological research can and has to move in general.”²¹ The emphasis on domain was undoubtedly suggested to him by Husserl, who says in *Ideas I* that the reduction achieves “the free vista of ‘transcendentally’ purified phenomena and, therewith, the field of phenomenology in our peculiar sense.”²² Husserl thinks Kant was the first to correctly see this field.²³ In 1929, Heidegger says that Husserl’s phenomenology “created an entirely new space for philosophical questioning, a space with new claims, transformed assessments, and a fresh regard for the hidden powers of the great tradition of Western philosophy.”²⁴ On the final page of the published portion of *Being and Time*, Heidegger will recall the need to secure the domain or horizon of question and answer (SZ, p. 437/487). This is the “field” for posing the cardinal question (SZ, p. 27/49). The function of the preparatory question is necessary for a first approach to the domain occupied by the fundamental question. Indeed, in the 1925 lecture

¹⁹ Heidegger puts the “the fundamental question” (*Fundamentalfrage*) as follows: “What is meant by being? What is the being of the intentional?” (1979, p. 191/140).

²⁰ Because an entity can serve as our point of departure, “We do not need the specific entity of intentionality in order to awaken the question of the being of entities” (1979, p. 192/141).

²¹ Heidegger (1992, 448/310).

²² Husserl (1998, p. xix).

²³ Husserl (1998, p. 142).

²⁴ Heidegger (1997b, p. 476).

course, what will become SZ I.1 bears the title, “Preparatory Description of the Field in Which the Phenomenon of Time Becomes Visible.”²⁵ Openness, target of both the transcendental and demystifying approaches to Heidegger scholarship, first emerges out of the preparatory question about Dasein.

Shortly after the 1927 publication of *Being and Time*, Heidegger had occasion to clarify his relationship to Husserl in the failed attempt to collaborate on the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article. Heidegger again agrees that the dative of manifestation differs in being from manifested entities, but again pushes further to grasp the unity of the human as both the dative and an entity. Now he can state that this is *Being and Time*’s central problem, targeted by the preliminary question about Dasein:

What is the mode of being of the entity in which “world” is constituted? That is Being and Time’s central problem—namely, a fundamental ontology of Dasein. It has to be shown that the mode of being of human Dasein is totally different from that of all other entities and that, as the mode of being that it is, it harbors right within itself the possibility of transcendental constitution.²⁶

He also puts the priority of Dasein in Husserlian terms. “Accordingly, the problem of being is related—all-inclusively—to what constitutes and to what gets constituted.”²⁷ Dasein is peculiar in being the entity that constitutes other entities, i.e., allows them to show themselves from themselves.

Two years later, Heidegger brought to print an “‘historical’ introduction” which aimed to “clarify the problematic” of the published portion of that text.²⁸ As Kant’s *Prolegomena* stands to his *Critique of Pure Reason*, so Heidegger’s *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* stands to his *Being and Time*. Heidegger will come to doubt the book’s worth as an interpretation of Kant

²⁵ Heidegger (1979, p. 183/135).

²⁶ Heidegger (1997c, p. 326, emphasis mine).

²⁷ Heidegger (1997, p. 327).

²⁸ Heidegger (1991, p. XVI/xix).

but not as a presentation of his own questioning.²⁹ In this book, Heidegger formulates his preparatory or preliminary question of SZ I.1-2 in its clearest terms: “How must the finite entity that we call ‘human’ be according to its innermost essence so that it can be at all open to an entity that it itself is not and that therefore must be able to show itself from itself?”³⁰ He formulates his fundamental, cardinal, or lasting question of SZ I.3 as follows: “*From whence are we at all to comprehend the like of being, with the entire wealth of articulations and references which are included in it?*”³¹ While the preparatory question traverses entities toward being, the cardinal question traverses being toward time. It is not the metaphysical question about entities, for these have been transcended, but it is also not the ontological-transcendental question about being. Rather, the question concerns that which engenders the meanings of being. The answer is that time or more specifically the horizon of Dasein’s timeliness, temporality, is that out of which we understand being. Heidegger becomes increasingly critical of the language he employs but, as I will show, the critique relies on the initial success of the transcendental program.

The dialogue with Husserl comes to expression in this encounter with Kant. We can only rekindle the question of being if we pay heed to the being of the questioner of being. Husserl’s wonder before the distinction between the dative and given entities is presupposed in the preparatory question, which targets the specific being of the dative as that entity who is the dative. Having now identified the preparatory and fundamental questions, let us see how they illumine the structure of *Being and Time*.

²⁹ In this way, Heidegger’s 1973 preface to the text continues to recommend it as an introduction to “the horizon of the manner of questioning set forth in *Being and Time*” even though he now realizes “Kant’s question is foreign to it” (1991, p. XIV/xviii). Nor is this horizon of questioning something that belongs to the past: “The Kant book remains an introduction, attempted by means of a questionable digression, to the further questionability which persists concerning the question of being set forth in *Being and Time*” (p. XV/xviii).

³⁰ Heidegger (1991, p. 43/30, and compare pp. 38-39/27).

³¹ Heidegger (1991, p. 224/157).

2. THE PREPARATORY QUESTION (SZ I.1-2)

At the outset of the first division (SZ I.1, §§12-13), Heidegger severely criticizes epistemology and the traditional inquiry into the subject-object relation with its difficulties of explaining how consciousness moves outside of itself to an object. More fundamental than the epistemological subject is Dasein's being-in-the-world or transcendence: Dasein's "primary kind of being is such that it is always 'outside' near entities which it encounters and which belongs to a world already discovered" (SZ, p. 62/89). The essence of Dasein *enables* us to be such that we encounter or access entities that are independent of us. That is, any actual intentional relation to entities is founded on a prior power to dwell among them, expressed variously as being-in-the-world, transcendence, or openness.³² He identifies the Aristotelian enabling power of essence and the Kantian condition for the possibility of cognition. He says that Kant's concern for the "condition for the possibility" is "the transcendental concept of essence."³³ We are open as disclosed, thrown open in our disposed understanding. At the heart of Heidegger's preparatory question is wonder about our essential openness to otherness.

In §§ 41-44 Heidegger points to the understanding-of-being and transcendence as the preliminary answer to the preparatory question about our ability to receive entities: "...only if the understanding of being *is*, do entities as entities become accessible" (SZ, p. 212/255). The understanding of being comes about because Dasein projects possibilities for itself on the basis of its being thrown into the world, and only thereby is it able to encounter other entities. Accordingly, he defines "care," the *being* of Dasein, as "ahead-of-itself-being-already-in-(the-world) as being-near (entities encountered within-the-world)" (SZ p. 192/237). In 1928, he

³² Cf. Heidegger (SZ, 38/63, and 1975, p. 438/308)

³³ Heidegger (1989, p. 289/203).

clarifies his meaning of transcendence, the subjectivity of the subject, or being-in-the-world.

Our understanding of being steps beyond the entity and enables us to receive it in its otherness:

Because the step beyond [*der Überschnitt*] exists with Dasein, and because with it entities, which Dasein is not, are stepped beyond, such entities become manifest as such, i.e., in themselves. Nothing else but transcendence, which has in advance surpassed [*übersprungen*] entities, first makes it possible for these, previously surpassed *as entities*, ontically to *stand opposite* [*gegenübersteht*] and as opposite to be apprehended in themselves.³⁴

We can encounter entities because we tend out beyond them and only thereby meet with their otherness. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger follows Augustine in terming this phenomenon, “care,” but he also finds points of contact with Aristotle’s phronetic “for-the-sake-of-which” and Kant’s concern for *a priori* synthetic judgments.

Transcendence enables us to encounter entities, but what enables transcendence? The unfolding of the preliminary question about Dasein finds itself confronted with “temporality as the metaphysical essence of Dasein.”³⁵ In SZ I.2, Heidegger does not leave the problem of transcendence behind, but keeps it in mind throughout, explicitly dealing with it in § 69.³⁶ Indeed, the clearest formulation of the transcendental question is to be found in that section, although it is conflated with the possibility of science: “What makes it ontologically possible for entities to be encountered within-the-world and objectified as so encountered?” (SZ, p. 366/417-418).³⁷ He says the answer is transcendence and its timely constitution: “This can be answered by recourse to the transcendence of the world—a transcendence with an ecstatic-horizonal foundation.” Transcendence is itself made possible by timeliness. Showing why and how this is the case is his principal task in SZ I.2.

³⁴ Heidegger (1978, p. 212/166; see also 1976, pp. 158-159/122-123).

³⁵ Heidegger (1978, p. 214/167).

³⁶ See Heidegger (1978, pp. 170/135 and 214-215/168).

³⁷ Earlier in the section, Heidegger puts the question more broadly: “. . . how are ‘independent’ entities within-the-world ‘connected’ with the transcending world?” (SZ, p. 351/402).

Heidegger's account of timeliness must account for transcendence in two ways. First, it must display the origin of the transcending, the toward-which as such. Second, it must display the origin of the determinacy of the transcending toward-which, whether to one's own possibilities in projection or making-present. Dasein, to encounter others, not only transcends but it transcends in determinate directions. Timeliness has two essential characteristics which account for the tendencies of Dasein as well as its determinacy. As ecstatic, timeliness originates the tendencies, and as horizontal, it originates the determinacy of the tendencies. Timeliness, because it ecstatically tends and tends horizontally, provides the matrix of possible relations in which Dasein transcends toward itself beyond others. Let us take each of these characteristics in turn.

Timeliness is ecstatic (§ 65). To secure the overthrow of the subject-object paradigm, Heidegger must show the ground for both the dative and the manifesting entities, for both the for itself and the in itself. Timeliness is a threefold unity which unfolds in three ecstases, the future, the having been, and the present. The threefold unity corresponds to the threefold unity of care as projecting in understanding, thrown in dispositions, and falling in making present.

Timeliness, then, unites and also specifies the matrix of relations of transcendence.

Future, having-been, and present, show the phenomenal characteristics of "towards-itself," the "back-to," and "letting-be-encountered-by." ... *Timeliness is the originary "outside-itself" in and for itself.* ... Timeliness is not, prior to this, an entity which first emerges from *itself*; its essence is to unfold in the unity of the *ecstases*. (SZ pp. 328-329/377)

Timeliness, as ecstatic, accounts for the transcendental openness of Dasein. It stands Dasein out of itself in determinate directions toward its authentic self, its world, or entities in the world.

Timeliness is horizontal (§ 69). Timeliness is not ecstatic and as an addition horizontal. Rather, as ecstatic it is horizontal. "Ecstases are not simply raptures in which one gets carried

away. Rather, there belongs to each ecstasis a ‘whereto’ of getting carried away. This ‘whereto’ of the ecstasis we call the ‘horizontal schema.’” (SZ, p. 365/416).³⁸ Heidegger himself will regret using the word “horizon,” and many commentators follow suit, but he intends it to name something essential to ecstatic timeliness. The word is dispensable, but the determinacy of the ecstases which the word designates is not. He needs it in some form to account for the domain of intentionality. He uses the language of horizon to articulate how the ecstatic unity of timeliness accomplishes the opening up of the place, the world, the “Da,” which belongs to *Da-sein* and in which other entities can be encountered.³⁹ Ecstases alone do not grant the wherein of world.

The horizon of timeliness as a whole determines that *toward-which* factually existing entities are essentially *disclosed*. With one’s factual being-here [*Da-sein*], a potentiality-for-being is in each case projected in the horizon of the future, one’s “being-already” is disclosed in the horizon of having been, and that with which one concerns oneself is discovered in the horizon of the present. ... [O]n the basis of the horizontal constitution of the ecstatic unity of timeliness, there belongs to that entity which is in each its own “here,” [*Da*] something like a world that has been disclosed. (SZ, p. 365/416)

With the horizon of timeliness, the answer to the question, “What nourishes the toward-which of the understanding of being?” is achieved. Timeliness itself, in its ecstatic-horizontal constitution enables and nourishes the toward-which of the understanding of being. By delimiting the ecstases, the horizon provides the “enclosure” (*der Umschluß*) for understanding and thereby enables transcendence.⁴⁰ “Horizon” expresses the *finis* of finitude.

The finite entity that we call “human” must be according to its innermost essence *timely as ecstatic-horizontal* so that it can be open to an entity that it itself is not and that therefore must be able to show itself from itself. To receive what is, we must be ecstatically opened and

³⁸ See also Heidegger (1975, p. 429/302).

³⁹ For Heidegger’s own defense of the term, see 1975, p. 438/308.

⁴⁰ Heidegger (1978, p. 269/208)

horizontally related. “Timeliness ripens and unfolds itself” (*Zeitlichkeit sich zeitigt*), and this process is the “primal event” (*das Urereignis*) of world-entry in which Dasein can meet with entities.⁴¹ In unfolding, timeliness always already draws Dasein beyond entities towards Dasein’s futural possibilities, and this surpassing enables entities to be present in their otherness. Heidegger writes, “Being-in-the-world, transcending toward world, unfolds itself as timeliness and is only possible in this way. This implies that world-entry only happens if timeliness unfolds itself. And only if this happens can entities manifest themselves as entities.”⁴² To access an entity, then, is not to have an idea of it or for it to produce causally a representation in us; rather, to access is to draw something near and allow it to show itself as it is itself. Timeliness, then, enables Dasein to transcend in the peculiar sense of being other than the epistemological dyad immanent-transcendent. In transcending entities, Dasein is always already intimate with them.⁴³

In the final pages of *Being and Time*’s published text, Heidegger looks back at the preparatory question and forward to the cardinal question. He warns that however “illuminating” the answer to the preparatory question may be, with its distinction between the being of Dasein and the being of other entities, philosophy cannot rest content with it (SZ, pp. 436-7/487). Instead, it must press forward within the space it has won and inquire into the cardinal question. “[O]ur way of exhibiting the constitution of Dasein’s being remains only *a way*. Our *aim* is to work out the question of being in general” (SZ, p. 436/487).⁴⁴

⁴¹ Heidegger (1978, p. 274/212).

⁴² Heidegger (1978, p. 274/211-212).

⁴³ “Exactly that which is called immanence in theory of knowledge in a complete inversion of the phenomenal facts, the sphere of the subject, is intrinsically and primarily and alone the transcendent” (1975, p. 425/299).

⁴⁴ On this passage, see Crowell (2001, p. 297).

3. REVERSING THE QUESTION (SZ I.3)

The clarification of the preparatory transcendental question makes it possible to understand its reversal and persistence in Heidegger's clarified itinerary. The original intent of SZ I.3 was to effect a shift from the question about Dasein and its preparatory attempt to clarify being, to the question about being as such in terms of its temporal horizon. This shift involves a reversal of perspectives. Instead of asking a particular question about the being of Dasein in terms of timeliness, he poses the universal question of being in terms of temporality. In making this shift, he does not leave the analysis of Dasein behind, but he takes it up as one of the questions of being. The title of SZ I leaves for SZ I.3 the task of explicating "time as the transcendental horizon of the question of being." In 1929 he writes,

What has been published so far of the investigations on "Being and Time" has no other task than that of a concrete projection unveiling *transcendence* (Cf. §§ 12-83; especially § 69). This in turn occurs for the purpose of enabling the *sole* guiding intention, clearly indicated in the *title* of the *whole* of Part I, of attaining the "*transcendental* horizon of the *question* concerning being." All concrete interpretations, above all that of time, are to be evaluated *solely* in the perspective of *enabling* the *question* of being.⁴⁵

SZ I.3, then, must shift from the transcendence of Dasein (SZ I.1-2) to the transcendental horizon for the question of being. The preparatory question about Dasein must yield to the cardinal question about the horizon of being's understandability. In 1927, he formulates the "beginning, final, and basic question of philosophy," topic of SZ I.3, in the following way: "Whence—that is, from which pre-given horizon—do we understand the like of being?"⁴⁶

Now, SZ I.3 was initially held back because of publishing constraints, then because Heidegger was unsatisfied with its formulation, and finally because he was unsatisfied with any formulations possible within the horizon of the work.⁴⁷ My sole task here is to indicate how SZ

⁴⁵ Heidegger (1976, p. 162n59/371).

⁴⁶ Heidegger (1975, pp. 19/15 and 21/16).

⁴⁷ Kisiel (2005) has assembled much of the evidence regarding Heidegger's reticence.

I.3 was to shift from the preliminary question to the fundamental question, and then how the fundamental question is related to the genuine intention of SZ I.3. I contend that his fundamental question belongs to SZ I.3, which is to say, it remains accessible by means of SZ I.1-2 and accomplishes the original intent of SZ I.3 to universalize the question about being. What is changed is the language about condition for the possibility and essence and hence the basic characterization of timeliness as that which enables Dasein to encounter entities.

3.1 *From the Timeliness of Dasein to the Temporality of Dasein and Being*

How, then, does the preparatory question about the transcendence of Dasein transform itself into the cardinal question about the temporal relation of Dasein's transcendence to the transcendence of being? Heidegger selected the question about Dasein as the way to the question about being, because entities with the character of Dasein have a special relation to the question of being. "In the question of the meaning of being there is no 'circular reasoning' but rather a remarkable 'relatedness backward or forward' which what we are asking about (being) bears to the inquiry itself as a mode of being of an entity" (SZ, p. 8/28.). SZ I.1-2 looks forward from Dasein to being; the task of SZ I.3 is, among other things, to look back from being to Dasein, to show the temporal origin of existence. SZ I.3 also needs to show the genesis of the other meanings of being, its modifications, and derivatives. The question drives us beyond the question of "being as such" to the question of being's origin: "*From whence are we at all to comprehend the like of being, with the entire wealth of articulations and references which are included in it?*"⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Heidegger (1991, p. 224/157).

How must we be to receive what is? is reversed into, How does the ecstatic-horizonal unity of time engender the various meanings of being, including Dasein's existence as opened to that being? In §§ 6 and 83, as he looks forward to SZ I.3, he says that since timeliness grounds Dasein, being must likewise arise in timeliness. "...time needs to be *explicated originarily as the horizon for the understanding of being, and in terms of timeliness as the being of Dasein, which understands being*" (SZ, p. 17/39). Heidegger's indicates this shift as the turn from the timeliness of Dasein to the temporality of being, the turn from *Zeitlichkeit* to *Temporalität*.

Thus the way in which being and its modes and characteristics have their meaning determined originarily in terms of time, is what we shall call its "*temporal*" determinateness. Thus the fundamental ontological task of interpreting being as such includes working out the *temporality of being*. In the exposition of the problematic of temporality the question of the meaning of being will first be concretely answered. (SZ, p. 19/40)

To justify the turn from timeliness to temporality, Heidegger needs to show why timeliness itself is the ultimate horizon and can thus serve as temporality, the "horizon for the understanding of being." Dreyfus, for one, says that Heidegger's own principles render such a turn impossible, for a deeper horizon could always become accessible.⁴⁹ Indeed, Heidegger seems to admit as much in *Being and Time* itself (SZ, p. 26/49). Why is timeliness ultimate? Because it is productive and articulates itself ecstatically and horizonally. As such, it provides the context for all understanding and its toward-which.

Because the ecstatic-horizonal unity of timeliness is intrinsically self-projection pure and simple, because as ecstatic it makes possible all projecting upon . . . and represents, together with the horizon belonging to the ecstasis, the condition of possibility of a toward-which, an out-toward-which in general, it can no longer be asked upon what the schemata can on their part be projected, and so on in infinitum.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Dreyfus (1991, pp. 38-39).

⁵⁰ Heidegger (1975, p. 437/307-308).

The ecstatic-horizonal unity of timeliness, as the origin of the possibilities of understanding, can serve as temporality and show the ways the various meanings of being originate. Timeliness is the ultimate originary context, that which enables all understanding, and for that reason, Heidegger takes it as the ultimate horizon. It is earlier than every possible earlier because it enables all possibilities. This is just another way of saying that timeliness is the ground for the apriori, for temporality, and only because of it are all possibilities apriori as well.⁵¹

In light of time as the horizon for the understanding of being, SZ I.3 was to undertake two tasks. The first was to handle four sets of problems concerning being: (1) The ontological difference; (2) The basic articulation of being; (3) The possible modifications of being and the unity of its manifoldness; (4) The truth-character of being.⁵² The second was to work out the phenomenological method, including its “apriori” terms as well as the continued priority of Dasein even within the cardinal question. This last point calls for considerable amplification. In shifting from the particular question about the being of Dasein to the universal question of being, it turns out he does not leave behind the priority of Dasein but it obstinately announces itself in every aspect of the universalized question of being. Heidegger’s new elaboration of SZ I.3 in the summer semester 1927 lecture course makes this especially clear. Whenever he clarifies the four systematically-related problem-areas of being, Dasein comes to the center again and again. He seems uncertain regarding the phenomenological solution of these problems but not about the priority of Dasein. The priority of Dasein is especially apparent in the truth-character of being:

It is precisely the analysis of the truth-character of being which shows that being also is, as it were, based in an entity, namely, in the Dasein. It gives being [*Sein gibt es*] only if the understanding of being, hence Dasein, exists. This entity accordingly lays claim to a distinctive priority in the problematic of ontology. It makes itself manifest in all

⁵¹ Heidegger (1975, p. 463/325).

⁵² Heidegger (1975, p. 33/24, and 1978, pp. 193-4/153).

discussions of the basic problems of ontology and above all in the fundamental question of the meaning of being in general⁵³.

Dasein, the entity that is ontically distinctive in that it is ontological, thus introduces into the domain of ontology an ineluctably ontic foundation. Husserl handled this entanglement by sharply distinguishing the transcendental attitude and the natural attitude. Only within the natural attitude are entities at issue; the transcendental attitude dispenses with entities and turns to their givenness alone. But Husserl's clarity on the issue involves the absurdity of an unbridgeable chasm between the transcendental ego and the mundane ego. Again, Heidegger regards this as a neglect of the specific being of Dasein, which can lose itself into the world inauthentically or gain itself authentically as that for whom the world is disclosed. Hence, Heidegger, in the crucial SZ I.3 speaks of "the ontic foundation of ontology."⁵⁴ In the *Cartesian Meditations*, Husserl rejects this as the absurd position of "transcendental realism" in which the dative of the world is also a "tag end of the world."⁵⁵ Now, Heidegger does not intend to "define entities as entities by tracing them back in their origin to some other entities, as if being had the character of some possible entity" (SZ, p. 6/26). What he has in mind is not an ontic explanation, then, but an ontological one. Dasein, that entity that is ontological, is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the givenness of being. "It gives being [*Sein gibt es*] only if disclosedness is, that is to say, if truth is. But truth is only if an entity exists which opens up, which discloses, and indeed in such a way that disclosing belongs itself to the mode of being of this entity. We ourselves are such an entity."⁵⁶ Without the disclosive activity of such an entity, ontology is simply not possible: "Ontology cannot be established in a purely ontological manner.

⁵³ Heidegger (1975, p. 26/19).

⁵⁴ Heidegger (1975, p. 33/24).

⁵⁵ Husserl (1969, p. 63/24). Crowell, despite his accurate diagnosis of the Husserl-Heidegger feud (2002), yet sides with Husserl regarding the inappropriateness of the ontic within the ontological (2001, p. 235).

⁵⁶ Heidegger (1975, p. 25/18).

Its own possibility is referred back to an entity, that is, to something ontic—the Dasein.”⁵⁷ In the domain of SZ I.3 it becomes necessary, then, to enact a third, even more radical interpretation of Dasein.⁵⁸ This is the analysis of Dasein qua transcendental ego, which is nonetheless necessarily always also an entity. To be given, being needs a dative, and to be a dative, one needs to be an entity. Heidegger will come to be somewhat troubled by this state of affairs, and I will return to the point below.

Just what does the temporal repetition of Dasein reveal? In 1928, referring to SZ I.3, Heidegger writes about how the play of timeliness enables the being of Dasein:

Timely unfolding [*Die Zeitigung*] is the free swinging of originary, whole timeliness; time swings itself and swings itself back. (And only because of swing is there throw, facticity, *thrownness*; and only because of swinging is there *projection*. Cf. the problem of time and being indicated in *Being and Time*.)⁵⁹

The more radical interpretation of Dasein, then, shows not only the unity of Dasein as timeliness (SZ I.2) but the very emergence of the interplay of throw and project (*Wurf-Entwurf*) in the self-articulation of time (SZ I.3). As ecstatic and horizontal, time “unfolds itself, swinging as a worlding.”⁶⁰ Time makes possible being-in-the-world, because it “is essentially a self-opening and releasing [*ein Sich-öffnen und Ent-spannen*] into a world.”⁶¹ Heidegger can then conclude that “time as pure self-affection forms the essential structure of subjectivity.”⁶² In Kantian terms, this swinging is the interplay of spontaneous receptivity and receptive spontaneity characteristic of the transcendental power of imagination.⁶³ Temporality, then, enables the interplay of thrownness and projection characteristic of that entity uniquely capable of understanding being.

⁵⁷ Heidegger (1975, p. 26/19).

⁵⁸ Heidegger (1975, p. 319/224; 1978, p. 215/168).

⁵⁹ Heidegger (1978, p. 268/208).

⁶⁰ Heidegger (1978, p. 270/208-9).

⁶¹ Heidegger (1978, p. 271/210).

⁶² Heidegger (1991, p. 189/132).

⁶³ Heidegger (1991, p. 196/137).

The first part, SZ I, takes as its point of departure the everydayness of Dasein before tracing it back to timeliness and then the turn to temporality. The projected second part, SZ II, moves from temporality to historicity, to show the ways researching philosophers have approached the problematic of temporality. It provides “a phenomenological destruction of the history of ontology, with the problematic of temporality as our clue” (SZ, p. 39/63). From 1925 to about 1930, he thinks Kant is “the first and only person who has gone any stretch of the way towards investigating the dimension of temporality or has even let himself be drawn hither by the coercion of the phenomena themselves” (SZ, p. 23/45). In contrast to this Kantian movement is the tradition from which Kant himself was not able to break free: the interpretation of being as presence which stretches from ancient philosophy, including Aristotle, through modern thought, especially Descartes, and right up into Kant and Hegel.

3.2 *From the Temporality of Dasein and Being to Ereignis*

Heidegger’s dissatisfaction with SZ I.3, entitled “Time and Being,” had nothing to do with its original aim to turn from projection upon the ultimate context to show the origination of understanding from out of that context. The dissatisfaction, in other words, had nothing to do with the shift from the question about Dasein’s timeliness to the question about the temporality of being as such. In 1937-38, he writes, “For the inadequacy of the withheld section of ‘Time and Being’ was not because of an uncertainty concerning the direction of the question and its domain, but because of an uncertainty that only concerned the appropriate elaboration.”⁶⁴ In the *Letter on Humanism*, Heidegger says he held SZ I.3 back not because of a problem in the telegraphed shift from the question of Dasein to the question about the meaning of being, but

⁶⁴ Heidegger (1997a, p. 414/367).

because of a failure of language to express this shift. “The division in question [SZ 1.3] was held back because thinking failed in the adequate saying of this turning and did not succeed with the help of the language of metaphysics.”⁶⁵ In the preface to William Richardson’s book, Heidegger takes pains to affirm the continuity of his project and the fact that “the turn” belongs to the very structure of *Being and Time* and the turn from SZ I.1-2 to SZ I.3.

The thinking of the turn *is* a change in my thought. But this change is not a consequence of altering the standpoint, much less of abandoning the basic question [*der Fragestellung*], of *Being and Time*. The thinking of the turn results from the fact that I stayed with the matter-for-thought [of] “Being and Time,” sc. by inquiring into that perspective which already in *Being and Time* (p. 39) was designated as “Time and Being.”⁶⁶

As these texts amply show, the domain or site targeted by the preparatory question was not the problem. Just what were these grounds of dissatisfaction which caused him to hold back SZ I.3? The “remarkable back and forth relatedness” of the thrown project, Dasein, to being was formulated inadequately.

The being of Dasein transcends entities and can therefore ask questions, and being is the *transcendens* pure and simple (SZ, p. 38/62).⁶⁷ The root of these two transcendencies is temporality, which serves as the “transcendental horizon for the question of being” (SZ, p. 39/63). The transcendence of the questioner’s being and the transcendence of being as such belong together and are made possible in the unfolding of timeliness. In “On the Essence of Ground,” Heidegger says that Dasein’s transcendence allows entities to be discovered. A marginal note expands this vision and introduces his later language:

⁶⁵ Heidegger (1976, p. 159/250).

⁶⁶ Heidegger (1967, xvi, translation modified).

⁶⁷ In his draft of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article, Heidegger expresses these two transcendencies in Husserlian language as follows: “Because the being of everything that can be experienced by the subject in various ways—the transcendent in the broadest sense—is constituted in this pure subjectivity, pure subjectivity is called transcendental subjectivity” (1997c, p. 307).

But Dasein and be-ing itself? Not yet thought, not until *Being and Time*, second half [i.e., I.3 of the unpublished “second half”]. Da-sein belongs to be-ing itself as the simple onefold of entities and being; the essence of the “occurrence” — unfolding of temporality [*Zeitigung der Temporalität*] as a preliminary name for the truth of be-ing.⁶⁸

The interplay of Dasein and being is intended in the very structure of *Being and Time*.⁶⁹

Heidegger comes to balk at transcendental language and instead opts for new language concerning the truth of be-ing. Transcendence comes to be renamed “event of appropriation” (*das Ereignis*) as the correlation of Dasein and be-ing: “transcendence as the ecstatic—timeliness—temporality” when approached “from the truth of be-ing” is “appropriation” (SZ, p. 440, marginalia).

Why Heidegger considers this change in terminology necessary can be understood by considering the movement characteristic of transcendental terms. Central to transcendence is the surpassing (*Übersprung*) of entities. The phenomenological researcher recovers such a movement by resolutely resisting the falling tendency of Dasein. “...the question of being is nothing other than the radicalization of an essential tendency-of-being which belongs to Dasein itself—the pre-ontological understanding of being” (SZ, p. 15/35). In this way, the apriori structure of transcendence, the schematism of temporality, is the correlate of the researcher’s authenticity. The dynamic of research is squarely rooted in Dasein and its timeliness. On this view, then, the variety of viewpoints in the history of philosophy has to be explained in terms of the resoluteness of its philosophical researchers. The movement comes in transcending (*Schwung*) entities, not in reciprocally relating (*Gegenschwung*) to be-ing. Even though Dasein is thrown, research is projection, and it therefore cannot account for the historical horizons of being-interpretations. The philosophers all transcended entities but in terms of various meanings

⁶⁸ Heidegger (1976, p. 159/123).

⁶⁹ See Sheehan (2001a, p. 15).

of being. Heidegger accordingly thematizes the originary affectivity of the philosopher, which he terms “need” (*Not*). The need arises in a disposition: “The need compels by disposing, and this disposing is a displacing [*Versetzung*] in such fashion that we find ourselves disposed (or not disposed) toward entities in a definite way.”⁷⁰ Philosophy, then, arises from this affectivity: “Philosophy, if it is, does not exist because there are philosophers, nor are there philosophers because philosophy is taken up. On the contrary, philosophy and philosophers exist only when and how *the truth of be-ing itself appropriates itself* [die Wahrheit des Seyns selbst sich ereignet].”⁷¹

Another difficulty for Heidegger, besides the historically diverse meanings of being, is whether the metaphysical tradition can contribute to the inquiry into the reciprocity of be-ing and Dasein. Finding encouragement in his reading of Aristotle and Kant, he initially thinks that it can. But their language of essence and condition for the possibility, articulated in the ontological or transcendental perfect tense (*Marginalia*, SZ, p. 441-442) in the end is rooted exclusively in what he comes to call the “mathematical.” This means that it begins from an entity and therefrom projects being; consequently, it is ill-suited to name the reciprocity of Dasein and be-ing. In *Contributions*, he writes, “Therefore, the effort was needed to come free of the ‘condition for the possibility’ as going back into the merely ‘mathematical’ and to grasp the truth of be-ing from within its *own* essential sway (appropriation).”⁷² Indeed, the language itself seems to make be-ing into an “object” opposite Dasein, but this was never his intention. Consequently, in *Being and Time* he intended something more than he could say in terms of its ontological-transcendental language. Thereafter, he dispenses with the mathematical tendency of research.

⁷⁰ Heidegger (1984, p. 161/140).

⁷¹ Heidegger (1984, p. 105/120).

⁷² Heidegger (1989, p. 250/176). Dahlstrom (2005, pp. 37-44) and Malpas (2007, pp. 126-134) provide helpful overviews of Heidegger’s criticisms of transcendental philosophy in the *Contributions*.

The need for inquiry is no longer rooted in the falling of Dasein but instead the historical withdrawal of that which gives be-ing to Dasein. With a different disposition comes a different essence of Dasein. In this way, Dasein belongs to be-ing and its need. Temporal horizon, then, yields to appropriation, and transcendental research yields to a leap into the truth of be-ing.

Heidegger's identification of the above two problems with transcendental thought, research and the mathematical, likewise impacts what he envisioned for SZ II. He comes to see that we access what *Being and Time* called the "temporality of being" by means of recalling the history of being and by means of being appropriated by what yet needs to be thought. The distinction between system and history, SZ I.3 and SZ II, stems from the problematic idea of research and projection; Heidegger rather comes to emphasize that research is not due to the will of the researcher but is made possible by thrownness and appropriation. The variety of being-interpretations in the history of philosophy is not due to a lack of authenticity but instead to the granting of different fundamental attunements out of which the various philosophers philosophized. Heidegger can understand more not because he is somehow "more authentic" than Descartes or Kant; he rather stands as the recipient of something newly given in such attunements as angst and terror.⁷³ A second problem with SZ II arose soon after the publication of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Heidegger came to realize he had distorted Kant in taking him to be at all concerned with the problematic of temporality. Rather, Kant, like those before and after him, was concerned with entities alone. With this realization, however, the transcendental language of *Being and Time* suddenly appears inappropriate for saying what he wants to say. Transcendental research is ahistorical because it does not think about fundamental

⁷³ See Engelland (2009, pp. 183-185).

moods, and the height of transcendental philosophy in Kant does not consider what *Being and Time* calls the temporality of being.⁷⁴

In the *Letter on Humanism*, Heidegger clearly affirms that the transcendental formulation arrived at the truth of being but its focus on research only allowed a portion of the field to come to language:

In the poverty of its first breakthrough, the thinking that tries to advance thought into the truth of being brings only a small part of that wholly other dimension to language. This language even falsifies itself for it does not yet succeed in retaining the essential help of phenomenological seeing while dispensing with the inappropriate concern with “science” and “research.”⁷⁵

With “truth of be-ing” Heidegger adopts and transforms language already part of his operative vocabulary in *Being and Time*. He speaks of *veritas transcendentalis*, disclosedness of being, and *veritas temporalis* (SZ, p. 38/62, and 1975, p. 460/323). Here the genitive is both subjective and objective; it expresses the reciprocity of disclosedness (Dasein) and being. He does not see this reciprocity as mechanical, a function of the methodological research activity of Dasein, but instead as historical. The transcendental pathway (SZ I.1-2) is retained but only to motivate its abandonment into the domain it discloses (SZ I.3). “Only provisionally the *transcendental* way . . . in order to prepare the swinging around and leaping into” (1989, p. 305/215). Not transcendence’s “swinging” (*Schwung*) and “leaping beyond” (*Übersprungen*) entities, but instead the “swinging around” (*Umschwung*) and “leaping into” (*Einsprung*) the “reciprocity” (*Gegenschwung*) of Dasein and be-ing. Be-ing *needs* Dasein and Dasein *belongs* to be-ing.⁷⁶

The terminus of the leap, then, is no longer adequately expressed with the language of

⁷⁴ See Engelland (2010, pp. 160-165).

⁷⁵ Heidegger (1976, p. 187/271).

⁷⁶ “This reciprocity of *needing* and *belonging* makes up be-ing as appropriation; and the first thing that is incumbent upon thinking is to raise the swinging of this reciprocity [*die Schwungung dieses Gegenschwunges*] into the simplicity of knowledge and to ground the reciprocity in its truth” (1989, p. 251/177). Sheehan (2001a) explains, “This reciprocity . . . between the fact that givenness needs its dative . . . and the dative’s *belonging* to givenness . . . is what Heidegger means by *das Ereignis*, and it is the central topic of his thought” (p. 9).

transcendental philosophy and its metaphysical heritage. Condition for the possibility, the transcendental concept of essence, does not capture the historical emergence of that possibility. The essence of Dasein itself proves to be at stake in the truth of be-ing. Heidegger's anticipated repetition of the Dasein-analytic in SZ I.3 occurs now in terms of the reciprocity of Dasein and be-ing, named by the "truth of be-ing."⁷⁷ The shift is not from Dasein to be-ing but from Dasein *as the researcher into being* to Dasein *as the appropriated site or truth of be-ing*. Here, the question of the truth of be-ing is equally the question of the be-ing of truth.⁷⁸ Instead of asking about the horizon of reciprocity, he shifts to the historical happening of reciprocity and formulates his fundamental question as follows: "How does the truth of be-ing sway?"⁷⁹

4. THE TRANSCENDENTAL QUESTIONS CLARIFIED

Heidegger sharply distinguishes his grounding question about the horizon of being from what he takes to be the guiding question in the history of metaphysical inquiry, "What is an entity?"⁸⁰ This question, he argues, interprets the being of entities as constant presence. The preliminary question about Dasein is his own path for crossing from the first to the other question, from the limited horizon of metaphysics to what he calls in *Contributions* "another beginning." As such it is properly placed, uncomfortably to be sure, between the guiding and the grounding questions. The preliminary question targets Dasein's ontic distinction of being ontological. It is an entity open to the being of entities. The grounding question then asks what is responsible for the correlation of Dasein and being, whether this be temporality or *Ereignis*. Neither the preliminary question nor the grounding question is couched in terms of the guiding

⁷⁷ Heidegger (1997a, p. 414/367; 1967, p. xx).

⁷⁸ Heidegger (1989, p. 20/15).

⁷⁹ Heidegger (1997a, p. 422/373).

⁸⁰ Heidegger (1991, pp. 222-4/156-7; 1989, p. 75/52; and 1983, pp. 15/21 and 25/35).

question of metaphysics. But there is no way to approach the grounding question except by means of the preparatory question about Dasein. The preparatory question, then, is central in motivating the shift from the question about entity to the question about the reciprocity of Dasein and being.

Through the 1930s and later, Heidegger's thought remains concerned preliminarily with the "to be" of the dative for the givenness of entities and primarily the opening up of the domain in which we can be the dative of being. The preliminary question considers our openness to things and the primary question our openness as the site of being. The primary question is only had by means of the preliminary question, but the primary question shows that the preliminary question is inadequately put. Consequently, in *Contributions*, he can remark regarding the difference between the openness and entities, a difference which only emerges in the preparatory-transcendental question: "For as necessary as this distinction is (to think in traditional terms), in order to provide at all a preliminary perspective for the question of being, just as disastrous does this distinction continue to be."⁸¹ The success of the preliminary question leads to its surpassing. He can cease to ask the preliminary question precisely because he moves deeper within the domain it opens. The evidence suggests, then, that the first transcendental question, though formulated in unfortunate metaphysical terms, does prove to be continually relevant, because it engages the history of philosophy in a productive way.⁸² In *Contributions*, he observes, "When coming from the horizon of metaphysics, there is at first no other way even to make the question of being conceivable as a task."⁸³ The destructive program of SZ II, then,

⁸¹ Heidegger (1989, p. 250/176-7).

⁸² See Engelland (2008).

⁸³ Heidegger (1989, p. 450/317).

receives its direction from the questioning belonging to SZ I.1-2, aiming as it does at the field of SZ I.3.

At the outset, I identified two important threads among Heidegger scholars that have emerged in the last decade: the transcendental motif and the clarification of his lasting question. While both make welcome headway in understanding Heidegger, both approaches leave obscure the role of the transcendental in the “turn.” Specifically, the transcendental program of *Being and Time* appears fundamentally mistaken, and this appearance conceals the essential motivating role transcendence plays in making a first approach to the space of the fundamental question. The key to clarifying this matter is disentangling his two questions and showing their interplay, especially in the troubled SZ I.3. The reconstruction of the preparatory question (SZ I.1-2) and its reversal (SZ I.3) reveals that Heidegger’s later criticism of the (preparatory) transcendental question in fact relies on the success of the question. Transcendental terms become translated into the terms of *Ereignis* and its “reciprocity” (*Gegenschwung*). The intended “reversal” (*Umschwung*) is accomplished, in part, by means of the “upswing” (*Schwung*) of Dasein’s transcendence. The “leap” (*Sprung*) is prepared for by the “leaping ahead” (*Übersprung*) of Dasein’s transcendence. Transcendence, then, is taken up into a more comprehensive movement of reciprocity. It is not annulled but completed. In a certain sense, it is fitting to speak of Heidegger’s cardinal question as a transcendental one, insofar as he realized transcendence was a “preliminary name” (*Vorname*) for *Ereignis*; the appropriate name for this phenomenon only first showed itself by means of the (finally inappropriate) transcendental approach.⁸⁴ In the end, he remains a “transcendental” thinker, in a sense peculiarly his own yet one undeniably indebted to

⁸⁴ Heidegger (1976, p. 159/123).

the tradition that carries that name (Husserl, Kant, and more liberally Parmenides, Aristotle, et al).

The project of these pages, recapitulating the transcendental and clarifying tendencies of recent Heidegger scholarship, shows the need to distinguish and relate the “transcendental” questions operative in Heidegger’s path of thinking. This distinction justifies two conclusions. The transcendental motif continues to be important due to its essential role in his clarified itinerary. The demystification project, approached transcendently, lays bare the structure of *Being and Time* as it reverses the first to the other transcendental question. How must we be to access entities? *Essentially opened up ecstatically and horizontally by timeliness*. What is responsible for the reciprocity of Dasein and being? *The event of appropriation*. The shift from timeliness to appropriation (initially by means of transcendental temporality) happens within the domain opened by timeliness, the domain that belongs “topographically” to the unpublished but still fruitful SZ I.3.

Reference List

- Crowell, Steve. 2001. *Husserl, Heidegger, and the space of meaning: Paths toward transcendental phenomenology*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- Crowell, Steve. 2002. Does the Husserl/Heidegger feud rest on a mistake? An Essay on psychological and transcendental phenomenology. *Husserl Studies* 18: 123-40.
- Crowell, Steve, and Jeff Malpas, eds. 2007. *Transcendental Heidegger*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dahlstrom, Daniel. 2001. *Heidegger's concept of truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Dahlstrom, Daniel. 2005. Heidegger's transcendentalism. *Research in Phenomenology* 35: 29-54.
- Dahlstrom, Daniel. 2007. Transcendental truth and the truth that prevails. In *Transcendental Heidegger*, ed. Steve Crowell and Jeff Malpas, 63-73. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dreyfus, Hubert. 1991. *Being-in-the-world: A Commentary on Heidegger's 'Being and Time,' division I*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Engelland, Chad. 2008. Heidegger on overcoming rationalism through transcendental philosophy. *Continental Philosophy Review* 41: 17-41.
- Engelland, Chad. 2009. The Phenomenological motivation of the later Heidegger. *Philosophy Today* 53 Supplement: 182-189.
- Engelland, Chad. 2010. The Phenomenological Kant: Heidegger's interest in transcendental philosophy. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 41: 150-169.
- Gelven, Michael. 1989. *A Commentary on Heidegger's 'Being and Time'*, rev. ed. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1967. Vorwort. In *Heidegger: Through phenomenology to thought*, 2d ed., William Richardson, viii-xxiii. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1975. *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie (Gesamtausgabe 24)*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [The basic problems of phenomenology, rev. ed., trans. Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982].

- Heidegger, Martin. 1976. *Wegmarken* (Gesamtausgabe 9), ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Pathmarks, ed. William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1978. *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz* (Gesamtausgabe 26), ed. Klaus Held. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [The Metaphysical foundations of logic, trans. Michael Heim. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1979. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (Gesamtausgabe 20), ed. Petra Jaeger. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [History of the concept of time: Prolegomena, trans. Theodore Kisiel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1983. *Einführung in die Metaphysik* (Gesamtausgabe 40), ed. Petra Jaeger. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Introduction to metaphysics, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1984. *Grundfragen der Philosophie: Ausgewählte 'Probleme' der 'Logik'* (Gesamtausgabe 45), ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Basic questions of philosophy: Selected 'problems' of 'logic', trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1989. *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)* (Gesamtausgabe 65), ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Contributions to philosophy (From enowning), trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1991. *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* (Gesamtausgabe 3), ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Kant and the problem of metaphysics, 4th ed., trans. Richard Taft. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1992. *Platon: Sophistes* (Gesamtausgabe 19), ed. Ingeborg Schüßler. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Plato's 'Sophist', trans. Richard Rojcewicz and André Schuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1997a. *Besinnung* (Gesamtausgabe 66), ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [Mindfulness, trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary. London: Continuum, 2006].
- Heidegger, Martin. 1997b. For Edmund Husserl on his seventieth virthday, April 8, 1929. Trans. Thomas Sheehan. In *Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927-1931)*, ed. Thomas Sheehan and Richard Palmer, 475-477. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Heidegger, Martin. 1997c. 'Phenomenology,' Draft B (of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Article), with Heidegger's Letter to Husserl. Trans. Thomas Sheehan. In *Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927-1931)*, ed. Thomas Sheehan and Richard Palmer, 107-146. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Heidegger, Martin. 2001. *Sein und Zeit*, 18th ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag [Being and Time, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962].
- Husserl, Edmund. 1969. *Cartesian meditations*, trans. Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1998. *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy. First book: General introduction to a pure phenomenology*, trans. F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kisiel, Theodore. 2005. The Demise of 'Being and Time': 1927-1930. In *Heidegger's 'Being and Time': Critical essays*, ed. Richard Polt, pp. 189-214. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kisiel, Theodore, and Thomas Sheehan, editors. 2007. *Becoming Heidegger: On the trail of his early occasional writings, 1910-1927*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Malpas, Jeff. 2006. *Heidegger's topology: Being, place, world*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Malpas, Jeff. 2007. Heidegger's topology of being. In *Transcendental Heidegger*, ed. Steven Galt Crowell and Jeff Malpas, pp. 119-134. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Polt, R. 1999. *Heidegger: An introduction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rockmore, Tom, editor. 2000. *Heidegger, German Idealism, and Neo-Kantianism*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Sheehan, Thomas. 2001a. Kehre and Ereignis: A prolegomenon to Introduction to metaphysics. In *A Companion to Heidegger's 'Introduction to metaphysics'*, ed. Richard Polt and Gregory Fried, pp. 3-16. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sheehan, Thomas. 2001b. A Paradigm shift in Heidegger research. *Continental Philosophy Review* 34: 183-202.