The Dissertation Committee for Markus Mikula Weidler
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Heidegger's Theft of Faith:

A Campaign To Suspend Radical Theology

Committee:

_____
Kathleen Higgins, Co-Supervisor

_____
Katherine Arens, Co-Supervisor

_____
Robert C. Solomon

_____
Paul Woodruff

_____
Frank C. Richardson

Heidegger's Theft of Faith:

A Campaign To Suspend Radical Theology

by

Markus Mikula Weidler, M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2005

Heidegger's Theft of Faith:

A Campaign To Suspend Radical Theology

Publication No. _____

Markus Mikula Weidler, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Co-Supervisor: Kathleen Higgins
Co-Supervisor: Katherine Arens

In this inquiry I pursue two tasks. First, I locate the roots of Heidegger's philosophical project historically within a specific theological discourse bent on redefining the relation between religion and politics. Heidegger's main, if covert, intent was to combat the egalitarian, pluralistic impulses carried by a tradition of *critical Christology*, which leads from F.W.J. Schelling's (1775-1854) *Philosophy of Revelation* to the work of the radical theologian-philosopher Paul Tillich (1886-1965). These egalitarian impulses spring from a broadened understanding of religious community as a *material communication community* unified through the use of shared symbols into a community of understanding, knowledge, and interests.

The theoretical expansion and deepening of such a communication model, I detect in the writings of the renegade Neogrammarian, Hermann Paul, here considered in light of the "neo-Idealist" initiative of one of Paul's most prominent critics, the Romanist Karl Vossler. Prior to the advanced theological exposition of symbolically mediated communication, in works such as Tillich's book *Dynamics of Faith* (2001; Engl. orig. 1957), the Neogrammarian movement in language studies, I argue, holds the key to accessing the cloaked Christological subtext of Heidegger's thought.

Second, after thus locating Heidegger's philosophical agenda within its intellectual-historical context, I expose how Heidegger manipulates *philosophical rhetoric* to achieve the suspension of Schelling's theological legacy. My analysis of Heidegger's rhetorical behavior is focused on his *Letter on Humanism* (written 1946, published 1949), a text very overt in both its philosophical biases and its politics. The *Humanismusbrief* comes the closest to revealing Heidegger's own self-positioning within his generation. The work's conclusion provides a brief look ahead, or *Ausblick*, to indicate the main features of how these findings about the *Letter* can be brought to bear on Heidegger's masterpiece fragment, *Being and Time*.

Through this approach, Heidegger's inherently political philosophy gains a much clearer profile in the context of its formative phase in the waning days of the Weimar Republic and opens a new perspective on later attempts by its author to "re-apply" his philosophical program to the cultural situation of postwar Germany, as well as to the ethical-epistemological problems remaining after twelve years of German isolationism.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In this inquiry I pursue two tasks, the first of which is meant to lay the groundwork for the second.

First, I locate the roots of Heidegger's original philosophical project historically within a specific theological discourse that aimed at redefining the relation between religion and politics, concerned with a new understanding of religious language. According to my primary claim, Heidegger's main, if covert, intent was to stymie the egalitarian, pluralistic impulses carried by a tradition of *critical Christology*, which leads from F.W.J. Schelling's (1775-1854) *Philosophy of Revelation*[1] to the work of the radical theologian-philosopher Paul Tillich (1886-1965).

In the following, my focus remains on Schelling as the theoretical pioneer, sporadically acknowledged by Heidegger as his philosophical inspiration but mostly downplayed as just another representative of German Idealism, a tradition from which Heidegger never tired to distance himself.[2]

The egalitarian impulses of such critical Christology are generated by a politically charged epistemology in the early twentieth century that Heidegger was at pains to reject: an epistemology centered around a broadened understanding of religious community as a *material communication community* that is unified through the use of shared symbols into a community of understanding – a community of knowledge and interests analyzed expressly in works such as Tillich's book *Dynamics of Faith* (2001; Engl. orig. 1957).

What will emerge as critical in such a community-based epistemology is the materiality of such symbol-oriented communication, which will be spelled out below in terms of the contextual, or "geg(n)ende"[3] mediation of meaning formation. In this context, meaning formation pertains not just to concept formation, but to different modes of cultural agency of the kind that Heidegger analyzes in his opus magnum, *Being and Time* (1927).[4] Specifically, cultural agency of this sort is explicated in terms of equipment, or "equipmedley" (*Zeug*),[5] and its respective "referential context" (*Verweisungszusammenhang*)[6] – a *material semiotics* of cultural production that the early Heidegger helped develop, just as much as he would soon suspend and redirect its political force.

Second, after thus locating Heidegger's philosophical agenda within its intellectual-historical context, I expose, how Heidegger actually manipulates *philosophical rhetoric* to achieve this refutation of Schelling's theological legacy – a practice that speaks both to his philosophical genius and his purposive intervention aimed at combating the epistemic shift of his era. From this perspective, several of Heidegger's central claims appear much less idiosyncratic, as they instead document his discursive sensitivity and stratagem. As we shall see, in many cases his purported innovations are actually responses to his tacit interlocutors, attempts to neutralize their positions rather than at elucidating his own.

In distinction from political rhetoric or rhetoric in an even more general sense, the crucial feature of this kind of philosophical rhetoric consists in its investment in a methodological constellation, the inner tensions of which it will mobilize and sometimes exploit. To be clear, philosophical rhetoric, in my use of the term, always preserves a

political dimension, regardless how implicit or encrypted it may be on occasion. Yet by drawing its authority or discursive power from an undercurrent of methodological debate(s), philosophical rhetoric in a full-fledged sense puts a qualifier on its successful discursive working, which other definitions of rhetoric do not impose. The merit of this approach to a philosophical theorem through its rhetoric is that it allows us to unlock much of the terminological opacity – as it will in this case, clarifying many of the seeming thematic ruptures confronted in Heidegger's text.

To set up the parameters for the concrete examination of the rhetorical behavior of Heidegger's writing, my analysis is focused on Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism* (written 1946, published 1949). The results gained from the analysis of a text that is very overt in both its philosophical biases and its politics are meant to be applied "backwards" to Heidegger's masterpiece fragment *Being and Time*.[7] In the present course of this inquiry, I will not yet carry out this application to its full extent. Instead, my primary concern remains with the *Humanismusbrief*. This text, I believe, comes the closest to revealing Heidegger's own self-positioning within his generation. Following the detailed examination of the philosophical stakes and the rhetorical workings of this document, then, I will provide a brief look ahead, or *Ausblick*, to indicate the main features of how these findings about the *Letter* can be brought to bear on *Being and Time*. The full-fledged analysis of Heidegger's master fragment will be reserved for an extended future version of this study.

Breaking the chronology of Heiddegger's writings in this way is justified because, in the *Letter,* Heiddegger himself "invites" the reader to turn back and take a fresh look at his first major publication. As a piece of self-editorship (or even self-staging), this

(re)interpretive invitation on the part of Heiddegger remains problematic. Hence, without taking Heiddegger's word for it, I put his retrospective self-analysis to the test and examine on what grounds Heiddegger could claim that he never abandoned his project from *Being and Time*. Is there a subtext that connects *Being and Time* and the *Letter on Humanism*, or not? Utilizing the text of the latter to unlock the text of the former is the solution I have evolved.

According to this approach, my work moves beyond the now well-worn debate over Heidegger's Nazi involvement, a debate which has met with extensive treatment over nearly the last two decades, in the course of a fourth wave of criticism sparked by Victor Farias' book *Heidegger and Nazism* (1989; French orig. 1987). These different waves of criticism have been delineated in Hugo Ott's introduction to his *Martin Heiddegger: Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie* (1988). [8] Instead, as noted, I will try to locate the roots of Heidegger's thinking in a controversy over religion and politics that *preceded* WWII, and to pursue it into its postwar permutations.

Viewed through the interpretive lens provided in this study, Heidegger's inherently political philosophy in fact gains a much clearer profile in the context of its formative phase in the waning days of the Weimar Republic. Just as importantly, preparing a rereading of *Being and Time* through the optics of the *Letter on Humanism* opens a new perspective on later attempts by its author to "re-apply" his philosophical program to the cultural situation of post-war Germany, as well as to the ethical-epistemological problems remaining in the air after twelve years of German isolationism.

Outline and Significance of the Present Project

In pursuing the two tasks described above, the chapters progress according to the following train of thought. In the first chapter, I present Schelling as the key figure "behind the scenes" of the indicated controversy over new forms of faith and their respective practices of material symbol use. Here Schelling will emerge as the initiator of a Christological line of thought that provides a pluralistic framework for grounding a new cultural politics.

In particular, this political potential will be analyzed with regard to Christology's treatment of the persona of the Christ as a semiotic principle that actively shapes and transforms the historical self-understanding of the members of religious communities. The dynamics of faith within the group are interpreted as a critical political force, which can be asserted in its own right, but never separated from the other vectors of cultural meaning production operative in the group's irreducibly complex life-world. A cultural politics of faith thus obviates any dogmatic partitioning, where a domain of (fixed) religious meanings is isolated from the rest of social life and thereby invested with "auratic authority."[9]

Following Schelling's approach, such politics aims at bridging the gap between different forms of "stale theism" (*[s]chaler Theismus*)[10] and ill-founded conceptions of atheist secularism, which are superseded as false alternatives. In this manner, Schelling points to a new understanding of socially mediated religiosity, as he insists on an irreducible multiplicity of possible religious life-worlds beyond Christian dogma and any equally dogmatic rejections thereof. These new life-worlds constitute immanent understandings of the world, shared among those in a community.

To make my case for an overdue re-appreciation of the later Schelling's relevance for contemporary Heidegger scholarship, I will begin the first chapter by examining specific *hermeneutic strategies* that are operative in Theodore Kisiel's landmark publication *The Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time (1993).[11] Impressive in its comprehensive scope as well as its vision for detail, this study remains illuminating even as it fosters what I take to be interpretive trends toward neglecting the neo-Schellingean trajectory I want to emphasize. Speaking of the hermeneutic strategies engaged by Kisiel's work, thus refers to a *double bypass*, that is, two intersecting routes along which the main contributors to the methodology of a new Christologically informed, material semiotics have been eclipsed to this point in the existing scholarship.

Note that this approach makes no assumptions about Kisiel's intention as an author. Instead, my commentary is meant to clarify different modes of reading Heidegger that are promoted by his text. In order to bring out the interrelatedness as well as the variations of emphasis among these routes of Heidegger interpretation, I will use the different aspects of the aforesaid twofold bypass to make a transition into the following two chapters, respectively, constituting the first section of my inquiry.

The opening chapter on Schelling, then, will address the first of the two bypasses. By giving center stage to Emil Lask's impact on Heidegger's early philosophical development, the text of *The Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time reinforces the hermeneutic strategy of interpreting Heidegger's thought process over against (the Marburg School of) neo-Kantianism. In Kisiel's account, this interpretive trend is not lessened but rather strengthened by the fact that Lask is presented as a renegade neo-Kantian of sorts, whose ability to infuse the language of transcendental value philosophy

with mystic overtones reminiscent of Meister Eckhart would have had great appeal to Heidegger. In light of Lask's hybrid qualities, the present connection is fully compatible with both Heidegger's express turn away from Rickert and his final need to move beyond Lask, as well.

Thus understood, my present notion of a neo-Kantian bypass that has helped to obscure the Heideggerian program that I am pursuing carries a double meaning, as it speaks to a double movement within contemporary discourses on Heidegger. The importance of Schelling is bypassed through a strategic emphasis on Heidegger's bypassing of neo-Kantianism. The fact that this emphasis has lost nothing of its discursive relevance over the ten years since the publication of Kisiel's seminal book is evidenced by his recurrent affirmations of that hermeneutic strategy.[12]

As for the second bypass, taken up in chapter two, Kisiel's account of "The Dilthey Draft" of *Being and Time* falls in line with a long-standing tendency in Heidegger scholarship. According to this "tradition," Heidegger is commonly contextualized in terms of Dilthey's position within the nineteenth-century *Geisteswissenschaften* debate, without contextualizing Dilthey himself in terms of the other factions or interlocutors within that discursive constellation. This pertains especially to the "enunciations" (to borrow Julia Kristeva's term) by the physician Hermann Helmholtz since the 1840s, which set the tone for the debate over the status of science for the second half of that century and beyond.[13]

To resist the discursive narrowing of the *Geisteswissenschaften* controversy, as implied by the Dilthey shortcut that most scholars have accepted to date, I set out to reterritorialize what I take to be one of the most crucial, but also most neglected sources

of Heidegger's methodology in *Being and Time*, namely the "Neogrammarian Revolution" in the science of language (*Sprachwissenschaft*) or linguistics writ large in the form of nineteenth-century philology.[14] More precisely, I will discuss this scientific revolution in terms of the "philosophical deviation" of one of his most important, yet undersold representatives, Hermann Paul.[15]

To make this case, I want to scrutinize and critique the Dilthey-bypass in such a way as to bring out a crucial line of influence, which relates Heidegger's quest for a new philosophical method back to a specific nineteenth-century controversy over historical psychology and philology. Prior to any attempt at detecting the repercussions of this controversy in Heidegger's text, however, it is useful to begin by establishing a general methodological link that connects Heidegger's project to this particular psychological discourse. This link, I argue, consists in a specific strand of material semiotics within Edmund Husserl's pioneering program of phenomenology, which remains vital for an account of both the genesis and the internal workings of Heidegger's *Being and Time*.

In terms of philosophical method, this blueprint for a semiotics of culture speaks to the proximity of Husserl and Cassirer, commonly neglected in recent Heidegger scholarship. Acknowledging this connection also casts a new light on the all too familiar Heidegger-Cassirer controversy that culminated in the (in)famous Davos disputations, in 1929.[16] To probe this discursive interface, I set out to show how an integral part of Husserl's thought gets effectively distorted and eventually silenced in the course of contextualizing Heidegger with reference to Dilthey's work in the area of historical science. In particular, I will show how the promotion of a false notion of "radical" phenomenology, associated with an equally misleading story about Heidegger's "radical"

departure from the theoretical stance of his mentor, has helped eclipse some of Husserl's most important contributions in the context of Dilthey's critique of historical reason.

After thus explicating the stakes of philosophical method within this discursive constellation, and after showing how Husserl's thought is intimately related to that of Cassirer (and Schelling) within it, we can then proceed to a second phase of critiquing the Dilthey-bypass, in the second section of this study, where Heidegger's occluded nineteenth-century interlocutors will have their say. In particular, Paul's conception of the *material mediation* of meaning will serve as a linchpin for bringing out the methodological ramifications of cultural semiotics, which not only forge a link between Paul and Cassirer but also corroborate the lingering bond between Cassirer and Heidegger, the latter's proclamations to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any comprehensive treatment of Paul's theoretical advances, especially within his own field of Germanic studies and historical philology, would explode the scope of this investigation. For my purposes of rereading Heidegger, however, it is important to appreciate the ways in which the influence of Paul's work reached beyond the limits of his discipline. In chapter three, I argue that, to estimate his influence on the field of philosophy, where Heidegger's career took off in the 1920s, we must not consider the Neogrammarian revolution in isolation, but rather as embedded in an ongoing debate in the humanities, which was in full swing in Germany since the 1870s.

To this end, we need to take note of the so-called "neo-Idealist reaction"[17] to this revolution, a motion of resistance against the Neogrammarian impulse toward a reorientation concerning both the objectivity and the validity standards of scientific inquiry. Against the background of this debate, Husserl's previously sketched semiotics

also gains new weight in tracing the different sources of influence within the early Heidegger's development up to *Being and Time*. By identifying and explicating these philosophical imports as the core of this chapter, we will be able to distinguish different aspects of Heidegger's strategy in his re-staging of these Neogrammarian as well as neo-Idealist elements of his thought in the *Letter on Humanism*, the bridge document through which Heidegger sought to remount his philosophical project from the Weimar period for a postwar era.

More specifically, the relevance of Neogrammarian innovation for Heidegger's project can be determined most effectively by attending to the work of the influential Romanist Karl Vossler, whose crusade against "metaphysical positivism" rendered him one of the key figures of the neo-Idealist opposition against Paul's methodological forays into a new area of linguistic research.

In chapter four, I turn to Paul's own work that proves him sensitive to the fundamental reciprocity inherent in all social communication phenomena. Concerning these routes of mutual influence, he avoids the one-directionality and one-dimensionality that undercuts Vossler's notion of "relative progress." Instead of placing the source of linguistic creativity and transformatory power in language development solely in the "soul" of the individual language user, Paul offers a more robust notion of collective meaning formation, in that he stresses the importance of material mediation of all communicative processes. This chapter will thus argue that, by reconceiving the individuality of each language user vis-à-vis their respective language community, he paves the way for the later projects of hermeneutic thinkers like Gadamer, on one hand, and post-structuralist thinkers like Deleuze and Guattari, on the other.

We will begin by turning to Paul's major work, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880) in comparison to Husserl's model of the relation of mind and history, and to Gadamer's hermeneutics of understanding. Thereafter, we will move to a comparison of Paul with the early Wittgenstein, in order to outline what is at stake in Paul's more materialist – but not positivist – appropriation of a psychological-hermeneutic approach to meaning. Wittgenstein appears more transcendentalist, until we pursue Deleuze and Guattari's correction of his neglect of the communicative situation. Finally, as the last section of this argument, I will return to how the psychologist-empiricist debate about science engaged by these philologists (Vossler and Paul) recasts the history of phenomenology as we know it, and hence also sets the stage for Heidegger somewhat differently than has been assumed. In this regard, it is, once more, Schelling's thought that emerges as the central reference point for the second section of my study.

While earlier chapters of the present discussion addressed the contexts in which Heidegger's work functioned, chapter five will show how his specific approach to language and meaning evolved from his early writings on. We will start with his early critique of linguistics/philology, reaching back as far as his 1913 dissertation and his 1916 *Habilitationsschrift* (first submitted 1915), which together constitute an early call for a subject of knowledge constituted differently than the model at play in the psychology and philology of the era. After that I will turn to his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (1925) in order to address how his turn away from philology allows him to refute Husserl and his model of intersubjectivity in understanding. At the end of this chapter, I will return to the significance of these modes for the evaluation of Heidegger's project and its appeal to religion.

If the earlier chapters of this study set up the problem of the rhetorics from which Heidegger borrowed, the sixth and last chapter has a different function, moving into the heart of Heidegger's most familiar and most controversial writings. Starting with the 1949 *Brief über den Humanismus*, it sets up Heidegger's paradigm for a new theology of reading, which finds and circulates its meanings in concrete expressions of culture, including most importantly poetry and what I will explicate as "vital anecdotes" – a paradigm that will "recur" in *Being and Time*, in modified form.

To make this case, I will open out the *Letter* as predictive of how he manipulates ethics in the text to enact a "theft of faith." Heidegger will, once again, deny his roots in a post-Schellingean discourse, as he undercuts his own previous sketch of a material dialogics, in favor of a rhetorically amplified form of nationalist language cult. Such *cultural nationalism* is supported by a new conception of *communicative space*, which provides one of the few clear indications of Heidegger's occluded dialogue with the Young Hegelians and their "other mentor" (besides Hegel as inspiration and target), Schelling. At the core of the *Humanismusbrief*, the actual task that a new kind of humanism has to meet, regardless of whether we label it "metaphysical" or "postmetaphysical," is to determine a mode of human communication that can give meaning to people's lives, beyond the dichotomic confines of private and public "existence."

Thus the main challenge for a Schelling-oriented, Young-Hegelian type of *Existenzphilosophie* (in contradistinction to a Sartrean existentialism) is to determine and explore a specific communicative spatiality, as Heidegger intimates at the very beginning of the *Letter on Humanism*, in terms of his famous phrase "language is the house of

being" (313). But soon Heidegger's orientation will take a different turn, as he redirects the post-Schellingean route to "existence in language" in a way that will distort and suspend the critical-Christological stakes of the debate over a new paradigm of communication.

The distortive transition from Heidegger's shrouded roots in Schelling's thought to some semiotic self-corruption thereof is effected by his equivocal interchange of *Ansprechen* (talking-to) and *Anspruch* (demand, command, address). The expression *Ansprechen*, I argue, still belongs to the conception of material communication, which can be located in Heidegger's 1925 lecture course, *Prolegomena*, earlier examined in chapter five. The term *Anspruch*, by contrast, belongs to a different understanding of communicative space, which effaces the concrete "location" or context from which the demand is issued. Instead, demand is now invested with transcendent overtones of unmediated access to, or rather reception of, divine meaning – Heidegger's hint at an immaterial semiotics of Being, rendered as ethereal "Saying" (*Sagen*),[18] which Schelling would emphatically deny.

Against the background of these considerations about Heidegger's communicative architecture and his proposal for (re)building "the house of being" in a new form of religious language, we can detect the pervasive influence of Christology in the *Letter on Humanism*. In the present context of communicative space and the possible paths for and limits on conveying transcendent meaning, I suggest that the *Letter* can plausibly be read as a *guide for those who pray*, a *prayer guide*. Cast in Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric, however, such guidance tends to let prayer deteriorate into *political idolatry*, where the act of worship and the search for new forms of religious understanding

becomes dangerously self-referential and cultural-nationalist. The purported demand (*Anspruch*) of Being calls upon a community ("the Germans," in this case) not only to revere their cultural heritage but to revere their own reverence for their cultural heritage, as well. The culture-nation (of Germany) becomes the immaterial subject-object of its own prayers, an invisible community of idolatrous agents.

Going against the grain of Heidegger scholarship, which tends either to scapegoat or exonerate Heidegger completely with respect to the political effects of his crypto-religious philosophy, I suggest that one of his politically most aggressive texts provides a possible remedy to its own tendencies toward idolatrous corruption. A temporary safeguard against the aforesaid kind of political idolatry, then, is contained in the anecdote of Heraclitus, which is imparted toward the end of the *Humanismusbrief*. The anecdotal structure of this segment stands out, because it proves largely immune to Heidegger's ruses of rhetorical distortion. Because of this feature of semiotic resilience, or counter-productivity of meaning, I view Heidegger's Heraclitus anecdote as an example of a *vital anecdote* of the sort described by Deleuze and Guattari, in *What is Philosophy?* (1994).[19] Here, the "vital" aspect relates to the semiotic power of anecdotes that can give meaning to people's lives, while it may help protect human existence from idolatrous self-corruption, if always only for the time being.

Thus understood, vital anecdotes become *existential anecdotes*, to be interpreted within a critical-Christological framework of *Existenzphilosophie*, following in the footsteps of Schelling who paved the way for reforming communicative spatiality, in general, and religious language, in particular. Schelling's prototypical reconception of the material dimensions of religious language, expressly invoked by Heidegger's *Letter*

on Humanism as "language as the house of being," thus opens a plane of Young-Hegelian discourse about new practices of theo-philology and existential language philosophy pointing ahead to the work of later authors on the same discursive trajectory, such as Martin Buber, Fritz Mauthner (Buber's one-time pupil), Walter Benjamin, and the later Wittgenstein. In this study, I cannot engage these instances of what I perceive as post-Schellingean projects, which reterritorialize *Existenzphilosophie* on a manifold plane of linguistic mysticism broadly conceived.

Instead, I want to show the extent to which Heidegger's work belongs within this constellation of revolutionizing religious language, by tracing his debt to Schelling through the "missing link" of the late nineteenth-century debate over scientific method in psychology and historical philology. Revisiting Heidegger's early thought in light of these discourses will cast a very different light not only on his relation and supposed break with his mentor, Husserl (cf. chapter two) and his philosophical opposition to Cassirer (cf. chapter four), but also on Heidegger's theological affinity to his short-term colleague at Marburg University, Paul Tillich.

Like the "linguistic mystics" (Buber, Mauthner, Benjamin, later Wittgenstein), I will not treat Tillich's work in any detail but keep my focus on the Schelling-Heidegger connection. Nonetheless, Tillich deserves special attention as one of the most prominent and, I think, most resourceful neo-Schellingeans among Heidegger's contemporaries. For the purposes of my discussion of Heidegger's cloaked intervention in the reform efforts regarding a material semiotics concerned with religious language use – the Christological subtext connecting the *Humanismusbrief* back to *Being and Time* – I will

deploy Tillich's notion of *the demonic*[20] as my theoretical reference point in analyzing the workings of Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric.

Thus claiming a persistent bond of methodology and agenda between Husserl's phenomenological psychology, Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms, and Tillich's Christological approach to history, on one hand, and Heidegger's "post-humanist" analysis of *Dasein* (before *and* after WWII), on the other hand, is no disservice to Heidegger, in my opinion, because it does not casually brush aside his self-understanding and force an unwanted theoretical alliance onto his work. On the contrary, engaging Heidegger as one of Schelling's most important renegade followers, I suggest, can help bring out the best in the early Heidegger, as a thinker to be recognized in his own right but within a discursive constellation different from the one(s) he cared to acknowledge, especially in the course of his strategic postwar "metamorphosis." According to this analysis, the early Heidegger is inherently hybrid and demonic, oscillating between theological revolution and political idolatry. In order to appreciate his Christological ingenuity and his relevance for contemporary discussions over religious language use, we must resist his recurrent disavowal of "German idealism" and nineteenth-century historical philology.

---

[1] Schelling lectured on various occasions on the philosophy of revelation, primarily between 1831-1841/42. In capitalizing the title here, I am referring to the so-called Paulus-transcript of Schelling's last Berlin lecture of WS 1841/42, published in German as: F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42* [sog. Paulus-Nachschrift], ed. M. Frank (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977). Meanwhile, the original version of Schelling's lecture on the topic, given at Munich in 1831/32, has been published as: F.W.J. Schelling, *Urfassung der Philosophie der Offenbarung / Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling*, ed. W.E. Ehrhardt, 2 Teilbände (Hamburg: Meiner, 1992). The original version of the Munich lectures is more extensive, and especially the second volume contains important material with respect to Schelling's account of evil and Satan. While mostly referring to the first edition of the 1841/42 lectures, I will indicate whenever I resort to the *Urfassung*.

[2] See: Dieter Thomä, *Die Zeit des Selbst und die Zeit danach: Zur Kritik der Textgeschichte Martin Heideggers 1910-1976* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1990): "Wenn Heidegger sich dagegen verwahrt mit der "zeitlichen" Struktur des Daseins, wie etwa mit der "Sorge," in eine anthropologische /

psychologische / ontische "Beliebigkeit" abzugleiten (vgl. 1927a, § 10), so bekommt dies dann aus der Geschichte der Subjektivität heraus eine neu zu verstehende Berechtigung: Er knüpft mit der Zeitlichkeit des Daseins an einen geschichtlichen Stand des Subjekts an, er steht in einer Geschichte der Selbstverständigung, die nicht äusserlich zu dementieren ist. So findet sich schon bei Schelling eine systematische Verbindung der Verzeitlichung der Subjektivität mit dem "Daß" des unvordenklichen Seins; zusammengeführt aufs Engste im "ich bin" und dessen "Tendenz zum Geschichtlichen" (s.o.)" (235). "Man gelangt – wie sich hier erst andeutet – von einer "klassischen" Subjekttheorie her in eine Nähe zu Heidegger, die dieser nie wahrhaben wollte. Dies liegt insbesondere daran, dass der Angelpunkt von Heideggers Subjektkritik zeit seines Lebens die Destruktion einer cartesianischen (?) [sic.] Seins-Gewissheit des reflexiven Subjekts blieb. Bei dieser Fixierung verzerrt sich aber die Wahrnehmung gerade solcher Positionen wie der Hegels und Schellings [Thomä note 134]" (234).

Thomä's study is helpful for several reasons. As the preceding quotation indicates, he lays his finger on a persistent, but false claim toward distance from German Idealism, on the part of Heidegger as well as many of his commentators. He also obviates the Heideggerian shortcut, which abbreviates a comprehensive critique of the modern subject to some deconstructionist endeavor of anti-Cartesianism. In this regard, *Die Zeit des Selbst und die Zeit danach* deserves credit for its general sensitivity to the complex connection between Heidegger and Schelling, in particular.

At the same time, this link is staged in a way that truncates both Schelling's and Heidegger's thought, in my opinion, insofar as these authors are jointly placed on a trajectory of ""classical" subject theory" (see above), which tends to ignore the *historical approach to religion* that is crucial to their thought, respectively. The "tendency toward the historical" (see above) remains a loose end in Thomä's account because of his one-sided treatment of the notion of "mediation" (*Vermittlung*), which he considers only in the context of subordination under "abstract generality" (*abstrakt Allgemeinheit*, immediately below). While he hints at a broader meaning of mediation, with reference to Hegel, he does not pursue this line of thought within Schelling's own theoretical framework, at least not in the context of the central philosophical link between Schelling and Heidegger: "Schelling sieht die Hegelsche Emphase der "tätigen" Vermittlung mit dem Allgemeinen (s.o. C.3.2) blockiert von einer abstrakten Allgemeinheit, in der das "wirkliche Selbst" nicht mehr unterkommt – und damit setzt die Wendung zum "Daß" ein als Abweichung von der dialektischen Bewegung. Aber dieses "Daß" steht nicht prinzipiell gegen die "Vermittlung," sondern tritt nur heraus, wenn die Existenz sich einer drohenden Unterwerfung unter die "Allgemeinheit" widersetzt. – Dann stellt sich aber die Frage, unter welchen historischen Bedingungen dieses "Heraustreten" einsetzt" (219-220). With respect to Heidegger, Thomä will have to say more on the issue, but for Schelling he does not answer this last question, which I deem crucial for assessing Heidegger's debt to Schelling. In fact, he effectively forecloses exploring Schelling's thought, with respect to (historical) mediation, when he writes: "Dabei kann man nicht sagen, Schelling würde Hegel einfach "falsch" lesen – ebensowenig ist er gegen ihn mit dem Vorwurf der begrifflichen Überhebung über das Sein schon selbstverständlich im Recht. Wenn dessen "Einheit" in Schellings Augen ein leeres Konstrukt ist, muss dieser sich umgekehrt sagen lassen, er flüchte sich aus der lebendigen Vermittlung in eine *Denkfigur jenseits aller Vermittlung*, eine imaginäre Ursprünglichkeit der Existenz" (221-222) [emphasis added]. As I will show in chapter one of this study, in light of the later Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation*, it is not convincing to characterize his critique of "negative philosophy," in general, and Hegel's thought, in particular, as "beyond all mediation."

The moral stakes of this misrepresentation are indicated by Thomä himself, when he summarizes his comparison between Schelling and Hegel with regard to the "violent" aspect of "generality," faced by the subject:

> "Schelling wie Hegel – "Daß" einerseits, vermittelndes Aushalten der Gegensätze andererseits – sind, trotz der schärfer werdenden Unterschiede, auf einen gemeinsamen Ausgangspunkt bezogen. Sie gehören zusammen in eine Theorie des Subjekts, das zumindest dem Anspruch nach dessen Bestimmung angesichts einer abstrakten, gewaltsamen "Allgemeinheit" zum Ziel hat.
>
> Der Unterschied ist dann "nur," dass Hegel "Einzelnes" und "Allgemeines" noch in einem Prozess zum Wohle ihrer selbst zusammenzubringen beansprucht, während Schelling stattdessen um des Subjekts willen den Rückzug antritt. Sie trennen sich also in der Beurteilung der Möglichkeiten, die für das Subjekt bestehen" (222).

Attributing such a "retreat" (*Rückzug*) to Schelling, "for the sake of the subject" (*um des Subjekts willen*), is just as implausible as the previous presentation of his view as "beyond all mediation." It becomes clear that Thomä's account of Schelling casts an increasingly aporetic light on the latter's view, in large part because Thomä does not probe any resources of Schelling's *theological* thought. To be sure, he does engage some of Schelling's medical imagery for religious and/or cultural phenomena, such as the "scars of the spirit," but he does not bear out the ramifications concerning the relation between *Heilung* (cure, convalescence, mending) and *Heil* (salvation): "Das Verhältnis zur Allgemeinheit ist also nicht so, wie es Hegel für seine Sythese gebraucht hatte. Heilung für die "Wunden (…), die der menschliche Geist (…) sich selbst geschlagen hat," erwartet Schelling nicht von der inneren Verfassung des "Prozesses," sondern jenseits des subjektiven Dilemmas vom göttlichen "Balsam" (II, 3, S. 10f.)" (229). In this rendering it appears as if Schelling is eventually begging the question of subjectivity, as he "retreats" from the violent potential of human discourse, namely the tension between the subject and generality (in Thomä's language), hoping to nurse his wounds with some "divine balm," outside the synthetic process posited by Hegel.

Such an analysis comes at the cost of downplaying Schelling's relevance for contemporary discussions over symbolic violence and questions of how it may be both engendered and possibly remedied by the dynamics of religious discourse. Along these lines, *Die Zeit des Selbst und die Zeit danach* foregoes an approach to Schelling as the theoretical pioneer of a new understanding of *Existenzphilosophie*, centered around the historical mediation of religious meaning, which I want to examine in this study. In this vein, Thomä does neither refute nor explicitly replace what he criticizes as a reading of Schelling as the "by now notorious precursor of an "existential" turn: "Wir stehen vor der Gegenstellung von "Daß" und "Was," mit der Schelling zum inzwischen notorischen Vorläufer einer "existenziellen" Wendung wird [Thomä note 83]" (208). By contrast, my first chapter proposes an interpretation of the later Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation* that conceives the latter as the blueprint for a new form of *Existenzphilosophie* that reconstrues the historical *Vermittlung* of religious meanings in ways that remain crucial for the development of Heidegger's thought before and after the publication of *Being and Time*.

[3] For *Gegend*, see esp.: *Being and Time*, § 22; for Heidegger's evolving use of this expression, cf.: GA 77: *Feldweg-Gespräche* (1944/45), 1995. Here and in the following, the volumes of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, or collected edition (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klosterman, 1976 –) are designated by "GA" plus the volume number. Cf. also: Martin Heidegger, *Gelassenheit* (Pfullingen: Neske, 1959). Translated as: Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund (New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

[4] Quotations from the German original refer to: GA 2: *Sein und Zeit* (1927), 1977. Note that the seventh edition (1953) establishes the pagination for all subsequent editions. The fourteenth edition (1977) is the first to incorporate Heidegger's marginal notes.

[5] The common translation of *Zeug* as "equipment" has the disadvantage of investing the term with connotations that tend to restrict its meaning to practical use contexts. To be sure, "equipment" remains clearly distinct from "instrument(s)." In this regard, "equipment" is often associated with some kind of subconscious handling, as opposed to the conscious deployment of a particular instrument in view of a particular task. However, any such hint at subconscious agency does not yet address the question of how distinct or specific the goal is, which is supposed to guide or "inform" the subconscious use of "equipment," in Heidegger's sense. In other words, there is a lurking ambiguity at work, which tends to conflate subconscious, implicit, and imprecise. The mere fact that an action (or way of acting) proceeds subconsciously does not entail that its practical purpose is vague. Lack of "mental focus" (conscious attention or awareness) does not imply lack of "practical focus" (the material precision of the task that is subconsciously engaged). Differently put, the *psychological* lack of *explicitness* associated with subconscious agency does not preclude *practical explicitness* or precision. Accordingly, rendering *Zeug* as "equipment" still invites interpretations that limit the meaning of *Zeug* to clear-cut practical assignments to be tackled, e.g., in the context of a "workshop" (*Werkstatt*). Along these lines, standard translations as well as standard interpretations are prone to reducing *Zeug* to *Werkzeug*. This reduction, partially motivated by Heidegger's own statements, effectively occludes an important strand of *materialist semiotics* that pervades Heidegger's early writings, in his search for a new philosophical methodology that would redefine the boundaries of philosophy as a professional discipline. To preserve this dimension of Heidegger's thought, I

opt for the somewhat eccentric translation of *Zeug* as "equipmedley," in order to stress the open-ended, meaning-sponsoring aspects of this notion without committing it to the limits of pre-formatted practical tasks, however subconscious they may be. I will return to this issue in more detail in chapter six of this study, where I point to the different featurings of *Zeug* in Heidegger's *Being and Time* compared to earlier versions of the same theme complex.

[6] See: *Being and Time*, § 17. Here Heidegger speaks first of "*Verweisungsganzheit*" (76), but in the summary of this paragraph, he uses the term "*Verweisungszusammenhang*" (82). In her recent translation of *Being and Time*, Joan Stambaugh translates the latter as "referential context," whereas John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson offer the cumbersome and somewhat misleading rendering of "context of assignments or references." For these alternative translations see: Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962); Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. J. Stambaugh (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996). For a fair comparison and general comment on the merits and demerits of each translation, see: Richard Polt, Heidegger: An Introduction (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 23.

[7] There is a sense of minimal agreement among Heidegger scholars that the fragmentary character of *Being and Time* must not be overstated. Most importantly, Heidegger does deliver some follow-up attempts at extending, if not completing his analysis. In the few years that immediately follow the publication of the "astonishing torso" of his master piece, the most relevant text pointing at partial elaboration are: GA 24: *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* (1927), 1975. Translated as: Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, trans. A. Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982); and of equal importance: GA 26: *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz* (1928), 1978. Translated as: Martin Heidegger, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. M. Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984). The clearest index of continuation, in this regard, is Heidegger's own. He thus adds a footnote to the introduction of *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, which states that this Marburg lecture course is intended as a newly conceived rendering of the Third Division of Part One of *Being and Time*: "Neue Ausarbeitung des 3. Abschnitts des I. Teiles von "Sein und Zeit."" (GA 24, Anm.1). For helpful, brief commentaries as to how the two subsequent works at hand tend to intersect with Heidegger's initial project in *Being and Time*, see: Polt (1999), pp. 36-37, 109-112; as well as the following contribution to vol. 25 in the series *Klassiker Auslegen*: Theodore Kisiel, "Das Versagen von *Sein und Zeit*," *Martin Heidegger, Sein und Zeit*, ed. T. Rentsch (Berlin: Akademie, 2001), pp. 253-279; esp. pp. 258-267. While the commentators agree that Heidegger does not manage to tie up all loose end left from *Being and Time*, they both acknowledge a new emphasis on freedom and liberation in Heidegger's diction, which is interpreted as a hint at his (first, if one assumes several) *Kehre* around the year of 1929. As I argue in chapter one, this supposedly new emphasis on freedom, too, receives a new twist, if Heidegger's project is approached through a comparison with Schelling's Christological thought.

[8] The counting of these waves of criticism may vary, depending on whether on focuses on the potential explosiveness of the material or the actual stir it caused at the time of its publication (Guido Schneeberger's book is a case in point, see right below). My present speaking of four critical waves, then, refers to the following sequence, *not* counting Heidegger's trial before the de-nazification committee right after the war. The first wave was set off by Jürgen Habermas's detailed review of Heidegger's then recently published *Introduction to Metaphysics* in the German newspaper, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. The second wave pertains to the appearance of Guido Schneeberger's book *Nachlese zu Heidegger. Dokumente zu seinem Leben und Denken* (1962), notwithstanding the fact that, as Ott points out, this "indispensable text […] has been left to gather dust in the libraries, its author dismissed as an outsider." The third wave took off after the reissue in 1983 of Heidegger's rectoral address, "The Self-affirmation of the German University," along with the first publication of *The Rectorship 1933-34: Facts and Thougts*, timed – according to Heidegger's instructions – to coincide with the fiftieth anniversary of Hitler's seizure of power. The fourth wave, finally, hit more internationally with the publication of Victor Farías' book *Heidegger and Nazism* (1989; German edition 1989; French/Spanish original 1987). Depending on how one assesses the respective ripple effects, one could associate an earlier fifth wave with Heidegger's (in)famous *Spiegel* interview "Only a God Can Save Us" (1966), revealed – again, according to Heidegger's own instructions – with a ten-year

delay in 1976. For the preceding data and further commentary, see the introduction to: Hugo Ott, *Martin Heidegger: A Political Life*, trans. A. Blunden (London: Harper Collins, 1993 [orig. 1988]).

[9] In speaking of "auratic authority," I am alluding to Walter Benjamin's account of aura, the (partial) demise of which he welcomed in his essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction": "And what is really jeopardized when the historical testimony is affected is the authority of the object [Benjamin, note 3]. One might subsume the eliminated element in the term "aura" and go on to say: that which withers in the age of mechanical reproduction is the aura of the work of art. This is a symptomatic process whose significance points beyond the realm of art. One might generalize by saying: the technique of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition" (221). "An analysis of art in the age of mechanical reproduction must do justice to these relationships, for they lead us to an all-important insight: for the first time in world history, mechanical reproduction emancipates the work of art from its parasitical dependence on ritual. […] From a photographic negative, for example, one can make any number of prints; to ask for the "authentic" print makes no sense. But the instant the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applicable to artistic production, the total function of art is reversed. Instead of being based on ritual, it begins to be based on another practice – politics" (224). Further down, Benjamin shows himself aware of both the stakes and the "threats" related to the changed political function of art, which harbors the potential for "progressive" as well as "reactionary" attitudes or modes of perception: "Mechanical reproduction of art changes the reaction of the masses toward art. The reactionary attitude toward a Picasso painting changes into the progressive reaction toward a Chaplin movie. […] Painting simply is in no position to present an object for simultaneous collective experience, as it was possible for architecture at all times, for the epic poem in the past, and for the movie of today. Although this circumstance in itself should not lead one to conclusions about the social role of painting, it does constitute a serious threat as soon as painting, under special conditions and, as it were, against its nature, is confronted directly by the masses. […] Thus the same public which responds in a progressive manner toward a grotesque film is bound to respond in a reactionary manner to surrealism" (234-235). On a more encouraging or "adventurous" note, he states a page later: "Then came the film and burst this prison-world asunder by the dynamite of the tenth of a second, so that now, in the midst of its far-flung ruins and debris, we calmly and adventurously go traveling. With the close-ups, space expands; with slow motion, movement is extended. The enlargement of a snapshot does not simply render more precise what in any case was visible, though unclear: it reveals entirely new structural formations of the subject" (236). For Benjamin, then, the new media do not warrant unchecked optimism and belief in progress. Instead, they open up new possibilities and an "unexpected field of action" (ibid.).

[10] See: Schelling, *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, 170.

[11] Theodore Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's* <u>*Being and Time*</u> (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

[12] Kisiel, Theodore, "Das Versagen von *Sein und Zeit*;" and Theodore Kisiel *Heidegger's Way of Thought: Critical and Interpretative Signposts* (New York: Continuum, 2002). Regarding the latter, see esp.: chapter five and six.

[13] For Helmholtz's role within the nineteenth-century science debate, especially with respect to his influence on Ernst Mach who became an important interlocutor for Husserl, see: Katherine Arens, *Structures of Knowing: Psychologies of the Nineteenth Century* (Dordrecht, Boston MA: Kluwer, 1989), pp. 22-23, 219-221; and John T. Blackmore, *Ernst Mach: His Work, Life, and Influence* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 56-60. Also, cf. Ernst Cassirer's synoptic account that explicitly puts Helmholtz's influence in relation to the "Definition of Modern Linguistic Science and the Problem of Phonetic Laws" (I, 167-176; for Helmholtz's significance, esp. 168-169) in: Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, trans. R. Manheim (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-57 [orig. 1923-1929]), 3 vols. [vol. 1, *Language*; vol. 2, *Mythical Thought*; vol. 3, *The Phenomenology of Knowledge*]. For the belated adding of the fourth volume, see: Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, trans. J.M. Krois (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), vol. 4, *The Metaphysics of Symbolic Forms*. Here and in

the following, when quoting from Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, I preface the page number with a Roman numeral to indicate the volume.

[14] I adopt this term from chapter five of: Olga Amsterdamska, *Schools of Thought: The Development of Linguistics from Bopp to Saussure* (Dordrecht, Boston: D. Reidel, 1987). Her book has been an indispensable resource for my work on the discursive dynamics between comparative linguistics, (classical) philology, and philosophy, in general, and the Paul-Vossler-Cassirer constellation (see below) in particular.

[15] See: Katherine Arens, "On Rereading Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*," *Multiple Perspectives on the Historical Dimensions of Language*, ed. K.R. Jankowsky (Münster: Nodus, 1996), pp. 105-114. Against the background of her former work, *Structures of Knowing* (1989), Arens remains the only author who explicitly stresses the vital connection between Paul's status as the key representative of the Neogrammarian movement in late nineteenth-century linguistics and the different branches of "continental" philosophy that gained a distinct profile within the volatile context of fin de siècle Europe. From this perspective, Paul's contributions strike right at the hard of a vibrant discursive constellation, in which *Sprachwissenschaft* and philosophy "proper" co-entered in an interdisciplinary debate over remapping the human sciences, both theoretically and institutionally. While I explore the new vistas that have been opened up by this approach with respect to the formative phase of Heidegger's philosophy, the present study remains fundamentally indebted to Arens' methodological guidance.

[16] Two recent documentations revisit this encounter: Michael Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, Heidegger* (Chicago: Open Court, 2000), pp. 1-9. Paetzold, *Ernst Cassirer – Von Marburg nach New York*, pp. 86-105.

[17] Cf. Amsterdamska, *Schools of Thought*, chapter six.

[18] For Heidegger's introduction of, and elaboration on that central expression, in the *Letter on Humanism*, see: "Das auch heute erst noch zu Sagende könnte vielleicht ein Anstoss warden, das Wesen des Menschen dahin zu geleiten, dass es denkend auf die es durchwaltende Dimension der Wahrheit des Seins achtet" (329). "Das Denken achtet auf die Lichtung des Seins, indem es sein Sagen vom Sein in die Sprache als Behausung der Existenz einlegt. So ist das Denken ein Tun. Aber ein Tun, das zugleich alle Praxis übertrifft. […] Das Denken bringt nämlich in seinem Sagen nur das ungesprochene Wort des Seins zur Sprache" (361). In this place, Heidegger expounds on the meaning of "bringing to language" as well as the well-known phrase of being "on the way to language" (or: "underway to language"): "Die hier gebrauchte Wendung "zur Sprache bringen" ist jetzt ganz wörtlich zu nehmen. Das Sein kommt, sich lichtend, zur Sprache. Es ist stets unterwegs zu ihr. Dieses Ankommende bringt das ek-sistierende Denken seinerseits in seinem Sagen zur Sprache. Diese wird so selbst in die Lichtung des Seins gehoben. […] Die Ek-sistenz bewohnt denkend das Haus des Seins. In all dem ist es so, als sei durch das denkende Sagen gar nichts geschehen. […] Indem wir nämlich die der Sprache zugeschickte Wendung "zur Sprache bringen" eigens denken, nur dies und nichts weiter, indem wir dies Gedachte als künftig stets zu Denkendes in der Acht des Sagens behalten, haben wir etwas Wesendes des Seins selbst zur Sprache gebracht" (361-362). Das Denken ist als Denken in die Ankunft des Seins, in das Sein als die Ankunft gebunden. Das Sein hat sich dem Denken schon zugeschickt. Das Sein *ist* als das Geschick des Denkens. Das Geschick aber ist in sich geschichtlich. Seine Geschichte ist schon im Sagen der Denker zur Sprache gekommen. […] Die Schicklichkeit des Sagens vom Sein als dem Geschick der Wahrheit ist das erste Gesetz des Denkens, nicht die Regeln der Logik, die erst aus dem Gesetz des Seins zu Regeln warden können" (363) [Heidegger's emphasis]. At the very end of the *Letter*, Heidegger concludes: "Das Denken sammelt die Sprache in das einfache Sagen. Die Sprache ist so die Sprache des Seins, wie die Wolken die Wolken des Himmels sind. Das Denken legt mit seinem Sagen unscheinbare Furchen in die Sprache. Sie sind noch unscheinbarer als die Furchen, die der Landmann langsamen Schrittes durch das Feld zieht" (364). Quoted from: Martin Heidegger, "Brief über den Humanismus," Wegmarken (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1967). Here, I am using the second, expanded edition of 1978, which is included in Heidegger's *Collected Works*, vol. 9 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Band 9; hereafter also referred to as: GA 9).

[19] I will return to the different (structural) traits of *vital anecdotes* in chapter six.

[20] In my discussion of Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*, I will attend to Tillich's notion of *the demonic*, in the concluding chapter of this study.

Section I:

The Double Bypass

Chapter One

Schelling: Christology as Semiotics

The roots of Heidegger's original philosophical project can be located historically within a specific theological discourse that aimed at redefining the relation between religion and politics. According to my primary claim, Heidegger's main, if covert, intent was to combat the egalitarian, pluralistic impulses carried by a tradition of critical Christology, initiated in large part by the later Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation*.

My present notion of critical Christology differs, to some degree, from the one commonly attributed to Schelling. According to Christian Danz's (2000)[1] general characterization, Christology for Schelling is, first of all, the explication of the content of revelation (*die Explikation des Inhaltes der Offenbarung*). This content, in turn, consists in nothing but the persona of Jesus Christ (*die Person Jesu Christi*).[2] With Danz, we can let Schelling speak for himself:

> Der eigentliche Inhalt des Christentums ist aber ganz allein die *Person* Christi; […] Man kann also sagen: In einer Philosophie der Offenbarung handle es sich allein oder doch nur vorzüglich darum, die Person Christi zu begreifen. Christus ist nicht der Lehrer, wie man zu sagen pflegt, Christus nicht der Stifter, er ist der *Inhalt* des Christentums. (XIV, 35)[3]

This passage is doubly intricate, insofar as the two central notions, "persona" (*Person*) and "content" (*Inhalt*), are not taken in their usual sense or as they are used in ordinary language. Accordingly, the German term *Person* must not be rendered "person" in English. Instead "persona" seems to be the best option in order to stress that, in Schelling's account, the name Jesus is *not* the proper name of a person, however special in his role as "teacher" of humanity or "founder" of the Christian religion. As we shall

see, for Schelling, the founding paradox of God's incarnation in Jesus, the puzzle of the God-Man who is both fully divine and fully human, cannot be understood if "the Son" is considered in (mysterious) analogy to the criteria of human personhood, since the name appears to a content, *Inhalt*.

Likewise, the term *Inhalt* is not to be taken in the common sense of content, in which the content of a story refers to its plot, subject matter, or topic broadly conceived. However, no alternative translation besides "content" is readily available. To avoid misunderstanding, it is therefore crucial to underscore that, according to the kind of critical Christology that Schelling helped initiate, the Christian creed is not rooted in a story about the (historical) person of Jesus Christ and his exemplary deeds. As will be explained in more detail below, Jesus is not seen as the paradoxical paragon of humanity exemplified by a divine agent incarnate. In this understanding, he is not the protagonist of a linearly structured holy narrative, but rather the center of a world understanding.

As Danz (1998) points out, this approach to Christianity assigns a double-frontier position to Schelling's critical Christology, as it tries to avoid what it perceives as the aporias of supranaturalist theology, on one hand, and rationalist enlightenment-theology, on the other.[4] These views are rejected as implying faulty reductions of the divine to the human, or vice versa, which both fail to present the symbolic tension implied by the notion of God's incarnation (*Menschwerdung*) as something meaningful rather than self-contradictory or nonsensical. Although pointing in opposite directions, so the criticism goes, both supranaturalist theology and rationalist enlightenment theology ultimately beg the question.

Their acumen in treating the central tenets of Schelling's Christology notwithstanding, what commentators like Danz generally do not discuss is the specifically *semiotic framework* of Schelling's view, which extends his theologico-philosophical discussion into a project of cultural politics and social reform. Informed by a non-deflationary methodology, such cultural politics examines and enlists religious meanings as social forces, without secularizing them away in the process.

Heidegger, I will argue in what follows below, was alert in particular to this aspect of *Christology as semiotics*. As Heidegger knew, instead of the historical occurrence of a somehow "person-like" God-Man, Schelling argues that the name Jesus stands for a *meaning-giving principle*, which engenders various modalities of historical self-understanding as the unifying ground for the formation and transformation of a specific kind of religious community as communication community. Such understanding, mediated through the historical symbol of the Christ, defies any clear distinctions between the form and the content of the Christian message (Evangelium), as have been issued by philosophy and theology, under conditions of disciplinary separation and hermeneutic competition.

Superseding such rivalry, the conception of Jesus as persona, offered by critical Christology in the mold of Schelling, construes the "content" of Christianity in decidedly non-dogmatic terms, namely as the *open-ended* process of a historical semiotics that construes faith as a critical social force in its own right – not a retarding force looking backwards, but a search for meaning that engages in a kind of social semiosis. Following this conception of a new religiosity as a social and meaning-giving force, faith is not a static belief system, but an active force enacted through the evolving (re)shaping (*[Um-*

]Gestaltung) of religious meanings, which are materially mediated by symbolic practices. As they enter into social space, those practices carry a form of religious discourse, the semiotic productivity of which is not restricted to conscious dialogue among the believers, nor does it gesture at collapsing the sacred into the mundane, or vice versa, as the religious projects by the rationalist and supranaturalist theologians do, respectively. Instead, it creates a productive dialectic between the discourses of the faithful and the non-faithful which leads to the production of new social meanings.

The inherently non-dogmatic trait of such Christology, then, consists in its central claim that there is no single "Christian mind set" or fixed textual canon[5] that could claim sole authority over the "historical truth" about Jesus. On the contrary, the *revelation* of Christian truth is viewed as an ongoing, never finished process of meaning formation, a process of semiotic creativity. From this point of view, neither Christianity as a spiritual movement nor the appearance of Jesus are phenomena *in* history. Instead, the persona of Jesus is a symbol of the creative nature (*Wesen*) of history itself, for which Tillich later coined the phrase of Jesus as the "middle of history."[6] Faith in Jesus, then, leads to new engagement with the social sphere as active production of the meanings of history.

The pivotal point that this example brings for the following investigation is that, within the historical-semiotic framework of critical Christology, the symbolics of the persona of Jesus are directly linked to the riddle of creation, namely the question of how God could create a world from Himself, yet different from Himself.[7] In other words, the riddle of creation (*Schöpfung*) and the paradox of God's becoming human in Christ (*Menschwerdung*) are two sides of the same Christological coin. Said in more conventional philosophical terms, this analysis bridges questions of *ontology* and

representation, or, as Heidegger will term it, *Being* and *Being-in-the World*, a terminological complex more often thought to derive from Hegel. Yet the recourse to Schelling's central *Denkfigur* (cognitive motif; literally, thought-figure) in this regard highlights that of *Zeugung* ([pro]creation), along with the questions it spawns concerning the identity and/or difference between the creator and his creation. The Schelling connection, then, opens up a new account of world understanding, beyond those of strict rationalism.

These questions will prove central for Heidegger's analyses in *Being and Time*,[8] in unacknowledged proximity to the later Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation*. Seen against the preceding characterization of Schelling's pioneering project, *Being and Time* thus turns out to be a book that is pervaded by the Christological semiotics of*Zeugung* . As I will demonstrate, in the Weimar years of his philosophical production as well as in his attempt to remount his project for a postwar audience, Heidegger is at pains to cloak this connection to Schelling and the Young Hegelians. He does so through a variegated vocabulary, which combines the technical terminology of fundamental ontology with the everyday idiom of *Dasein*'s analysis.

This effort at obfuscation is in fact reinforced in contemporary Heidegger scholarship along three different, but related routes, which I identify as philosophy's double bypass of Christological semiotics. To make my case for an overdue reappreciation of the later Schelling in this chapter, then, I will begin by examining specific hermeneutic strategies that are operative in Theodore Kisiel's landmark publication *The Genesis of Heidegger's* <u>*Being and Time*</u> (1993). Impressive in its comprehensive scope as well as its vision for detail, this study remains illuminating even

as it fosters what I take to be interpretive trends toward neglecting the neo-Schellingean trajectory I want to emphasize.

The first philosophical bypass, the first way that traditional Heidegger criticism has elided this particular account of meaning, is the subject matter of this chapter. Calling such avoidance strategies "bypasses" pertains to readings of Heidegger that tend to reduce the discursive scope of the formative phase of his thinking to an exchange and eventual break with neo-Kantianism rather than to a broader reference to idealism, as I am positing here, using Schelling as my example. Such too-simple readings also continue to be instrumental, for example, in occluding the relevance of Cassirer's thought for the early Heidegger. More pervasively, by suppressing Cassirer's legacy, this discursive reduction also blocks out those crucial philosophical sources, which he and Heidegger share. Approaching Heidegger through Schelling, in this chapter, will allow us to uncover how current critics' hermeneutic strategies perpetuate the myth of fundamental difference among the two thinkers, according to a skewed dramatization of the Davos disputations in 1929, whose rhetorical repercussions have not ceased to cast a distorting light on the initial stages of Heidegger's intellectual development.

The Neo-Kantian Bypass: Falsifying Heidegger's Origin

In the opening part of *The Genesis of Heidegger's* <u>*Being and Time*</u> (1993), Theodore Kisiel emphasizes the impact on Heidegger's early thought by the work of Emil Lask, a member of the so-called "Southwest German School" spearheaded by Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert. By giving center stage to Lask's importance for Heidegger's inception of a radicalized phenomenology [of culture], Kisiel reinforces

critics' common hermeneutic strategy of interpreting Heidegger's thought process over against neo-Kantianism.[9] In Kisiel's account, the urgency of upholding this interpretive optic is not lessened but rather strengthened by the fact that Lask is presented as a renegade neo-Kantian of sorts, one whose ability to infuse the language of transcendental value philosophy with mystic overtones reminiscent of Meister Eckhart would have had great appeal to Heidegger. Lask's stereotype, then, is easily transferred onto Heidegger, to justify a particular reading masking the broader appeal I am tracing here. Yet in light of Lask's hybrid qualities, my approach to Heidegger through Schelling is fully compatible with both Heidegger's express turn away from Rickert and his final need to move beyond Lask as well.

Thus understood, my present notion is that a neo-Kantian bypass has helped to obscure the Heideggerian program that I am pursuing. In fact, this bypass carries a double meaning, as it speaks to a double movement within contemporary discourses on Heidegger. The importance of Schelling is bypassed through a strategic emphasis on Heidegger's bypassing of neo-Kantianism. Textually, this approach is based on one of the central tenets in Kisiel's overall Heidegger interpretation, namely that "[i]t all began in KNS 1919" (19, 21).[10] More precisely, the inquiry of Kisiel's *Genesis* book begins with the following claim:

> Thus, through Lask's mediating of the neo-Kantian tradition in the direction of Husserl and Aristotle, the two earliest philosophical influences upon Heidegger, he has developed a sense of intentionality and categorial intuition which allows him to move toward a new sense of the a priori, that of the facticity of historical meaning, which finds its norms in experienceability instead of knowability. (35)
>
> This historical facticity of meaning reflects Heidegger's choice from among the options of the transcendental philosophies of the time. Not an ideal and theoretical realm of validity but a "transcendental" realm of pretheoretical meaning flowing from life itself. (34)

In this formulation, the present claim does not hold up to scrutiny. While Kisiel is certainly right in stressing neo Kantianism as one of the crucial reference points in philosophical discourse at the time when Heidegger's career was about to take off, this school had no monopoly over the "historical facticity of meaning," nor were they the first ones to present it in the way that would prove decisive for Heidegger's own development.

This becomes clear, once we broaden the question of influence and take into account not only those schools of thought from which Heidegger sought ostensibly to distinguish himself, but also those philosophical lineages that he incorporated (often unchanged) into his own body of thought. In this regard, the formula "it all began in KNS 1919" can be misleading in two related ways, which conjointly promote the neo-Kantian bypass in Heidegger scholarship under consideration.

First, if primarily focused on the "Southwest German School" around the figure of Rickert, this formula unduly narrows the debate over the "historical facticity of meaning," by downsizing the underlying *materialism debate*, in which the position taken by transcendental value philosophy marked only one of the later stages. Second, once this narrowed neo-Kantian signpost is pinned to the year of 1919, it is prone to foreclose other sources that entered Heidegger's thought before and after these lecture courses but still prior to the final writing process and publication of *Being and Time*

Considering the former point, the stakes of the overarching debate about materialism are laid out, for example, by Ernst Bloch's comprehensive commentary in *Das Materialismusproblem*.[11] Especially in section 35, "Bürgerliche Auflösungen der mechanischen Materie," Bloch links certain metaphysical questions about the nature of matter to epistemological questions about the nature of human consciousness and

experience, within a political, ideological context. Bloch's discursive mapping is instructive, even if one does not agree with his particular Marxist critique of bourgeois idealism.[12] Highlighting the work of Friedrich Albert Lange (1828-1875) and Ernst Mach (1838-1916), Bloch remains sensitive to the different facets of historical facticity manifest in human experience. In the Heidegger context, the latter are blurred by Kisiel's above reference to "experienceability" and "pretheoretical meaning flowing from life itself," which seems to draw Heidegger's topical breakthrough closer into the vicinity of *Lebensphilosophie* or vitalism, in the mold of Henri Bergson (1859 -1941), rather than making any link to this major debate on materialism of the age. A stereotype here is used to foreclose a viable framing within which to discuss Heidegger.

While the Bergson connection was acknowledged early on as an important factor especially in Heidegger's evolving views on the concept of time,[13] a further neo-Kantian bypass of the Christology debates that I have outlined above, I argue, is best obviated by stressing the interfaces of phenomenology and certain currents within the philosophy of science, which point from Freiburg to fin-de-siècle Vienna. In terms of philosophical methodology, acknowledging the actual conversation between Husserl's phenomenology and Mach's phenomenalism (or "empirico-criticism")[14] is crucial for assessing "Heidegger's choice[s] from among the transcendental philosophies of the time," in Kisiel's phrase. These considerations about the methodological background and scope of Heidegger's "breakthrough to the topic" already point to the second concern raised against Kisiel's formula according to which "it all began in KNS 1919."

Considering the further aspect of Kisiels's argument, trying to recover any possible influence after the year of 1919, and leading up to the publication of *Being and*

Time, the role of Ernst Cassirer's work in particular takes on a new meaning for tracing Heidegger's development up to his magnum opus and beyond. As is well known, Cassirer himself was never comfortable with being labeled a neo-Kantian.[15] Yet, this fact is commonly not brought to bear on the relation between Heidegger and Cassirer. Symptomatically, then, Cassirer is completely absent from Kisiel's account of Heidegger's early thought.[16]

Yet this question of what it means to be a neo-Kantian in the era opens up other faces to Heidegger's project. For instance, Cassirer openly credits Schelling with asking the right questions about new forms of religiosity and about the relation between religious consciousness, mythical consciousness, and cultural reform, even as he rejects some of Schelling's own answers.[17] However, to fully assess the close affinity between Schelling's project of Christological critique and its respective continuations on the part of Cassirer and Heidegger, we must go back to the late Schelling's own text. The key document in this regard is his *Philosophy of Revelation* (1831; 1841/42),[18] which mounts the central semiotic motif of *Zeugung*, which will make a redressed, but no less central reappearance in *Being and Time* as well as in Heidegger's Kant critique, written soon after. The latter was published as *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929), composed by Heidegger in the immediate aftermath of the Davos encounter with Cassirer.

One of the main inconsistencies generated by critics' neo-Kantian bypass as characterized thus far springs from its negligence of Heidegger's actual Kant critique, which provides many cues that become obliterated, if the beginning of Heidegger's "path" (in Pöggeler's phrase) is locked primarily into his 1919 lecture course on

"Phänomenologie und transzendentale Wertphilosophie." The situation is further confounded by the additional assumption of a significant break (the perennially controversial *Kehre*) in Heidegger's thought, which Otto Pöggeler has associated with the year of 1929, as the marker of a new beginning.[19] Purportedly, Heidegger now moves away from the insurmountable dead-ends of *Being and Time* toward his "actual" magnum opus, the *Beiträge zur Philosophie* (1936-38).[20] Right after the publication of *Being and Time*, so the story goes, Heidegger begins to break new ground and enters into the new phase of the philosophy of *Ereignis* – an account that has been promulgated by Heidegger himself, through a now-famous footnote in the *Letter on Humanism*.[21]

To be sure, the commentaries by Kisiel and Pöggeler are not fully congruent with the historical facts, or even with alternate critical accounts. Kisiel does not follow Pöggeler in emphasizing the *Beiträge* over *Being and Time*, although his recent account of "The Failure of Being and Time" (2001)[22] would seem to reinforce Pöggeler's earlier claim about the dead ends generated by Heidegger's breakthrough work, which prompted the author to abandon the completion of this master fragment and move on to a new philosophical methodology.

However, conjointly, these two major commentaries on the unfolding and purported transformation of Heidegger's early thought effectively eclipse the philosophical stakes of the Heidegger-Cassirer controversy as they might have appeared to contemporaries. Instead of probing the crucial interfaces of Cassirer's and Heidegger's critique of Kant, *during* the late 1920s (strictly speaking 1927-1929), these critics divert attention backward to the neo-Kantian "beginnings" pinpointed in 1919

(Kisiel) as well as diverted attention forward, that is, underway to a "second start" in the name of *Ereignis* philosophy, in 1936 (Pöggeler).

The effects of these strategies have been serious within the history of philosophy. Pulling in two different directions in this manner has created the peculiar effect that the lingering claim about Heidegger's supposed "crisis" and reorientation around the year of 1929 does not focus on Heidegger's actual production during that time at all and glosses over, most notably, his detailed Kant critique. The vectors of this alleged reorientation are explicated in such a way that the actual "moment" of change in Heidegger's thinking is rendered nebulous. To be sure, the so-called Kant book, which falls right within that moment, has not gone unnoticed by any means. But its critical reception is continuously overshadowed by the rhetorical exploitation of the Davos "spectacle" as a clash of two philosophical generations, in which the "sporty" Heidegger somehow debunked the "dusty Olympian" Cassirer.[23]

Along with this rhetorical retirement of Cassirer as the purported loser of this debate and any claim to philosophical relevance, the main omission of such treatment relates to the central, if cloaked, presence of Schelling's Christological thought in Heidegger's Kant critique in the late 1920s. As I will show toward the end of this chapter, Heidegger's attack on the B-edition of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* is, in large part, a replication of Schelling's Kant criticism launched close to a century earlier. In particular, Heidegger's claims in terms of the "self-affection" (*Selbstaffektion*) of "original time" (*ursprüngliche Zeit*)[24] will prove to be strikingly parallel to Schelling's conception of the "inner negation" of God, as the condition for the possibility of the creation of a finite world by, or from, an infinite Being. As I will rephrase and pursue it,

the question that Heidegger inherited from Schelling and now levels against Kant is how eternity "gives birth" to finite time, or the sense of time that organizes and unifies a finite world – a question, which Heidegger went to great length to strip from its immediate theological connotations, despite his clear parallel to Schelling's (and Tillich's) accounts.

In other words, the christological *Denkfigur* of *Zeugung*, in the mold of Schelling's philosophy of revelation, is part and parcel of Heidegger's defense of original imagination (*ursprüngliche Einbildungskraft*). The latter, Heidegger claims, must be asserted as an independent third power, over against Kant's tendency (especially in the B-edition of the First Critique) to subsume this power under his conception of constitutive categories as *reine Verstandesbegriffe*. More precisely, in discussing the conditions of what makes the creation of a finite and thus meaningfully unified (life-) world possible, I posit that Heidegger is entering the discourse of Christological semiotics, which Schelling had revolutionized in his treatment of the two founding paradoxes of Christianity, namely the paradox of God's creation of the world and the paradox of God's incarnation in the Christ.

To examine Heidegger's Christological debts to Schelling during this decisive time window in the late 1920s, and hence to overcome the neo-Kantian bypass of this phase, I will highlight only those thematic strands in Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation* that are most relevant and most easily detectable in Heidegger's Kant critique. To this end, the following section will provide a brief sketch of Schelling's account of the "unpreconceivable" as well as his treatment of the unity of the Trinity, in terms of the relation between "three potencies" and "three personalities."

My coverage of these thematic nodes within Schelling's overall Christological programmatic will thus be confined to a basic illumination of the central semiotic motif of *Zeugung*, which organizes the subtext not only of Heidegger's 1929 Kant book but also undergirds integral parts of *Being and Time*, published two years earlier.

The Plural God: Potencies and Personalities

As Thomas Buchheim (1997) has plausibly argued, one of the main shifts in Schelling's intellectual development falls within the year of 1806, when he delivered his "Anti-Fichte."[25] According to the *Schröter-Edition*'s division of Schelling's works into "main volumes" (*Hauptbände*), this also marks the transition from his writings on the philosophy of identity (third main volume, covering the years 1801-1806) to the philosophy of freedom (fourth main volume, covering the years 1806-1815).

In the following, my textual references to Schelling fall mostly into the period after this transition. For the purpose of detecting and elucidating Schelling's influence on Heidegger, against the grain of the neo-Kantian bypass, I shall generally focus on the later Schelling. In doing so, I will take my cues primarily from the *Philosophy of Revelation*.

For Schelling, the guiding notion, which informs his Christological analysis of Christian symbolics, is "the living God" (*der lebendige Gott*) (191). The characterization of the latter is contained in one of Schelling's explications of his conception of monotheism:

> *Monotheism* ist die Lehre, die Gott als solchen, oder seiner Gottheit nach, bestimmt. *Worauf beruht aber die eigentliche Gottheit?* Der wahre Gott, sagt man, ist der lebendige. Der lebendige aber ist nur der, der aus seinem unvordenklichen Sein heraustretend, dasselbe zu einem Moment von sich macht,

> *sein Wesen davon befreiend*, es als *Geist* setzen kann, womit ihm zugleich *die Möglichkeit gegeben* ist, *Schöpfer zu sein, dadurch, dass er seinem unvordenklichen Sein ein anderes Sein entgegensetzt*. (191)[26]

This passage is as crucial as it is puzzling. On one hand, it introduces Schelling's fundamental distinction between *two modalities of God*, namely God in the mode of His "upreconceivable" being (*sein unvordenkliches Sein*) and God in the mode of Godhead (*Gottheit*). On the other hand, it points to the central, Kant-inspired theme complex that asks about the conditions of possibility for God's activity as creator. Under the name of the living God, it is the transition from God to Godhead that "liberates" God from his unpreconceivable status through positing Himself as Geist (*es* [*sein Wesen*] *als Geist setzen*). Only by "stepping outside" (*heraustretend*) His unpreconceivable being, God comes alive and becomes truly creative – the "true God" (*der wahre Gott*).

The most baffling aspect of this image of God is perhaps the notion of self-differentiation, implied by Schelling's speaking of God stepping outside himself, which gets even more complicated in light of an immediate qualification. According to this qualifier, the mode of the unpreconceivable is not simply overcome or canceled but carried over into the modality of Godhead, of which it now constitutes but one aspect (*dasselbe zu einem Moment von sich macht*). Hence, not only do we have to distinguish between the two basic modalities of the unpreconceivable God and the living Godhead, but we will also have to ascertain multiple aspects within the living Godhead itself.

Even as the meaning of this conception is still unclear at this point, Schelling has nonetheless already set the stage for his general claim that monotheism, properly understood, is inherently pluralist. From the viewpoint of his critical Christology, we can make sense of both the unity and the creative productivity of a single God only by

acknowledging His inherently plural nature, which is implied by the puzzle of the unity of the Trintiy. For Schelling, the living God of Christianity is a plural God:

> *Der Schöpfer ist nicht der schlechthin Einfache*, und da diese Mehrheit *eine geschlossene* Totalität ist, der *All-Eine*. (189)
>
> *Gott ist also der All-Eine, den Gestalten seines Seins nach nicht Einer, sondern mehrere; nur seiner Gottheit nach ist er notwendig Einer*, weil in allen jenen Gestalten der Wirkende. *Von seiner Gottheit abgesehen, ist Gott nicht Einer, sondern mehrere*. (191)

To follow Schelling's solution to this puzzle and to clarify his present notion of the unpreconceivable and his conception of God's self-differentiation (which, as we shall see, he addresses as "inner Negation"), I suggest that we must begin by considering Schelling's related commentary on creation, which strikes me as more easily accessible. For my present purposes, then, Schelling's two most central claims about creation are, first, that no necessity of its occurrence can be derived from the general concept of God and, second, that creation is inherently multi-faceted and cannot be explained as "something simply positive" (*etwas einfach Positives*, 181).

Right from the start, Schelling objects to the idea that creation begins with the conscious, voluntary decision of an intelligent demiurge or creator God. As he says a few pages earlier, assuming such act is hardly more than declaring creation to be incomprehensible, and such naïve acceptance amounts to nothing but "stale theism" (*Schaler* [sic!] *Theismus*) (170). Instead, creation must be understood as irreducibly complex as far as the different factors are concerned, which are joined in its process:

> *Schöpfung* ist nicht etwas einfach Positives, gleichsam ein aus sich Hinaussetzen. Vielmehr das ursprünglich Daseiende wird in Schranken gebracht, das so weit dann ein in sich Seinendes, sich selbst Besitzendes ist, dadurch dass an ihm das Können hervorgebracht worden; […]. (181)

In other words, what is naïve about the notion of an intelligent creator God is the uncritical assumption of capability, or correlatively possibility, as a simple given. "Correlative" means that the notions of capability and possibility are two sides of the same coin, in the present context. In this sense, God's capability to create the world is correlative to the possibility of the world's being created. Regardless from which angle we look at it, capability/possibility cannot be taken as a simple given.

For Schelling, God, in His first instance, is not a personal, intelligent designer.[27] God did not just have the capability to create the world, then simply to decide to use or actualize this capacity, and thus make the world. By contrast, Schelling holds out the possibility that creation has to be explained in terms of the dynamic, processive interplay between necessity and contingency. On a preliminary note, we might thus compress this basic insight of Schelling's critical Christology in the formula: *possibility is not a simple given but concurrent with the processive interplay of necessity and contingency*.

However, even this specification of the multiple aspects of the creative process does not yet address the main step from the conditions of the possibility of creation to its actual happening. To this point in his work (covering close to the first two hundred pages of the text of his lecture course!), Schelling's argument has been hypothetical:

> Bis jetzt haben wir die Schöpfung nur als eine mögliche gesehen. Dass der Schöpfer diese Möglichkeit ins Werk setzte, ist nicht a priori einzusehen, wie überhaupt keine freie Tat. Indem wir aber eine solche zufällige, aber immer mehr in Verstand verwandelte Welt, die durch die Mittelglieder bis zum menschlichen Bewusstein aufschreitet, vor uns sehen, *ist es durch Erfahrung bewiesen, dass das Notwendigseinende wirklich und der Tat nach Gott ist;* welcher Beweis sich aber immer mehr verstärkt. (188)

This statement points us to one of Schelling's most prominent tenets in terms of philosophical methodology: namely, his distinction between *negative* and *positive*

philosophy. In the present context of Christology, Schelling charges that negative philosophy with a concept-centered approach that advances to the characterization of God as the necessary being but remains completely mute on the puzzle of creation:

> Bis zu diesem Begriff des notwendig, d.h. allem Begriff voraus Seienden fährt auch die negative Philosophie. Sie fährt durch ihren letzten Schluss, das richtig verstandene ontologische Argument, darauf. (156-157)
>
> Das Notwendigseiende ist der absolut transzendente Begriff. Die alte Metaphysik wollte mit dem Begriff über den Begriff in das Sein hinauskommen. (159)

Negative philosophy remains within the confines of the "old metaphysics" (159). On its own terms, such metaphysics is tailored to a pure science of reason – an a priori science. It promotes a complete *immanent withdrawal* of reason, and thus remains within a negative of meaning.[28] Whenever it pretends to proceed from the concept (of God) to the existence (of God and/or the created world), it becomes vulnerable to the charge of *dogmatic metaphysics*. The latter is gainsaid by Schelling's famous dictum: "The existence of God cannot be evidenced, only the God-ness of that which exists [can]."[29]

Aligning himself with the Kantian heritage of critical philosophy, Schelling thus proposes his own Christological, "post-Kantian" approach, which is meant to execute what Kant's critique of an overreaching metaphysics had already prepared but not carried out to the fullest:

> Die Transzendenz der alten Metaphysik war bloss relativ, halb, zaghaft; *die der positiven Philosophie ist absolut und resolut, aber*eben darum keine Transzendenz in dem Sinne, wie sie Kant verbietet. Habe ich mich erst immanent gemacht in der Idee, dann freilich werde ich transzendent. *Fange ich aber vom Transzendenten an, wie Spinoza, so überschreite ich nichts*. *Kant* verbietet die Transzendenz nur der dogmatisierenden Vernunft, die von sich ausgeht; aber er *verbietet nicht, vom Begriff des Notwendigexistierenden aus zum höchsten Wesen, als Posterius, zu gelangen*. (159)

The wording of the last sentence is rather unfortunate, as far as Schelling's use of the expression *Begriff* is concerned. After all, his primary claim up to this point has been that negative philosophy cuts itself off from the world and boxes itself in through its exclusive reliance on concepts immanent to human reason. But now he seems to be saying that positive philosophy also starts from the *Begriff* (of God or whatever else's existence is in question). This is *not* what Schelling means. He does not change course in the middle of his argument. Instead he gives in to a terminological quirk, namely his routine of maintaining the same designation for something at the point of its negation and furnishing it with the attribute "absolute" or an adverbial combination therewith. According to this befuddling technique, "the Necessary-being is the absolutely transcendent concept" (*der absolut transzendente Begriff*) (159). That is, he is extending the notion of *Begriff* itself, to include not only the traditional *concepts of reason*, but also *concepts of faith*, concepts about existence and the like, which rationalist-Kantians would cosign to the realm of speculation.

In order not to misunderstand Schelling, one has to heed what he said two pages earlier, with respect to the "disloding and dropping of the concept" as the gateway from negative to positive philosophy.[30] Consequently, Schelling remains consistent with his preceding summary of the difference between negative and positive philosophy, where he characterizes the starting point of the latter as follows:

> Die negative Philosophie war durch ihr allem Sein zuvorkommendes Denken *apriorische* Wissenschaft. *Der Anfang der positiven Philosophie ist das allem Denken zuvorkommende Sein. Sie geht vom Sein, dem kein Begriff vorausgeht, zum Begriff, zum "Überseienden."* (156)

The beginning of positive philosophy is prior to all conceptual thinking, it begins with something prior to conceptual comprehension – perhaps best characterized as an

embracing of the ground of being. Internally consistent or not, this general proposal may strike many a reader as counter-intuitive, if not a dead end. One wonders how this is any better than the "stale theism" that Schelling discards by rejecting the notion of God as a free, intelligent designer, which would leave the phenomenon of creation unexplained (cf. 170). How can any philosophy start with the incomprehensible without throwing in the towel? Schelling answers:

> Das Blindseiende ist der mit dem Denken nicht identische Inhalt (im Gegensatz zum Anfang der negativen Philosophie) kann ihm aber *zugehen*. Die negative Philosophie hat zum Inhalt das a priori begreifliche Sein, *die positive das a priori unbegreifliche Sein, damit es a posteriori zum Begreiflichen werde*. Und ein solches Begreifliches wird es eben in Gott. *Das Unerkennbare des Blindseienden wird in Gott begreiflich,* wird *ein der Vernunft in Gott immanenter Inhalt*. (159-160)

Here Schelling prepares for his central notion of the unpreconceivable (*das Unvordenkliche*), which the preceding quotation renders "the a priori incomprehensible that [can become] comprehensible a posteriori." The conditions of blind-being (*das Blindseiende*) are explained as that which generally precedes thinking, but through an a posteriori detour (by observing the process phenomenon of creation), it can become comprehensible. This is an almost modern phenomenological move, relating the potential to the actual as sharing a ground of being, as blind and revealed.

More precisely, blind-being is *not defined as* incomprehensible, which would seem to undercut philosophical effort altogether from the viewpoint of negative philosophy. Instead, it refers to that which grounds any formation of concepts in the first place. As such, the *Blindseiende* is not a paradoxical or somehow self-denying concept but designates something that reveals itself through creation:

> *Gott entäussert sich nicht in die Welt*, sondern erhebt sich vielmehr in seine Gottheit; entäussert ist er unvordenklicher Weise; […] *Am Sein- und*

> *Nichtseinkönnen hat Gott den realen Grund, auf welchem er das in der negativen Vernunftwissenschaft als blosse Möglichkeit Enthaltene zur Wirklichkeit führt*. (177)

As already intimated through the conception of the blind-being, positive philosophy begins its inquiry at a layer of potential creation that is prior to concept-based thought. In the theologico-philosophical context of God's necessity, this precludes two assumptions for explaining the evolutionary process of the world. Positive philosophy thus rejects not only the premise of an intelligent creator God who decides to "discharge" Himself into the world; there is no origin moment, only being. This position also objects to immediately viewing the source(s) of creation in terms of divine potency. We cannot start by looking at God's capabilities, which He may or may not exercise:

> Der Potenz kann aber nicht Potenz, sondern nur Actus vorhergehen. Aber eben darum, um wirklich zu Gott zu gelangen, *müssen wir vom Sein ausgehen, das der Potenz vorhergeht*. (156)
>
> Das *wahre Prinzip* kann *nicht die Potenz* sein, *die dem Sein vorausgeht*. *Prinzip* ist nur, was gegen alle erst nachfolgende Möglichkeit gesichert ist; das unzweifelhaft Existierende, obenauf Bleibende. (160)

In the language of mental capacities, Schelling thus introduces the "unpreconceivable" as a technical term to support and specify his claim that the analysis of God's necessity cannot begin with a doctrine of potencies. Instead the "true principle" has to be ascertained prior to all subsequent mere possibilities or conceivabilities, as a more general ground of being:

> Man könnte sagen: Was aller Potenz, kommt auch allem Denken zuvor! Und allerdings, das Sein, das aller Potenz zuvorkommt, werden wir auch *das* **unvordenkliche** *Sein*, als *allem Denken vorausgehend*, nennen müssen. Was der Anfang alles Denkens ist, ist noch nicht das Denken; […] (161) [bold print, as rendered in this edition of the *Paulus-Nachschrift*]

On the plane of the unpreconceivable, there is no production of meaning yet, insofar as there is no spiritual motion or development. This is the level of Spinoza's dead substance, because it does not participate in known being. While it would be gratuitous to call Him dead, God hasn't creatively come to life yet, as it were. However, Schelling insists, even at this amorphous state, God is not uniform but*before* form. "Das unvordenkliche Sein ist das reell Erste. *Irgend einmal war nichts als eben dies rein Seiende;* […]" (162). In other words, unlimited "pure being" is unqualified *homogeneity*, which Schelling goes on to describe in terms of *Gelassenheit*.

The latter notion has a double meaning. It can refer to a state of *tranquility* and by a slight, Heidegger-style stretch of common use, it can designate a state of *being-left*, as in: being-left-alone, being-left-to-onself, being-left-unstirred, being-left-undifferentiated. As these alternative renderings indicate, the two meanings are not all that far from each other to begin with. Translated as tranquility, the expression retains some mental connotations; in the sense of being-left, it points to the more technical aspect of diversification writ large or, in this case, the lack thereof. Accordingly, *Gelassenheit* is a convenient expression to be included in a monist dictionary, in that its connotations hover between a mental quality and a more technical, probabilistic quality of being, concerning the transition from conditions of unqualified immobility to a diversified process of creative development.

If it were not for the empirical phenomenon of creation, namely the diversity and relative regularity of the world around us, this would be the end of the story. *Qua* unpreconceivable, there is no logical or conceptual necessity for God to ever get out of this state of undifferentiated tranquility. However, since we observe something different

from such divine tranquility, the question is how there could be any transition from the tranquil divine to the present state of the world's commotion:

> […] da aber *ausser ihm* Anderes existiert, so muss es ein Mittel geben, darüber hinwegzukommen. […]
>
> Nur die von Anfang *vorausgehende* Potenz haben wir verworfen. […] Aber nichts verhindert und es wird von der Natur des Reinseienden nicht widersprochen, dass demselben sich nach der Hand *eine Möglichkeit* darstelle, *ein Anderes zu sein, als es unvordenklich* ist. (162)

As we can glean from this passage, the unpreconceivable is not a concept. Thus Schelling is *not* offering us a *definition* of God. What his conception of the blind God points to, instead, is the aspect of *continuity* and *potential*, understood as a requisite condition or ground (not potency or active power!) for the process of creation. As a subject matter of positive philosophy, the blind God stands for material continuity, not conceptual unity or logical consistency.

In keeping with this interpretation, the "presented possibility of being something different" ([*dargestellte*] *Möglichkeit, ein Anderes zu sein*) refers to a *material anomaly*, or chance occurrence, within the divine continuum – a random disturbance of tranquil homogeneity. Importantly, the occurrence of such material anomaly is neither precluded nor guaranteed, neither impossible nor necessary, in light of God's homogenous condition. Again, there is no conceptual rigor at work here, which would tip scales either way – contrary to the methodology of negative philosophy as a purely immanent science of reason. It is only by dint of the phenomenon of creation that we must assume that such material disturbance actually did take place and stirred God out of his indifference. In this account, Schelling's elaborations on the irreducible aspect of contingency within the unpreconceivable assume a notion of absolute chance as an ontic force within an *on-going process of creation*, the world's continuous evolution:

> Das zufällige wird das ungleiche sein; ist dies entstanden, so wird an der Stelle, wo sonst nichts als das reine *A* war, das *B* sein, und der actus purus (A), der zuvor durch nichts gehemmt, oder in sich zurückgetrieben war, hat einen Gegensatz, wird aus der Stelle gerückt, in die Höhe gehoben, […]
>
> Und *auf diese Weise kommt in das unbewegliche Sein eine Beweglichkeit*, es bekommt eine Negation in sich, hört zwar nicht auf actus purus zu sein, ist aber nun […] nur potentiâ actus purus […] (164)

The last quotation indicates one of the general difficulties in sorting out Schelling's account of the relation and interplay of potencies. Once a change has occurred, the initial conditions are hard to recognize in retrospect. In the present case, the chance occurrence of an "inner negation" (*Negation in sich*) lifts the unpreconceivable onto the level of being a potency that stands in tension with a possible other. In the mode of tranquility, it was an "actus purus," Schelling's Latin term of choice for what we have identified through the notion of the continuum. By material chance, a region of possible resistance congeals within this tranquil *homogeneity*, which introduces an aspect of contrast and alternative – an aspect of *heterogeneity*.

Yet even such talk of "inner negation" is problematic because, in its unpreconceivable *Gelassenheit*, its left-alone-ness, the material continuum has no spatial dimensions. Hence it may appear misleading to speak of anything congealing or emerging "within" it. Schelling is aware of this difficulty and, by way of illustration, he resorts to the physiological image of inflammation. The tranquil mode of God as *actus purus* turns into the mode of *potentia actus purus*, "as if through a body part, which was first at rest but now has become inflamed, all the parts lying above it get lifted up."[31] Such metamorphosis can be construed within a monistic framework and does not entail or presuppose any substance dualism. Likewise, the *physio-logic* of the material continuum does not assume or presuppose absolute Newtonian or Cartesian space.

Instead, any inside-outside relation is an effect of the contingent "inflammation" of the material continuum. In a manner of speaking, the latter's homogeneity constitutes a rather volatile mode, despite the featuring of its "tranquility." Such homogeneity is always already laced with material chance happenings. On occasion, such happenings may harden into a relation of *contrast*, which can now be characterized in terms of interiority and exteriority.

However, to account for the emergence of such contrastive spatiality, we have to assume yet another factor:

> Gott *ist das das Andere (B) Seinkönnende. Aber er ist* das B-Seinkönnende *nur, sofern er das blinde Sein voraus hat. Und wiefern in jenem Seinkönnen seine Gottheit begründet ist, so ist ihm schon hier seine Gottheit* vermittelt *[…] (169)*
>
> Die Idee der Gottheit, die über dem actu Seienden ist, offenbart dem vom Sein gleichsam prävenierten *das Zufällige seines Existierens; es offenbart ihm zugleich das Mittel, sich von dem unvordenklichen Sein zu befreien*. Die Idee für sich hätte keine Gewalt; der actus muss vorhergehen. (168)

In this place, Schelling introduces a further aspect (besides continuity, and absolute chance) that is necessary in order to explain how there could have been any evolutionary advance from the homogeneous mode of God as the unpreconceivable to the creation of a diverse and fickle world. This aspect concerns *mediation* (*Vermittlung*). According to Schelling, we need to assume such an additional power as opertative within the process of creation to account for an exlcuded alternative in terms of *possible creation failure*.

In the originary mode of the unpreconceivable, God is mere homogeneity, an unbound material continuum, which Schellig calls *actus purus* or *A*. With respect such tranquil homogeneity, no movement of any kind can be conceived. As I developed in detail, this homogeneity may or may not get "inflamed" in certain areas. There is no conceptual schema or logical necessity that would predetermine or prevent such

occurrence. *If* such inflamation takes place, this means that there are random shifts or condensations, which can congeal into zones of regional resistance.

According to this *physio-logics* of "inner negation" (*Negation in sich*) an element of basic tension is introduced into the material homogeneity of the continuum, yielding a spatiality of contrast where areas of different intensity are partitioned off. The power of such inner negation, Schelling identifies as the *first potency*, called *B*, which disrupts God's *Gelassenheit*. It is this power which brings about any creative motion whatsoever.[32]

For the tranquil God, to answer to such "irritation" of his homogeneity, Schelling posits a *second potency*, called *potentia actus purus* or *A2*. However, in terms of possible creation failure, God's response could be overpowering. In a manner of speaking, He could "overreact" to the possibility of His negation, to which He has been alerted by the efficacy of *B*. God's will would show itself in its awesome and terrible strength and immediately obliterate any contrastive spatiality.[33]

So the excluded alternative to be accounted for, in view of a continuously (re)created world as we observe it, is the absence of a cataclysmic "no-world dialectic" where an unbound tranquil continuum would collapse into an equally unbound chaos as the unchecked assertion of God's wrath.[34] Hence, for creation to actually take place, Schelling asserts the presence of a *third potency*, called *A3*, a factor of *moderation* or *gradation*, which "slows" God's will down, as it were, so that it would unfold gradually – rather than catastrophically – into a constantly transforming, diverse manifold.[35]

The upshot of these considerations is that, for Schellingean Christology, the aspects of the *continuous*, the *contingent*, and the *gradual* are correlative factors, which

only in combination can account for the phenomenon of the world and its transforming diversity.[36]

This is the core of Schelling's overall [Christological] argument. Chance is *absolute*, but absolute here means an *irreducible* aspect of a metaphysical triplet: continuity-chance-graduality. Any general assertions to the effect that "in the beginning there was only chance or sheer chaos" are dismissed as begging the question of possible creation. Absolute chance is *not* metaphysically singular or *independent* but marks one force in a triadic force field, a tense constellation of three ontic powers.

Put differently, for Schelling the only meaning of chance is random deviation, or more precisely: *randomness is deviation*. However, deviation can only "show itself" against the background of continuity, i.e., vis-à-vis a material continuum – a ground of ontic normativity, if you will. If there was no such background, chance could not "occur." Accordinly, if one understands absolut chance to be the only ontic force from which everything else derives, it becomes a contradiction in terms. In this manner, we are led to the backbone of Schelling's case for a pluralist monotheism, the plural God of Christianity, which is condensed in the following passage:

> [E]ine Möglichkeit kann nicht ausgeschlossen werden, sondern nur eine Wirklichkeit. Das unvordenkliche Sein, das wir darum als potentia potentiae bezeichnet haben, gibt ihr selbst erst die Möglichkeit, sich zu zeigen. Vor diesem Sein konnte sie sich nicht zeigen, und so hat sie im unvordenklichen Sein gleichsam eine Stätte gefunden, die sie vorher nicht hatte. Nicht an das Existierende selbst, sondern an das in diesem eingeschlossene Notwendige kann sie sich wenden […] (178)

If we wanted to pun on Heidegger's famous phrase, in the *Letter on Humanism*, we could aptly sum up Schelling's point by saying that *continuity is the house of chance or probability*.[37]

Having thus reviewed Schelling's analysis of the creative workings of the metaphysical triplet continuity-chance-graduality, it is important to pay close attention to his mode of presentation, if we also want to understand why and how he restates his account of divine potencies in terms of divine personalities. As the last step in our programmatic sketch of Schelling's critical Christology, this will clarify how the puzzle of creation can be seen as the flip side of the puzzle of incarnation. Following Schelling, the present conception of *creation* outlined thus far is meaningful only if we refine understanding of it in terms of *Zeugung*. Moreover, for the purposes of this study, it is only in terms of *Zeugung* that the resources of Schelling's Christology for a theory of material semiotics focused on cultural politics can be brought to the fore.

According to this approach, what is perplexing about the *Philosophy of Revelation* is that, in large part, it is occupied with the paradoxical task of carrying out the "successful failure" of a giant thought experiment. Underway to the puzzle of the unity of the Trinity, Schelling thinks that we cannot understand the possibility of creation unless we hypothetically isolate the different ontic forces that are at work within it. This strategy is viable with respect to the first and the second potency. However, once the third potency is "added," we realize that such separation of forces is not real but only a heuristic means to get a more distinct perspective on the various, irreducible aspects that are inextricably combined within the single process of creation.

In fact, if this thought experiment of fragmentary vision were successful all the way, it would thereby fail. That is to say, it would fail to account for the structural unity that organizes the open-ended process of an evolving world as well as the creative act that manifests itself in the course of it. In short, a thought experiment of hypothetical

isolation may be useful to help us understand a unified phenomenon. Yet, the overall success of any such trial depends on its purposively built-in failure, at its last step. Differently put, if the three potencies were indeed fully isolatable, it is hard to see how they could help explain the overarching unity that informs the creative productivity of the Godhead and its Trinitarian structure. In the face of complete isolation, the unity of the Trinity would either disintegrate into separate ontic forces, or the potency account and the personality account on Schelling's part would leave the reader with two basically disconnected alternatives.

By contrast, if the third potency marks the very interface between the thought experiment of the three potencies and the subsequent account of God's plural personalities, it is not only acceptable but indeed necessary that the two threefold conceptions do not match fully or symmetrically. In other words, it speaks in favor of Schelling's account that the different potencies identified with respect to the puzzle of creation and the different personalities identified with regard to the puzzle of incarnation cannot be directly mapped onto one another.

Bearing this in mind, the "cooperation" of the three potencies does *not* constitute a successive or cumulative order. At the very moment when the third potency is factored into our analysis of possible creation, it becomes clear that what has been described as three ontic forces are only so many inseparable aspects of a singular, yet irreducibly complex process. To underscore this point, in the later part of his lecture course, Schelling ties his strategy of hypothetically separating three potencies within God's creative activity back into an analysis of the theree personalities that are inseparably unified in theTrinitarian structure of the Godhead. This precludes a symmetric mapping

that would equate the first potency *B* with the "Father," the second potency *A2* with the "Son," and the third potency *A3* with the holy "Spirit":

> Die Potenz des Anfangs B ist nicht der Vater, sondern *nur die zeugende Kraft des Vaters*, nur die Potenz des Vaters; *der Vater selbst bleibt ausserhalb des Prozesses*. Wirklicher Vater ist er nur im verwirklichten Sohne, […] Der Vater und der Sohn kommen also miteinander zur Verwirklichung. […] Der Vater ist erst Vater, wenn er das Sein wieder als Zurückgebrachtes in sich hat. Hier also, wo das Sein ein zur Möglichkeit Zurückgebrachtes ist, ist es das gemeinschaftliche Sein des Vaters und des Sohnes, und *das gilt auch vom Geist*. […] Es sind nicht drei Götter, weil *das Sein* und also *auch die Herrlichkeit des Seins eine für alle gemeinschaftliche* ist. Wo demnach die Entgegensetzung der Potenzen aufhört, da sind *nicht mehr Potenzen, sondern Persönlichkeiten*; […] (195-196)

Given the thematic focus of this study, the most important concequence of Schelling's analysis of the Trinitarian constellation of personalities pertains to the open-ended process of religious meaning formation that is entailed by it, as well as its non-dogmatic implications which promote the critical potential of faith in the context of cultural politics. The key to the political dimension of cultural reform within Schelling's theologico-philosophical program lies in his understanding of the three personalities as so many principles of meaning production. The dynamic interrelation of these principles liberates religious discourse from any alleged limits imposed with reference to orthodox "legitimacy" or canonical "authority."

In this context, the acknowledged indebtedness of Cassirer's *philosophy of symbolic forms* to Schelling is most apparent, and it is here where the neo-Kantian bypass of both thinkers comes full circle, through its neglect of the methodological link between critical Christology, material semiotics, and a politically charged, religious phenomenology.

At a critical juncture in his argument, where Schelling comments on the "final purpose" of creation (in section XIV. *Das Endziel der Schöpfung*), he distances his view once again from the suggestion that the creation of the world was something that could be logically derived from God's nature, or something that God somehow "needed" to reach a more transparent "self-consciousness" of Himself (183). In contrast to any such derivation scheme or false teleology of divine consciousness, Schelling characterizes the "purpose" of creation as an open-ended process of meaning formation. Such process keeps sponsoring and transforming the "real significance" (see right below) of the dynamic manifestations of faith mediated through symbol use – a semiotics of cultural production and non-dogmatic religiosity. In reference to the creative interplay of the three potencies, Schelling states:

> Das entgegengesetzte Sein wird in verschiedenen Stufen überwunden und so kann die zweite Potenz sich in verschiedenem Masse verwirklichen. Dies wird auch von der dritten gelten; denn sie ist durch die Überwindung der ersten. Durch dies Verhältniss ist eine unendliche Mannigfaltigkeit möglicher Stellungen der Potenzen gegeneinander gegeben, und bei dem, welcher der Herr diese Potenzen ist, steht es, diese Stellungen alle zu versuchen, und die Mannigfaltigkeit der möglichen Welt vor sich im Bilde vorüber gehen zu lassen. Hier erhalten die Ideen, die Urbilder, <u>reelle Bedeutung</u>. (184)[38]

At an equally important point toward the end of his lecture course (XXXIV. *Über das Werk Christi*), Schelling restates this pluralist tenet of his critical Christoloy, in a way that translates the idiom of potencies into that of personalities, focused on the persona of the Christ with which we began this chapter:

> *Aber nicht bloss die drei Potenzen* sind gemeint. *Jede Provinz eines Reiches der Natur hat einen eigenen Herrscher, und das menschliche Bewusstsein ist dadurch in die Spannung einer Unzahl solcher Herrscher gesetzt, die an irgendeinem Punkte des menschlichen Bewusstseins sind*. In einem fortschreitenden Prozess wechselt von Moment zu Moment die Bedeutung der in demselben enthaltenen Mächte und Potenzen. Darum kann eine Unzahl solcher Mächte auftreten, die an irgend einem Punkte des Bewusstseins sich geltend machen können. Christus hat

> den Menschen davon frei gemacht, d.h. *das Unüberwindliche ihrer Macht ihnen genommen, nicht ihr Dasein aufgehoben*. (313)

This passage is significant because it indicates that the persona of the Christ, in its general Christological sense, stands for one of the three creative forces within the dynamic constellation of the Trinity. At the same time, from the perspective of material semiotics and its concern with particular manifestations of religious meaning through group-specific symbol use, the "work" (*Werk*) of the Christ relates to the Christ-aspect, as it were, of any symbol that fuels and is fueled by religious discourse.

As a corollary of critical Christology that is both non-dogmatic and universal, this implies that the symbolics of the persona of the Christ inform the open-ended production of religious meanings in any group, even if no reference to the historical Jesus or even the New Testament in general is made. Christ is understood as a universal semiotic principle, whose historical tranformations and meaning-producing powers are not bound to the authority of a fixed, textual canon.[39] Accordingly, there is no predetermined restriction on the kind of symbolic practices through which faith can effect social change and cultural transformation. Bearing these characteristics of Christological semiotics in mind, we can now revisit Heidegger's intellectual production around the year 1929, in order to undermine the neo-Kantian bypass, which is commonly followed in philosophy, at the expense of Schelling and Cassirer.

Heidegger's Kant Critique after Schelling: *Zeugung* and *Einbildungskraft*

As was shown by the preceding exposition of Schelling's Christological methodology, in general, and his distinction between negative and positive philosophy, in particular, his project can be described as a "post-Kantian" approach to religious

discursivity underway to a materialist semiotics of culture, very comparable to Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Schelling thus endorses Kant's criticism of dogmatic metaphysics. He thus credits Kant with paving the way for a new philosophical methodology but points out that his improvement has not been carried out to the fullest, insofar as the alternatives of negative and positive philosophy are merely juxtaposed, leaving us with two loose ends.[40]

In his 1929 book, Heidegger is of course more detailed than Schelling on this issue, regarding the target of his Kant critique – and, as I have argued, his Schelling-appropriation. Yet, when it comes to formulating his own alternative, he is much less precise than Schelling in the *Philosophy of Revelation*. To bring out the parallels between Schelling and Heidegger, as well as Schelling's greater theoretical acumen, my discussion will be limited to demonstrating the connection between Schelling's Christological conception of *Zeugung* and its material-semiotic ramifications, on one hand, and Heidegger's conception of the "self-affection" of "original time," on the other hand. At the same time, it should become clear that this theme complex lies at the heart of Heidegger's "post-Kantian" project, which identifies him as a direct successor of the Schellingean tradition of German idealism, contrary to his own remarks, through which he repeatedly seeks to distance himself from "German idealism" in general.[41]

As is well known, in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphyscis*, Heidegger argues that the A-edition of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* provides more promising an approach to the problem of "pure synthesis" (*reine Synthesis*) than the modified B-edition. Heidegger specifies this problem in § 13. *Die Frage nach der Wesenheit der reinen Erkenntnis* and in § 14. *Die ontologische Synthesis*, which conjointly form an early climax of the book, in

terms of the most central theoretical issues addressed by it. Heidegger gives Kant credit for drawing attention to the activity of pure synthesis effected by the "transcendental imagination" (see esp. pp. 63 ff.; and p. 197) visà- vis the other two basic capacities of pure intuition (*reine Anschauung*) and pure thinking (*reines Denken*).

However, having laid his finger on this mysterious synthetic "root" power, which "grounds" the two other "sources" of cognition (*Erkenntnis*), intellect and sensibility,[42] Kant shies away from acknowledging the imagination's independent status as a "structural center" (*strukturale Mitte*) (64) and eventually collapses it into the intellect. This tendency toward "reinterpreting" (*Umdeutung*) the power of pure imagination into a function of pure thinking is especially prominent in the second edition of Kant's *First Critique*, which is why Heidegger finds the first edition fundamentally preferable.[43]

Against the backdrop of these considerations, Heidegger presents his account of "original time," which, I argue, represents the most signficant import of Schelling's later thought. This import relates to the Christological-semiotic *Denkfigur* of *Zeugung*, familiar from the *Philosophy of Revelation* and its conception of divine personalities, which Heidegger clearly engages, while he immediately blurs the Trinitarian tension that Schelling went to great length to analyze in detail. Heidegger's coopting of materialist-semiotic Christology in the tradition of Schelling becomes most tangible through the combined reading of §§ 22, 34, 35.[44]

In § 22. *Der transzendentale Schematismus*, which may well be seen as the theoretical hub of the entire book, Heidegger explicates the "full structure of ontological cognition" in terms of the relation between making-sensible (*Versinnlichung*) and transcendence (*Transzendenz*). According to Kant, finite cognition (on the part of human

beings or other creatures of similar cognitive constitution) requires that the two sources of intellect and sensibility work together. More specifically, the categories of the pure intellect (*die reinen Verstandesbegriffe*) have to be made-sensible (*versinnlicht*). In Heidegger's words:

> [Z]ur Transzendenz gehört notwendig Versinnlichung, und zwar reine. Behauptet wurde, diese Versinnlichung geschehe als ein Schematismus. […] Die Schema-bildende Versinnlichung hat zur Absicht, dem Begriff ein Bild zu verschaffen. Das in ihm Gemeinte hat so einen geregelten Bezug zu einer Erblickbarkeit. […] Das Schema bringt sich, d.h., den Begriff, in ein Bild. (102)

With respect to the transcendental dimension of making-sensible, it all turns on the meaning of "picture" in this context. Heidegger agrees with Kant that, regarding the schematization of the pure categories of the intellect, picture or picturing cannot be taken in the sense of empirical intuition or even mathematical construction.[45] In continuation of Kant's transcendental aesthetics, Heidegger asserts that the notion of picture implied by the present conception of transcendental schematism has to be understood as "pure picture" (*reines Bild*) which, in turn, is posited as *time*.[46]

However, Heidegger rejects Kant's "terse" (*lapidar*) (105) way of accounting for the transcendental unity of the pure categories of the intellect in terms of a fixed table of judgement (Kant's famous *Urteilstafel*, containing three categories under each of four rubrics). Instead, Heidegger argues, the unity of transcendental schematization implies a conception of time as "pure self-affection" (*reine Selbstaffektion*), which Heidegger describes in quasi-theological diction (where "Offenbarmachen" sounds close to "Offenbarung"):

> Die ursprüngliche Zeit lässt die reine Bildung der Transzendenz geschehen. (197) Aber nicht als dieses Gebilde [das reine Nacheinander der Jetztfolge] ist die Zeit ursprünglicher Grund der Transzendenz, sondern als reine Selbstaffektion. Als

> solche ist sie auch die Bedingung der Möglichkeit des vorstellenden Bildens, d.h. Offenbarmachens, des reinen Raumes. (200)

The crux in Kant's tendency to collapse the power of the transcendental imagination (which Heidegger tends to identify with original time)[47] lies in the fact that he conceives of the "pure picture" of the transcendental schematization as "pure succession of a now-series." According to Heidegger's objection, this fails to explain the production of pure space. The latter notion, in my reading, refers to the very same conception of *contrastive spatiality* that we gleaned from Schelling's account of how a relation of basic interiority and exeriority may emerge from the tranquil continuum of the unpreconceivable. In fact, Heidegger's prior characterization, in § 22, seems to suggest as much, when he elaborates on the effects of transcendental schematization as forming "that which stands against in the pure letting-stand-against":

> Er [der transzendentale Schematismus] bildet das im reinen Gegenstehenlassen Gegenstehende dergestalt, dass sich das im reinen Denken Vorgestellte notwendig im reinen Bilde der Zeit anschaulich gibt. *Die Zeit also ist es, die als a priori gebende von vornherein dem Horizont der Transzendenz den Charakter des vernehmbaren Angebotes verleiht*. Aber nicht nur das. Als das einzige reine universale Bild gibt sie dem Horizont der Transzendenz eine vorgängige Umschlossenheit. *Dieser eine und reine ontologische Horizont ist die Bedingung der Möglichkeit dafür, dass das innerhalb seiner gegebene Seiende je diesen oder jenen besonderen offenen, und zwar ontischen Horizont haben kann*. Die Zeit gibt der Transzendenz aber nicht nur den vorgängig einigen Zusammenhalt, sondern als das rein sich Gebende schlechthin bietet sie überhaupt so etwas wie Einhalt. (108) [my emphases]

While one should be sparing with such pronouncements, I venture to say that this passage contains two of the single most important sentences in Heidegger's opus (see italics). The second one, in particular, presents an ingeniously flawed claim, by introducing the pseudo-conception of "a single and pure ontological horizon." Upon scrutiny, this expression is completely vacuous, the mere adding of a terminological construction,

which does not serve any purpose in Heidegger's present argument except to impose a condition of completeness about the one-to-one correlation of potential and revelation. Yet, this fantastic notion, this move towards a pure ontology rather than a more open phenomenology of revelation, will guide his logic throughout the rest of his career. Furthermore, this passage offers strong evidence for Heidegger's cloaked incorporation of Schelling's Christological thought because of his careful use of the terminological bundle and setting of the problem that Schelling already offered.

In light of Schelling's analysis of the metaphysical triplet of continuity-contingency-graduality, in particular, three things become clear that I note here before I discuss each in more detail. First, in the above passage, Heidegger assigns (and absolutizes) several powers to original time that Schelling's analysis in the *Philosophy of Revelation* had specified more clearly as the correlative forces within the open-ended process of creation. Second, the first italicized key sentence shows Heidegger to be vulnerable to the kind of dogmatic metaphysics that Schelling wanted to obviate by means of a new methodology under the title of positive philosophy. Third, according to the second italicized key sentence, Heidegger assigns "one job too many" to original time.

As for the first claim, we can ascertain the following correspondences between these two reactions to Kant. In Heidegger's above summary of the workings of original time, "the transcendent" (*das Transzendente*) plays a role very similar to Schelling's tranquil continuum, as previously described – it is a staging of potential in itself, blind, not-yet-revealed but with the potential to be. Next, Heidegger's speaking of "the perceivable offer" (*das vernehmbare Angebot*) appears to be an exact replication of

Schelling's characterization of "the idea of the Godhead" in terms of God's "wisdom," which was always with God but not created by Him.[48] The notion of "circumclosure" (*Umschlossenheit*) is harder to place, but if interpreted as "enclosure" it would bear connotations of fundamental partitioning. Thus understood, it would point to the effect of initial negation (or limitation), which Schelling attributes to the first potency (*das dem Ursein entgegengesetzte andere Sein*, B).[49]

Or, perhaps more likely, Heidegger might be using "circumclosure" and "cohesion" (*Zusammenhalt*) interchangeably to make the same point, in which case both expressions would seem to point to Schelling's description of the continuum quality of the transcendent. In that case, however, *Umschlossenheit* and *Zusammenhalt* are equally problematic, insofar as original time cannot plausibly be said to "give" continuity to the transcendent. From Schelling's perspective, such a gesture is gratuitous and thus meaningless, because the transcendent – by definition – *is* the ultimate continuum, namely, God in His mode of unpreconceivability, rather than something already constructed and hence already limited. (This already points to my third claim, addressed in more detail below. Heidegger introduces circumclosure and cohesion in the immediate context of "the single and pure ontological horizon." If, as I argue, the latter notion is vacuous, then any characterization of it in terms of its circumclosed or cohesive qualities would have to be vacuous, too.)

The notion of "moderation" (*Einhalt*), finally, is reminiscent of Schelling's rendering of the third potency as the scalar power, which *mediates* God's will into a variegated, open-ended process of creation as opposed to being exacted negatively, as cataclysmic wrath.

As for my second claim, Heidegger's account of original time as "a priori giving" (see first italicization above) appears to be in direct violation of Schelling's embrace of positive philosophy and his insistence that the transcendent qua unpreconceivable can become comprehensible only a posteriori. Hence, it is either misleading or false to speak of original time as "a priori giving," for it is only *after* we perceive any beings (within our "particular, open, ontic horizon" to use Heidegger's own phrase) that we must *assume* that such "giving" has taken place. Admittedly, there is a lurking ambiguity here between the *necessary a priori* and the *contingent a priori*, which unfortunately cannot be fully disposed of in view of Heidegger's diction.[50]

According to my third and most important claim, the second italicized sentence contains a faulty claim about the "single and pure ontological horizon" as the condition of the possibility for ontic horizons to form through specific patterns of structural organization, by dint of which meaningful items become identifiable within these horizons. If we strip away the convoluted syntax, Heidegger's claim amounts to a peculiar encapsulation of what Schelling had described as ontic *horizons* within a *single* ontological horizon. However, not only does the positing of such an overarching ontological horizon does not do any explanatory work as far as the successful activity of transcendental schematization is concerned. It actually falsifies the workings of original time by assigning "one job too many" to it – by prescribing limits to potential (albeit totalizing ones).

Relying on Schelling for clarification once more, we find that Heidegger's speaking of the "horizon of transcendence" (*Horizont der Transzendenz*) in the preceding sentence is already a misnomer. In the tranquil state of unbound homogeneity, the

transcendent has no horizonal qualities yet, since the notion of horizon presupposes some kind of contrast (contrastive spatiality) or limitation. Yet, once any such limitation has occurred, what results is a multitude of open ontic horizons, which do not depend on a single and pure ontological horizon as their precondition.

Put in Schelling's idiom of creation, the creation of multiple (perhaps infinitely many) life-worlds as the potential revelations of the ontic does not presuppose the *creation* of worldhood as such. Hypostatizing the latter notion into a necessary entity amounts precisely to the kind of dogmatic metaphysics that Schelling militated against. From a critical Christological point of view, the conditions of possibility for creating (life-) worlds can be explained without any spurious reference to the necessary existence of a single meta-world. More precisely, the metaphysical triplet of continuity-contingency-graduality effectively undercuts the suggestion of a single ontological horizon as the enabling condition for multifarious ontic horizons.

Evading the First Detour: Some Conclusions

Taking stock of the above findings, Heidegger's 1929 Kant critique provides substantial cues with respect to his indebtedness to a tradition of critical Christology, in general, and the later Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation*, in particular. Written only two years after the publication of *Being and Time*, the Kant critique also casts a different light on his main work than is suggested by the neo-Kantian bypass in present-day Heidegger scholarship. The Schelling connection reveals one of the active reactions to Kant's work, an approach to ontology that circumvents too-simple dogmatism and offers the entrance into what might profitably be called a critical ontology project. Heidegger's

Kant critique sets out on a very parallel path, echoing even some of Schelling's terminology, but then moves to foreclose the collapsing of immanent revelation and potential transcendence that is the strongest part of Schelling's account.

Specifically in the realm of the history of philosophy, this connection also probes Heidegger's actual intellectual production during a time of purported crisis and reorientation, which gainsays his alleged distance from "German idealism." More critically for the further stages in my project, it anticipates what I believe is one of Heidegger's more serious later moves in empistemology, his assumption of a falsely staged opposition to the most prominent interlocutor among his philosophical contemporaries, Ernst Cassirer, to whom I will turn in the next chapter.

---

[1] Christian Danz (2000), pp. 265-286.

[2] Cf.: Ibid., p. 273.

[3] Here Danz is quoting from Schelling's collected works in fourteen volumes: Gesamtausgabe in 14 (XIV) Bänden, Stuttgart und Augsburg 1856-1861, in the edition prepared by his son K.F.A. Schelling. In Danz's reference, Roman numerals indicate the respective volume, while arabic numerals indicate the page number.

[4] See: Christian Danz, "Die Philosopie der Offenbarung," *F.W.J. Schelling*, ed. H.J. Sandkühler (Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 1998), pp. 169-189. "Das Thema der Christologie ist weder ein übernatürliches Wunder, welches allen Bezug zum Natürlichen von sich abgestreift hat und sich wie ein Fremdkörper in der Welt des Natürlichen ausnimmt, noch die Gestalt eines Lehrers, der unter der Hülle von fremdartig anmutenden Vorstellungen eine vernünftige Moral stiftet. […] Führt nämlich einerseits die supranaturalistische Fassung der Christologie zu der für diese ruinösen Konsequenz, tendenziell *doketistisch* zu werden, d.h. eine Aufhebung des Menschseins Jesu Christi zu betreiben, so hebt andererseits die rationalistische Aufklärungstheologie das Gottsein des Christus auf. Beide Positionen kommen jedoch darin überein, dass sie in ihrem jeweiligen Aufbau der Christologie von Gegebenheiten ausgehen" (182).

[5] In particular, Schelling specifies the status of the New Testament as a "document" (*Urkunde*) of Christianity as follows: "Wenn wir in unseren Entwicklungen Gebrauch vom N.T. machten, so galten diese nur als *Urkunden, in denen Eingebungen des Christentums zu erkennen sind*. Die besondere Frage nach dem Urheber dieser oder jener Schrift ist sekundär, und hat nur für das Dogmatische Interesse, Wichtigkeit. Denn *die Dogmatik hat nur darum die Wahrheit, weil sie in apostolischen Schriften niedergelegt ist*. Aber wir halten jene Lehre für *wahr, d.h. heisst notwendig in dem grossen Zusammenhang, aus dem das Christentum zu begreifen ist;* und darum halten wir jene Schriften für echte, *vom Geiste des Christentums eingegeben*. Nicht äussere Zeugnisse, sondern der Inhalt macht sie echt, und die ihre Echtheit bezweifeln

(z.B. den Philipperbrief), sollten doch erst sich um das wahre Verständniss bemühen (z.B. jenes aussergöttlichen Zustandes)" (320). Concerning the last remark, cf. also: "Das N.T. ist nicht zu verstehen, wofern man nicht dem Sohne eine aussergöttliche Existenz zuschreibt. So erhält die Versuchungsgeschichte erst dadurch Licht. Wäre dies Faktum erfunden, so wäre es wenigstens konsequent im Sinne der christlichen Ansicht" (263). Here and in the following, page numbers in Schelling's text, if not further specified, refer to the 1977 edition of the *Paulus-Nachschrift* of the *Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42*.

[6] For one of Tillich's most pertinent remarks concerning this religious "motif," see: "Die christiliche Theologie betrachtet als *sinngebende Mitte der Geschichte ein personenhaftes Leben, das völlig durch die Beziehung auf das Transzendente bestimmt ist* [Tillich, note 20]. Damit ist zunächst gesagt, dass der Ort des Heils der *Religion* angehört, d.h. demjenigen menschlichen Verhalten, das als Antwort gemeint ist auf ein Einbrechen der Transzendenz. Die Mitte der Geschichte als Garantie sinnhafter Gerichtetheit der Zeit kann sich nur konstituieren durch einen Akt aus der Transzendenz, durch ein reines Ergriffensein, wie wir es bezeichnet hatten. Denn nur auf diese Weise kann die Zweideutigkeit der Zeitlinie überwunden werden, nur im Erscheinen eines sich als unbedingt erweisenden, transzendenten Sinnes ist die Drohung der Sinnlosigkeit aufgehoben. Das Ergriffensein von der Mitte der Geschichte ist ein unbedingtes, transzendentes Ergriffensein. *Das Schicksal, in dem dieses Ergriffensein sich vollzieht, ist transzendentes Schicksal oder "Prädestination." Die Entscheidung, in der das Ergreifende ergriffen wird, ist transzendente Entscheidung oder "Glaube."* Nur für den Glauben ist Christus als Mitte der Geschichte gesetzt und nur durch Christus als Mitte der Geschichte ist Glaube an ihn möglich" (201-202). Quoted from: Paul Tillich, "Christologie und Geschichtsdeutung" (1930), *Main Works / Hauptwerke*, ed. Carl Heinz Ratschow, volume 6 / Band 6: *Theological Writings / Theologische Schriften*, ed. Gert Hummel (Berlin / New York: De Gruyter – Evangelisches Verlagswerk Gmbh, 1992), pp. 189-212.

[7] Here and in the following I keep the sexist pronoun, in reference to God. This is meant to avoid terminological confusion especially when treating of Schelling's discussion of the Trinity in terms of three potencies and three personalities. In this manner, I will keep referring to "the Father," "the Son," and "His creation," etc. At the same time, it should become clear that Schelling's own objection to interpreting the symbolics of the Trinity in terms of somehow superhuman, but still personal agency also obviates the discriminatory suggestion that masculinity is inherent part of the symbolic meaning of the Man-God.

[8] Especially in the context of the "existential-ontological structure of death" (§§ 50-53).

[9] In his initial comments on Heidegger's "breakthrough to the topic" on the way to *Being and Time*, Kisiel holds: "The quest for a breakthrough to pretheoretical life is carried over into 1919. But its "true reality and real truth" has in the interim changed with Heidegger's radicalization of phenomenology, as we shall see, by purging it rather thoroughly of its earlier elements of scholastic metaphysics and neo-Kantian philosophy of culture. The first task of the 1919 courses is to set phenomenology off as sharply as possible from neo-Kantianism, especially the branch with which the young Heidegger had closely allied himself called "transcendental value-philosophy" (so in the title of one course in SS 1919), the "Southwest German School" of Wilhelm Windelband, Heinrich Rickert, and Emil Lask" (18).

[10] "KNS" is the abbreviation for *Kriegsnotsemester* (literally: war-emergency-semester).

[11] Ernst Bloch, *Das Materialismusproblem: Seine Geschichte und Substanz* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1972) [written 1936-37; revised and expanded 1969-71]. For Bloch's own indebtedness to Schelling, see: Axel Wüstehube, *Das Denken aus dem Grund: Die Bedeutung der Spätphilosophie Schellings für die Ontologie Ernst Blochs* (Würzburg: Könighausen & Neumann, 1989).

[12] As Bloch writes with respect to the works of Friedrich Albert Lange and Ernst Mach: "Die Welt, sagt *Mach*, ist eine Masse von Empfindungen, die im und als Ich nur stärker zusammenhängen, im und als Dingkörper sich nur in einem gewissen Gleichgewicht befinden. Es gibt nichts als "Empfindungen" oder besser, neutraler: "Elemente"; […] Machs Phänomenalismus, Hume überbietend, hebt Materie und Individuum, Object und Subject gleich grosszügig auf" (297). "Hat Engels Dühring heimgeleuchtet, so hat

Lenin auf die Berkeley-Gefahr des Machismus, selbst für Austromarxisten hingewiesen; […]" (298). "Es gibt auch feinere Art, von dem Stoff bürgerlich Abschied zu nehmen. So neukantianisch, deutlich in F.A. *Langes* "Geschichte des Materialismus" (1866), die ihn als naturwissenschaftlich allein gültig anerkennt. […] Einzigartig auch verband sich hier die Trennung von mechanischem Alltag und Plüsch der guten Stube mit dem Kantischen Dualismus von realer Notwendigkeit und intelligibler Freiheit. Beginnende Furcht der Bourgeoisie vor dem Materialismus des Proletariats lieferte – noch nicht bei Lange, wohl aber bei den späteren Neukantianern – den deutlichen Anlass. Der Dualismus zwischen idealem Wert und materieller Wirklichkeit wurde bei ihnen bequem, die eine Seite hat zwar alle schönen Ideale, doch keine reale Wahrheit, die andere alle reale Wahrheit, doch nicht den schönen Zug des Ideals" (299).

[13] See, e.g., the early critique of *Being and Time* in: Alfed Delp, *Tragische Existenz: Zur Philosophie Martin Heideggers* (Freiburg: Herder, 1935). For Bergson's influence on Heidegger's thought, see esp.: Part I., *Geschichtliche Zusammenhänge* (Historical Contexts), pp. 23-27. Written by a member of the Jesuit Order, Delp's commentary constitutes an important, but completely neglected, addition to the more familiar critique by Karl Löwith, insofar as it examines Heidegger's *Existenzphilosophy* from a theologically sensitive perspective.

[14] For debatable reasons, Husserl had charged Mach's position with "psychologism," as T. Blackburn relates in: *Ernst Mach: His Life, Thought, and Influence*, pp. 174-176. For one of the most thoroughgoing accounts that locate Husserl's and Mach's respective projects within the complex debates over psychophysics and its philosophical repercussions, see: Katherine Arens, *Structures of Knowing: Psychologies of the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Reidel, 1989).

[15] See: John M. Krois, *Cassirer: Symbolic Forms and History* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1987), pp.114-115, 121; and: Michael Friedman, *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger* (Chicago: Open Court, 2000), pp. 26, 99-110. Both Krois and Friedman have begun to counteract the neo-Kantian bypass. They are more critical toward the variations within and around the different neo-Kantian schools of thought than Kisiel is in his placement of Heidegger's beginnings. At the same time, I suggest that Krois and Friedman's findings can be effectively supplemented and expanded by an account that detects Schelling as the methodological pioneer of a new form of transcendental philosophy. According to this approach, we can identify a trajectory of philosophical methodology that traces the phenomenological discussion of "life worlds" back to the Christological discussion over the two related puzzles of creation and incarnation, within a framwork of material semiotics.

[16] Banned from the main body of the text, Cassirer is mentioned only twice in the *Notes*, mostly for mere textual reference. In tracing the first occurrence of the term *Existenzphilosophie* (existence-philosophy), Kisiel (p. 551) points to the letter from Jaspers to Heidegger on July 8, 1928, in which Jaspers comments on Heidegger's 1928 review of Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, vol. 2, *Mythical Thought*. The other mentioning (p.561) consists in a general remark on the documentation of the Davose disputations between Cassirer and Heidegger rather than the actual content or philosophical stakes of this encounter. – The same attitude toward the role of Cassirer is indicated by the fact that he is not given any attention whatsoever by the contributors to the Heidegger volume in the widely influential *Cambridge Companion* series: *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles Guignon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[17] For the Schelling-Cassirer connection, cf.: Markus Weidler, "Toward a New Materialist Semiotics: Undoing the *Dialectic*'s Philosophical Hypocrisy." *Monatshefte*, 96, No. 3 (Fall 2004): 388-408.

[18] For the different dates, see: Introduction, note 1, above.

[19] For Heidegger's self-commentary in this regard, see the Afterword to: Martin Heidegger, "Vom Wesen der Wahrheit," *Wegmarken* (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klosterman, 1967), pp. 201-202. This passage is interesting for several reasons. To begin with, the text of the essay was originally delivered as a public lecture in 1930 and first published in 1943. In the second edition of 1949, the first paragraph of the Afterword was added. In this additional paragraph Heidegger explicitly speaks of a "turn" (*Kehre*): "Die

Antwort auf die Frage nach dem Wesen der Wahrheit ist die Sage der Kehre innerhalb der Geschichte des Seyns" (201). Next, the Afterword cross-references the *Letter on Humanism*, which will be examined in detail in chapter six. Finally, Heidegger's remark intimates a "turn" of his own. Yet his locution remains ambiguous with respect to the exact nature of this change, as far as the continuation or discontinuatin of the project in *Being and Time* is concerned: "Der Vortrag "Vom Wesen der Wahrheit" sollte bereits im ursprünglichen Entwurf durch einen zweiten "Von der Wahrheit des Wesens" ergänzt werden. Dieser misslang aus Gründen, die jetzt im Brief "Über den Humanismus" angedeutet sind. Die entscheidende Frage (*Sein und Zeit*, 1927) nach dem Sinn, d.h. (S.u. Z. S. 151) nach dem Entwurfbereich, d.h. nach der Offenheit, d.h. nach der Wahrheit des Seins und nicht nur des Seienden, bleibt absichtlich unentfaltet. Das Denken hält sich dem Anschein nach in der Bahn der Metaphysik und vollzieht dennoch […] einen Wandel des Fragens, der in die Überwindung der Metaphysik gehört. […] Jede Art von Anthropologie und alle Subjektivität des Menschen als Subjekt ist nicht nur, wie schon in "Sein und Zeit," verlassen und die Wahrheit des Seins als Grund einer gewandelten geschichtlichen Grundstellung aufgesucht, sondern der Gang des Vortrages schickt sich an, aus diesem anderen Grund (dem Da-sein) her zu denken" (201-202).

[20] Otto Pöggeler, *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking*, trans. D. Magurshak and S. Barber (Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1987 [orig. 1963]). As Pöggeler puts it in the Afterword to this second edition:

> […], I have presented Heidegger's ways since the crisis of 1929 in such a way that it yields something like a systematic result. The transformation of the question about the sense of Being into the question about truth and freedom leads him to go back into the ground of metaphysics; thus metaphysics, above all from Plato and Nietzsche, can be submitted for a decision. The core of the overcoming of metaphysics, the harmony of the appropriative event and carrying out as the reformulation of identity, difference, and ground, leads to the other beginning manifested by the pre-Socratic philosophers and by primordial poetry and art. (280; Cf.: Otto Pöggeler, *Heidegger und die hermeneutische Philosophie* (Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1983).

Here, the author states on a similar note: "Das nächste grosse Werk, in dem Heidegger nach dem entscheidenden Umbruch in seinem Denken von 1929 seinen neuen Ansatz darzustellen suchte, waren die "Beiträge zur Philosophie" von 1936-1938" (14). Consider also the recent follow-up volume to Pöggeler's first book on Heidegger's path of thinking: Otto Pöggeler, *The Paths of Heidegger's Life and Thought* (Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1997 [orig. 1992]). Apparently more impressed by the fourth wave of the Nazism controversy than someone like Hugo Ott would expect in light of prior revelations, Pöggeler's approach to Heidegger has gained a somewhat more critical edge, while his partisanship remains mostly intact. Apropos the relation between *Being and Time* and the *Contributions*, he writes: "The "aboriginality" of the question of being is at the same time the "downfall" of "rules," so that no gradual "development" from *Being and Time* to the *Contributions* is possible" (22). "In *Being and Time* it appears that at any moment the interweaving of the systematic construction and the historical deconstruction could unravel in Part Two. The *Contributions*, by contrast, are a unified thought process, in the course of whose six stages several distinctive paths are traced, all of which are united by the same theme – *Ereignis*" (23-24). As will become clear in the course of this study, my view differs from Pöggeler's. His reading of the *Contributions*, I think, vastly overestimates the philosophical resources and novelty of a largely aphoristic text. In light of Heidegger's own previous work and the philosophical discourses he (covertly) engages, Pöggeler (1983) strikes me as fundamentally mistaken, when he says:

> In jedem Fall wäre es ganz abwegig, Heidegger's Denken zurückzuinterpretieren in die sog. metaphysische Tradition, sei das nun die Philosophie der Griechen, seien es die Scholastik und die Mystik des Mittelalters, sei es die neuzeitliche Philosophie einschliesslich der Positionen des späten Fichte und des späten Schelling. Heideggers "Beiträge zur Philosophie" bestimmen das Sein als Ereignis, nämlich das "Seyn" oder das Sein selbst, das Wesen des seins oder jene Wahrheit des Seins, innerhalb deren das sein als Offenheit des Seienden sich in unterschiedlichen Weisen zeigen kann. (55)

Not only does this comment seem to contradict Pöggeler's (1987) statement, quoted above, according to which the post-1929 Heidegger was led "back into the ground of metaphysics; […] above all from Plato and Nietzsche." In glossing over the decisive difference between the later Fichte and the later Schelling, this pronouncement also remains oblivious to the underlying presence of the latter's thought in Heidegger's

work. Even Pöggeler (1983) himself seems to be uneasy about this glib dismissal of Schelling, when he asserts more cautiously:

> Der Schuldbegriff von "Sein und Zeit" akzentuiert also nicht eine Nachtansicht des Daseins; er gehört vielmehr in den Versuch einer letzten Begründung des Denkens, wie er in einer ähnlichen, jedoch spekulativ-metaphysischen Weise von Schelling unternommen wurde, der seit den "Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit" Hegels Metaphysik durch eine tiefer ansetzende Begründung noch einmal zu überholen gedachte. Das Schuldigsein als Grundsein einer Nichtigkeit hat aber noch eine *zweite* Seite, und diese Seite rückt Heideggers Analyse auch aus dem Denken heraus, das der späte Schelling unter dem Namen einer positiven Philosophie versuchte. Das Dasein ist nicht nur überhaupt infolge seiner Geworfenheit nichtig, sondern auch nichtig in seinem konkreten Entwurf, insofern dieser eine bestimmte Wahl ist, die das eine wählen kann, das andere aber *lassen* muss. (104)

Considering Schelling's work in the *Philosophy of Revelation* it is not at all clear that Heidegger can be claimed to advance beyond Schelling along the lines that Pöggeler hints at in this place. And even if he could, it might be all the worse for Heidegger, not Schelling, as someone like Tillich would insist.

[21] Martin Heidegger, "Brief über den Humanismus," *Wegmarken* (GA 9). The first note reads: "1. Auflage 1949: Das hier Gesagte ist nicht erst zur Zeit der Niederschrift ausgedacht, sondern beruht auf dem Gang eines Weges, der 1936 begonnen wurde, im 'Augenblick' eines Versuches, die Wahrheit des Seins einfach zu sagen. – Der Brief spricht immer noch in der Sprache der Metaphysik, und zwar wissentlich. Die andere Sprache bleibt im Hintergrund" (313).

[22] Kisiel (2002), esp. section: 12.4 Der Abbruch beginnt: Einleitung in die Philosophie (WS 1928/29), pp. 267-276.

[23] For these attributes, see: Paetzold (1995), pp. 101-102, 104.

[24] GA 3: *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* (1929), 1991. See in particular: §§ 34-35.

[25] Thomas Buchheim, Introduction (*Einleitung*) to: F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1997), pp. IX-LV. See esp.: pp. XV-XVII.

[26] In the following, whenever I quote from the Paulus-Nachschrift of Schelling's *Philosophie der Offenbarung*, the italics are always Schelling's. Any time I add an emphasis of my own, it will be indicated through underlining.

[27] "Wir sind nicht gleich beim persönlichen Gott; […]" (155).

[28] I glean the notion of immanent withdrawal from the following passage, where Schelling criticizes Hegel as follows: "Wenn Hegel die Philosophie damit anfangen will, dass man sich ins reine Denken begibt, hat er *das Wesen der rationalen Philosophie* trefflich ausgedrückt. <u>Dieses Sich-Zurückziehen ins reine Denken</u> ist aber bei Hegel nur mit Beziehung auf die Logik gemeint; es sind nicht die Sachen, wie sie a priori im Denken sind, sondern die Begriffe selbst als solche, als subjektive, gemeint. Aber mit blossen Begriffen ist kein wirkliches Denken" (129).

[29] "*Die Existenz Gottes lässt sich nicht erweisen, sondern nur die Gottheit des Existierenden, […], und auch diese nur a posteriori*" (175). There is no fully satisfactory translation for Schelling's use of "Gottheit" here, insofar as the present context invests it with three interlocked meanings: Godhead, Divinity, God-ness. I opt for the latter in this place, to retain the rhetorical force of Schelling's inversion in this sentence.

[30] "*Der Begriff des Blindseienden* löst sich von der Voraussetzung, die er in der negativen Philosophie hat, ab, und die *positive, indem sie* den Begriff fallen lässt, und *bloss das Blindseiende behält, ist ganz selbständig*, kann auch geradezu davon anfangen" (157).

[31] "[…], wie wenn durch einen zuvor ruhigen, dann in Entzündung geratenen Teil eines Körpers die über ihm liegenden Teile in die Höhe gehoben werden" (164).

[32] "[Als erste Potenz d]ie veranlassende Ursache der ganzen Bewegung, *das dem Ursein entgegengesetzte andere Sein*, B, als dessen Energie wir einen zufälligen, aus den Schranken des blossen Könnens gesetzten, schrankenlosen, blinden, gesinnungslosen Willen gefunden haben. Dies Sein nun wirkt ausschliessend auf das *Ursein*, im Anfang völlig ausschliessend, so dass, was jetzt reiner Actus war, wir uns jetzt als rein aufgehoben denken müssen" (180).

[33] […] "*Die zweite Potenz* (A2) ist die ursprünglich negierte, […] die sich nur sofern verwirklicht, als sie die andere negiert. Als ursprünglich wirkliche konnte sie sich nicht verwirklichen; dies setzt Negation voraus. […] Es musste ihr die erste Möglichkeit (B) vorangehen. Nachdem B aufgehört hat, Potenz zu sein, ist es an dem actus purus, Seinkönnendes zu sein. […] Ist dies nun vollendet, hat A2 keinen Gegensatz mehr, so bliebe am Ende des Prozesses nichts eigentlich Wirkendes mehr" (181).

[34] This is a metaphysical distinction, and it does not make sense to ask how the latter would "look" any different from the former, since both exclude experiential distinction of any kind. Within the context of Schelling's inquiry into the principles of creation, they mark different stages in a *hypothetical* process. In this sense, boundless tranquility comes before inner negation, whereas boundless willing *would* come after inner negation. The fact that creation actually took (and is taking) place implies that God did not "over-react." But then the question is how this should be *understood* in terms of the interplay of material ontic forces within the process of creation.

[35] "Die dritte Potenz, A3 in die Wirklichkeit [sic!]. […] So weit A2 nun an B sein Werk vollzogen hat, so weit ist dem A3 Raum gegeben, wie denn schon A3 als das Ordnende, Stufenbestimmende, im Prozess waltete. Der Geist ist es, der Mass und Ziel setzt, und der siegreichen Potenz eine Grenze der Überwindung bestimmt" (182).

[36] To be clear, as far as Schelling's *numerical order* is concerned, he does not present continuity as the first potency. Instead he puts forth B, which relates to contingency, namely the contingent occurrence of "inner negation." Yet, as we saw in detail, such inner tension can factor only "within" a material continuum. The unpreconceivable as actus purus (A) referred to tranquil homogeneity. This is reflected in the *alphabetical* rather than the numerical *order* and accounts for the befuddling way in which the two are mapped onto each other (with B as the first potency). Hence, in terms of intensity writ large (including tranquility), creation *rests on* the unpreconceivable A (actus purus) as its amorphous background or serene abyss. At the same time, in terms of motion and intitial contrast, creation *begins* with the occurrence of B, as the acknowledged possibility of negation, which elevates A to a concrete possibility A2 (potentia actus purus). – This also explains why Schelling, rather awkwardly, speaks of the "two moments" (*zwei Momente*: […]) (181) after he spent so much time laying out the three potencies involved. It is with these qualifying remarks about Schelling's numerical list and his alphabetical list in mind, then, that I speak of the *continuous*, the *contingent*, and the *gradual* as the three ontic forces involved in the process of creation.

[37] Heidegger, "*Brief über den Humanismus*": "Die Sprache ist das Haus des Seins" (language is the house of being) (313).

[38] On a very similar note, Cassirer (1923) states in the first volume of his *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*: "This transformation into form [*Wandlung zur Gestalt*] is accomplished in different ways and in accordance with different constructive principles [*Bildungsprinzipien*] in science and in language, in art and in myth; but they all agree in so far as that which finally appears before us as a product of their activity in no way resembles the mere *material* from which they originally proceeded. It is thus that spiritual consciousness in the fundamental function of sign-creation, in general and in its diverse directions, truly differs from sensory consciousness. It is here, in place of the passive givenness of some or another external existent, that an independent shaping given by us first arises, through which it then appears differently for us in different regions and forms of reality. Myth and art, language and science, are in this sense shapings *toward* being; they are not simple copies of an alreay present reality, but they rather present the great lines

of direction of spiritual development, of the ideal process, in which reality constitutes itself for us as one and many – as a manifold of forms [*Gestaltungen*], which are nonetheless finally held together by a unity of meaning" (I, 107). – Note that the page number refers to the standard translation by Ralph Manheim, but the actual translation is Michael Friedman's, who quotes this central passage from Cassirer and provides his own rendering in English, which I find superior to Manheim's. See: Friedman (2000), p. 102.

[39] For Schelling's commentary on the status of Christian "documents" (*Urkunden*), see: note 5, above.

[40] "[…], und *Kant* setzte richtig: es sei unmöglich, zu einem Begriff unmittelbar die notwendige Existenz zu finden. Nur hätte Kant die Komplikation des Notwendigseienden und des Begriffs Gottes trennen und das notwendig Seiende ganz frei von allem Begriff setzen müssen. Dies Letzte lag ihm um so näher, da er das notwendig Existierende als Vernunftbegriff, der sogar die Vernunft überweltige, anerkannte. Mit Recht eifert er dagegen, dass man den Begriff nicht verderbe, indem man ihm den Begriff des höchsten Wesens unterlege. So hat aber Kant den höchst immanenten Begriff des höchsten Wesens und den absolut transzendenten des notwendig Seienden nebeneinander. Jener ist das Ende der negativen, dies der Anfang der positiven Philosophie. So grenzen sie aneinander. Kant setzte sie beide nebeneinander als notwendige Vernunftbegriffe" (159).

[41] To give but one prime example from his Kant book (GA 3) under consideration: "Alle Umdeutungen der reinen Einbildungskraft in eine Funktion des reinen Denkens – eine Umdeutung die der "deutsche Idealismus" im Anschluss an die zweite Auflage der Kritik der reinen Vernunft noch übersteigerte – verkennt ihr spezifisches Wesen" (197).

[42] Ibid., § 6., pp. 36-37.

[43] Ibid.: "Wird jedoch die transzendentale Einbildungskraft, wie das in der zweiten Auflage geschieht., als eigenes Grundvermögen gestrichen und ihre Funktion dem Verstand als der blossen Spontaneität übertragen, dann schwindet die Möglichkeit, reine Sinnlichkeit und reines Denken hinsichtlich ihrer Einheit in einer endlichen menschlichen Vernunft zu begreifen, ja auch nur zum Problem zu machen. Weil die transzendentale Einbildungskraft aber auf Grund ihrer unzerreissbaren ursprünglichen Struktur die Möglichkeit einer Grundlegung der ontologischen Erkenntnis und damit der Metaphysik eröffnet, deshalb bleibt die erste Auflage dem innersten Zuge der Problematik einer Grundlegung der Metaphysik näher" (197).

[44] In fact, this juxtaposition is encouraged by Heidegger himself: cf. note 149, in § 22, which points ahead to §35.

[45] Cf. pp. 102-103.

[46] "Die Zeit ist als "reines Bild" das Schema-Bild und nicht etwa nur die den reinen Verstandesbegriffen gegenüberstehende Anschauungsform. […] Der Schematismus der reinen Verstandesbegriffe muss daher notwendig in die Zeit hineinregeln. Die Zeit aber ist, wie die transzendentale Ästhetik zeigte, die Vorstellung eines "einzigen Gegenstandes" [here Heidegger inserts: note 139: A 31 f., B 47]. […] Daher ist die Zeit nicht nur das notwendige reine Bild der Schemata der reinen Verstandesbegriffe, sondern auch ihre einzige reine Anblicksmöglichkeit. Diese einzige Anblicksmöglichkeit zeigt selbst in sich nichts anderes als immer nur Zeit und Zeithaftes" (104).

[47] "Deshalb ist aber auch das ursprünglich Einigende, das scheinbar nur vermittelnde Zwischenvermögen der transzendentalen Einbildungskraft, nichts anderes als die ursprüngliche Zeit" (196).

[48] In the *Philosophy of Revelation*, Schelling elaborates: "Soll nun die Welt eine freie gesetzte Schöpfung des göttlichen Willens sein, so muss zwischen der Ewigkeit Gottes und der Welt etwas in der Mitte sein. Die Welt als eine mögliche musste in dem göttlichen Willen enthalten sein. Das Mittel, das nachfolgende Sein sich als möglich vorzustellen, hatte der Schöpfer an jener *Urmöglichkeit*, die er in sich hat, seit er ist.

Diese befreit ihn von seinem unvordenklichen Sein; sie gibt ihm die Möglichkeit, dies Sein als Mittel zur *Überwindung* des entgegengesetzten Seins zu verwenden, *sich selbst als frei vom Sein, als reine Potenz, als Geist zu setzen*" (184). "Alles was nun die [salomonischen] *Sprichwörter* von der Weisheit sagen, stimmt überein mit der von uns gegebenen Natur der Urpotenz, die dem Schöpfer erst die Schöpfung vermittelte. […] Jene Urpotenz ist nicht eine Hervorbringung Gottes. Zwar ist sie auch *nicht vor* ihm als die Potenz seines Seins, aber so wie er ist, ist sie da, stellt sich ihm dar *als etwas, das er wollen und nicht wollen kann*. Obwohl nicht Gott, war sie doch nicht Geschöpf, und dadurch eben das Mittlere zwischen Gott und dem Geschöpf" (187).

[49] Cf. note 32, above.

[50] The use of "necessary" in the first sentence does not speak to the issue, because here necessity pertains merely to the character of the transcendental schematism, which by Kant's and Heidegger's defnition has to engage both pure thinking and pure sensibility. Even the phrase "in advance" in the very sentence under consideration does not provide a clear answer, since it could simply connote "prior to experience" as the general meaning of a prioricity, irrespective of further qualification in terms of necessary versus contingent, of which only the former (the necessary a priori) is rejected by positive philosophy.

Chapter Two

Aberrations of "Radical" Phenomenology:

Eliding Dilthey and Husserl

The second bypass which critics have used to occlude the epistemological and rhetorical thrusts of Heidegger's work will be the focus of this chapter. I identify this bypass as the Dilthey-bypass, Kisiel's account of "The Dilthey Draft" of *Being and Time* that falls in line with a long-standing tendency in Heidegger scholarship. According to this "tradition," Heidegger is commonly contextualized in terms of Dilthey's position within the nineteenth-century *Geisteswissenschaften* debate, without contextualizing Dilthey himself in terms of the other factions or interlocutors within that discursive constellation. This pertains especially to the "enunciations" (to borrow Julia Kristeva's term) by the physician Hermann Helmholtz since the 1840s, which set the tone for the debate over the status of science for the second half of that century and beyond.[1]

To resists the discursive narrowing of the *Geisteswissenschaften* controversy, as implied by this kind of Dilthey shortcut, I set out to reterritorialize what I take to be one of the most crucial, but also most neglected sources of Heidegger's methodology in *Being and Time*, namely the "Neogrammarian Revolution" in the science of language (*Sprachwissenschaft*) or linguistics writ large.[2]

To make this case, I want to scrutinize and critique the Dilthey-bypass in such a way as to bring out a crucial line of influence, which relates Heidegger's quest for a new philosophical method back to a specific nineteenth-century controversy over historical psychology and philology. Prior to any attempt at detecting the repercussions of this

controversy in Heidegger's text, however, it is useful to begin by establishing a general methodological link that connects Heidegger's project to this particular psychological discourse. This link, I argue, consists in a specific strand of material semiotics within Edmund Husserl's (1859-1938) pioneering program of phenomenology, which remains vital for an account of both the genesis and the internal workings of Heidegger's *Being and Time*.

To probe this discursive interface, I will carry out a two-step analysis, jointly in this chapter and the next section (chapters three and four). In this chapter, then, I set out to show how an integral part of Husserl's thought gets effectively distorted and eventually silenced in the course of contextualizing Heidegger with reference to Dilthey's work in the area of historical science. In particular, I will show how the promotion of a false notion of "radical" phenomenology, associated with an equally misleading story about Heidegger's "radical" departure from the theoretical stance of his mentor, has helped eclipse one of Husserl's most important contributions in the context of Dilthey's critique of historical reason. (The psychological-philological analysis will be reserved for the next section of this project.)

This contribution of phenomenology to Heidegger's project consists in a specific conception of "[h]istory [as] an all-inclusive personal science, a science of the personal and of its facticity taken all-inclusively" (PhP, 176).[3] As we shall see, this programmatic for reconceiving historical science and research practices lends itself to being extended into a comprehensive theory of different domains of cultural meaning formation – a regional ontology for cultural studies within a material semiotic framework, centered

around the notion of "categorial form" which Heidegger inherits in no small part from the second volume of Husserl's *Logical Investigations* (1900-01).[4]

In terms of philosophical method, this blueprint for a semiotics of culture speaks to the proximity of Husserl and Cassirer, commonly neglected in recent Heidegger scholarship. At the same time, this affiliation between phenomenology and semiotics points in another way to yet another discursive ramification occluded by the Dilthey-bypass already discussed, namely some striking parallels between Husserl's approach to history and Schelling's critical Christology. In keeping with my exposition of the latter in the first chapter of this study, we will see how Husserl's case for regional ontology is quite congenial with Schelling's case for positive philosophy over against dogmatic metaphysics.

Although it will become clear that Husserl's position retains some restrictions on regional meaning production, which both Schelling and Cassirer would want to remove, all three authors will emerge as working along the same discursive trajectory of historical semiotics and regional ontology – a *historical semontology*, if you will, almost post-structuralist in spirit. The continued relevance of this project is evidenced by the contemporary work of authors like Kristeva and Deleuze and Guattari,[5] just as it is strategically occluded by Heidegger, as he ostensibly severs all ties to "German idealism."

After thus explicating the stakes of philosophical method within this discursive constellation, and after showing how Husserl's thought is intimately related to that of Cassirer and Schelling within this constellation, we can then proceed to a second phase of critiquing the Dilthey-bypass. To this end, the results of this chapter, regarding the

phenomenological foundation for a historical semiotics, will be brought to bear on Heidegger's (hidden) references, in the next section, where Heidegger's buried nineteenth-century interlocutors will have their say.

Red Herrings Surrounding the "Dilthey Year" (1924)

In *The Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time, Kisiel distinguishes three drafts that precede the publication of the final, yet fragmented, version of the book that finally made it into the 1927 issue of Husserl's *Jahrbuch*. Covering the last three years prior to Heidegger's landmark publication, he assigns a different thematic as well as author-oriented focus to each draft. Yet these differences should not be overstated, he holds, because of an underlying continuity of Heidegger's course of philosophical questioning:

> As we progress from one draft to another, as we move from 1924 to 1925 to 1926, the dominant question becomes in turn "What is history?," "What is being?," "What is time?," with the other two however always lurking in the background. We might therefore speak of a hermeneutic draft, an ontoeroteric draft (focused on the question of being *as such*), and a kairological draft. Each has its dominant figure who became its focus of deconstruction: whence the Dilthey draft, the Husserl draft, and the Kantian draft. Behind both Husserl and Dilthey is the deconstruction of Descartes […]. (313)

In Kisiel's rendering, I argue, this division is very misleading, and with respect to his characterization of the idiosyncratically coined "ontoeroteric" draft, downright false, in light of Heidegger's own statements in the 1925 text under consideration. Kisiel's way of chronologically relating these drafts is in need of revision because, upon scrutiny, the "Dilthey draft" of 1924 turns out to be a red herring. As will be shown, Heidegger's 1925 text, based on the lecture course series "History of the Concept of Time" (*Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, GA 20) can be called a "Dilthey draft"

with much greater justification, which is obscured by Kisiel's willful distortion of it as "ontoeroteric."

Before going into any specifics, it is to be noted that Kisiel's designation of "drafts" does not refer to single texts respectively. Accordingly, he groups two 1924 versions of "The Concept of Time" (namely the "oral publication," that is, the public address presented to the Marburg Theologians' Society on July 25 [315][6]; and the modified, actual follow-up to a "would-be journal article" [321] brought to completion in November) together with the so called "Kassel Lectures" of 1925 under the joint rubric of the "Dilthey draft." Similarly, for him, the "ontoeroteric draft" comprises the 1925 lecture course "History of the Concept of Time" along with WS 1925/26 lecture course "Logic (Aristotle) [The Question of Truth]."[7]

Considering the public address at Marburg during the summer of that "Dilthey year" (357), Kisiel determines the "recurring leitmotif of the lecture" (317) in terms of "the immediacy of human experience" (316), a "still quite nascent phase in the discussion of *In-Sein*, the equiprimordial constellation of involvement with the world and self through affective disposition, understanding, and discourse" (317) – culminating in the "fulcrum statement "Time is the how" (BZ 27)" (ibid.).[8] Assessing the philosophical weight of Heidegger's presentation, Kisiel remark critically:

> What is waiting in the wings, beyond the concept of time which is the one topic of the lecture, is precisely the concept of being itself, and therefrom a more radical sense of time "itself." (317)
>
> Thus, the public lecture of 1924 only intimates the turn from Dasein to being, to the "being *of* [T]emporality" (BZ, 26) of the famous Third Division of BT. Muted and thoroughly undeveloped as it is, such intimations feed Gadamer's declaration that this deceptively simple lecture, teeming with "ordinary language" statements more than the formal language of ontology, is the "Urform" of BT, if we understand this in the sense of a nascent and incipient "primitive form." (319)

In continuation of the last remark, Kisiel goes even further and declares that, in light of its conceptual crudity, "[t]he lecture is therefore not really a draft of BT." [9] This dismissal is hardly balanced by Kisiel's concluding celebration of the lecture's rhetorical brilliance.[10] This overall judgment concerning the lack of philosophical precision or "radicality," is prone to eclipse the methodological import of this lecture with respect to Heidegger's working conception of *Vorwissenschaft* (BZ 6), which Kisiel explicitly links to Heidegger's notion of "productive logic," delivered "more creatively" (320) a year later.

In other words, at the very point where the Dilthey connection could be spelled out most forcefully with regard to scientific method, Kisiel *defers the issues that are deemed significant interventions* to the 1925 draft which, however, has already been claimed by his "ontoeroteric" label. Under this label, these interventions are stylized into quite different projects.

The situation is aggravated by Kisiel's elaboration on the leitmotif of the "individuating encounter with death," already operative in the 1924 public address, and how he uses it to establish a methodological link between Heidegger's crude "oral publication" and his later, more creative methodological statements. Expounding on Heidegger's 1925 notion of "productive logic," Kisiel writes:

> […] a "productive logic" (GA 20: 3; also SZ 10), which leaps over the sciences into the domains of reality they investigate, sometimes exposing dimensions of their being which articulate new directions of research, if not new sciences. Such is the case in this lecture, which "breaks" through the traditional conception of time in order to "enter" a new domain of possibility. The method of "destruction" is the radical formality of the formal indication: dissolution of the *structured what* into the *unstructured how* of the *indeterminate extreme* of my certain goneness, which is to be kept free of all what, when, how long, and how much" (320-21). [emphases added]

This account of the methodological implications of Heidegger's death motif in the context of scientific research is plainly false. As will become clear through the examination of the 1925 text of the *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, the "how" is *not* unstructured. Instead, it is to be construed in terms of *open structures* or, more precisely, *opens systems of meaning formation*, which Heidegger discusses in terms of *Seinssinn* (sense of being).[11]

By Kisiel's own account, the summer of Heidegger's purported "Dilthey year" (1924) has been rhetorically stimulating but philosophically toothless thus far. Moreover, in his thematic synopsis of Heidegger's public address, Kisiel has effectively neutralized the most important interface between Heidegger's and Dilthey's respective project. The question over scientific methodology and the *semiotic* dimension of*In -Sein* or being-in-the-world is deferred to the second draft, where it will not be recaptured in its original context. In particular, this deferral is affected by a faulty engagement of Heidegger's conception of death as an "indeterminate extreme," which blurs its implications for a debate over new standards of research and scientificity – a misconstrual of *limit situation* that will keep haunting the interpretation of Heidegger's conception of death in its restated version in *Being and Time* and beyond.

Moving on to the next "item," or couple of items, within the Dilthey draft as Kisiel reads it, we find that the article version of "The Concept of Time" later that year is construed as yet another red herring, which does not help to elucidate the methodological import of Dilthey's work into the genesis of *Being and Time*. As for the "would-be journal article," Kisiel reports that "Erich Rothacker, a follower of Dilthey and coeditor of the newly founded *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und*

Geistesgeschichte and, as philosopher, in charge especially of the latter domain of 'intellectual history'" (321), had approached Heidegger in 1922 to submit an article to the journal. Judging by a reassuring statement on Heidegger's part regarding his intention of submission, this "remains a viable publication project into late 1924. […] But it is never written, in part because Heidegger's project of historical destruction assumes a less religious orientation by 1925" (322).

After aborting this item, however, Heidegger proposes a second article to Rothacker, intended to comprise a review of the Dilthey-Yorck correspondence, which Heidegger plans to supplement with a "fundamental statement about Dilthey's work in general. In the ensuing months, this "review" article grows to more than double its originally estimated length and becomes instead a seventy-five-page fundamental statement about Heidegger's own work. […] As a result, it was transferred to Husserl's *Jahrbuch*, where it appeared well over two years later, after growing into the full-length book that we know as *Being and Time*" (ibid.).

Several things are to be noted about Kisiel's staging of this second item within the bundle constituting the Dilthey draft. To begin with, his recurrent remarks about Heidegger's "less religious orientation by 1925" are misleading, unless we reduce the meaning of such orientation on Heidegger's part to overt references to the "theology of the Young Luther" or other religious representatives of similarly public stature.[12] However, in light of my findings about the pervasive and persisting influence of Schelling's critical Christology, in chapter one, we must reject Kisiel's repeated claim about Heidegger's advance past theology.

In commenting on the 1924 public address at Marburg, discussed above, Kisiel states: "But the unspoken possibility of this question [of being as such] was already present from the beginning in the phenomenological goal "to understand time out of time" (BZ 6) *itself* and not from the theological starting point of eternity" (318). As a general trait of his *Genesis* story, Kisiel fully embraces Heidegger's self-staged return to Ancient Greek philosophy, primarily featuring Plato and Aristotle. In the present context of Heidegger's alleged turn away from theological thought, the claim of the preceding quotation is thus reinforced two pages further down:

> Heidegger puts this temporal clue toward historical destruction to work for the very first time in the lecture through the references to Aristotle's *Physics* (BZ 7f.) which raise the issue of the paradigm of "in time" operative in the time of everydayness and science. It is also at work in the bracketing of the theological approach to time through eternity, "the empty being-forever of αει" (BZ 5), which "turns out to be a mere derivative of being-temporal" (BZ 6). But these are only the halting beginnings of a historical destruction of ontology by way of fundamental insights into time. At this seminal phase there is hardly a full-fledged program in place for destroying the history of ontology along these newfound lines, aside from the ongoing confrontation of the towering figure of Aristotle. (320)

The main problem with this characterization is that it perpetuates the myth of Heidegger as the thinker who single-handedly took on Ancient Greek thought as the almost single and actual challenge to be met in the endeavor of a destruction of historical ontology. Heidegger is placed in a philosophical vacuum, presented as a solipsistic genius who directs his "radical" gaze to the ancient roots of philosophical questioning. Not only does this characterization of (one of the components of) the so-called Dilthey draft, as Kisiel identifies it, fail to illuminate anything about Heidegger's relation to Dilthey's critique of historical reason, it actively precludes the assessment of such crucial influences on the genesis of *Being and Time*.

Kisiel accesses Heidegger's thought primarily in terms of Heidegger's chosen, if often revered, targets, without asking from where Heidegger got his *constructive* impulses. In the present case, concerning the "paradigm of 'in time,'" such methodological solipsism comes at the cost of eliding the actual pioneer of reconceiving the nature and relation of infinite time vis-à-vis finite time, Schelling. By contrast, one ought to insist that the theological discussion of eternity is anything but passé for the early Heidegger. In ostensibly distancing himself from any "empty being-forever," Heidegger will draw from an alternative notion of eternity very much like Schelling's tranquil continuum.

Importantly, in the present context of the Dilthey draft, this continuing debt to German Idealism, which Heidegger is always eager to denounce, can be shown not only with respect to Heidegger's later Kant critique of 1929, as demonstrated in chapter one. It is also already detectable, in a somewhat different philosophical language, in the 1925 lecture course, which does not fit Kisiel's "ontoeroteric" bill, as the latter will prove to promote even more forcefully the solipsistic return to philosophical antiquity just criticized.

Staying for the moment with Kisiel's present account of the 1924 "would-be journal article," that is, the second article project that did not see publication in Rothacker's journal but was converted directly into the text of *Being and Time*, we can observe how such work-internal solipsism receives yet another spin. If the unpublished piece turned more or less directly into the text of Heidegger's magnum opus, there is no longer any real difference between "draft" and final version. Of course, it is not Kisiel's fault if things worked out that way. Nor do we have to assume any artificial or rigid

boundaries between drafts and final copies, in speaking of any "real difference," which would seem to undercut the very notion of a draft. Granting these points, however, still leaves the question intact whether the inclusion of the text in question among the different items subsumed under the title of the "Dilthey draft" has any explanatory value at all.

Pointing to the mere fact that, after all, Heidegger was going to review the Dilthey-Yorck correspondence and then add a "fundamental statement about Dilthey's work in general" (322) will not do. The more intimately the 1924 project is locked into the final 1927 text of *Being and Time*, the less likely it is to shed light on the developmental stages and routes of influence affecting Heidgger's work underway to his master piece. This worry is confirmed by Kisiel's way of relating the two texts. In fact, one of the most baffling traits of his exposition is that the genesis of *Being and Time* is here not so much explained in terms of the would-be article of 1924. Instead, since the two documents are not really distinguishable in the end anyway, the reference to Heidegger's second almost-submission to Rothacker serves merely as a cue that allows Kisiel to interpret (the genesis of) *Being and Time* in terms of *Being and Time* – a real instance of a hermeneutic circle in practice (not to be mistaken for the famous methodological hermeneutic circle, which Heidegger did not deem necessarily vicious).

To be clear, this criticism does not preclude the general possibility of interpreting certain texts on their own terms. With regard to their internal structure and organization, for instance, one may well gain valuable insights from ascertaining "what goes with what" (to borrow a phrase from Kenneth Burke's *Philosophy of Literary Form*). However, by itself any such interpretative approach does not live up to the professed task

of Kisiel's genesis project. Remember how he introduces his division and designation of the different drafts. In specifying the "identity criteria" for each draft, he states: "We might therefore speak of a hermeneutic draft, an ontoeroteric draft […], and a kairological draft. Each has its dominant figure who becomes its focus of deconstruction: whence the Dilthey draft, the Husserl draft, and the Kantian draft" (313).[13] The effects of the asserted hermeneutic circle in his account are thus evidenced by the fact that the core sections of Kisiel's presentation of the Dilthey draft do hardly treat of Dilthey's project at all.

In section I "Dilthey's Line of Questioning and Yorck's Basic Intention," Kisiel provides a solid three-page summary of Dilthey's project (cf. 323-325). However, the bulk of the following discussion (pp. 326-357) consists, for the most part, of work-internal conceptual genealogies in Heidegger's growing body of thought, all the way up to the treatment of the third and last item in the Dilthey draft bundle, the so-called Kassel Lectures (1925). I say "for the most part," because there is one significant passage where Kisiel shows himself well aware of the methodological stakes of the *Geisteswissenschaften* controversy, in relation to Dilthey's theoretical contributions. Yet eventually he gives in to the reductivist tendencies that have already been identified, especially with regard to his one-sided emphasis on the "towering figure" of Aristotle.

To be more specific, on pp. 337-338, Kisiel returns to the loose end of "intellectual history" that was posited by his prior philosophical profiling of Erich Rothacker (cf. 321). Now he comments in more general terms:

> [P]ublic interpretedness and its curiosity also tyrannize the history of the sciences. Confidence in the possession of *universally valid sentences* replaces the repeated questioning back to the original ground-giving contexts of being which constitute the respective subject matters of the sciences. This applies especially to the

> research whose task it is to interpretatively expose *the self-referential dimension of Dasein itself*, in particular "intellectual history" (*Geistesgeschichte* = history of the mind or spirit) and philosophy (337) [emphases added]

The problem at hand is the notion of "historical consciousness" (ibid.) and the question whether this notion holds any methodological resources for the historical sciences, as they set out to redefine their standards for scientific validity and intellectually responsible research. More specifically, what kind of "universally valid sentences" or judgments can be derived for a method relying on the notion of historical consciousness applied to specific cultural eras, epochs, or life-worlds.

In this regard, the "self-referential dimension of Dasein itself" refers to the potential problem that the agents of historical research are always interwoven with the very material they set out to register and organize meaningfully. There is no neutral standpoint outside the sea of historical happenings, "we" are always already immersed in it, which seems to undermine any claims toward scientific objectivity. Yet, as Heidegger will point out, this inevitable degree of *participation in history* is not necessarily a drawback, for it could be considered not only in terms of subjective distortion (of scientific data) but, on the contrary, in terms of immediate access.

In this account, the historical scientist's unavoidable mode of participation in her own dynamic data collection could then result *either* in deficient modes of appropriating history in overly personal or overly standardized ways, i.e., "inauthentically." *Or*, such ineluctable participation could actually open up space for an original or "authentic" encounter with, or experience of, the historical period under consideration. In the latter case, the scientist would not so much seek to conceptually dissect and record the "historical consciousness" of a cultural era, according to standards of accurate

replication. Instead, authentic repetition would have to be understood as *Wiederholung*.[14] At least, for Heidegger the seeming tension between inescapable self-referentiality and scientific validity in historical research has become an open question again.

Clearly, this question is not new with Heidegger but has previously been dealt with in great detail, for example, by the classicist and historian Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884). In his exposition of *historical method*, Droysen thus characterizes the "possibility of […] understanding" as follows:

> The method of historical investigation is determined by the morphological character of its material. The essence of historical method is *understanding* by means of *investigation*. […]
>
> The possibility of this understanding arises from the kinship of our nature with that of the utterances lying before us as historical material. A further condition of this possibility is the fact that man's nature, at once sensuous and spiritual, speaks forth every one of its inner processes in some form apprehensible by the senses, mirrors these inner processes, indeed, in every utterance. On being perceived, the utterance, by projecting himself into the inner experience of the percipient, calls forth the same inner process. [here, the editor inserts: note 3] (121)[15]

The same discourse on historical method and the enabling conditions as well as limits of understanding is continued in Dilthey's exposition of "objective mind" (*objektiver Geist*), proffered in his account of "The Construction of the Historical World in the Human Sciences" (1910).[16]

By omitting the central role of these predecessors, the dimension that is missing from Kisiel's account of the reshuffled stakes of "intellectual history," is the positivist-versus-idealist constellation that was decisive for Heidegger or anyone else who joined Dilthey in these debates. Moreover, the way in which the different factions in this controversy tried to stake out their respective positions cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries as they were evolving in the era, a fact which Kisiel underplays if not entirely

ignores. In this manner the debate was not confined to the quarters of historiography proper but received some of its most decisive impulses from the fields of historical philology and comparative linguistics.

In the area of cultural historiography, it was especially the rival projects of Nietzsche's mentor Jakob Burckhardt (1818-1897), Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893), and Droysen that set the tone for subsequent attempts at reconceiving "intelllectual history" and reterritorializing historical method, which Heidegger would have been aware of through his reception of Dilthey.[17] While the Nietzsche of *The Birth of Tragedy* showed clear signs of Burckhardt's influence, his successor in Basel, the renowned linguist Jacob Wackernagel (whom Heidegger references in an important footnote toward the end of *Being and Time*!)[18] displayed strong sympathy for the advances in comparative method that were promulgated by the Neogrammarians (*Junggrammatiker*) at the time, pointing to the work of Berthold Delbrück in particular.[19]

Although they never formed a fully homogenous front as a group, the Neogrammarians came under increasing attack by the neo-Idealists, who charged them with "metaphysical positivism." As one of the main spokesmen of this idealist reaction, Karl Vossler entered into a vivid love-hatred relationship with Hermann Osthoff and Hermann Paul. (The actual dynamics of the Paul-Vossler controversy and their vital bearing on Heidegger's thought form the subject of the next chapter, where I will demonstrate Heidegger's strategic omission of Paul, which is particularly glaring in his 1925 lecture course, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* [GA 20].)

In the context of Heidegger's Dilthey draft, this multifarious constellation cannot be ignored without distorting the actual background of Heidegger's nascent discussion of

the self-referential character of Dasein on the way to its *Being and Time* rendition. Especially the indicated trajectories of cultural historiography (Burckhardt), neo-Idealist linguistics (Vossler), and Neogrammarian philology (Paul) need to be taken into account in order to unearth Heidegger's unacknowledged sources and interlocutors with respect to the transforming landscape of "intellectual history," in general, and the various criticisms about scientifically flawed notions of "historical consciousness," in particular.

Kisiel's commentary does not sufficiently engage this constellation. Instead, in remarking on certain "ordering schemes" or "comparative typologies," which Heidegger left behind, he invokes the standard reference to Oswald Spengler's "physiognomic morphology" (337). Spengler's approach functions as a straw man decoying the reader from the real historicism debates of the time, because the modern reader is inclined to take sides with Heidegger and dismiss the Spenglerian standard of typified knowledge as a scientifistic, rather than scientific, form of "concealed curiosity" (ibid.). Despite the immense popularity of his book, *The Decline of the West* (volume one, 1918; volume two, 1922), however, Spengler had too little theoretical clout to be considered a primary reference point for the young Heidegger, as far as the quest for a new philosophical method is concerned.[20] As Pierre Bourdieu (1991) poignantly puts it:

> It is just as wrong to situate Heidegger in the purely political arena, relying on the affinity of his thought to that of essayists like Spengler or Jünger, as it is to localize him in the "philosophical" arena "properly speaking," that is in the relatively autonomous history of philosophy, for instance in the name of his opposition to the neo-Kantians. The most specific characteristics and effects of his thought are rooted in this dual reference, and in order to understand it adequately, we must ourselves regenerate, consciously and methodically, the reciprocal connections that Heidegger's political ontology sets up in practice, as it creates a political stance but gives it a purely philosophical expression. (5-6)

Clearly, Kisiel does not propose any straightforward association of Heidegger's philosophical proposals for reconceiving historical science with Spengler's conservative-revolutionary rhetoric. On the contrary, he clearly distances Heidegger's project from the theoretically deficient model of typological classification provided by Spengler. In this regard, Kisiel is not directly subject to Bourdieu's criticism of politico-philosophical conflation. However, as Spengler is featured as the primary, but all-too-easy target for Heideggerian critique, the latter is once again isolated from the most vital influences it received in the intellectual-historical constellation, which Heidegger entered in his response to Dilthey's critique of historical reason.[21]

Again, then, Heidegger's Dilthey draft becomes in this account misleadingly one-dimensional, because it insulates Heidegger's philosophical intervention from its most resourceful contemporary alternatives. With this selective orientation, it favors a reductivist lineage, laid out by the author of *Being and Time* himself, which skips over the second half of the nineteenth century and seeks to link Heidegger directly to the Ancient-Greek beginnings of a tradition that is supposedly no longer able to tackle the conundrum of *Dasein*'s self-referentiality forcefully enough.

In consequence, Kisiel's characterization of the Dilthey draft enacts, as he did with the Schelling bypass, exactly a parallel Dilthey-bypass which celebrates the radical nature of Heidegger's approach, at the expense of various pioneers in historical-philosophical method such as Karl Vossler, Hermann Paul, and – closest to Heidegger – Ernst Cassirer. To be sure, the respective contributions of these thinkers are not always compatible. At the same time, we have to pay heed to the fact that, on occasion, these theoreticians themselves tend to overstate the actual differences among them, most

notably Karl Vossler in his (over)reaction to Paul. As we shall see, Heidegger proves to be aware of these tensions and he will strategically pit them against one another, in an effort to set his own *Dasein* analysis apart from the rest of the field.

In the context of intellectual history and historical consciousness, the present effects of Kisiel's Dilthey-bypass become most tangible in his commentary on "the manifold forms of cultural expression" (338). As he keeps giving in to Heidegger's strategy of positioning himself over against an emaciated philosophical tradition, from which German Idealism and nineteenth-century *Sprachwissenschaft* have been conveniently eliminated, Kisiel's persistent neglect of the work of Heidegger's contemporary, Ernst Cassirer, comes full circle in the immediate continuation of his remarks about Oswald Spengler:

> And although these research endeavors [by systematic and dialectical philosophy] seek ultimately to interpret "humanity," the question of Dasein in its being is seldom raised, or it is explored in terms of an *already-finished system* or an unquestioned definition of man as a "rational animal." Even a *"philosophy of life"* by and large strays into the study of the *manifold forms of cultural expressions of life or its worldviews*. To the degree that life itself in its being and as "being" is thematized, it is interpreted in terms of the being of the world or of nature. But the sense of being thereby remains in the indifference of a *self-evident and unquestioned verbal concept*. (337-338) [emphases added]

This criticism of inauthenticity in historical science proffers an awkward amalgamation of different views, alluding to but not clearly identifying familiar contemporaneous projects of *Lebensphilosophie* (Bergson and/or Ditlthey?), worldview philosophy (Jaspers?), and a philosophy grounded in forms of cultural expression (Burckhardt or Cassirer?). All of these strangely intermixed views are here associated with the kind of deficient typology ("already-finished system," "self-evident and unquestioned verbal

concept") that was just introduced under the "popular" name of Oswald Spengler, as if none of them had passed beyond the latter's level of cultural analysis.

In fact, Kisiel refers to Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews* on the next page where he hints at Heidegger's sympathetic attitude toward Jaspers's "basic philosophical attitude":

> In this context [of Dasein's in its temporal particularity], Heidegger acknowledges the importance of Jaspers's "limit situation" for an ontology of Dasein, and expresses solidarity with the basic philosophical attitude expressed in the Foreword of Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews*, with its "center of gravity" in this "category" of limit situation. (339) (cf. chap. 3 above)

This approximation of Heidegger and Jaspers, centered around the phenomenological motif of death, is rather deceptive. If we follow Kisiel back to his preceding exposition in chapter three and also inspect the actual text of Heidegger's *Anmerkungen zu Karl Jaspers "Psychologie der Weltanschauungen"* (1919/21), we find that Heidegger's solidarity is skin deep, as far as philosophical method is concerned. Even if he found Jaspers's notion of the "limit situation" useful as a rudimentary starting point for working out his own conception of death in the context of *Seinssinn*,[22] he glibly dismisses Jaspers's approach of *blosse Betrachtung* (mere inspection) because of its wrong pretense of non-interference and neutrality.

In doing so, Heidegger's general charge against Jaspers is that he remains insensitive to the dynamics of *Vorgriff* (pre-prehension or anticipatory grasp; literally pre-grip), which precludes him from acknowledging the preconceptions, if not prejudices, implicit in his own approach. In his review of Jaspers's book, Heidegger delivers his judgement in stark terms, notwithstanding the conciliatory remarks at the beginning and at the very end of the essay. After indicating Max Weber and Sören Kierkegaard as two

of Jaspers's most important influences, both of whose "actual intentions" Jaspers "fundamentally misunderstood" (*auf dem Wege eines […] prinzipiellen Missverstehens*)[23] Heidegger concludes his review by stating:

> Jaspers verfällt einer Täuschung, wenn er meint, in einer blossen Betrachtung würde gerade das Höchstmass von Nichteingreifen in die persönliche Entscheidung erreicht und so der Einzelne für seine Selbstbesinnung freigegeben. […] Die blosse Betrachtung gibt gerade das nicht, was sie geben will, die Möglichkeit eines radikalen Nachprüfens und Entscheidens und, was damit gleichbedeutend ist, das strenge Bewusstsein von der Notwendigkeit des methodischen Fragens" (42)
>
> Es ist gerade ein Anzeichen für die Verkennung und Unterschätzung der echten Methodenproblematik, wenn Jaspers an die Probleme der Weltanschauungspsychologie in dieser einzelwisssenschaftlichen Einstellung herangeht und verkennt, dass "Allgemeine Psychologie" und "Weltanschauungspsychologie" sich so unter sich und sie beide von der prinzipiellen Problematik der Philosophie nicht ablösen lassen. (43)

In Heidegger's opinion, Jaspers unduly narrows the philosophical scope regarding the problem of method. Jaspers, so the criticism goes, ignores the philosophical underpinning of *historical psychology*.

Whether this judgment is justified or not, what is more important for my present purposes is Heidegger's general commentary on historical psychology, which is nested in his review of Jaspers's psychology of worldviews. In particular, this commentary illustrates that the Dilthey-bypass, as I have identified it here, was rhetorically encouraged by Heidegger himself in his exchange with Jaspers in the early 1920s. In the same review, he asserts:

> Dass wir heute in ganz eigentümlicher Art von, in und mit der Geschichte leben, ist doch zum mindesten auch etwas (wenn nicht gar mit eine Hauptsache), "was *da* ist," auch wenn die "Psychologie" diese Tatsache überhaupt noch nie und die Philosophie lediglich in der objektiven Aussenorientierung bemerkt haben. Aber gerade diese Tatsache muss einer die Existenzphänomene intendierenden Betrachtung als etwas gelten, was zu "verstehen" ist. (38)

Given Heidegger's early reading of, and familiarity with, psychophysics and historical psychology,[24] this claim about "psychology" not even having begun to enter the relevant level of debate is nothing short of sanctimonious. Heidegger is clearly (ab)using Jaspers's project as a means to conflate and dismiss the recent currents in historical psychology altogether or, more precisely, to gainsay their very existence.

As is clear from his extensive early criticism of Wilhelm Wundt's "thought laws" (*Denkgesetze*),[25] not only did Heidegger know about the advances made in the field of the hermeneutics of historical psychology, he actively responded to the internal conflicts within this field, where two rival projects lead to increasing partisanship among the debaters. In his dissertation and his habilitation, Heidegger thus registers the widening schism between *empirical* historical psychology, represented by the work of Wilhelm Wundt and *conceptual* historical psychology, promoted and modified by Paul's methodological work on language development.[26]

Upon scrutiny, Heidegger's more or less "polite dismissal" of (rather than general sympathy with) Jaspers's *Betrachtung*-approach in worldview philosophy, in the early 1920s, proves to be a strategic means to occlude the extensive work he had already done in this area. This discursive lineage connects him not only to Vossler and Paul, but also to Burckhardt and Cassirer, in ways that Heidegger was at painst to downplay, as he was drawing closer to launching his magnum opus. In particular, Heidegger will retain crucial theoretical imports from the tense discursive constellation of conceptual historical psychology (Paul) as well as neo-Idealist language philosophy (Vossler), in order to revamp them in the idiom of *Dasein*'s analysis. Such revamping is not so much a rejection or overcoming as it is a procedure of supplementation and modification. As we

will see, Heidegger co-opts these discursive strands through a philosophical rhetoric that effectively converts nineteenth-century *historical psychology into* twentieth-century *phenomenological ontology*.

In doing so, he cloaks the methodological subtext of his project, which links him to German idealism in the figure of Schelling, by creating a surface text of "ancient-Greek radicalism," variously invested with different connotations of medieval scholasticism and a "poeticized" German neo-Classicism invoking Hölderlin – not Goethe, who is discarded as one of the primary representatives of a "historical humanism."[27]

At the Heart of the Dilthey-Bypass: The "Ontoeroteric" Hoax of Fundamental Ontology

Sharpening our criticism of the Dilthey-bypass and better situating Heidegger's project, we can distance the latter a degree from the false kind of "ancient-Greek radicalism" just mentioned, which must be claimed here as the rhetorically amplified symptom of a more deep-seated philosophical commitment than traditional Heidegger commentary has admitted. As indicated earlier, in Kisiel's rendering this radicalism is embraced rather unreservedly in his characterization of Heidegger's "ontoeroteric" draft of *Being and Time*, namely the 1925 lecture course, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*. To repeat, in his account, this draft is *not* included in the bundle of textual items constituting the Dilthey draft, but this is the very problem, if one wants to reclaim the agenda I am assigning to both *Being and Time* and the *Letter on Humanism*. Assigning an ontoeroteric agenda to this work not only promotes a deceptive version of

ancient radicalism, in the above sense, but also preempts the authority of a key document, which proves to be more resourceful a candidate for being considered a Dilthey draft than the items previously selected from Heidegger's "Dilthey year" of 1924.

For Kisiel, the ontoeroteric character of the *Prolegomena*, then, consists in its determinate turn to the question of *being as such*. He explains his idiosyncratic choice of designation for analyzing Heidegger's purportedly new philosophical focus, in "hyper-radical" terms [my expression]. According to Kisiel's characterization, Heidegger's 1925 approach to being as such mobilizes a "double radicality," which fuses the "radicality of Greek ontology" with the "equally primoridal radicality of phenomenology" (362):

> The ultimate radicality that ensues from the fusion of these two radicalities first finds its most pointed expression in SS 1925. The point of fusion between phenomenology and ontology is accordingly the phenomenon par excellence, the ontophenomenon of "being." In more phenomenological terms, it is *our most original experience, the primal experience of our beginnings in experience itself, which once again is simply "being,"* at first bland, then exclamatory, and finally interrogative. The primacy that Heidegger now gives to the interrogative phenomenon of being thus yields, not just the phenomenological ontological draft of BT, as a result of this fusion, but more pointedly the "onto-eroteric" [here Kisiel inserts: note 1][28] draft, focused on the "question of being as such." (362-363) [my emphasis]

Under the banner of "ultimate radicality," the concern of the onto-eroteric approach (Kisiel will drop the hyphenation in the following) with "being as such," is thus specified in terms of "our most original experience, the primal experience of our beginnings in experience itself." This phrase, I argue, is a phenomenological tautololgy[29] that lacks any explanatory value. In its present context, however, it proves to be an effective rhetorical means to stage Heidegger's philosophical "pathos": an ontoeroteric mode, in which "the quest for being first manifests itself on the preverbal erotic level."[30] Guided by Plato and Aristotle, presumably,[31] the radical ontoeroteric phenomenologist attends to an

inquisitive mode, which points us to "the full force of the interrogative experience" at "the very threshold of language."[32]

Under the section heading *The Categorial Dimension As World*, Kisiel restates his account of ontoerotericism. "The primal experience of our beginnings in experience itself, which once again is simply 'being,'" is now described as "lived absorption in categorial apprehension but not yet in categories" (371):

> The "ontological thrust must be underscored: a *categorial component* or modification is operative tacitly, say, in *our simple perception of entities*, before it is conceptually grasped as a category. This *prejudicative apriori structure is the enabling background to any and every experience*. Explicating these implicit "objective" structures of experience becomes the task of ontological phenomenology. In fact, that is all that phenomenology is: "There is no ontology *next to* phenomenology. Rather, scientific ontology is nothing but phenomenology" (98/72). (371) [my emphases]

If we compare the last two quotations, a central problem becomes apparent. Kisiel shifts from "experience itself, which is […] simply 'being'" to "our simple perception of entities" and the structural background conditions that enable "any and every experience" on our part. Here we witness a fundamental slide from *experience as such* to *any experience*. These two are not the same, neither logically nor phenomeno-logically, for I can make general claims about the enabling conditions for any experience, namely *any experience in particular*, without subscribing to anything like "experience as such." Kisiel's reference to the latter, thus invokes what may be called the fundamental ontologist's most favorite myth – "the sheer experience of being *itself*" (366)– w hich allows the individual to conceive of the respective discipline of philosophical territory as "radical," "primal" – a quest for "trans-historical" (or ahistorical) ontology rather than regional ontologies.

Furthermore, the present reference to the "categorial component" in experience, explicated in terms of "prejudicative apriori stucture," gainsays the centerpiece of Kisiel's overall appoach to Heidegger and his account of the genesis story of *Being and Time*, namely his persistent claim that "it all began in KNS 1919" with Heidegger's strategy of "formal indication." This claim becomes untenable because Kisiel's account of categoriality cannot stand on its own, that is, without further qualification it amounts to a misconception. Yet, once we try to ammend the present account, we have to reach further back than KNS 1919, namely to Heidegger's earliest writings and to the teaching of Husserl:

> In placing overriding emphasis on the radicality of Greek ontology, he [Heidegger] appeals to the four years of labor prior to SS 1925. But this must be coupled by the equally primordial radicality of phenomenology which Heidegger, two years earlier in his first breakthrough of KNS 1919, already understood as the "pretheoretical primal science of origins." (362)[33]
>
> The categorial act is […] an *expressive* or articulative act which "*discloses* the simply given objects *anew*, so that these objects come to explicit apprehension precisely in what they are" (84/62). The formally indicative magnet word in the entire gloss, and beyond, is in fact "structure": *the structurations of being itself*, in *multiplying beings into manifold senses*, in providing the apriori structures in and by which beings appear, in *articulating different regions*, sciences, and logics; in turn, *the articulation itself* is obviously a structuration calling for examination; the structure of comportment, perception, the perceptual assertion, consciousness, encounter, aroundness, worldhood, in-being, and so on. [here Kisiel inserts: note 4][34] (372) [last four emphases added]

In these passages, crucial to Kisiel's genesis story, the ontoeroteric myth of "being as such," promulgated as the "passionate" quest carried out by fundamental ontology as radical phenomenology, is restated in terms of the structural characteristics of "articulation itself." According to the present "chain" of explication, which incorporates terms from Heidegger's own text, the "categorial" is explicated as "expressive" or "articulative;" "articulative" is explicated as "new disclosure of objects;" the latter in

terms of "the structurations of being itself," which, in turn, is spelled out in terms of "multiplying beings into manifold senses," thus articulating "different regions, sciences, logics."

This concatenation, or rather encapsulation, of definitions remains largely opaque. In particular, Kisiel does not explain what it means to "multiply beings into manifold senses." Nor does he explain why and how these "beings" are given before they are distributed among, and organized into, "different regions." Presumably, the pre-individuation of these "beings" is grounded in "our simple perception of entities" before their "categorial component […] is conceptually grasped as a category" (371; cf. quotation, p. 22, above).

This opacity notwithstanding, it is still apparent that this account of Heidegger's conception of categorial(s), or categorial acts, as opposed to categories, promotes a flawed notion of radical fundamental ontology as the "pretheoretical primal science of origins" (362). Fundamental ontology, so the story goes, has a philosophical job to do that is prior to the study of regional ontologies. Put in the present language of structure, the radical phenomenologist wants to interpolate an extra domain of philosophical inquiry *in between* the "structurations of being itself," on one hand, and the resulting regional ontologies, on the other. According to what I will term this *ontoeroteric fantasy*, radical phenomenology thus aspires to ruling the philosophical territory of "being as such" or "articulation itself." And to assert this territorial authority, a language is invented, which announces the philosophical knowledge or insight to be had in this domain of inquiry in terms of: "comportment [itself]," "perception [itself]," "perceptual

assertion [itself],"[35] "consciousness [itself]," "encounter [itself]," "aroundness [itself]," "worldhood [itself]," and "in-being [itself]" and so on (372; cf. last quotation, above).

To be clear, in his list of these categorial aspects, Kisiel does not attach the "itself" qualifier to the respective expression for each categorial. However, if this qualification is not implicity assumed, it is utterly unclear how these various categorials are supposed to explicate the notion of "articulation itself" (ibid.). In that case, Kisiel's entire last sentence would be superfluous, since we could rest simply with the preceding statement about "different regions, sciences, and logics." In fact, in my opinion, that is exactly what we should do. Articulation itself, consciousness itself, worldhood itself, in-being itself, etc., are only so many names for the same radical pipe dream, the same ontoeroteric fantasy – claiming authority over a philosophical void rather than the historically present logics of world presentation, as Heidegger's contemporaries would do.

To illustrate the uselessness of referring to in-being itself for a hermeneutic perspective, for example, consider what we may call one of Heidegger's *categorial glitches* in *Being and Time* (Division One, chapter two, § 12).[36] Here, Heidegger sets out to explain "the ontological distinction between being-in as an existential [*In-Sein als Existenzial*] and the category of the "insideness" ["*Inwendigkeit*" *von Vorhandenem*] that things objectively present can have with regard to one another" (56).[37] The existential character or mode of being-in is attributed to *Dasein*, whereas those "beings" unlike *Dasein* are characterized through the categorial mode of "insideness,"[38] an abstraction that more modern Heidegger readers like Derrida caution us against as a false assumption

of autonomy that must be put "under erasure." As an illustration of "insideness," then, Heidegger provides the following example:

> With this term [being-in] the kind of being of a being [*Seinsart eines Seienden*] is named which is "in" something else, as water is "in" the glass, the dress is "in" the closet. By this "in" we mean the relation of being that two beings extended "in" space have to each other with regard to their location in that space. Water and glass, dress and closet, are both "in" space "at" a location in the same way. This relation of being can be extended; that is, the bench in the lecture hall, the lecture hall in the university, the university in the city, and so on until: the bench in "world space" [*im Weltraum*]. These beings whose being "in" one another can be determined in this way all have the same kind of being – that of being objectively present – as things occurring "within" the world. (54)

This illustration on Heidegger's part appears flawed, insofar as "institutional" or "social" entities like universities and city do not have the same mode of being objectively-present as do quantities of water, glass, fabric, wood. At the same time, these "social" entities do not easily fit Heidegger's present characterization of *Dasein* as "the being which I myself always am" (*Dieses Seinende, dem das In-Sein in dieser Bedeutung zugehört, kennzeichneten wir als das Seiende, das ich je selbst bin.* [ibid.]).

In other words, Heidegger's above example conflates the categorial and existential (according to the terminology of *Being and Time*), in the context of being-in. This categorial glitch is significant because it shows that Heidegger's tendency to equivocate *Dasein*, by dressing it up with, and then stripping off from it, connotations of personal identity, undermines his own ontological distinctions. While he is at pains to preclude any understanding of *Dasein* in terms of individual souls or conscious psyches, he never explains whether *Dasein* as "the being which I myself always am" has the same being-in structure (or care-structure, for that matter) as universities, cities, or perhaps corporations.

In light of these loose ends, it becomes clear that Heidegger has not made a solid case on behalf of radical phenomenology as fundamental ontology,[39] for the utility of introducing structural categorials such as: "being itself," "consciousness itself," or "articulation itself." Instead, we have good reason to believe that these entries in the dictionary of the radical phenomenologist are completely vacuous, a pseudo-language that lacks philosophical content. Such language remains *discursively* revealing, however, if we interpret the corresponding enunciations as the expression of an ontoeroteric fantasy, a dream of territorial authority on the part of the philosopher seeking ground among his contemporaries.

For my present purposes, the main point to register in this regard is that, in *Being and Time*, Heidegger's distinction between the *Seinsarten* (modes of being) of *categorial* versus *existential* operates with an "emaciated" notion of categorial. As we shall see in the next chapter, his earlier conception (especially in the second part of his 1916 habilitation) of that notion is more complex and does not yet collapse the *categorial* into the *categorical*. Within the young Heidegger's *Bedeutungslehre*, the notion of the categorial still holds semiotic resources of meaning formation, in terms of open-ended structures rather than closed conceptual systems, which are subsequently repressed in *Being and Time*. This change is lost on Kisiel, for whom everything interesting starts in KNS 1919.

More importantly, the omission of this early version of a full-fledged, semiotically "thick" notion of the categorial engenders what I believe is one of the most stultifying effects of the Dilthey-bypass in contemporary Heidegger scholarship. It elides the notion of regional ontologies as open systems of meaning production, the dynamic

structural features of which are not reducible to static conceptual, or *categorical*, schemes. Instead, this bypass fosters a false conception of phenomenological radicality based on permanent horizons of understanding. Whether we call it ontoerotericism or not, its fundamental mistake is to interpolate a domain of "structuration itself" ("articulation itself," "worldhood itself," "in-being itself"), between the "structurations (plural!) of being itself" and the formation of regional ontologies. It is the same *ad hoc* invention which we detected in Heidegger's 1929 Kant critique, namely the positing of a single ontological horizon as the enabling condition for (understanding) the formation of various, semiotically productive life-worlds.

Incidentally, Kisiel points to "Heidegger's burst of enthusiasm for Kant's schematism" (372) in the very same context of categorial acts, struturation, and articulation. Yet this does not prompt him to consider visible parallels like Cassirer, Schelling, or German idealism in general, as pertinent sources for the genesis of *Being and Time* or the preceding *Prolegomena*. Instead, we can observe how the neo-Kantian bypass and the Dilthey-bypass interlock in Kisiel's view, for he reduces this burgeoning interest in Kant's schematism to "Heidegger's "retake" of his own genealogy" (ibid.). Consequently, this view remains oblivious to Heidegger's debt to Schelling as well as to his proximity to Cassirer, just as it overlooks the shift of meaning in Heidegger's notion of the categorial.

The Schellingean subtext, however, becomes quite tangible with respect to the discussion of being-in, in *Being and Time*. Rather than supporting any ontoeroteric ambitions toward radical phenomenology, Heidegger makes a clear gesture at the kind of contrastive spatiality that we found explicated in detail in Schelling's *Philosophy of*

Revelation. At a crucial juncture in his account of the existential mode of being-in, Heidegger thus summarizes his fundamental-ontological approach in terms that are again strongly reminiscent of the late Schelling, both terminologically and methodologically:

> *Ihre Absicht* [*die Absicht der vorliegenden Untersuchung*] *ist eine fundamentalontologische*. Wenn wir sonach dem In-Sein thematisch nachfragen, dann können wir zwar nicht die Ursprünglichkeit des Phänomens durch Ableitung aus anderen, d.h. durch eine unangemessene Analyse im Sinne einer Auflösung vernichten wollen. Die Unableitbarkeit eines Ursprünglichen schliesst aber eine Mannigfaltigkeit der dafür konstituierenden Seinscharaktere nicht aus. *Zeigen sich solche*, dann sind sie existenzial gleichursprünglich. Das Phänomen der *Gleichursprünglichkeit* der konstitutiven Momente ist in der Ontologie oft missachtet worden zufolge einer *methodisch ungezügelten* Tendenz der *Herkunftsnachweisung von allem und jedem aus einem einfachen "Urgrund."* (SZ, 131) [the first emphasis is Heidegger's; other emphases added]

In light of the results gained in chapter one, two things stand out in Heidegger's statement. First, his rejection of "a simple ur-ground" bears a strong resemblance to Schelling's Christological conception of a plural God. Second, Heidegger's seemingly unimportant subclause, "*Zeigen sich solche*, […]" actually marks a concession to Schelling's central tenet of *positive philosophy*, according to which the essence of the transcendent can be understood only *a posteriori*, that is, only after observing the actual effects of the creative factors that are co-constitutive of this essence. In this regard, Heidegger's speaking of a "Mannigfaltigkeit der [ein Ursprüngliches] konstituierenden Seinscharaktere" is strikingly similar to Schelling's account of the three potencies and how they can be pitted against one another in a potentially infinte variety of ways.

The clincher, however, is that none of this warrants the assumption of "being-in itself" ("worldhood itself" or "articulation itself"), as Schelling and Cassirer would insist. Radical as they may sound, these pseudo-categorials are nothing but the expression of an ontoeroteric strategy, which seeks to reduce regional ontologies to *closed categorical*

systems of fixed conceptualization rather than ackowledging their semiotic power as *open categorial* systems of meaning formation. It is only after the notion of regional ontologies has thus been stymied that the fundamental ontologist can rush in an "re-envigorate" the meaning production in a certain semiotic region through his or her radical and "passionate" questioning.

If we resist this reduction of the open categorial to the closed categorical, however, it becomes clear that this kind of radical questioning does not do any phenomenological work. In terms of philosophical methodology, the ontoerotericist interpolates a mysterious middle ground between potential being and regional ontologies. Such positing holds no semiotic resources for contributing to the constitution of *Seinssinn*. Instead, it amounts to a discursive gesture that lays claim to territorial authority in philosophical discourse. And that, as we shall turn to in the next section, elides one branch of Husserl's phenomenological project, one that is all too often conflated into a flattened notion of what the discipline comprises.

Eliding Husserl's *Phenomenological Psychology*: Distortions of "Categorial Form"

As another important ramification, this "emaciation" of the categorial eliminates the *historical* dimension of Heidegger's (increasingly cloaked) conception regional semiotic productivity. Kisiel will hint at the "historical I," whose "involvement in an impersonal "original something," the It which worlds and properizes me" (366), as somewhere buried in Heidegger's new rendering of the phenomenological project. Yet, by the time he addresses the dynamics of a priori structuration and the articulation of different regions (cf. 372),[40] this historical aspect is no longer present. In other words,

after highlighting the "magnet word" of "structure" (ibid.), the actual relation between the aspects of aprioricity, regionality, and historicality is glossed over in Heidegger's work without being refuted.

The bypass-effects of this omission are especially noticeable with respect to Kisiel's treatment of Husserl vis-à-vis Dilthey, as far as their respective influence and relevance for the genesis of *Being and Time* is concerned. Turning to the last item within the Dilthey-draft bundle, the *Kassel Lectures* (1925), we find that both Husserl and Dilthey are dismissed all too easily, in the context of categorial intuition (*kategoriale Anschauung*), a move which occludes their clear and continuing appeal to historicity as a regional ontology.

Remember, according to *The Genesis of Heidegger's* <u>*Being and Time*</u>, it is the ontoeroteric draft that is supposed to feature the figure of Husserl primarily.[41] Yet, this does not keep Kisiel from dismissing both Dilthey and the "basically ahistorical Husserl" (360) as subject to Heidegger's de(con)struction of Cartesianism, in the Dithey-draft context of the *Kassel Lectures* already:

> *Both Dilthey and Husserl, and before them Descartes*, are overtly criticized for their fundamental neglect of the question of the being of the entity which they make central. Whether the human being is defined as a psychic context, a coherence of experience, a center of acts unified in an ego, and so on, none of the phenomenologists ever raised *the question of the sense of being* of this, our own Dasein. Instead, *they fall back on traditional definitions dividing man into reason and sense, soul and body, inner and outer, without sense of what holds these realities together as a whole*. (360) [my emphases]

This characterization is simply inaccurate, especially as far as Husserl is concerned. Calling him "basically ahistorical" is largely justified, but the suggestion that Husserl did not attend to "the sense of being" (*Seinssinn*) or to the question of "what holds these realities together" is gainsaid by his explicit treatment of those very themes; especially in

the second volume of the *Logical Investigations* (1900/1901) and his later book on *Phenomenology of Psychology* (1925), a lecture course delivered in the same year in which Heidegger's *Prolegomena* was published. Hence, Husserl cannot plausibly be disposed of "by way of a parody of the Cartesian self" (ibid.).

Although "Husserl is not named here" (ibid.), Kisiel seems to be taken in by Heidegger's own statement from the *Prolegomena*, according to which "Husserl does not advance beyond Dilthey."[42] But with Heidegger, more often than not, those statements are tempered by assertions that seem to point in the opposite direction. Along with his famous praise of Husserl's *Logical Investigations* as the "founding document of phenomenology" (*das Grundbuch der Phänomenologie*), Heidegger indicates the late Dilthey's enthusiasm over this work.[43] In this place, Heidegger clearly voices his preference for the second volume of Husserl's *Logical Investigations*, "which contains what is crucial."[44]

For the purposes of this study, and within the present context of categorial acts and the "structurations of being (itself)," the main contribution on Husserl's part that I want to emphasize in revisiting Heidegger's *Prolegomena* relates to his conception of *material individuality* with respect to cultural meaning formation – his acknowledgment of a material semiotics of culture. To be sure, Husserl himself did not fully extend his notion of semiotic materiality into the domain of cultural science. Yet, as Katherine Arens has shown, Husserl was not quite as "ahistorical" as is commonly assumed.[45] In this vein, Husserl pointed the way to a new method in cultural historiography, the same project that drew Dilthey's attention as he recognizes the importance of Burckhardt's

analysis of Renaissance culture,[46] which marks one of the theoretical advances that helped pave the way for Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*.

In preparation for the next chapter, I confine myself here to a brief sketch of the kind of meaning-sponsoring material individuality, the import of which can be detected in Heidegger's *Prolegomena*. Acknowledging this theme complex about method in cultural science within Husserl's phenomenology is significant for two reasons. For one thing, it insulates Husserl from being dismissed by way of de(con)structing Descartes. Considering Husserl's general notion of "pure subjectivity," it will become clear that any criticism, which is primarily concerned with rejecting the Cartesian conception of consciousness, does not apply to Husserl's explication of the aspect of "matter" (*Material*) with respect to *categorial forms* (see quotation, right below).

For another, this particular facet of Husserl's work casts a new light on Heidegger's phenomenological mentor, which establishes an important link to the different projects of nineteenth-century psychology. Moreover, it corroborates the integral connection between Heidegger and Cassirer, grounded in a shared concern for methodological reform in cultural science, notwithstanding their different executions of this agenda and their different philosophical idioms.

In Part V. (chapter two, § 20) of his *Logical Investigations*, Husserl distinguishes between the "quality" (*Qualität*) and the "matter" (*Materie*) of any act, understood as intentional lived-experience (*intentionales Erlebnis*).[47] He goes on to specify this distinction as follows:

> Die Qualität bestimmt nur, ob das <u>in bestimmter Weise</u> bereits "vorstellig Gemachte" als Erwünschtes, Erfragtes, urteilsmässig Gesteztes u. dgl. intentional gegenwärtig sei. Darnach muss uns die <u>*Materie* als dasjenige im Akte gelten, was ihm allerst die Beziehung auf ein Gegenständliches verleiht</u>, und zwar diese

> Beziehung in so vollkommener Bestimmtheit, dass durch die Materie nicht nur das Gegenständliche überhaupt, welches der Akt meint, sondern auch die Weise, in welcher er es meint, fest bestimmt ist [here Husserl inserts note 1]. Die Materie – so können wir noch weiter verdeutlichend sagen – ist die im phänomenologischen Inhalt des Aktes liegende Eigenheit desselben, die es nicht nur bestimmt, dass der Akt die jeweilige Gegenständlichkeit auffasst, sondern auch als was er sie auffasst, welche Merkmale, Beziehungen, **kategoriale Formen** er in sich selbst ihr zumisst. An der Materie des Aktes liegt es, dass der Gegenstand dem Akte als dieser und kein anderer gilt, sie ist gewissermassen der die Qualität fundierende (aber gegen deren Unterschiede gleichgültige) Sinn der gegenständlichen Auffassung (oder kurzweg der *Auffassungssinn*). (LI, 415-416) [Husserl's emphases; my additional emphasis in bold.]

Here I cannot do justice to the complexity of Husserl's explication of the "meaning aspect of object-oriented apprehension"[48] (*Sinn der gegenständlichen Auffassung*). Instead I will attend only to those features that are most crucial in preparing for the examination of Heidegger's *Prolegomena*, with respect to material individuality in meaning formation and the issue of "categorial forms" (*kategoriale Formen*), in continuation of our previous discussion of "categorial acts."[49]

To begin with, Husserl's present notion of "matter" shows that he is not engaged in Cartesian epistemology but rather proffers a blueprint for what I am calling a *material semiotics*, in which the possibility of meaning formation is spelled out in terms of certain epistemic structures. These structures both integrate and limit the items (*Gegenstände*) that can emerge from a specific context of intentional lived-experiences (*intentionale Erlebnisse*). Here, the limits of structural organization, called categorial forms, are at the same time the enabling conditions for a life-world (transcendental but not transcendent), the integrated totality of which both transcends and grounds individual acts of consciousness.

Speaking of transcendence here refers to Husserl's tenet about the stable and complete character of the constitution of reality, that is, the claim that there is a unified

world whose objectively true features are, in principle, accessible to the phenomenological researcher through "the method of ideation" (PhP, 66), which aims at a standard for "trans-subjective validity" (PhP, 29), as he puts it in his later book on *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925).[50]

This notion of transcendent reality, however, does not make Husserl a (naïve) metaphysical realist. He is not interested in any claims about "things in themselves," independent of mental activity, just as he refuses to consider the world a product of individual mental construction. In this manner, he is indebted to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* but also departs from it, by *collapsing the mental into the real*. The latter step is absolutely crucial for Husserl's phenomenological project. It shows his notion of transcendence to be one of *immanent transcendence*, very similar to Schelling's conception of God as the real ground (*das reelle Erste*) put forth within the framework of positive philosophy, regardless of the fact that Husserl did not conceive of it in theological or Christological terms. As Husserl explains with respect to the objects that can be encountered and recognized as emerging from this kind of transcendent structural background:

> The object transcends the real content of the stream of lived experiences; only its real moments are "immanent" to it.
>
> Yet, this concept of the transcendent, of the object present to consciousness in its imminence, still includes several great difficulties […] (PhP, 137)

As Arens (1989), to whose treatment of Husserl's psychology I am indebted here, points out: "The worst of these difficulties is the issue of multiple significations or appearances of the object, and the necessity to differentiate between the meaning of an object and its various intentional meanings (PhP, 141)" (210). We can clarify this difficulty by

considering how Husserl combines his "method of ideation" with his method of "phenomenological reduction." The former can be illustrated with respect to Husserl's famous example of the peception of a house, which Arens summarizes as follows:

> An observer can only see it [any particular house] from one side, but its existence (the other unseen walls) is always fleshed out by the thinker. Any change in perspective on that object does not lead the observer to think that a new object has emerged in place of the old, but rather that the object is presented from a new perspective (PhP, 45). Each appearance of the house is merely a new horizon in experiencing, an "*a priori* necessary structure" (PhP, 42). (198)

In the lived experience of a house, there are universal structures of time, space, (color, intensity) at work, that can be tickled out by going through a "test series" of perspectival shifts. Rather than disintegrating the notion of an unchanging perceptual ground, these shifts can bring out the stable and unifying qualitites of our individual house-perceptions. The latter are thus construed as organized by the structural features of an overall experiential world in which certain kinds of perceptions become available, including spatial (in this case three-dimensional) perceptions, or more narrowly, house-perceptions. No single perception of a house, on the part of a single personal observer, can exhaust – or create – its own enabling conditions, namely the a priori structures of perception in any given experiential world. While there may be several, perhaps infinitely many, such worlds, we only have phenomenological access to the transcendent ground, i.e., the priori structural make-up of "our own" life world. Accordingly, the perceptual-structural profile of any such experiential domain is cosidered as *immanent transcendent*.

The accompanying difficulty in terms of "multiple significations or appearances of the object" pertains to the fact that our experience of houses and other things is almost always "colored" by other experiential qualities, such as social connotations (the political power perceived "off of the walls" of imperial-looking government buildings; or the

reassurance, or unease, perceived in the presence of hospitals or morgues). The crux for Husserl is twofold. First, no two people seem to perceive the same house in the same way. Second, there also seems to be no standard for prioritizing one set of experiential "coloration" over another.

Husserl's solution to this quandary consists in his "phenomenological reduction," which basically strips perception of all its social or cultural overtones and aims at the "pure conceptual essence" (PhP, 59), or *eidos*, of a house, or anything else that is integral part of the unified perceptual nexus of a life world. Actually looking at a house from different angles, or rotating an imaginary house in our mind, can reveal a fundament of spatial dimensionality, just as going through a variational sequence of color perceptions may grant phenomenological knowledge about a certain color dimensionality.[51]

To repeat, what any such sequential test series is supposed to reveal is not the traits of some "thing in itself" or mind-independent entity (like the Platonic idea of a house). The transcendent ground of perception is *mental* but *not individually mental*. Ideational analysis thus concerns the perception of perception, as it is sometimes put. Any particular *eidos* is a universal structural feature, a "real moment" (PhP, 137) of an experiential world, which can be brought out through sequentially sifting through the "real content" of individual perceptions, none of which is able to reveal the "real moment," or real aspect, by itself. An *eidos* is a structural quality that is both a priori and world-relative, a regional-ontological entity of immanent transcendence or transcendental immanence.

Husserl does *not* posit a single ontological horizon that would contain, or encompass, or "ground" all other horizons. In this place, Husserl is not really interested

in the *pre-eidetic* domain (my term), should any such exist (he would consider that assumption beyond the scope of the verifiable). Yet, if he were to address it, in keeping with his general phenomenological method, the pre-eidetic would have to be characterized in terms similar to Schelling's notion of the *unpreconceivable*, which is not a horizon but a "tranquil" or not-yet-differentiated continuum. Once differentiation takes place, we immediately confront a multiplicity of different *eidetically* structured realms.

Husserl's present account, we might say, skips over but does not go against Schelling's analysis of the three potencies, and already starts at the level of perceptual "personalities"[52] instead. In this regard, his ideational analysis is generally compatible with Schelling's framework of positive philosophy. At the same time, Schelling and Cassirer would object that the phenomenological reduction in Husserl's material semiotics is too restrictive, but that it could be effectively extended into a full-fledged theory of cultural meaning formation, be it as critical Christology or as a philosophy of symbolic forms.

In this vein, Cassirer expressly acknowledges the methodological resources of Husserl's material semiotics, in general, and his working conception of categorial forms (the structural foundation of any experiential world, in terms of its *Seinssinn*), in particular, when he says:

> It is one of the fundamental achievements of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology to have sharpened once again our perception of the diversity of cultural "structural forms" and to have pointed out a new approach to them, departing from the psychological method. Particularly, the sharp distinction between psychological "acts" and the "objects" intended in them is crucial. Husserl's own development from the *Logische Untersuchungen* (2 vols. Halle, 1913-1922) to the *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie* (Halle, 1928) makes it increasingly clear that the task of phenomenology, as Husserl sees it, is not exhausted by the analysis of cognition but calls for an investigation of the structures of entirely different objective spheres, according to what they "signify"

> and without concern for the "reality" of their objects. Such an investigation should include the mythical "world," not in order to derive its specific actuality by induction from the manifold of ethnological and ethnic-psychological experience, but in order to apprehend it in a purely ideational analysis. As far as I can see, however, no attempt of this sort has been undertaken either in phenomenology or in mythological research, where the genetic-psychological approach still holds almost uncontested sway. (II, 12: note 7)

As Cassirer implies, Husserl himself did not apply his method to different areas of cultural meaning production, in keeping with the (self-imposed) strictures of his phenomenological reduction. However, with respect to Husserl's later writings, it can be shown that he was well aware of the potential for broadening his initial approach.

In addition to Cassirer's reference to Husserl's *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy*, we may thus point again to the *Phänomenologische Psychologie* (1925), of which Heidegger said that it was in the making since 1916.[53] Here, Husserl directly addresses the issue of cultural analysis:

> Culture is not a layer of properties pertaining to natural objects as psyches, rather, it is a psyche in objects of the surrounding world, objects which admittedly are natural objects whenever they are investigated from the point of view of natural truth, but which as such have only natural properties. […] The world, considered personally, is the nature of the natural scientist and of all personalities interested in nature; the orientation of the socio-cultural sciences, nature, and correlatively the natural scientist, is a personal theme. History is an all-inclusive personal science, a science of the personal and of its facticity taken all-inclusively. Eidetics [phenomenological psychology] is the all-inclusive science of ideally possible forms of personality in the unity of a personally regarded, and thereby historical, world. (PhP, 176)

As this passage clearly documents the close methodological ties between Schelling, Husserl, and Cassirer, it also hints at the lingering limits that kept Husserl from bringing his program to bear on cultural theory with full force. On one hand, Husserl's present account of *historical personality* and its "facticity" as the subject matter for "history as an all-inclusive personal science" is directly hooked into a project of revolutionizing cultural

historiography, which points from Nietzsche's mentor Jakob Burckhardt and is study on *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1860) to Cassirer and Kristeller's later treatment of *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* (1948).

On the other hand, one can detect a crucial limitation to Husserl's approach, which consistis in the fact that his model of personal science does not address or accommodate for any feedback dynamics, within meaning formation, between the individual perceiver of cultural items (*Gegenstände*) and the other members of her "experiential community." Even if we extend the scope of the latter by allowing cultural overtones into the ideational analysis of the perception of houses and color fields, Husserl's program remains largely mute on the communicative dimension of materially mediated semiotic practices.

In this regard, the *eidetic* phenomenologist remains somewhat solipsistic *not* because he or she is confined to observations in their own head. Instead of promoting any epistemological (Cartesian) solipsism, Husserl's position retains a trait of communicative isolation insofar as the routes of meaing formation lead only from sequentially varied observations by individual phenomenologists to the a priori structures of the experiential world that grounds the emergence of their perceptions in the first place. Husserl does not consider the possible effects of mutual influence with respect to the semiotic interaction between different *eidetic* communities, or the semiotic interaction between an *eidetic* community and its individual members.

To put the point more generally, according to Husserl's conception of the "matter" component in intentional lived-experience, the categorial forms – or forms of signification – that determine the *Auffassungssinn* (meaning-aspect of apprehension) of

any given life world do not transform or evolve. To be sure, semiotic structuration, for Husserl, must not be confused with any law-governed causal or genetic process, where a substratum of a certain set of things-in-themselves would dictate the semiotic superstructure of possible experience. However, Husserl insist on the "causal unity" or "causal *habitus*" (PhP, 78) of each form of signification, which means that the constellation of its "real moments" remains the same, that is, each world preserves its "stable style" (PhP, 77) of meaning production.

In other words, the *horizon* of each semiotic system is *closed* and "self-contained" (PhP, 165). While *eidetic* reality is transcendentally pluralistic and not guilty of the kind of metaphysical dogmatism, with which Schelling had charged negative philosophy, Husserl claims solid standards of "pure subjectivity" (ibid.) for each life world. Each system of meaning production constitutes a "monad" (ibid.) whose immanent sense of being does not change or evolve. This monadic quality does not pertain to individual psyches but to the mental mechanisms which organize and unify a particular experiential domain.

Thus understood, Hussel's immanent transcendentism operates within a philosophical framework of regional ontology, which is *not metaphysically dogmatic but semiotically deterministic*. Against this background, the phenomenologist hopes to ascertain and properly *describe* the "objectively true" character of a particular life world from within its perceptual structures. Yet, there is no tranformatory participation involved in such research activity, which would actively prompt semiotic evolution by reshaping or recasting the meaning of any cultural *eidos*, which cannot be seen as "malleable" for Husserl.

From Phenomenological Psychology to a Material Semiotics: Some Conclusions

It is with respect to this curb on world-immanent semiotic development, then, that Cassirer will seek to extend Husserl's material-semiotic insights and put them to work for a more complex and dynamic theory of culture. In doing so, he will, as we shall see in the next chapter, draw from the earlier work of Hermann Paul whose earlier conception of semiotic matter (*Vorstellungsmasse*) already went beyond some of the limitations, from which Husserl was not able, or willing, to free himself. Accordingly, it is with regard to questions about the malleability and structural transformation of certain cultural eide, from within a given life world, that new philosophical ground may be broken.

By contrast, it is a disservice to Husserl (Paul, Cassirer), in particular, and to material semiotics, in general, if the phenomenological notion of categorial forms is translated into a scheme of fundamental ontology, which seeks to corrupt and disempower the productivity of regional ontologies by positing a single ontological meta-horizon. I have demonstrated this with specific reference to Kisiel, but this tendency has been long the trend among contemporary Heidegger scholars in celebrating Heidegger's "radical" advance beyond Dilthey and Husserl, thus bypassing them both.

The cost of such radical aberrations becomes especially tangible, when we compare his early writings to his 1925 production shortly before the publication of *Being and Time*. Examining his dissertation and habilitation in conjunction with the *Prolegomena* lecture course will bring out Heidegger's continued, if increasingly cloaked, indebtedness to his phenomenological mentor, from whom he did not depart as swiftly or starkly as is commonly assumed. The significance of illuminating this remaining link to Husserl's material semiotics, by giving special attention to Heidegger's

co-optation of the notion of categorial form, is that it brings out Heidegger's suppressed connection to nineteenth-century historical psychology and comparative philology. The latter, in turn, undercuts the now-standard banning of Cassirer from contemporary Heidegger interpretation. Once Heidegger's nineteenth-century roots are excavated from the subtext of his writings, Cassirer's continuous relevance can no longer be ignored, along with the Neogrammarians congenial to him. In fact, as we turn to the early writings and the *Prolegomena*, in the next chapter, we will find that one does not have to dig very deep to find Heidegger's buried interlocutors.

---

[1] For Helmholtz's role within the nineteenth-century science debate, especially with respect to his influence on Ernst Mach who became an important interlocutor for Husserl, see: Katherine Arens (1989), pp. 22-23, 219-221; and John T. Blackmore (1972), pp. 56-60. Also, cf. Ernst Cassirer's synoptic account that explicitly puts Helmholtz's influence in relation to the "Definition of Modern Linguistic Science and the Problem of Phonetic Laws" (I, 167-176; for Helmholtz's significance, esp. 168-169) in: Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, trans. R. Manheim (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-57 [orig. 1923-1929]).

[2] I adopt this term from chapter five in: Olga Amsterdamska (1987).

[3] Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenological Psychology: Lectures, Summer Semester, 1925*, trans. J. Scanlon (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977) [here and in the following also referred to as: "PhP"]. The original German text was posthumously published as: Edmund Husserl, *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925*, ed. W. Biemel, *Husserliana*, Vol. IX (The Hague: Marinus Nijhoff, 1962). The present passage is quoted in: Arens (1989), p. 213.

[4] Edmund Husserl, *Logische Untersuchungen: Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntniss*, vol. 2 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1993 [orig. 1900-01]).

[5] For an especially pertinent contribution in this area, at the discursive intersection of historical semiotics and regional ontology, see: Katherine Arens, "The Linguistics of French Feminism: *Sémanalyse* as Critical Discourse Analysis," *Intertexts*, 2, No. 2, (Fall 1998): 171-184. – In this study I do not pursue the discursive continuity between Schelling, Cassirer, and the post-structuralists in any detail. In my conclusion, however, I will make a gesture at one important point of contact that strikes me as particularly resourceful, namely the critical-Christological resources of the notion of "vital anecdote," put forth in: Deleuze and Guattari (1994).

[6] *Der Begriff der Zeit: Vortrag vor der Marburger Theologenschaft Juli 1924*, ed. Hartmut Tietjen (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989) = *The Concept of Time*, trans. W. McNeill (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992).

[7] For the editorial changes related to the rendering of this title, see: Kisiel's note 17, p. 398. – The textual unity of the final draft is, by definition, no longer a matter of preparatory texts. Instead the issue becomes one of conceptual genealogy, which explains how the "conceptual forces" of the previous two drafts "are refurbished and mobilized for [the] central task," namely "the kairological climax" (422) in *Being and Time*, as Kisiel understands it. For a detailed discussion and criticism, see: chapter three, below.

[8] The parenthetical abbreviation in Kisiel's phrase, "BZ," refers to the German title of the public address, *Der Begriff der Zeit*, cf. note 6, above.

[9] More specifically: "The lecture is therefore not really a draft of BT, even though it contains virtually, albeit in very unequal proportions, all the major elements of the Second Division of BT on "Dasein and Temporality," as Heidegger himself notes at one point in BT (SZ 268n)" (319).

[10] "Nascently crude but pregnantly suggestive, a brilliant rhetorical *tour de force* of ordinary language in a period of so much turgid writing, nevertheless without lapsing into cheap popularization, structured by a sophisticated method, therefore charged with latent insights and unspoken possibilities: […]" (321).

[11] See especially Heidegger's (GA 20) self-reflective remarks on his formal account of "signification" (*Bedeutsamkeit*) in terms of "indication" (*Verweisung*) (274). More specifically: "Der Titel Verweisung zeigt formal eine Struktur an, die sich an veschiedenen Phänomenen ausprägt. Zeichen ist eine Art von Verweisung, Symbol, Symptom, Spur, Dokument, Zeugnis, Ausdruck, Überrest . Diese Verweisungsphänomene können hier nicht im einzelnen verfolgt werden, […]. Man muss, wenn man die Realität des Realen verstehen und nicht über das Reale etwas erzählen will, immer auf die Struktur des Seins und nicht etwa auf die Fundierungsverhältnisse des Seienden unter sich sehen. […] Wenn wir sagen, die Grundstruktur der Weltlichkeit, das Sein des Seienden, das wir Welt nennen, liege in der Bedeutsamkeit, so ist damit ausgedrückt, dass die Struktur, wie wir sie bisher gekennzeichnet haben, die Verweisungen und Verweisungszusammenhänge im Grunde Bedeutungszusammenhänge sind" (275-276) [Heidegger's emphasis]. Against the background of these remarks, Heidegger then comments on the "phenomenological notion of death" (*phänomenologischen Begriff des Todes*) as follows: "Es bedarf der genuinen Interpretation des Todes als eines reinen Phänomens des Daseins, und das wiederum besagt: Wir haben den Tod aus dem her zu verstehen, was bisher an Seinsstrukturen über das Dasein herausgestellt wurde. Die phänomenologisch reine Durchführung dieser Aufgabe zeigt das Merkwürdige – die besagte Unmöglichkeit ist nur Schein. Die echte phänomenologische Interpretation des Phänomens des Todes ist vielmehr der einzige Weg, den Blick dafür zu öffnen, dass das Dasein als solches über eine Seinsmöglichkeit verfügt, es selbst genuin in seiner Gänze zu sein. Der Seinscharakter dieser Seinsmöglichkeit selbst wird dann den phänomenalen Boden für die Gewinnung des Seinssinnes des Ganzseins des Daseins abgeben" (430-431).

[12] Cf. Kisiel's remarks on the aborted first article project, which Heidegger had promised to Rothacker, which went under the tentative title, "The Ontological Foundations of Late Medieval Anthropology and the Theology of the Young Luther" (322).

[13] Cf. quotation, p. 75, above.

[14] See: Martin Heidegger remarks in *Sein und Zeit*, where he relates *Wiederholung* to his method of "destruction" (*Destruktion*), while contrasting it with an (inauthentic) notion of "tradition": "Erst in der Durchführung der Destruktion der ontologischen Überlieferung gewinnt die Seinsfrage ihre wahrhafte Konkretion. In ihr verschafft sie sich den vollen Beweis der Unumgänglichkeit der Frage nach dem Sinn von Sein und demonstriert so den Sinn von der Rede einer "Wiederholung" dieser Frage" (*SZ*, 26). On the same note, cf. his earlier remark: "Die hierbei zur Herrschaft kommende Tradition macht zunächst und zumeist das, was sie "übergibt", so wenig zugänglich, dass sie es vielmehr verdeckt. […] Die Folge wird, dass das Dasein bei allem historischen Interesse und allem Eifer für eine philosophisch "sachliche" Interpretation die elementarsten Bedingungen nicht mehr versteht, die einen positiven Rückgang zur Vergangenheit im Sinne einer produktiven Aneignung ihrer allein ermöglichen" (ibid., 21).

[15] As Kurt Mueller-Vollmer points out in this note: "This passage clearly echoes Humboldt's famous characterization of language and speech from his *Introduction to the Kawi Language*. […]" (123). On a similar note, Droysen elaborates on the reciprocal dynamics involved in understanding: "The human being is, in essential nature, a totality in himself, but realizes this character only in understanding others and being understood by them, in the moral partnerships of family, people, state, religion, etc. – The individual

is only relatively a totality. He understands and is understood only as a specimen and expression of the partnerships whose member he is and in whose essence and development he has part, himself being but an expression of this essence and development" (122). For these references, see: *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German Tradition from the Enlightenment to the Present*, ed. K. Mueller-Vollmer (New York: Continuum, 1985).

[16] In: Wilhelm Dilthey, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. VII (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1960).

[17] Cf., e.g., the following remark: "Das Wissen von der Kunst wandelt sich im 19. Jahrhundert, entsprechend der wachsenden Unkraft zu metaphysischem Wissen, in das Erfahren und Erforschen der sogenannten reinen Tatsachen der Kunstgeschichte im weitesten Sinne dieses Wortes. Was im Zeitalter Herders und Winckelmanns im Dienste einer grossen Selbstbesinnung des geschichtlichen Daseins stand, wird jetzt um seiner selbst willen betrieben: als Fach. Die eigentliche Kunstgeschichtsforschung beginnt. Gestalten wie Jakob Burckhardt und Hippolyte Taine, die unter sich wieder ganz verschieden sind, lassen sich freilich nicht mit dem Messgerät des Fachbetriebes ausmessen. Die Erforschung der Dichtung kommt in den Bereich der Philologie. "Echte Philologie" ist der "Sinn für das Kleine" [here Heidegger inserts note 7]" (GA 43, 105-106); note 7: "Wilhelm Dilthey, Gesammelte Schriften, Bd. XI, Berlin und Leipzig 1936, S. 216. – This reference is particularly significant because it shows that Heidegger was generally aware of the routes of reciprocal influence among different fields, such as art-historiography, cultural history, and philology, all of which being drawn into the discourse over redefining historical science.

[18] See: SZ, p. 349, note 11. Heidegger abbreviates Wackernagel's first name as "Jak.," although it is actually "Jacob." This notwithstanding, the author is clearly identified through the title and the year of the textual reference.

[19] For an account of the Neogrammarian movement, see: Olga Amsterdamska (1987), esp. chapters IV, V, VI, pp. 90-175; for Delbrück's position, in particular, see: pp. 112, 116-118.

[20] Already in *Phänomenologie der Anschauung und des Ausdrucks* (1920) (GA 59), Heidegger clearly dismisses Spengler as theoretically useless: "Oswald Spengler, der die letzte grosse Philosophie des Abendlandes zu geben beansprucht und ihre Grundzüge in der Idee einer universalen Symbolik vorlegt, gibt – was das Prinzipielle, Fundamentale, Erstentscheidende betrifft – lediglich einen Ableger vor allem der erstgenannten Gruppe von Motiven der Lebensphilosophie, der, die durch einen bewegten, orientierten Kontinuismus unterbaut ist. Seien Philosophie ist ganz von vorgestern und dem "windigen Gerede" der von ihm genannten, aber mehr noch verschwiegenen Philosophien weitgehend verpflichtet. Die notorische Unkenntnis und journalistische Oberflächlichkeit des heutigen Bildungspöbels musste sich Spenglers Buch bemächtigen, zumal diese Buch stark positive und leicht zugängliche, aber keine philosophischen Qualitäten hat" (16). "Spengler hat die Probleme der Gegenwartsphilosophie, also diejenigen, die sie letztlich, ohnse selbst herausgehoben zu sein, beschäftigen, weder gesehen noch gelöst, sondern lediglich durch eine gewaltsame Verallgemeinerung neu verdeckt, also nicht einmal den *Problem*horizont der Philosophie verändert, geschweige denn diesen selbst neu gewonnen" (17). In this place, Heidegger seems to indulge his critique of an inferior theoretician. While this criticism is revealing in itself, it also goes to show that merely pointing to the difference between these two thinkers is not immediately helpful for locating Heidegger among his "actual" interlocutors, that is, those authors he would take seriously, whether through agreement or disagreement.

[21] For a concise synopsis of Dilthey's critical project in the context of historical hermeneutics, see: Josef Bleicher, *Contemporary Hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as Method, Philosophy, and Critique* (London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 11-26.

[22] Cf. note 11, above.

[23] "Die Art und Weise, wie Jaspers die "Methode" gewählt hat und wie er sie selbst deutet, ist einmal im Vorgriff motiviert, geht im besonderen aber auf den ausdrücklich vermerkten Einfluss Max Webers und Kierkegaards zurück, allerdings beide Male nur auf dem Wege eines, im Vorgriff motivierten, prinzipiellen

Missverständnisses der eigentlichen Intentionen beider" (40). Quoted from: Martin Heidegger, *Wegmarken* (GA 9).

[24] Heidegger had read Ernst Mach's *Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen* by 1912, if not before (cf. his reference: GA 1, p. 6). He extensively discusses the work of Wilhelm Wundt in his dissertation, *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus* (1913), also included in the first volume of the *Gesamtausgabe*; and even in later works, such as the *Prolegomena* (1925), he refers to figures like Avenarius (GA 20, p.225).

[25] See Heidegger's dissertation: Martin Heidegger, *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus* (1913) (GA 1); esp. pp. 87-90.

[26] I adopt this distinction between empirical and conceptual psychology, and the specific terminology, in which it is presented, from Katherine Arens' (1989) book: *Structures of Knowing*; for the Paul-Wundt controversy, see esp.: pp. 138-139, 146-149. Her account strikes me as particularly useful with respect to the following investigation of the "categorial" (see: pp. 25 ff., below). It will also prove helpful in clarifying the actual differences as well as overlaps between Paul and Vossler, treated in the next section.

[27] Heidegger's stabs at Goethe, in the name of Hölderlin, are especially prominent in the *Letter on Humanism*: "Zum historisch verstandenen Humanismus gehört deshalb stets ein studium humanitatis, das in einer bestimmten Weise auf das Altertum zurückgreift und so jeweils auch zu einer Wiederbelebung des Griechentums wird. Das zeigt sich im Humanismus des 18. Jahrhunderts bei uns, der durch Winckelmann, Goethe und Schiller getragen ist. Hölderlin dagegen gehört nicht in den "Humanismus", und zwar deshalb, weil er das Geschick des Wesens des Menschen anfänglicher denkt, als dieser "Humanismus" es vermag" (GA 9, 320).

[28] In this note, Kisiel elaborates on his neologism as follows: "By coining the term "erote*r*ic," I have allowed myself a slight orthographic liberty with the usual English adjective "erote*t*ic" (from ερωτησις, questioning) in order to suggest the close tie between *eros* and questioning that Greek etymology reflects. Especially in this phenomenological context, the quest for being first manifests itself on the preverbal erotic level, the pathos which gives rise to the question of being, before it reaches the verbal level of questioning" (544).

[29] In fact, at some point, Kisiel seems to criticize Heidegger for resorting to an overly theatrical or dramatic conception of phenomenology or phenomenological research: "Being befalls me, I am *betroffen*, afflicted, stricken, visited by its sense … or nonsense: Greek astonishment, postmodern angst. These middle-voiced vectors of questioning and questioned are about as far as Heidegger gets in this course in pressing to the limit and so testing the language first evoked in KNS to describe the historical I's involvement in an impersonal "original something," the It which worlds and properizes me, so that I am very much in It and of It even before I raise the question" (366). – Yet, at the same time, Kisiel turns around and enthusiastically embraces the "double-radicality" of Heidegger's approach, as is shown through the quotations I provide throughout this section. More specifically he remains oblivious to Heidegger's actual treatment of the "historical I," which, to repeat, does not start in KNS 1919, but is already fully underway in Heidegger's dissertation and habilitation, as I demonstrate in the following.

[30] Cf. note 28, right above.

[31] Contrary to Kisiel, Heidegger's alignment with Greek philosophy's way of questioning remains ambiguous. He claims the authority of Plato and Aristotle, and suspends it at the same time. In this manner he creates a rhetorical aura of a "new" start with "old" authority. Yet, in the end it remains completely unclear how exactly Plato and/or Aristotle are supposed to have paved the way to the "radical" question about being as such. In fact, at the most crucial point, when Heidegger translates this question into the idiom of Dasein, he thoroughly equivocates the issue when he juxtaposes "Dasein as being-possible" and Dasein "in its possibilities" (185). To trace the course of Heidegger's invocation of Greek thought more fully, consider the following sequence of comments. In § 14. *Die Exposition der Seinsfrage aus dem radikal verstandenen Sinn des phänomenologischen Prinzips*, Heidegger begins on a note that would seem

to support Kisiel's ontoeroteric case: "Das phänomenologische Fragen führt seinem innersten Zuge nach selbst zur Frage nach dem Sein des Intentionalen und vor allem vor die Frage nach dem Sinn des Seins überhaupt. So ist die Phänomenologie in ihrer eigensten Möglichkeit radikalisiert nichts anderes als das wieder lebendig gewordene Fragen von *Plato* and *Aristotle: die Wiederholung, das Wiederergreifen des Anfangs unserer wissenschaftlichen Philosophie*" (184). Similarly Heidegger recognizes the "higher level" (here compared to Parmenides), on which Plato and Aristotle "worked out the question about being": "Wenn wir uns in die Geschichte zurückorientieren, dorthin wo die Seinsfrage zum erstenmal auftauchte, bei *Parmenides*, dann sehen wir […] Das Sein ist dasselbe wie das Vernehmen des Seienden in seinem Sinn. Hier schon in der Frage nach dem, was das Sein ist, wird ausdrücklich das Erfahren des Befragten selbst mit in Rechnung gesetzt, obzwar hier die Frage selbst noch gar nicht in ihrer Struktur explizit da ist. Später dann, […] [wird] auf einem höheren Niveau die Frage nach dem Sein ausgearbeitet […] – bei *Plato* und *Aristoteles* […]" (201).

Yet, so far, these remarks of appreciation for the Greek tradition have been inconclusive. It is not quite clear yet how, or to what degree, either Plato or Aristotle has exacted (to be sure, in their own way) what Heidegger refers to as the "phenomenological tendency" (*phänomenologische Tendenz*) in this place, which consists in "clarifying and understanding being as such" (*Sein als solches aufzuklären und zu verstehen*) (ibid.). Heidegger himself thus hastens to add that by taking our bearings from the "classic scientific philosophy of the Greeks", we must not take their authority for granted, as far as the "fundamental question of being" is concerned: "Wenn die phänomenologisch gewonnene Fundamentalfrage nach dem Sein sich als die herausstellt, die die klassische wissenschaftliche Philosophie der Griechen gerade lebendig werden liess, so darf dieses geschichtliche Faktum nicht etwa als Autoritätsbeweis für die Richtigkeit der Frage genommen werden. Vielmehr kann das nur ein Hinweis darauf sein, dass diese Frage im Zuge des forschenden Fragens überhaupt offenbar selbst liegt" (186-187).

At this point, Heidegger's reference to Plato and Aristotle appears competely arbitrary, they may or may not instantiate the "phenomenological tendency" just as good as anyone else. In fact, at some point, Heidegger makes it sound as if Plato could not help himself to attend to the question of being, since this question, in a manner of speaking, implies its own mode of being asked, or asking itself: "Dass *Plato* zur Frage nach dem Logos im Sinne der Dialektik kommt, liegt einfach im Sinne der Frage selbst, die er stellte und wie er sie stellte, im Sinne der Frage nach dem Sein, die selbst fordert, das Fragen als ein Seiendes zu bestimmen" (201). – Aside from the inherent ambiguity of Heidegger's staging of Plato and Aristotle, the fundamental misconception that Heidegger proffers to his readers comes to the fore, when he specifies the question of being *as such* in terms of Dasein's structure of *Jeweiligkeit*, for which Kisiel (500) offers the following options for translation: "at-the-time-ness," "particular whileness," "temporal particularity." Heidegger claims that there is no Dasein, which is not *jeweilig*: "Der Fudamentalcharacter des Seins des Daseins ist demnach hinreichend erst in der Bestimmung gefasst: *Seiendes, das ist im Jeweilig-es-zu-sein*. Dieses 'je', 'jeweilig', bzw. Die Struktur der 'Jeweiligkeit' ist für jeden Seinscharakter dieses Seienden konstitutiv, d.h. es ist überhaupt kein Dasein, welches als Dasein wäre, das nicht seinem Sinne nach *jeweiliges* wäre" (206).

The crux is that, in spelling out the question of being *as such* in terms of "at-the-timeness" he posits "at-the-time-ness *as such*" (*Jeweiligkeit als solche* [206]; Heidegger's emphasis). Aside from looking like a contradiction in terms, this generalziation does not follow logically from Heidegger's claim right before. Even if every Dasein is *jeweilig* – according to its sense (*seinem Sinne nach*)! – it does not follow that there is *Jeweiligkeit als solche*. The structurally determined sense of being, for each Dasein, is *regional*. And Heidegger's insistence that there is structure as such, amounts to saying that there is regionality as such, which is a meaningless expression – there simply is no "fundamental character of being" (*Fundamentalcharaker des Sein*), if that is meant to imply region as such, structure as such, sense as such. Insisting on these terms means to insist on a no-reality – it is the fundamental ontologist's perennial hoax.

[32] Note Kisiel's qualifier: "In this question of appropriately titling the different drafts, it should be noted that the guiding focus of this draft is not a concept, be it being or time, but "the full force of the interrogative experience" first clearly posed in its "initial vitality" and "full vigor" by Plato in the *Sophist*, 244A (GA 20: 179/129). The true thrust of "dia-lectic" in Plato, for all its verbosity, suggests that we are in this interrogation at the very threshold of language (201/149)" (363).

[33] Cf. also: "The "question of being itself" is clearly meant to be the leading edge of BT itself, that thin cutting edge that would bare the immediate and thus radical reality of "being" first described in its fullness in KNS" (366).

[34] This note does not add to Kisiel's argument here and thus does not affect my present criticism. Kisiel simply remarks on the "prolific occurrence of the nondescript word "structure"" in Heidegger's text, which he presents as indicative of "its guiding significance for Heidegger's formally indicative and schematizing approach" (545). There is no further illumination as to what such significance really amounts to, which would amend the problems in the main body of the text, addressed in the following.

[35] Kisiel does not define this term, and so it is not clear what exactly that means, or how it is different from perception in general, or whether it constitutes a "substructure" of perception.

[36] I am indebted to Katherine Arens for bringing the problematic character of this particular passage to my attention.

[37] This is Stambaugh's (1996) translation for: "Zunächst gilt es nur, den ontologischen Unterschied zwischen dem In-Sein als Existenzial und der "Inwendigkeit" von Vorhandenem untereinander als Kategorie zu sehen" (SZ, 56). The page number refers to the original pagination, which the GA edition shows in the margins.

[38] "Das Vorhandensein "in" einem Vorhandenen, das Mitvorhandensein mit etwas von derselben Seinsart im Sinne eines bestimmten Ortsverhältnisses sind ontologische Charaktere, die wir *kategoriale* nennen, solche, die zu Seiendem von nicht daseinsmässiger Seinsart gehören. In-Sein dagegen meint eine Seinsverfassung des Daseins und ist ein *Existenzial*. […] *In-Sein ist demnach der formale existenziale Ausdruck des Seins des Daseins* [here Heidegger inserts note 'b'; see right below]*, das die wesenhafte Verfassung des In-der-Welt-seins hat*." - note 'b': Aber nicht des Seins überhaupt und gar des Seins selbst – schlechthin. (SZ, 54)

[39] Heidegger expressly speaks of "fundamental ontology," when he returns to the theme complex of "being-in," in chapter five, § 28. *Die Aufgabe einer thematischen Analyse des In-Seins*: "Das bislang Herausgestellte ist vielfältig ergänzungsbedürftig im Hinblick auf eine geschlossene Ausarbeitung des existenzialen Apriori der philosophischen Anthropologie. Darauf zielt aber die vorliegende Untersuchung nicht. *Ihre Absicht ist eine fundamentalontologische* [Heidegger's emphasis] (SZ, 131).

[40] For the full-length quotation, see: p. 96, above.

[41] See: p. 313; quoted pp. 75, 83, above.

[42] "*Husserl* kommt über *Dilthey* nicht hinaus, so überlegen seine Analysen im besonderen gewiss sind. Im Gegenteil, ich möchte mindestens nach meiner Auffassung von Dilthey vermuten, dass Dilthey zwar die Seinsfrage nicht stellte, auch die Mittel dazu nicht hatte, dass in ihm aber die Tendenz dazu lebte" (GA 20, 173).

[43] "Der erste, der sofort die zentrale Bedeutung dieser Untersuchungen erkannte, war *Dilthey*. Er bezeichnete diese Untersuchungen als den ersten grossen wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt in der Philosophie seit Kants "Kritik der reinen Vernunft". *Dilthey* war siebzig Jahre alt, als er mit *Husserls* "Logischen Untersuchungen" bekannt wurde, in einem Alter, wo andere sich längst sicher und wohl fühlen bei ihrem System" (GA 20, 30).

[44] "Der zweite Band, der das Entscheidende enthält, […]" (Ibid., 31).

[45] See: Katherine Arens (1989), pp. 194-215.

[46] Cf. Wilhelm Dilthey, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. XI (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1960), pp. 70-76.

[47] "[…] Akte[…] in dem oben präzisierten Sinne von *intentionalen* Erlebnissen […] (409)." "[…] Ähnliche Unterscheidungen zwischen *Qualität* und *Materie* vollziehen wir bei allen Akten. Es handelt sich bei dem letzteren Titel nicht um eine Abteilung und sammelnde Wiedervereinigung von Bestandstücken des Aktes, wie Subjetsakt, Prädikatsakt u. dgl. Darnach wäre der geeinigte Gesamtinhalt der Akt selbst. Was wir hier im Auge haben, ist etwas ganz Anderes. Inhalt im Sinne von Materie ist eine Komponente des konktreten Akterlebnisses, welche dieses mit Akten ganz anderer Qualität gemeinsam haben kann. Sie tritt also am klarsten hervor, wenn wir eine Reihe von Identitäten herstellen, in welchen die Aktqualitäten wechseln, während die Materia identisch bleibt. Dazu bedarf es keiner grossen Veranstaltungen. Wir erinnern an die übliche Rede, dass <u>derselbe Inhalte</u> das eine Mal Inhalt einer blossen Vorstellung, das andere Mal Inhalt eines Urteils, wieder in anderen Fällen Inhalt einer Frage, eines Zweifels, eines Wunsches und dergleichen sein kann" (411-412). Here and in the following, I indicate Husserl's italics as such, while I use underlining to indicate the block print in his text. If appropriate, any emphasis on my part will be rendered in bold type.

[48] Here I opt for the admittedly awkward translation of "*Sinn*" as "meaning aspect." The literal translation of "sense" would be misleading because of its connotations of sense perception, in English; at the same time, rendering *Sinn* simply as "meaning" would seem to equate it with *Bedeutung*. The term "meaning aspect," if cumbersome, strikes me as the best alternative, especially to bring out Husserl's concern here, which lies with the structural organization of meaning, which constitutes the transcendent background of a particular life-world, in which particular meanings (*Bedeutungen*) may become available.

[49] See: pp. 95 ff., above.

[50] Edmund Husserl (1977 [1925]).

[51] Cf. Arens (1989), p. 200.

[52] For Husserl's actual use of the term "personality" in a very Schellingean fashion, see: PhP (176), as quoted below.

[53] That Heidegger was astutely aware of this facet in Husserl's thought is evidenced by his remarks in the *Prolegomena* (GA 20), pp. 167-168.

Section II:

The Material Mediation of Meaning:

From Cassirer to Paul and Back Again

Chapter Three

Vossler and the Refutations of Positivism and Psychologism

The acknowledgement and appreciation of Hermann Paul's complex contributions especially within his own field of Germanic studies and to historical philology, in particular, would require a separate study, or rather several studies.[1] For my purposes of rereading Heidegger, however, it is imperative to register the ways in which Paul's work made a crucial impact far beyond the boundaries of his professional discipline. Specifically, the present section, in two chapters, will argue that, to estimate his influence on the field of philosophy from which Heidegger forcefully emerged in the late 1920s, we must not look at the Neogrammarian revolution as an isolated event, but rather as part of an ongoing debate in the humanities, effective in Germany since the 1870s.

Instead, to establish the stature of philologists like Paul and the most vital influence that his work had on philosophy, one needs to take into account the "neo-Idealist reaction"[2] to this revolution, a motion of resistance against the Neogrammarian impulse toward a reorientation concerning both the objectivity and the validity standards of scientific inquiry. Against the background of this debate, Husserl's previously sketched semiotics also gains new weight in tracing the different sources of influence within the young Heidegger's development up to *Being and Time*. By identifying and explicating these philosophical imports as the core of this chapter, we will be able to ascertain different facets of Heidegger's strategy in re-engaging these Neogrammarian and neo-Idealist elements of his thought as they will appear in the *Letter on Humanism*,

in which he is trying to remount his philosophical project from the Weimar period for a postwar era.

To this end, we will begin this section, in Chapter three, by locating the linguistic-philosophical constellation in which Heidegger operates, by looking for especially prominent interfaces that would relate his work back to these debates between philology and philosophy. More precisely, the relevance of Neogrammarian innovation for Heidegger's project can be brought out most effectively in the present chapter, I suggest, by focusing on one, if not *the* key representative of the neo-Idealist opposition against Paul's "deviation," the theoretician and trained Romanist Karl Vossler. The latter is by no means an arbitrary candidate, for he is commonly acknowledged as the primary spokesman of idealist resistance in the above sense, in that he authored the "manifesto" of this position.[3]

More importantly in the present context, however, is how Vossler's work also serves as the pivotal point of reference for critical commentary on Paul by one of Heidegger's most notable contemporaries, Ernst Cassirer. It is not much of an overstatement to say that, to this day, Cassirer remains the only eminent Heidegger critic in the "public" quarters of professorial philosophy[4] who has seen and examined this connection in any substantial detail.[5] Thus Cassirer's work will be the material entry point to the tie between philosophy and philology that is the key argument of this chapter. For a "re-educated" German postwar audience, in particular, this connection has been lost in correlation with the willful repression of Cassirer's own philosophical legacy by the "chief executives" of the Frankfurt School, as can be shown, e.g., with respect to one of their most influential works, the *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (1947 [orig. 1944]).[6] To fill

this lacuna under the guidance of Cassirer, I will thus treat Vossler's neo-Idealist protest first, and then make some comparisons to Husserl's phenomenological project, to draw out the particular hermeneutic and historical claims in Vossler's (ultimately inadequate) redrawing of the methodological problem of the linguistic sciences.

After making these arguments, I will turn, in chapter four of this section, to Hermann Paul's corrective, and thus to the heart of how the philology/philosophy interchange I am tracing here sets up Heidegger's unique approach to historical and transcendental meaning in a critical hermeneutics.

Following Cassirer's Lead: The Vicissitudes of Linguistic "Law"

Before moving into the core of the argument, it is critical to justify this avenue of proof, because it is not the most obvious way into the philology/philosophy debate from the present point of view. Most problematic is that the order in which the relevant texts appeared does not fully match the historical chronology insofar as Vossler's "manifesto" (1904) is, in large part, a response to Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880). Significantly, Vossler dedicates the concluding pages of his intellectual polemic against "metaphysical positivism" in (historical) linguistics to critical remarks on Paul's general approach to scientific research in language development. However, in Vossler's pen, these remarks do not do justice to the tenets of the evolving Neogrammarian project. In fact, we will find Vossler hard pressed to pinpoint the actual differences between Paul's position and his own, in light of several basic assumptions which they both share.

Given this situation, I suggest that we do not so much have to choose between Vossler and Paul, favoring one at the exclusion of the other. Instead, we have to put

Vossler's overstatement of their supposed theoretical differences back into perspective, which will allow us to appreciate both the partial overlap of their methodologies and what I will identify as Paul's further advances, which carry the *Sprachwissenschaft* debate to another level and eventually give him a theoretical edge over Vossler.

Cassirer's own judgment on the Paul-Vossler debate also seemingly underwent a certain change, at least in terms of emphasis, if not in terms of his underlying theoretical position. At one point, he seemed to have leaned more strongly towards Vossler's engagement of the idealist tradition after Humboldt, whereas most of his methodologically more detailed commentary takes side with Paul's methodology. Following this trajectory in Cassirer's thought is instructive for two reasons, as we use this argument to ground our analysis of Heidegger's position between philosophy and philology.

First, the appeal to Cassirer in addressing the actual differences between Vossler and Paul can help us avoid immediate overstatements of their controversy. Second, it may assist us in formulating a more refined account of Paul's advance over Vossler, not as a matter of clear opposition and dismissal but of improvement and expansion. Thus taking our cues from the different stages (of emphasis) in Cassirer's critical commentary on the two authors under consideration, we can then examine in more detail Vossler's case for a Humboldt-inspired neo-Idealism, followed by an account of Paul's view and its theoretical advantages.

According to Cassirer's critical commentary, the stakes of the Paul-Vossler controversy can be introduces as follows:

> If we look back over the whole development of the philosophy of language from Humboldt to the neogrammarians, from Schleicher to Wundt, we see that with all

> its increased special knowledge and insight it has, from the purely methodological point of view, moved in a circle. The attempt was made to relate linguistics to natural science, […] But the concept of nature that was chosen as a basis proved more and more to be a unity only in appearance. […] This development can be followed in the concept of phonetic law, which at first designated a strict, uniform necessity governing all linguistic changes, but became more and more alien to this signification. […] Thus, the very concept which was expected to provide a unified foundation for linguistic science, remained fraught with unmediated antagonisms which created new problems for the philosophy of language. (I, 173)

This synoptic account is especially instructive, because it bars a common prejudice, which associates the Neogrammarian movement with a version of scientific determinism based on a conception of natural laws (including sound laws) as expressions of "'blind' necessity" (ibid.). However, as Cassirer intimates in general terms in this passage, the pending revolution in linguistic science was not that simple, and no such "deterministic breakthrough" could be achieved, if one was looking for a limited theory of linguistic epistemology. Continued research in comparative linguistics did not support the ambition of rigidly "naturalizing" *Sprachwissenschaft* in this manner, either, insofar as the guiding concept of law itself remained problematic. What Paul and the Neogrammarians sought were principles, not laws – strategies that could model language change, not necessarily predict it.

The crumbling of this too-simple ideal of positivism is enthusiastically embraced by Karl Vossler, for whose neo-Idealist position Cassirer provides the following characterization which puts that stance into a more nuanced philosophical context:

> In his two books *Positivismus und Idealismus in der Sprachwissenschaft* (1904) (*Positivism and Idealism in Linguistic Science*) and *Sprache als Schöpfung und Entwicklung* (1905) (*Language as Creation and Development*) Vossler shows unmistakable Hegelian influence; but no less distinct is the line connecting him with Wilhelm von Humboldt. Humboldt's idea that language must never be considered a mere work (*ergon*) but as an activity (*energeia*), that the "facts" of language become fully comprehensible only if we trace them back to the spiritual actions from which they arise, is revived here under changed historical conditions.

> Even in Humboldt this principle is intended to indicate not so much the psychological "origin" of language as its enduring form that is effective through all the phases of its growth. This growth does not resemble the mere unfolding of a given natural germ, but everywhere bears the character of a spiritual spontaneity which is manifested in a new way at every new stage. In the same sense Vossler sets the concept of language as creation over against the intrinsically ambiguous concept of linguistic development. (I, 174)

This admirably concise summary of Vossler's viewpoint zeros in on one of the central sore spots of this debate about a method to study language change. In it, different reform projects in language studies converged, yielding the "intrinsically ambiguous concept of linguistic development." As Cassirer indicates, at this point in the debate, attention has been withdrawn from the "quest for origins" in linguistic research. The discussion is no longer focused on any genetic or "germ-ic" account of language growth which would posit language as a special ontology. Instead, the interest lies with the form or *forms of change* as the philological terms which need clarification, if they are to ground philosophical analyses of the ontology and epistemology of language, especially dealing with the degree(s) of creativity and (relative) stability implied by this conception of linguistic transformation. The issue of creativity, in turn, raises the question of the role of the individual language user within the dynamics of linguistic evolution that is taking place within her language community.

Regarding both the issue of (degrees of) creativity and the role of language-using individuals, Cassirer, in one place, hints at a tendency towards psychologism in Paul's work. In the essay "The Perception of Things and the Perception of Expression," which forms the second study of his *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences* (2000 [orig. 1942]),[7] he thus provides the following critical commentary:

> Hermann Paul has taken another direction from Windelband's and Rickert's in order to arrive at a solution to the question of the principles of the science of

> culture. He has the advantage over them in that he did not remain at the level of general conceptual distinctions but could take up the thread from his own concrete research and was able to draw from its richness. This work is concerned with the science of language, and the problems of the history of language constituted the paradigm in which Paul developed his fundamental perspective. He begins from the assumption that no historical discipline can proceed *merely* historically, that a science of pinciples must always support it. As such Paul wants to use psychology [here Cassirer inserts: note 2].[8] With this the spell of pure historicism appears to be broken. But on the other hand, the science of language and the science of culture are as a consequence in immediate danger of falling victim to psychologism. Paul's own theory has not escaped this danger. (38) [Cassirer's emphasis]

Cassirer then goes on to remark on Paul's debt to Friedrich Herbart's (1776-1841) psychological theory and suggests that "certain elements of Herbart's metaphysics have unknowingly penetrated into the [Paul's own] theory, jeopardizing its purely empirical character" (ibid.). In this specific regard, he refers to the judgment of Karl Vossler, who charges Paul with an import of Herbart's "agnostic mysticism," which purportedly results in a textual situation where the "basic question – the question as to the essence of language – […] is never able to emerge with clarity in his [Paul's] work" (ibid.).[9] All these references point to a common issue: how the empirical data of culture reveal the constitution of the mind, as well as that mind's rule-boundedness and degrees of freedom in innovation. "Psychologism" would make language and other cultural products closely correlated with the individual mind, whereas a science of culture, as Paul sees it, must be based on the common culture of the group.

In a manner atypical of him, Cassirer leaves his comments on Paul rather open-ended in this particular passage, as he rests content with simply presenting Vossler's judgment. He does not explicitly say to what extent he thinks Vossler's estimation of Paul's metaphysical baggage is accurate. While the very reference indicates that Cassirer

thought that Vossler had a point, it is not fully transparent whether he fully endorses this line of criticism.

Hence, we must be careful not to overinterpret the fact that Cassirer appears to be critical of Paul in this passage, especially since all his other – methodologically more extensive – comments on Paul are appreciative and do *not* fall in line with what looks like a tentative alliance with Vossler against Paul.[10] In keeping with my earlier remarks, it seems more plausible to assume that Cassirer found valuable contributions in both thinkers and that he knew very well where the two agreed and where they parted ways. He thus was willing to pursue their debate between empiricism and psychologism as the basis for a science of laws within the humanities.

Vossler: The Primacy of the Psychological – "Raphael Without Hands"

Creativity – the ability to innovate – is the first point of contention between these thinkers, because it is difficult to build into a strictly empiricist or positivist viewpoint. As is characteristic of his general approach to the science of language, Vossler puts strong emphasis on the aspect of creativity, which he spells out in a diction strongly influenced by Wilhelm von Humboldt, namely in terms of *Sprachgeist* (spirit of language) and *Sprachbegabung* (talent for language; or, capacity for language).[11] He thus puts forth one of the central tenets of his position in a way that expresses his anti-positivist orientation and also underscores the proximity of his theory to Paul's:

> Wenn die Menschen sich sprachlich untereinander verständigen, so hat das doch nicht seinen Grund in der Gemeinsamkeit der Sprachkonventionen oder des *Sprachmateriales* oder des Satzbaues, sondern in der Gemeinsamkeit der Sprach*begabung*. *"Sprachgemeinschaften," Mundarten u. dgl. gibt es in Wirklichkeit überhaupt nicht.* Diese Begriffe kommen ebenfalls nur durch mehr

> oder weniger willkürliche Gruppierungen zustande und sind ein weiterer Irrtum des Positivismus. (37) [the second emphasis is Vossler's; other emphases added]

This denial of the actual existence of "language communities" (*Sprachgemeinschaften*) based in a shared capacity for language (*Sprachbegabung*) is a provocative expression of Vossler's overall appeal to individualism in his account of the creative element in all language use and language development. As such, it constitutes a specific variation of Paul's central claim: "Das wirklich Gesprochene hat gar keine Entwicklung" (PrSp, 25), which Vossler will address explicitly toward the end of his book, endorsing Paul's account of language change being a change in the psychology and cognition of the uses, not of the language materials. His main point is that the phenomenon of (more or less) successful language use, or communication writ large, cannot be explained as based on some "shared aspect" (*Gemeinsamkeit*) of "language convention" (*Sprachkonvention*) or "language material" (*Sprachmaterial*).[12] Instead of any such conventional common ground, he argues, the very occurrence of linguistic exchange springs from a shared "talent for language" (*Sprachbegabung*).

In Vossler's characterization this talent assumes the features of a congenital capacity, on which he elaborates with regard to the language skills observable in children[13]:

> Das Kind wird nicht deshalb, weil es seine Sprachwerkzeuge hat und übt, zum geistigen Wesen, sondern es hat und übt seine Sprachwerkzeuge, weil es ein geistiges Wesen ist. Die Sprache ist das Symptom des Geistes, aber nicht umgekehrt. Die Sprachwerkzeuge sind nicht identisch mit der Sprachbegabung. (49)
> Das Wesen der Sprache ist *innere* Tätigkeit: *Intuition*. […] Die Energeia des Sprechens erwirbt man sich durch die Geburt; man hat sie, man übt sie und bildet sie, aber man lernt sie nicht. (50)

This is Vossler's rectification of what he deems a "genetic" misinterpretation[14] of Humboldt's famous dictum, according to which "language is not a product, but an activity" (*die Sprache ist kein Werk* [Ergon]*, sondern eine Tätigkeit* [Energeia]). Through his redefinition of "inner activity" (*innere Tätigkeit*) as intuition, Vossler means to defend what he takes to be the idealist core of Humboldt's theory of the "essence of language" (*das Wesen der Sprache*) against the misappropriation of the notion of *energeia*, on the part of the positivist. Language depends on spirit, as he notes, and to give it an independent concrete existence is misguided. Such misappropriation, he holds, is exemplified by the work of Wilhelm Wundt, among others, who falsely "naturalizes" (*unter welchen Bedingungen* […] *es am* […] *naturgemässesten vor sich geht*) the creative element in our talent for language, within a misguided framework of associational psychology.[15]

Against such positivist aberrations, Vossler enforces the notion of language as intuition, when he concludes that "speaking is creation by the spirit" (*Sprechen ist geistige Schöpfung*) (38). For that reason, as Humboldt says, a language cannot be taught, but only "awakened" (ibid.). Against this background, Vossler proceeds to project this general conception of the essence of language as intuition from the plane of individual *language acquisition* onto the plane of collective *language use*. After the former is construed as a congenital capacity that can be honed but not taught, the latter is now considered in terms of the developmental aspects of *communication* broadly conceived. Apropos *language development*, then, Vossler introduces a specific conception of "relative progress" (*relativer Fortschritt*):

> Ein sprachlicher Ausdruck *entsteht* durch individuelle Tätigkeit, aber er *bürgert sich ein*, indem ihn die anderen sich gefallen lassen, ihn aufnehmen, ihn

> wiederholen: entweder gedankenlos, also passiv, oder ebenfalls schöpferisch, also: *modifizierend, korrigierend, abschwächend oder verstärkend*, kurz: zusammenwirkend und kollektiv tätig. Im Moment der Enstehung oder des *absoluten* Fortschrittes betrachtet, ist die Sprache etwas Individuelles und Aktives; im Moment des Stillstandes und Festwerdens etwas Passives (sei's beim Einzelnen, sei's bei der Gesamtheit); im Moment des *relativen* Fortschrittes, d.h. nicht als Schöpfung, sondern als *Entwicklung* betrachtet, ist sie kollektive geistige Tätigkeit. (91) [third emphasis added]

This is the core of Vossler's argument against any naturalistic or materialist conception of linguistic development: language change happens at moments of individual appropriation. As we saw, Vossler dismisses all variants of genetic (causal) explanation schemes for language change with reference to the Humboldt-inspired notion of "intuition," defined as "inner activity" of the spirit. "Language is the symptom of spirit [*Geist*], but not vice versa" (49).

With this definition of *Sprachgeist* as creative intuition, Vossler's neo-Idealist conception of language has taken a decisive turn toward individualism and away from the language community as an independent force. In the broadened context of language *use*, Vossler's account drives a wedge between the individual's creative (the later Heidegger might say "poetic") inspiration over against the stultifying effects of conventionalism inherent in any form of group *communication*. In fact, from this point of view, communication *is* convention and thereby by definition opposed to individual creativity.

This idealist critique of the ineluctable corruption, or "averaging effects," of language by the group echoes Nietzsche's famous commentary on "herd" communication, in *The Gay Science*.[16] Similarly, it is largely paralleled by Heidegger's criticism of the "fallen" modes of language in *Being and Time* (esp. § 35).[17] Here we can bracket the question, to what an extent the "idealist" label may or may not fit either Nietzsche or Heidegger in other regards. In the present context of *Sprachgeist*, they all

join ranks with Vossler, along an exaggerated, arguably post-Humboldt trajectory of comparative linguistics and historical philology.

Yet this seems to leave us with a seeming paradox, which Vossler is well aware of. If the inherent group aspect of communication is reduced to nothing but an obstacle to creativity, then any increase in effective communication would be an index of linguistic degradation, pointing ahead to the final disintegration of the language community at hand. Considering the German speaking community as his example, Vossler concedes:

> Aber wer konstituiert denn das "Deutsch"? Das Deutsch kommt doch nicht *durch die Passivität oder durch die geistige Beschränktheit* der Deutschen zustande. Wäre die These der Passivität richtig, so müsste die deutsche Sprachgemeinschaft sich in demselben Masse auflösen und verflüchtigen, als die Fähigkeit und Tätigkeit des sprachlichen Ausdrucks sich bei den Deutschen steigert. – Die Erfahrung lehrt das Gegenteil: je begabter und je zivilisierter ein Volk, desto vollkommener seine Sprache, desto klarer und sicherer seine Grammatik, desto schärfer und feiner nuanciert sein Lexikon. Zweifellos! – Also kommt eine Nationalsprache in ihrer Gesamtheit und Gemeinsamkeit nicht durch geistige Passivität, sondern durch Tätigkeit, und zwar nicht durch individuelle, sondern durch *kollektive* Tätigkeit zustande: durch *Zusammenwirken*. (90) [first emphasis added]

Here we notice an equivocation in Vossler's argument (as well as a distinct nationalist bias, which will be important for Heidegger's case), which adheres to his phrase "durch die Passivität oder durch die geistige Beschränktheit" (through passivity or through spiritual confinement[18]). Formally and logically this is a disjunct, pulling him away from the creativity he has stressed to this point, but it is apparent that Vossler's argument gains its suggestive force only through conflating these two terms, so that the "passive" language takes on the condition of a national act of self-assertion. This conflation is not just a willful imposition, but relates to an ambiguity that is commonly, or colloquially,

built into the notion of "spiritual activity" or "mental agility," in the sense of *geistige Tätigkeit* invoked by Vossler.

On one hand, the criterion of *geistige Tätigkeit* seems to be qualitatively neutral and a mere index of "mental speed" or the processing capacity inherent in a language that facilitates thought. On the other and, being "mentally slow" or "retarded" is usually taken as a judgment not only about lacking "velocity" but also about lacking "ingenuity." The tacit assumption, presumably, is that *fast* processing is a necessary, though perhaps not sufficient, condition for *creative* processing. Conceptually, speed does not imply creativity, nor does creativity necessarily imply speediness. However, one might argue that, in order to comprehend, analyze, and (creatively?) interpret complex phenomena, one has to have a certain degree of mental *versatility*, to use an expression that conveys the ambiguity at hand to the fullest. Being mentally active now assumes additional, if covert, qualities of mental *maneuverability* or *flexibility* rather than just speed or excelleration rates of mental "activity" per se.

The relevance of this equivocation for Vossler's argument, which suspends being *geistig tätig* between being *mentally active* and being *mentally versatile*, is clear from the hypothetical consequenes which he envisions for the German language community under prolonged conditions of linguistic passivity. If there were no collective activity (*Zusammenwirken*), he holds, this language community, just as any other, would disintegrate (*sich* […] *auflösen und verflüchtigen*). To be clear, Vossler does not predict a scenario of final dissolution. Instead he expresses his hypothesis in terms of proportion. The German-speaking community (*die deutsche Sprachgemeinschaft*) would dissolve to the same degree (*in demselben Masse*) as its linguistic passivity would increase. In other

words, according to Vossler's self-criticism of his prior claim, the "thesis of passivity" (*die These der Passivität*) comes down to the seemingly paradoxical claim: The better the Germans communicate, the more they dissolve as a language community and become individuals.

What is interesting about this self-criticism on Vossler's part is that he seems to want to preserve some kind of *second-order creativity* for the notion of effective communication, something that might called *administrative creativity* or, maybe, creativity *in language maintenance*. For if we do not assume such implict notion in his argument, it is not at all clear why the German "national language" (*Nationalsprache*) should evaporate or "die" in the face of increasong passivity. After all, by Vossler's own definition, passivity does *not* mean that people speak less. It only implies that they do not produce novel constructions with novel meanings, but merely maintain the *linguistic status quo*. To use our preceding coinage, we could thus sum up Vossler's self-criticism of his passivity thesis by saying that the linguistic status quo cannot be maintained without some kind of second-order creativity, or creativity of maintenance – language becomes a strong tool for individualism once it is evolved within the group.

Differently put, a linguistic equilibrium (the stable status quo) does *not* correspond to the complete absence of innovation but requires at least some degree of "relatively" creative *Zusammenwirken*, which Vossler then translates into his notion of "relative progress" (*relativer Fortschritt*) (91). Linguistically, then, any relatively stable status quo is always already representative of a language community's dynamic state of relative progress. However, the aforesaid ambiguity between being mentally active and being mentally versatile carries over into Vossler's conception of relative progress and

thereby undermines his conception of collective activity or *Zusammenwirken*. At the same time, this ambiguity weakens his final critique of Paul, who, as we shall see, proffers a more robust notion of *Zusammenwirken*, in terms of material mediation in language development – a contribution from a group's changing experience to its language, not just from its minds.

The problem with Vossler's characterization of collective activity in language is that, in the last analysis, it proves to be a model of collectivity, which reduces interaction to isolated "offers" of new vision rather than genuine collaboration. All language users, as it were, pitch their individual linguistic innovations into the pot of public discourse, upon which it is up to the rest of the group whether they want to accept these offers for change or not. Yet, even this "public" response, in terms of acceptance or rejection, is carried out as the mere summation of individual responses. If those individual responses add up to a certain level of statistical significance (occurring often enough to echo and put pressure on the group), then the original contribution counts as "incorporated in the civic life" (*bürgert sich ein*) of the language community under consideration.

In this account, both sides of the *linguistic transaction* [my term] remain thoroughly individualistic as far as creativity is concerned. When Vossler, in the previous quotation (pp. 114-115, above), speaks of the "creative apprehension" of a certain linguistic expression "by others through modification, correction, diminution, or amplification" (91) (*indem ihn die anderen* […] *aufnehmen* […] *ebenfalls schöpferisch, also: modifizierend, korrigierend, abschwächend, oder verstärkend*), such response still appears limited to the mere accumulation of individual responses. To be sure, these responses may still engage one another in terms of (statistically significant levels of)

common acceptance but not in terms of actual collaboration, that is, not as an achievement by the group that surpasses the mere addition of individual performances.

On an almost Darwinian or Schopenhauerian note, Vossler proceeds by stressing that all linguistic change, including phonetic change, is a matter of *struggle*, a judgment which again emphasizes its specificity and activity. Once again, he turns to the language activity of children to make his point:

> *Man darf sich darum den sprachlichen Lautwandel keineswegs als "spontan" und durch den instinktiven Consensus Aller unmittelbar und ungehindert for sich gehend vorstellen*. Wie alles auf der Welt, so muss auch der Lautwandel ringen und kämpfen, bevor er sich behaupten, ausbreiten und herrschen darf. – Wie vielen verunglückten Lautwandel gibt es doch! *Wie viele individuelle Varianten, die am gleichen Tage, an dem sie geboren werden, wieder sterben!* Wie vieles bleibt auf kleine Kreise beschränkt, wie vieles wird *modifiziert, bevor es sich durchsetzt!* Wie viele sprachliche Neuschöpfungen entstehen Tag für Tag in allen Kinderstuben der Welt! Und was bleibt davon? Wie jämmerlich gering ist die Zahl der Lautwandlungen, die der Grammatiker verzeichnet, im Vergleich zu der Zahl der tatsächlich vorhandenen und vorhanden gewesenen! (93) [my emphases]

This statement is crucial, because it hints at basic overlaps as well as basic differences among the conceptions of language change by Vossler and Paul, respectively. In this place, Vossler discards the idea that the successful implementation of a novel expression (or phonetic item) rests on the "spontaneous" and "instinctive" sanctioning (*Consensus*) by some kind of communal super subject or collective consciousness.[19] As Arens has shown, Paul would agree to this, because he also rejects the general conception of a "group mind" or a "synergy in mental processing."[20]

Hence, it is not the case that language change occurs straightforwardly, when an individual produces a new language detail, which is then subjected to the scrutiny (judgment, preference) by a somehow unified public mind. Instead, the new element has to "wrestle and fight" (*ringen und kämpfen*) its way through a multitude of *local trials*,

which may or may not – via ripple effect – eventually result in public acceptance. In fact, the majority of local innovation, he says, does not pass these trials of *centrifugal expansion* of publicity (*Wie vieles bleibt auf kleine Kreise beschränkt*).

But notice how the status of "modifcation" has changed in Vossler's characterization of linguistic development via innovation (*Neuschöpfung*). Previously, *modification* was listed as one of the aspects that was meant to specify how individual "offers" for change will meet with relatively creative processing on the part of others. I tentatively explicated this notion of relative creativity, *qua* group response, in terms of administrative creativity or creativity in language maintenance. In the present context of linguistic struggle, however, Vossler appears to assign a different, if not opposite, role to modification. Formerly an index of (relative or second-order) creativity, it is now featured as a mere obstacle to innovation in language. "How much [of individual variation] gets modified, before it can become prevalent!" ([*W*]*ie vieles wird modifiziert, bevor es sich durchsetzt*).

This sits ill with Vossler's prior juxtaposition of "modification, correction, diminution, or amplification" (91), because now it looks as if modification and correction collapse into the weakening effects of diminution. At the same time, amplification is reduced to "mere acceptance" or "repetition" (ibid.) (*sich gefallen lassen,* […] *wiederholen*), that is, unchanged dissemination understood as a centrifugal ripple effect, in the above sense. In other words, what first looked like a conception of second-order creativity, has turned out to be a mere filter mechanism. Modification and amplification thus seem to be mutually exclusive. If a linguistic invention by one individual gets modified, or corrected, by another, we cannot speak of collective activity in the sense of

genuine cooperation, for modification means replacement of one element through something else. Accordingly, amplification proceeds only through repetition, which expands the radius of the novelty's "circle" or public ripple effect. *Creativity thus rests solely with the individual language user, with group resources acting only to reflect and reinforce it*. In fact, earlier in the book, Vossler seems to say as much, when he speaks of language development in terms of "contribution":

> [A]uf diesem Weg erfolgt alle Sprachentwicklung, alles sprachliche Leben. *Jeder gibt seinen kleinen Beitrag*, jeder beteiligt sich schöpfend: Sprechen ist geistige Schöpfung. […] Nachsprechen ist Sache des Papageis. Dafür hat der Papagei aber auch keinen *Stil* und ist kein *Sprachzentrum*. Er ist sozusagen die personifizierte Sprachkonvention, die reine Passivität; er spricht die Sprache nach, aber er behandelt sie nicht schöpferisch. (38) [emphases added]

As Vossler says here, "everyone makes his small contribution" (*Jeder gibt seinen kleinen Beitrag*). It is each individual that constitutes a "language center" (*Sprachzentrum*), as the source for spiritual creation (*geistige Schöpfung*). Mere repetition, by contrast, is described as but a "parrot" mode that lacks any creativity.

In this passage, Vossler deploys a specific notion of "style" (*Stil*), which proves to be the centerpiece of his model for a critical aesthetics grounded on the individual subject of language, that is, a *critical stylistics* in the service of a *hermeneutic method of (re)construction* which allows for the specificity of an utterance within a historical moment, yet still locates its meaning within the individual psyche as an originary act. Generally, this method is not new with Vossler. In fact, without saying so, here he shows himself closest to Johann Gustav Droysen who took up the same anti-positivist cause in historical science that Vossler is taking up in the field of linguistics.[21]

In doing so, both authors place themselves within a hermeneutic tradition is indebted to Friedrich Schleiermacher's (1768-1834) prototypical account of the

reconstruction of creative processes for the sake of a decidedly *non-dogmatic* practice of interpretation that aims at tying meanings back to both textuality and historical specificity, as well as to the psyches of the writing and interpreting subjects – all as contributing factors to the community of meaning. This approach is non-dogmatic in that the new hermeneutic method was not tailored to the specific contents of privileged texts (such as holy writings), nor did it grant any author privileged access to their own (textual) creations. The latter aspect, in particular, points to one of the theoretical cornerstones in this hermeneutic tradition, famously captured in Schleiermacher's claim that it is generally possible "that we [as interpreters] understand the author better than he understood himself."[22]

As for hermeneutic reconstruction, Bleicher (1980) summarizes Schleiermacher's prototypical conception of the former in a way that emphasizes the importance of this approach not only for the anti-positivist campaign of Vossler, but also for the hermeneutic project of Dilthey and Heidegger's response thereto:

> Apart from continuing the tradition of hermeneutics by systematizing and generalizing the methods of interpretation that had already been in use, Schleiermacher ranks as a central figure for two more reasons: one, he complemented grammatical exegesis with psychological interpretation, which he refered to as "divinatory." Hermeneutics is as much art as it is science; it endeavors to *reconstruct the original creative act* – "how it really was." Two, it is with Schleiermacher that we encounter the first step to analyze the process of understanding and inquire into the possibilities and limits of it. Adumbrating Dilthey's conception, *Schleiermacher refers to the substratum of general human nature that underlies potentially successful communication*. Individual differences are acknowledged, which leads to the *requirement of congeniality* the interpreter ought to approximate the intellectual – "spiritual" – stature of the author as closely as possible. (15) [emphases added]

This requirement of "congeniality" marks a specific strand of Hegelian thought that recurs, *mutatis mutandis*, in both Droysen and Vossler. As Gadamer has argued, both

authors reject the teleological side of Hegel's account of world history.[23] While they redefine the positive dictum of reconstructing meaning "as it was" into the context of an individual creator, they are both invested in his notion of universal history. In other words, the universality of history is understood as correlative to "the substratum of general human nature," as Bleicher puts it, which consitutes the enabling conditions for a hermeneutic enterprise that is both non-dogmatic and objective. The human mind becomes the universal that history in its appearance is not; that mind generates the community impulse for communication, as well, as being the center for the understanding of that communication.

Here, a comparison from other voices in that nineteenth-century hermeneutics debate becomes critical. Universal history, in Droysen's hermeneutic treatment of that theme, is featured as a total, if developmental frame of reference – a heuristic for our acts of understanding. By way of simplification, we can say that, for him, the interpreter's understanding "alien," i.e., historically removed, epochs, texts, or individuals requires participation in the same developmental totality of universal history from which these subject matters spring. While a complete vision of this totality is not available to the finite mind of any hermeneutically critical historian, univeral history still functions as a regulative framework for historical method, an assumption that history and the aggregate of human minds can be rendered transparent to each other. Oriented by the same overarching frame of reference, the interpreter and the objects of history to be interpreted thus share, and participate in, the same universal historical congeniality.[24]

With Vossler, who combines Hegel's account of universal history with Humboldt's account of the universality of the spirit of language, such congeniality is

spelled out in terms of the linguisticality of understanding as both the driving force and the enabling condition for language development and successful communcation, without being reducible to either of the two. He thus finesses the role of the individual within the community by rendering their relationship part of a necessary commonality of human mind, not as an originating force in their relation. Mediated by the work of other historical hermeneuticists of the day, like Droysen (who goes unmentioned in the 1904 "manifesto"), Vossler's present sketch of a model for critical stylistics thus enlist Schleiermacher's hermeneutic notion of *reconstructing* creative acts, within a linguistic framework of the all-pervasive influence of *Sprachgeist*. The goal of hermeneutics thus is to recreate individuality rather than to recover the network of communication in a time or place.

Here, the spirit of language is featured as the creative substratum that *both links and separates* all beings endowed with the "gift of language," in the sense of a congenital capacity or *Sprachbegabung*. The spirit thus links all language-talented creatures, insofar as they can spontaneously invent their own new language, even if initially they have no common ground in terms of shared language conventions.[25] Accordingly, the other aspect of this relationship, namely of separation, is not primarily concerned with these conventional differences, including the differences between one's mother tongue and any foreign language, since those can always be bridged as long as all parties possess the gift of language. Instead, separation among individuals occurs with respect to a difference in creativity, which is a matter of spiritual activity or versatility,[26] or, if you will, of artistic *intensity*. Some speakers are simply "more talented," or more intense in their linguistic activity than others, as they set themselves apart from their "conservative language-

audience" (60). Here, again, then, the psychology of the individual speaker appears as the central creative force in generating meaning through language.

Importantly, this difference is a matter of degree and not absolute, which Vossler further explicates through his claim that again begins to sound nationalist: that the difference between "cultured language" (*Kultursprache*) and "non-cultured language" (*Nicht-Kultursprache [Mundart]*) is but a difference of degree and not a "difference in essence" (*kein "Wesensunterschied"*) (59). Here, regional difference (local-cultural "dialect") is effectively suspended between national unity, featured as linguistic continuity, on one hand, and individual creativity, on the other. Differently put, on this continuous scale of linguistic activity or intensity, the creativity of some language artists is more "mercurial" (*sprunghaft*), which means they show greater "individual initiative" (*individuelle Initiative*) (60),[27] and thus are more determining of the collective.

As for the reconstruction of any such more or less intense, creative act, Vossler cotrasts his (and, interestingly, Benedetto Croce's) approach of a new critical stylistics with "old" forms of aesthetic *dogmatism*, where the critic would invoke an preconceived, abstract ideal of beauty (harmony, or some highest aesthetic good) as the external standard to be imposed on a particular artwork. By contrast, Vossler endorses a point of view that compares any "artwork" broadly understood, that is, any creative innovation writ large (including any form of linguistic innovations) only to itself.[28] That is, Vossler combats aesthetics with his stylistics, in order to transpose the exemplary content of a work in language into the psychological context of the producer, rather than referencing it to the overriding arc of historical development, as a pure Hegelian would.

He asserts the "scientific" status of this "critical procedure" as follows:

> Dabei ist das kritische Verfahren dasjenige aller geistigen Kritik: nämlich *bewusste Nachschöpfung oder Reproduktion des inneren Prozesses* der zum Kunstwerk etc. geführt hat. Wie eine logische oder eine arithmetische Funktion einzig nur dadurch zu kontrollieren ist, dass man sie wiederholt, so kann auch die ästhetische Funktion nur durch "Nachempfinden," oder besser: Nachschöpfen verstanden und beurteilt werden. Irrtum ist hier möglich und sogar sehr häufig, aber Willkür ist ausgeschlossen. Das Verfahren demnach durchaus wissenschaftlich. [here, Vossler inserts note 1][29] (42-43) [emphasis added]

This description is again very Humboldtian in character, as it describes a language community as those individuals who are, through their language ability and shared historical moment, able to access the work's content by accessing the acts of mind which created it. On a self-critical note, he illustrates this procedure with reference to the *Vita* by Benvenuto Cellini, the individual style of which Vossler had actually failed to appreciate according to the new criteria he is now putting forth.[30] Thus using his own previous analytical work as a tangible counter-example, he emphasizes the need for a form of *work-internal*, or *immanent* critique of individual style. He does so, again, in order to take a specific position against positivism, and to move his notion of science of language into a study of the rule-based acts of mind.

Such critique is also meant to provide a fine-tuned structural analysis that would assess any product of spiritual activity (*geistige Tätigkeit*) on its own terms, so to speak. More precisely:

> Erinnern wir uns nun, dass nach unserer Definition das Wesen der Stilistik in der idealistischen Ergründung des sprachlichen Ausdrucks als einer *rein individuellen* Schöpfung liegt; […] (36)
>
> Für die Erklärung des toten und von der positivistischen Grammatik aus allerhand Zeiten und allerhand Schriftstellern zusammengetragenen Sprachmaterials, d.h. für die *generelle* Sprachuntersuchung, bedeutet es eine unschätzbare Errungenschaft, *die beiden Pole des menschlichen Sprachvermögens: individualisierende und gruppierende Dingauffassung* fixiert und ihre *Kontrastwirkungen* im einzelnen aufgewiesen zu haben. Von der speziellen Stiluntersuchung aber darf man quantitativ weniger und dafür qualitativ um so mehr verlangen: sie sollte sich bemühen, auch die *dazwischenliegenden*

> *Grade* und all die kleineren und besonderen Züge aus der *geistigen Physiognomie des isolierten Individuums* herausarbeiten. (40) [the first and second emphases are Vossler's; other emphases added]

With this, he hopes to achieve the decisive turn away from positivism and toward a conceptual psychology. Still, there remains a peculiar tension within Vossler's account of "linguistic expression as purely individual creation" (*des sprachlichen Ausdrucks als einer* <u>*rein individuellen*</u> *Schöpfung*), because it is not quite clear whether "purely individual creation," here, refers to the *creating* individual, especially in the role of individual language user. Or, whether it refers to the *created* individual, namely the artistic product, especially in the form of a novel language item that could, eventually, affect the language resources, and hence the historical identity, of the language group.

Significantly, Vossler invests such "purely individual creation" with "both poles of the human language capacity: the individualizing and the grouping [mode of] object-apprehension" (*die beiden Pole des menschlichen Sprachvermögens: individualisierende und gruppierende Dingauffassung*), which the critical-idealist analyst of style is supposed to extrapolate (*herausarbeiten*) from the "spiritual physiognomy of the isolated individual" (*aus der geistigen Physiognomie des isolierten Individuums*).

To clarify, Vossler's present approach to linguistic expression as *geistige Tätigkeit*, I argue, correlates with many aspects of Husserl's method of ideational analysis – they are both in a certain sense phenomenologies of mind, analyses of what aspects of mind reveal themselves in certain classes of cultural production. From this point of view, it is not by accident that the later Husserl characterized the unique profile of different life-worlds in terms of "stable style," as I discussed in the previous chapter. The "style" becomes in Vossler a more specific historical reference, yet without historical

determinism. However, since Husserl was in several regards theoretically more precise than Vossler (at least, in his "manifesto" under consideration), we can effectively elucidate the problable intended position of the latter by translating it into the phenomenological language of the former, since both derive from similar premises. In doing so, one does not have to assume complete congruence between the two views, only significant overlap in some central regards.

According to a Husserlian version of this paradigm, then, Vossler's conception of the vectoral interplay within linguistic creation can be seen as oriented and also limited by dynamic forms of object-apprehension. Any such form constitutes the organizing principle of a uniquely structured process of individualizing-and-grouping – a dynamic mode of *structuration* that grounds a uniquely nuanced, experiential domain, i.e., a specific life-world, in which certain kinds of objects become available as meaningful units.

Speaking of "kinds of objects" here refers to the *immanent*, *categorial* dimension of regional ontologies, which was explicated in some detail in my discussion of Husserl's *Phenomenological Psychology*, in the previous chapter. In other words, these "objects" have object status only within a particular life-world governed by particular principles of structuration. In one sense, then, this can be a cognitivist-individual restatement of the Hegelian model for historical epochs. In the words of the last quotation from Vossler, not "all those smaller and particular nuances" (*all die kleineren und besonderen Züge*) within a particular life-world are encapsulated in any single object from that life-world – thus by implication defining the verbal artwork as immanent to that horizon, rather than referring to an absolute "true, good, or beautiful." The object does *not* constitute a

complete microcosmos of the experiential domain. Upon ideational analysis (with Husserl), however, each such object may grant access to the principles of structuration of that domain or life-world. In the same sense, presumably, Vossler's critical-aesthetic analysis can be said to aim at bringing out these immanent object-apprehending structures from within the "spiritual physiognomy of the isolated individual."

Yet, at this point, the aforesaid tension within Vossler's notion of "pure individual creation" (*reine individuelle Schöpfung*) (96) becomes critical, because Vossler does not pinpoint his analytical focus as clearly as Husserl does. Husserl unambiguously assigns priority to the structural nature of the phenomenon to be subjected to ideational analysis over any idiosyncratic traits in the perceiving consciousness of the phenomenological analyst. In fact, the very challenge and task of proper ideational analysis is to block out any such distorting, personal factors from observation but "read" the unique patterns of structuration off of the phenomenon that is being inspected.

For example, by rotating the image of a medieval house in the mind, one should be able to identify certain perceptual structures, which *organize* and *unify* this house into a meaningful unit within a specific medieval lifeworld. As explained earlier, the later Husserl of the *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925) appears willing to include "cultural colorations" into the rotation test sequence. So, part of this rotation cycle of perspectival shifts may include sequences where the phenomenological observer attends to certain social processes or rituals, in which the present house-phenomenon is involved (be it a wedding ceremony, a court session, or maybe some kind of leasure time gathering such as a game night).

Accordingly, ideational analysis accesses such ramifications of cultural structure by taking its bearings from the *Verweis*[31] character of a particular phenomenon like the image of a medieval house, or the "Chinese House" in Hermann Hesse's famous *Glass Bead Game*.[32] The latter kind of image, to repeat, does not by itself exhaust all the structures of this life-world but serves as a structural gateway into that experiential domain. Crucially, the act of phenomenological observation must not impose personal creativity, on the part of the analyst, onto the phenomenon under scrutiny. Instead, Husserl's method of running a phenomenological test series, or rotation cycle, is meant to let the phenomenon "speak for itself," that is, *reveal* its structure *objectively*. Hereby objectivity refers to the *immanent* stable style, or structural unity, of a particular life world, as the enabling condition for the production and apphrehension of cultural-house-objects (or any other object) as meaningful units, within a horizon with a specific style.

For Husserl, then, it is the standards of immanent validity of a structurally unified life-world which ground its semiotic productivity and makes it, in principle, accessible to ideational analysis as the methodological centerpiece of *scientific* phenomenology. For him, the "spiritual physiognomy of the isolated individual" (inVossler's phrase) can only refer to the semiotic make-up, i.e., the meaning-sponsoring structure, of a cultural *eidos* (like the image, not the picture, of a medieval house). As it is constituted by the objective traits of dynamic structuration encrypted in the phenomenon (as a structural life-world sample, not a microcosmos) such spiritual physiognomy cannot refer to the unique features of the conscious thought process in the phenomenologist's mind, in the course of ideational analysis. Husserl is thus much more aware than Vossler of the difference between the transcendental unity of apperception as the ground on which any life-world

will appear and the individual psychology which may generate a speech utterance or work within that world. The phenomenological impulse to a psychology that would enable communication within a group by definition belies the kind of appeal to creativity that Vossler attempted to make.

By Husserl's standards, the less individual creativity one contributes to an act of understanding, the more skillful one proves as a phenomenologist. The immanent creativity, or semiotic productivity, of any life-world is accessed most truthfully, if we do *not* infiltrate it by making creative contributions to it from within our own lifeworld. In this sense, Husserl clearly believes in the possibility of skillful *self-effacement* on the part of the truly scientific, phenomenological observer. While this would seem to put him in the immediate vicinity of Leopold von Ranke's criterion of validity in historical research (the positivist dictum of a faithful reconstruction), attributing a method of self-effacement to Husserl calls for immediate qualification in order to specify further what Vossler had partially obscured.[33]

To be sure, by giving ourselves over to the structural unity of a certain experiential domain, as Husserl would assume, we do *not* achieve a *neutral* mode of observation, because no life-world can be called neutral without being rendered empty or meaningless. Yet within an overall framework of regional ontology, Husserl suggests, we can achieve an *immanently objective* mode of observation, as we explore the stable style and fully integrated, or *closed horizon* of a specific life-world without (any amibition at) distorting or transforming it.

Vossler's tense notion of "purely individual creation" in linguistic expression, by contrast, is not directly associated with the structuration-indexing qualities of a particular

cultural *eidos*, which would have to be a language item for him.[34] Instead, Vossler's model for a critical aesthetics gets more problematic as he expressly posits a notion of *double individuality* with respect to *style* and *accent* (*Accent*):

> Die wahre und idealistisch orientierte Stilistik aber muss sich fortgesetzt der *doppelten* Individualität des Stiles bewusst bleiben. Sie muss uns zeigen, wie die sprachlichen Fromen 1) durch *die Individualität des Künstlers*, 2) durch *die Individualität seiner Intuitionen* bedingt werden. Zwischen Voltaires Tragödien und Voltaires Romanen ist ein stilistischer Abgrund.
>
> Ebenso verwendet ein und dasselbe Individuum in seiner Rede, je nachdem seine Intuitionen wechseln, auch wechselnden Accent. (77)
>
> *Stil ist individueller Sprachgebrauch*. Stilistischer Accent is individueller Accent, d.h. er wechselt von Individuum zu Individuum. *Insofer aber der Stil einen Gebrauch und eine Gewohnheit darstellt, kann er nicht individuell sein. Der zur Gewohnheit gewordene Stil ist "Manier" und wird Passivität*. Das Individuum beginnt sich selber nachzuahmen. (76-77) [the first emphasis is Vossler's; other emphases added]

This account of style is noteworthy for at least two reasons. First, Vossler defines style in such a way that it can never stabilize into an artist's trademark or "signature trait" – it has some claim to being a kind of historical transcendental. Second, it shows that Vossler's notion of individual language use (*individueller Sprachgebrauch*) remains conflicted, because not everything he says about particular instances of "stylistic accent" (*[s]tilistischer Accent*) seems to hold equally for the particular language user or artist. He conflates transcendentalism and historical appearance to preserve an empirical dimension to the method of his science of language.

As for Vossler's definition of style, if the latter does turn into anything like a signature trait, it thereby becomes mere habit or "manierism" (*Manier*). Here it is not completely clear whether individual style is limited to a single creative act only, or whether the same individual style can span over several artistic productions or performances, or what it would mean if adopted by the group. Vossler's examples do not

help: for instance, he asserts that Voltaire engaged two different styles in his production of tragedies and novels respectively. But that does not yet determine the scope of style within either one of these artistic modes. In other words, did "the individual" called Voltaire already "begin to mimic himself" (*Das Individuum beginnt sich selber nachzuahmen*) at the moment he embarked upon writing his second tragedy (or his second novel)? Even more sharply, is individual style always limited to one artwork (literary or otherwise) only?

Vossler does not directly answer these questions. Yet, his (self-) critical comments on his own treatment of Cellini's *Vita*, as mentioned before, would seem to imply that individual style is indeed limited to single acts of creation, especially when he speaks of the "spiritual unity" (*geistige Einheit*) of works such as this one.[35] In fact, at an earlier point in his text, Vossler is more explicit on the issue:

> Zum Ausdruck einer inneren Intuition gibt es immer nur eine einzige From. So viele Individuen, so viele Stile. Übersetzungen, Nachahmungen, Periphrasen sind neue individuelle Nachschöpfungen, die dem Original mehr oder weniger ähnlich sehen mögen, aber niemals mit ihm identisch sind. (37)

If every intution implies its own unique form of expression, or style, then individual style would indeed be limited to single creative acts, with no room for repetition or development of the same style. As Vossler says here, even attempts at "translation, mimesis, [and] paraphrasing" (*Übersetzungen, Nachahmungen, Periphrasen*) do not preserve the same style but already constitute "post-creations" (*Nachschöpfungen*; literally "[modelled-]after creations"), which "may resemble the original more or less, but are never identical with it" (*die dem Original mehr oder weniger ähnlich sehen mögen, aber niemals mit ihm identisch sind*).[36]

But from this perspective, the last quotation contains an understatement, when Vossler holds that there are "as many styles as [there are] individuals." Considering his own illustration with reference to the creative production of Voltaire, one ought to say that, generally, there are more styles than individuals. While Vossler may be happy to embrace this consequence, it raises further questions for his working notion of language use within a community of language users. In particular, if the individuality of particular language users is not congruent with the individuality of particular styles (since the latter will be more numerous than the former), then the question becomes, with which of these two kinds of individuality individual language use is associated. One might assume that the individuality of language use ought to be related most directly to the individuality of particular language users, but this does not easily fit Vossler's model.

In fact, the individuality of any particular language user as Vossler has described it already marks a limitation on "purely individual creativity." Not only may some individuals tend to "mimic themselves" (p.76-77), but *any* extension of individual style past a particular "moment" of intuition and its corresponding artistic production already marks a degrading down to the level of "relative progress" rather than pure creativity. As a lingering short-coming, Vossler's conception of individual style and individual accent leaves open the question as to just how long or short-lived the corresponding spans of intuition are.

This issue concerning the length, or better scope, of intuition springs from the fact that Vossler's view of critical stylistics is geared to underscore that the activity of *Geist* is all-pervasive with respect to any area of cultural creativity. Whether in painting, literature, or linguistic innovation writ large, *Geist* is consistently presented as the driving

force behind any genuine change of "accent." The difficulties in accounting for the supposed scope of any such invention springs from the fact that, in the context of linguistics, Vossler's account of intuition in terms of individual accent is such that he wants to attribute even the smallest variation or new "nuance" to the creative activity of *Geist* – a Hegelian overstatement:

> Die Aufgabe der Sprachwissenschaft ist darum gar keine andere als die: den Geist als die alleinig wirkende Ursache sämtlicher Sprachformen zu erweisen. Auch nicht die kleinste akustische Nuance, auch nicht die unscheinbarste lautliche Metathesis, auch nicht der harmloseste Sprossvokal, auch nicht der elendeste parasitische Laut darf der Phonetik oder der Akustik oder der isolierten Lautlehre preisgegeben werden! Phonetik, Akustik, Physiologie der Sprechwerkzeuge, Anthropologie, Ethnologie, experimentelle Psychologie, und wie sie alle heissen, sind *nur* beschreibende Hilfsdisziplinen und können uns die Bedingungen zeigen, unter denen sich die Sprache wandelt, aber in aller Welt nicht die Ursache.
>
> Die Ursache ist der menschliche Geist mit seinen unerschöpflichen individuellen Intuitionen, mit seiner αισϑησις; und die alleinherrschende Königin der Philosophie ist die Ästhetik. – Verhielte es sich anders, so hätte ich wahrhaftig die Philologie schon längst an den Nagel gehängt! (63)

Given this emphatic statement about the all-pervasive character of *Geist*, down to even "the most wretched parasitic sound" (which, presumably, would still be creative, as long as it constitutes a novelty, that is, a deviation from language convention), it is not quite clear how these microscopic units of language change could serve as cultural *eide*, in Husserl's phenomenological idiom.

To be more precise, it is not clear how one could perform the same analysis of individual style for common acts of language as communication that Vossler suggests for texts like Cellini's *Vita*, or perhaps one of Voltaire's tragedies or novels. The present problem of the scope of his correctives between psychologism and positivism thus boils down to the fact that single sound deviations do not display the same structural and compositional features, on which Vossler relied when he encouraged the critial-idealist

linguist to appreciate the unique style of such works as Cellini's, which he spelled out in terms of "its composition [and] leitmotifs " (*ihre Komposition, ihre leitenden Gedanken*) (40).

In other words, whenever Vossler pushes the pervasiveness of *Geist* to its extreme, he seems to forego the structual aspect of language change via language use. In doing so, he, in effect, decontextualizes the "inventions" of spirit, which – by his account – rise from the inner depths of the individual to be thrown into the arena of public discourse as one-directional offers of linguistic transaction. In the last analysis, this decontextualization yields an *atomistic* notion of linguistic *innovation* qua linguistic *deviation*, which both Paul and Husserl would reject on communitarian and transcendental grounds respectively. They would argue that, if considered in isolation, no new nuance ("innocent" vocal, or "parasitic" sound [63]) can count as creative deviation, insofar as no structural account can be given of how it relates to its meaning-sponsoring environment within a given life-world.

Significantly, even if we were to stipulate, for example, that a particular sound has never been produced in a particular language community and is now uttered and thus introduced by a certain individual for the first time, this would not be enough to give any interesting account of what this novelty amounts to. All the interpreter could say is "It is new," but that would not distinguish it from any other unheard-of sound. All novelties would be conflated in an uninformative conception of abstract newness.

Taking stock of our criticism of Vossler, we can say the following. According to Vossler's neo-Idealist conception of collective activity in language development, the whole (language community) really appears as nothing more but the sum of its parts,

rather than a transcendental ground for the community, as his emphasis on psychologism might imply. Hence, his notion of "relative progress" rests on a notion of linguistic transaction, which reduces *Zusammenwirken* to a public after-image of individual creativity. Upon scrutiny, the individual remains the sole source of spiritual creativity, and the historical moment loses any compelling role in community and language change.

Before moving on to examine whether and how Paul's theory anticipates and overcomes these lingering shortcomigs on Vossler's part, we can make the latter more concrete with reference to his striking image of "Raphael without hands," which he borrows from Lessing. One of Vossler's most incisive statements about the "talent of language" (*Sprachbegabung*) thus reads:

> Selbst wenn der Mensch aller und jeder Ausdrucksbewegung beraubt wird, so bleibt er doch immer noch ein sprachbegabtes Wesen: *geradeso wie*, nach einem berühmten Worte Lessings, *Raphael auch ohne Hände ein grosser Maler gewesen wäre*. Ergo ist die Definition der Sprache als Ausdrucksbewegung falsch, also gehört die psycho-physische Funktion nicht zum Wesen der Sprache. […] Ob es zur akustischen Äusserung kommt oder nicht, ist praktisch sehr wichtig, theoretisch völlig belanglos. (50) [my emphasis]

This stark distinction between theory and practice is not warranted by Vossler's own exposition of language development, in general, and linguistic transaction, in particular; it separates *ergon* and *energeia*, to return to Humboldt's terminology, in unacceptable ways. Considering the present example, we find that Vossler's claim that "Raphael would have been a great painter even without hands" actually begs the question about the individual workings of *Sprachgeist* vis-à-vis the collective activity and "relative progress" within the language community. In this regard, we can criticize Vossler's claim on two levels.

To begin with, the assertion about Raphael's artistic talent irrespective of *any* outlet or medium for expressing his "talent" (*aller und jeder Ausdrucksbewegung beraubt*), could be dismissed as purely speculative, a too-complete rejection of empiricism. From this point of view, it would seem, everyone who lacks the opportunity to express their creativity could claim "greatness" without having delivered any "evidence" or manifest support for this claim. Vossler might not be impressed with this criticism and respond that, according to his notion of intuition, within a neo-Idealist framework, it is*theoretically* consistent to assume the existence of a creative capacity in the individual prior to any particular artistic expression.

In fact, this assumption, he could insist, is part and parcel of the wedge he is driving between theory and practice in this passage. Within this framework, then, the demand for tangible evidence or "proof" would already be taken by Vossler as a symptom of some positivist reduction of *Sprachwissenschaft*, with respect to the purportedly proper methodological standards for validity – a wrong-headed ambition toward verifiability. However, even if we grant this point, for the sake of argument, Vossler's claim about Raphael's unexpressed greatness remains inconclusive for the present discussion about the individual and the collective dimension of language development, which points to another level of possible criticism.

Next, then, with respect to Vossler's previous characterization of *Zusammenwirken* as "diminishing" or "amplifying" (91) (*abschwächend oder verstärkend*), the general assertion about Raphael's potential greatness does not address the question about any possible increase, decrease, or just transformation of the individual creative capacity as prompted by the dynamic workings of a particular medium

(whether it involves the use of one's hands in painting or any other material practice). Here, the inherent ambiguity of Vossler's notion of collective activity rebounds. As we saw, the latter remained suspended between connotations of some kind of second-order creativity (creativity in maintenance), on one hand, and of a mere filter-mechanism in terms of the public acceptance of linguistic novelty, on the other hand.

Similarly, in the present scenario of an impaired artist, doomed to complete inarticulateness, Vossler fails to address whether and how the collective processing of the individual's *creations* or artistic products may affect and transform the impact of the individual's greatness as meaning. For Vossler, it seems, the route of creativity and creative influence only leads in one direction, from the inner depths of the individual's soul[37] to the outer arena of public discourse and collective communication. He never considers the opposite route (which, as we have seen, was critical for Humboldt, and which will be critical to Paul), from the group back to the individual, except for one hint, in a single subclause, at the end of his book.[38] In this sense, Vossler's neo-Idealist conception of linguistic innovation, or spiritual creativity writ large, is a one-way street. His model of *Sprachgeist* glosses over the possible feedback effects within language development, which Paul had emphasized as crucial in his earlier account of *language as communication*, as Arens (1989) has conclusively demonstrated.[39]

What those feedback effects of the material side of language might be – and hence what levels of intertwining exist between psychology and historical experience – will be the subject of the next chapter of this section.

---

[1] To name just two instructive studies: Kurt R. Jankowsky, *The Neogrammarians: A Re-evaluation of Their Place in the Development of Linguistic Science* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), and Anna Morpurgo Davies, *History of Linguistics Vol. IV: Nineteenth-Century Linguisitics* (New York: Longman, 1998).

[2] See: Amsterdamska, *Schools of Thought*, chapter six. Cf. Introduction, note 14 and note 17, above.

[3] Amsterdamska, *Schools of Thought*, 147: The document in question is the polemic little book: Karl Vossler, *Positivismus und Idealismus in der Sprachwissenschaft. Eine sprach-philosophische Untersuchung* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1904). Cf. also Jankowsky's (1972) qualifying remarks concerning Vossler's glib dismissal of the Neogrammarians, when he "spoke of them as the '*Dachdecker um Osthoff*,' implying that they inherited the readied building and just furnished the finishing touches to complete a structure which had been erected by others. True as this assumption basically is, we should not overlook that very essential changes were made by the Neogrammarians in the building which they undoubtedly inherited" (130). "Vossler's campaign against rampant positivism is largely justified, but it is not to the point, if directed against the Neogrammarians. Brugmann expressly acknowledges […] '*das Geistige*' as the driving force behind language, as the cause of its changes and the conditioning factor of its formal shape" (172).

[4] In terms of institutional authority and public office, Cassirer's career reached a peak when he was elected rector of the University of Hamburg in the spring of 1929. He actively entered office in November that year, delivering his inaugural speech on "Formen und Formenwandel des Philosophischen Wahrheitsbegriffes." This juncture in Cassirer's academic career is documented by his wife Toni Cassirer in the newly edited: *Mein Leben mit Ernst Cassirer* (Hamburg: Meiner, 2003), pp. 182-185. For further details concerning Ernst Cassirer's "political engagement for the Weimar Republic, see: Heinz Paetzold, *Ernst Cassirer – Von Marburg nach New York. Eine philosophische Biographie* (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1995), pp. 106-126.

[5] For two of Cassirer's most pertinent comments, see: Cassirer, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (I, 170-176; for Vossler, esp. 174), and *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences: Five Studies*, trans. S.G. Lofts (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 37-38, 64-70. I will consider these passage in more detail below.

[6] This "other side" of the Frankfurt School is examined in: Katherine Arens, "*Geister der Zeit*: The Allies' Enlightenment and German Literary History," *JEGP*, 102, No. 3 (July 2003): 336-61, and in Markus Weidler, "Undoing the *Dialectic*'s Philosophical Hypocrisy: Toward a New Materialist Semiotics," *Monatshefte*, 96, No. 3 (Fall 2004): 388-408. For the use of the expression "chief executive," especially with respect to Horheimer's role during the 1950s, see: Clemens Albrecht, "Vom Konsensus der 50er zur Lagerbildung der 60er Jahre: Horkheimers Institutspolitik" in: Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, Friedrich H. Tennbruck, *Die intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1999), pp. 132-168; see esp. pp. 135-145.

[7] Ernst Cassirer, *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*, trans. S.G. Lofts (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

[8] This note contains the following reference to Paul's main work: "Cf. Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachwissenschaft*, pp. 1 ff." – In the following, my own references will be to the fourth edition of this text: Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachwissenschaft* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1909). For parenthetical page references, I will use the abbreviation "PrSp."

[9] For the full quotation, see: "In Karl Vossler's judgment, 'One cannot lean on the psychology of Herbart without getting the metaphysics of this philosophy as part of the bargain. What genuine metaphysics is cannot be dismissed at the doorstep of the empirical sciences. In fact, Herbart's agnostic mysticism with its unknowable things in themselves has cast a dark shadow over the whole of Paul's science of language; as a result, it is just this basic question – the question as to the essence of language – that is never able to emerge with clarity in his work' [here Cassirer inserts: note 3]" (38). Note 3 provides the reference for the present quotation: Karl Vossler, *The Spirit of Language in Civilization*, trans. Oscar Oeser (London: Kegan Paul; Trench: Trubner, 1932), p. 5.

[10] Thus Cassirer gives Paul full credit for his theoretical advances – over Vossler, as I will argue – in the next study (= Study 3.) of the *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*, namely, in the essay "Concepts of Nature and Concepts of Culture." To support my assessment of Cassirer's commentary on Paul, I will quote in detail from this essay, at the beginning of the third section of this chapter, which contains a discussion of Paul's methodology in the present context of historical linguistics.

[11] In German, "Begabung" may also connote "Gabe" (gift), so that "Sprachbegabung" can bear overtones of "the gift of language" as well. For an overview of Wilhelm von Humboldt's philosophy of language, see: Hans Arens, *Sprachwissenschaft: Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1974).

[12] Vossler's notion of *Sprachmaterial* (language material) remains vague throughout the book, which leaves it unclear whether he actually meant to use it as a technical term or not. This marks a weakness in Vossler's account, and it should not be associated with Paul's distinct exposition of the material dimension of language use, in terms of *Vorstellungsmasse*, to which I will turn in section three. – Generally, Vossler associates *Sprachmaterial* with "dead" data collections, comprising items cut out from the spiritual unity of certain texts, according to the standards of "positivistic grammar" and merely "descriptive syntax" for the sake of "*general* language investigation" (see following quote). Commenting self-critically on his own positivistic misgivings, in a previous treatment of Benvenuto Cellini's *Vita*, he writes: "Statt dessen zerpflückte ich die geistige Einheit der Vita und zerschnitt sie nach syntaktisch-formalistischen Gesichtspunkten: in Rectio, Periodenbau, Wort- und Satzstellung, Permutationen, Pleonasmen und Ellipsen, und setzte jede dieser Kategorien mit einer psychischen Radix in Verbindung. – Dabei hoffe ich, wenigstens der Kirchhof-Wissenschaft der beschreibenden Syntax durch reichliche Materialsammlung einige Dienste geleistet zu haben, […] Für die Erklärung des toten und von der positivistischen Grammatik aus allerhand Zeiten und allerhand Schriftstellern zusammengetragenen Sprachmaterials, […]" (40).

[13] Prior to the children example, Vossler (1904) considers another scenario as an illustration of *Sprachbegabung*, namely a situation where members of completely "heterogeneous 'language communities'" are locked up together and still manage to communicate over time. This is meant to serve as an indication, if not evidence, that despite the absence of any common ground in terms of shared language rules or linguistic conventions, the different parties *spontaneously create their own language*, by dint of a common capacity for language, which they do share: "Man sperre zwei oder mehrere Individuen, die früher den heterogensten "Sprachgemeinschaften" angehört haben, und zwischen denen es keinerlie gemeinsame Sprachkonventionen gibt, zusammen: – sie werden sich vermöge ihrer Sprach*begabung* in Kürze verständigen" (37-38).

[14] As an example of such "genetic" misinterpretation, Vossler points to an essay by Eduard Wechßler, "Gibt es Lautgesetzte?" in: Festschrift für H. Suchier in "Forschungen zur roman. Philologie," Halle 1900, pp. 349 ff. [cf. Vossler's note 1, on p. 47]. In summing up his criticism of Wechßler, he remarks: "Zwischen der Defintion Wechßlers und derjenigen Humboldts besteht aber ein Widerspruch, […]. Für Wechßler ist das Primäre an der Sprache die psychophysische, das Sekundäre die rein psychische Funktion. So verhält es sich ja auch in Wirklichkeit. Zuerst übt das Kind sein Mundwerkzeug und später erst veräussert es geistige Eindrücke. Aber, was für das Anschauungsvermögen das Primäre ist, braucht es darum nicht auch für das Begriffsvermögen zu sein. Im Gegenteil! Schon Aristoteles wusste, dass das, was empirisch als das Spätere erscheint, in Wirklichkeit d.h. metaphysisch das Frühere ist" (49).

[15] For this criticism see: Vossler (1904), p. 48. As he explains in this place, the problem with this kind of associational psychology is that it does not even begin to address the question about the essence of language (a very Heideggerian line of critique). This flawed approach rests content with pointing to the reflexive, rudimentary gestures, like shaking one's head, which get replicated and become associated with certain meanings (e.g., aversion, in this case). As these gestures get socially codified into commonly understood signals (of aversion, in this case), they become available to conscious manipulation by the individuals, who can now purposely deploy such gestures as a purposive expression of their will, as a means to intentional acts of signification. However, as Vossler insists not without sarcasm, this naturalist

version of linguistic genesis completely bypasses Humboldt's point with respect to the conception of language as *energeia*:

> So mag es ja wohl gegangen sein. Die Darstellung ist ziemlich unanfechtbar. Man stattet den primitiven Menschen oder das Tier mit Reflexionsbewegung, mit Absicht oder Willen, mit einem Bewusstseinsinhalt, mit Gebärden und mit Stimmbändern aus – und nun kann *gesprochen* werden. […] W. Wundt, Münsterberg u. A. erklären uns, wie man das Sprechen macht, unter welchen Bedingungen und in welchen Situationen es am leichtesten und sozusagen naturgemässesten vor sich geht. Nichts weiter. *Die Frage nach dem Wesen und nach der Ursache der Sprache wird gar nicht gestellt. Man verdeckt das Problem unter der associationspsychologischen Brücke, die man von der symptomatischen zur symbolischen Ausdrucksbewegung hinüberschlägt.* Der Positivist ist damit zufrieden. Er weiss nun, wie das Räderwerk läuft. Deshalb ist es auch so schwer, ihm die Augen zu öffnen über ein Problem, das er gar nicht sehen will. (48) [last emphasis added]

[16] In aphorism 354, "On the 'genius of the species,'" Nietzsche writes: "[…], I may now proceed to the surmise that *consciousness has developed only under the pressure of the need for communication*; […] Consciousness is really only a net of communication between human beings; […] In brief, the development of language and the development of consciousness (*not* of reason but merely of the way reason enters consciousness) go hand in hand. […] My idea is, as you see, that consciousness does not really belong to man's individual existence but rather to his social or herd nature; that, as follows from this, it has developed subtely only insofar as this is required by social or herd utility. Consequently, given the best will in the world to understand ourselves as individually as possible, "to know ourselves," each of us will always succeed in becoming conscious only of what is not individual but "average." Our thoughts themselves are continually governed by the character of consciousness – by the "genius of the species" that commands it – and translated back into the perspective of the herd. Fundamentally, all our actions are altogether incomparably personal, unique, and infinitely individual; there is no doubt of that. But as soon as we translate them into consciousness *they no longer seem to be*" (298-299); quoted from: Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1974).

[17] Heidegger speaks in a similar voice, when he says the following, where I suggest alternatives to the standard translation that is not concerned with bringing out this nuance:

> For the most part, discourse [*Rede*; better rendered: speech] expresses itself [*spricht sich aus*] and has always already expressed itself. It is language. But then understanding and interpretation are always already contained in what is expressed [*im Ausgesprochenen*; better: what is uttered]. As expression [*als die Ausgesprochenheit*; better: as utterance; literally: as utteredness] language harbors in itself an interpretedness of the understanding of Da-sein. […] Discourse expressing itself is communication [*Mitteilung*]. Its tendency of being aims at bringing the hearer to participate in disclosed being toward what is talked about in discourse. – In the language that is spoken when one expresses oneself [*in der beim Sichausprechen gesprochenen Sprache*; better: in the spoken language with any utterance], there already lies an average intelligibility; and in accordance with this intelligibility, the discourse communicated [*die mitgeteilte Rede*] can be understood to a large extent without the listener coming to a being toward what is talked about in discourse so as to have a primordial understanding of it. One understands not so much the beings talked about, but one does listen to what is spoken about as such. This is understood, what is talked about is understood, only approximately and superficially. One means *the same thing* because it is in the *same* averageness that we have a common understanding of what is said. – Hearing and understanding have attached themselves beforehand to what is spoken about as such. Communication does not "impart" the primary relation of being to the being spoken about, but being-with-one-another takes place in [*bewegt sich* im; better: proceeds in; literally: moves within] talking with one another and in heeding [*Besorgen des*; in this context, better: attending to what is spoken about. What is important to it is that one speaks. The being-said, the *dictum*, the pronouncement provide a guarantee for [*stehen jetzt ein für*; ought to be rendered: have to stand in for; literally: now stand in for. – Heidegger connotes a replacement that is but a (bad) makeshift.] the genuineness and appropriateness of the discourse and the understanding belonging to it. And since this discoursing [*das Reden*] has lost the primary relation of being to the being talked about, or else never achieved it, it does not communicate in the mode of a primordial appropriation of

> this being, but communicates by *gossiping* and *passing the word along*. What is spoken about as such spreads in wider circles and takes on an authoritative character. Things are so because one says so. Idle talk [*Gerede*] is constituted in this gossiping and passing the word along, a process by which its initial lack of grounds to stand on increases to complete groundlessness. (BT, 167-168)

As indicated, Stambaugh's translation is not always accurate in these passages. Yet, the similarity of Heidegger's critique of communication to the respective criticisms by Vossler and Nietzsche is apparent. This similarity is not reduced, but rather reinforced, by the fact that Heidegger prefaces his commentary by emphasizing that he does not use the expression "idle talk" in a "disparaging"way: "The expression "idle talk" is not be used here in a disparaging sense. Terminologically, it means a positive phenomenon which constitutes the mode of being of the understanding and interpretation of everyday Da-sein" (BT, 167). – Vossler might not prefer the expression "positive phenomenon," because, for him, the passivity that is entailed by language conventions marks a deficiency, a mere lack, of *Sprachbegabung* rather than a positive force, or phenomenon: "Das Defizit in der Sprachbegabung, die Grenze der geistigen Individualität, erklärten wir, sei der wahre Grund für das Zustandekommen von sprachlichen Konventionen, von Sprachgemeinschaft und Sprachregel. Es ist kein Minus, keine negative Kraft, sondern gar keine Kraft: Nichts!" (89). Yet, with respect to his notion of "relative progress," Vossler immediately qualifies this claim about linguistic conventions as a mere "nothing." As we shall see, Vossler's account of communication as conformism in opposition to the creativity of *Geist* remains conflicted. Just as Heidegger, in the passage quoted from *Being and Time*, Vossler keeps wavering between disparaging and not so disparaging comments about the ineluctable effects of language use in communication.

[18] Notice that, in German, the connotations of "geistige Beschränktheit" are harsher than the literal English rendering suggests, as it carries overtones of mental retardation or downright stupidity.

[19] To be clear, the expressions "communal subjectivity" and "collective consciousness" can be used in different ways which may not always be congruent in their connotations of different degrees of overall mental unity, coherence, or homogeneity. In the present context, I use these two expressions as synonyms for a unified mental exigency that would be able to issue – express from its own resources – linguistic judgment as "spontaneously" as is normally associated with the conscious language use of individual speakers and their respective linguistic *attitude* (preferences, reservations, aversions, etc.).

[20] See, Arens (1989): "Paul is not looking for a synergy in mental processing, it is not a model for group mind. He looks instead for a psychological pattern that conforms to *typical* mental activity" (135) [emphasis added]. The consequences that Arens draws from this insight are crucial for understanding the methodological thrust of Paul's entire project. Following her instructive commentary on the issue, I will return to this central feature of Paul's theory, in the third section of this chapter, below.

[21] For Droysen's general agenda, see, e.g. Kurt Mueller-Vollmer's introductory remarks in: *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German Tradition from the Enlightenment to the Present*, ed. K. Mueller-Vollmer (New York: Continuum, 1985), pp. 118-119.

[22] Cited in Mueller-Vollmer (1985), p. 87.

[23] Concerning the non-teleological aspect, Gadamer states: "Thus resistance to the philosophy of world history drove history into the wake of philology. Its pride was to conceive the continuity of world history not teleologically, nor in the style of pre- or postromantic enlightenment, in terms of a final state which would be the end of history, a day of judgment for world history, as it were. But for the historical school there exists neither an end of history nor anything outside it. Hence the whole continuity of universal history can be understood only from historical tradition itself. But this is precisely the claim of literary hermeneutics, namely that the meaning of a text can be understood from itself. *Thus the foundation for the study of history is hermeneutics*" (199). For Droysen, in particular, see: "No preconceived idea concerning the significace of history should prejudice historical research. However, the self-evident assumption of historical research is that history constitutes a unity. Thus Droysen can explicitly acknowledge that the unity of world history is a regulative idea, even if it is not a concept of a providential plane" (208). Here

and in the following the page references to *Truth and Method*, refer to: Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. J. Weinsheimer and D.G. Marshall, 2nd revised edition (New York: Continuum, 1989).

[24] According to Bleicher's summary, "Droysen's hermeneutical theory contains two central points: the theory of experience and that of reconstruction. The former, which indicates some Hegelian influence, refers to a human need for expressing 'inner' processes. In the perception of such expressions, they are projected into the inner life of the perceiver where they give rise to the same processes. The correspondence of re-experienced and original process is guaranteed by an 'absolute totality' which we only have a faint conception of, but in which the originator and perceiver participate on account of their shared humaneness. – How the perception of an expression leads to inner reproduction is more properly dealt with in the second theory. In the study of history we are, initially, confronted with something unfamiliar and it is our task to assimilate it so that we can grasp it adequately and use it. – […] 'History brings to consciousness what we are and what we possess': our existence is not mere 'metabolic change' but we participate in a 'second creation' – that of an 'ethical world.' [Here, Bleicher inserts: note 8: Ibid. {Droysen, quoted in Wach (1933), vol. III}, p. 155]. Accordingly, Droysen refuses to concern himself solely with methodological questions at the cost of substantive considerations" (18).

This characterization of Droysen's ethical concerns is significant, because it indicates the social and political stakes of a new critical hermeneutics, for which Vossler, in the aftermath of Droysen's work, provides an aesthetic focus in terms of his critical-aesthetic method, which I will address immediately below. Significantly, from a shared platform of anti-positivism, both Droysen and Vossler stress the moral dimension of historical-linguistic science. The expressive "style" of Vossler's "manifesto" is polemical throughout, but this should not distract us from the genuine ethical concern that informs his discussion. Even if we remain hesitant to take all of his more satirical statements at face value, we should nonetheless pay heed to the "danger[s]" (80) of unchecked positivism and empiricism, as he presents them.

In this context, some of Vossler's more *violent formulations* are revealing, when he speaks about the "rectal science of radical positivism" (*die Afterwissenschaft des radikalen Positivismus*), about "intellectual suicide" (*intellektuellen Selbstmord*) (26), about "dead language parts in mass- and single graves" (*tote Sprachteile in Massen- und Einzelgräbern*) (38), and about the fact that "nothing is more dangerous and nothing more ridiculous than an empiricist who philosophizes" (*Nichts ist gefährlicher und nichts ist lächerlicher als ein Empiriker, der philosophiert*) (80). Using somewhat less drastic rhetorical means, such moral implications were also highlighted in the neo-Schellingean projects of Cassirer and Tillich, respectively, before they were effectively suspended in Heidegger's work.

As will be shown in the next section of the present discussion, the work of Gadamer, one of Heidegger's most renowned students, presents something of a hybrid case in this regard. Gadamer's work is of special interest, I argue, because his methodology is most intimately linked as a systematic philology to central insights of Paul's *Prinzipienlehre*, although this connection is not acknowledged sufficiently. Just like Heidegger in *Being and Time*, Gadamer makes brief references to Vossler at crucial junctures of his argument, in *Truth and Method*, without bringing the Neogrammarian side of the debate over linguistic creativity and language development into play. Unearthing this omission will also shed light on Gadamer's tendency to downplay the importance of Cassirer for his own hermeneutic project, a tendency which he seems to have inherited from his teacher.

[25] Cf. note 13, above.

[26] For the previous discussion of the ambiguity adhering to this term, see p. 136, above.

[27] As Vossler explains in more detail: "Freilich, je primitiver die Kulturverhältnisse, desto furchtsamer, desto zögernder, desto unscheinbarer und unsichtbarer die individuelle Tat in der Fortbildung der Sprache. Je geringer dementsprechend der Vorsprung des sprachschöpfenden Individuums vor dem konservativen Sprachpublikum, um so weniger sprunghaft und augenfällig, um so kontinuierlicher und regelmässiger die Vorwärtsbewegung der ganzen Sprachgemeinschaft. In der Mundart geht es schneckenmässig und gleichmässig, in der Kultursprache sprunghaft und weniger einheitlich vorwärts. Aber dort wie hier kommt aller Fortschritt nur durch die individuelle Initiative zustande. Nirgends ist Gesetz, überall ist Freiheit das Prinzip des geistigen Lebens" (60).

[28] In this place Vossler proffers a methodological equation of the "science of language" (*Sprachwissenschaft*), "stylistics" (*Stilistik*), and "art history" (*Kunstgeschichte*), yielding the program for a "new, critical aesthetics" (*neue, kritische Ästhetik*). He emphasizes the non-dogmatic character of this novel form of aesthetic criticism in contradistinction from any critique of art and/as language that posits any abstract ideal of beauty, which, according to Vossler, has to be dismissed as basically arbitrary: "Also nochmals: Sprachwissenschaft im reinen Sinn des Wortes ist nur die Stilistik. Diese aber gehört zur Ästhetik. Sprachwissenschaft ist Kunstgeschichte. – Wenn sich viele Philologen beim blossen Klang des Wortes Ästhetik bekreuzen, so denken sie dabei wohl immer noch an die alte, dogmatische, nicht an die neue, kritische Ästhetik. Die alte verglich das Kunstwerk mit einem abstrakten, selbstgeschaffenen Schönheitsideal, die neue vergleicht das Kunstwerk mit dem Kunstwerk selbst; denn sie hat einsehen gelernt, dass es ebensoviele Schönheitsideale als Kunstwerke gibt. Nicht der Dichter soll die Intuitionen des Kritikers, sondern der Kritiker diejenigen des Dichters belauschen und soll uns zeigen, wo und wieso der Dichter mit seiner eigenen Intuition in Widerstreit gerät und seiner Muse untreu wird" (42).

[29] Note 1: "Näher begründet und ausgeführt finden sich diese Lehren in Croces Ästhetik."

[30] See: pp. 39 ff; in particular: "Cellini's Stil wollte in diesem Fall mit sich selbst verglichen sein, nicht mit der Grammatik seiner Zeit. Statt dessen zerpflückte ich die geistige Einheit der Vita und zerschnitt sie nach syntaktisch-formalistischen Gesichtspunkten: […] Die *feineren* Färbungen des Stils gingen verloren, indem alles nur auf die zwei Hauptgrundlagen: "verstandesmässig" oder "gefühlsmässig" zurückgeführt wurde" (40). "Jedoch nicht bloss das Detail ward vernachlässigt, sondern auch das Ensemble: der Geist der *Vita*, ihre Komposition, ihre leitenden Gedanken konnten natürlich mittels eines vorwiegend syntaktischen Studiums immer nur stückweise und unsicher erfasst werden" (40-41).

[31] For "Verweis," cf.: Heidegger BT, § 15: "*Verweisungsmanigfaltigkeit*" (69); then esp.: § 16: "*Verweisung*" (74), and most explicitly: § 17. *Verweisung und Zeichen*: pp. 76-83; and esp.: "Den Verweisungszusammenhang, der als Bedeutsamkeit die Weltlichkeit konstituiert, kann man formal im Sinne eines Relationssystems fassen" (88).

[32] "[…] Denn schon seit Mariafels trug Knecht den Einfall zu einem Glasperlenspiele mit sich herum, den er für sein erstes feierliches Spiel als Magister benutzen wollte. Es sollte diesem Spiel, das war der hübsche Einfall, *für Struktur und Dimension* das alte, konfuzianisch rituelle Schema des chinesischen Hausbaues zugrunde liegen, die Orientierung nach den Himmelsrichtungen, die Tore, die Geistermauer, die Verhältnisse und Bestimmungen der Bauten und Höfe, ihre Zuordnung zu den Gestirnen, dem Kalender, dem Familienleben, dazu die Symbolik und Stilregeln des Gartens. Es war ihm einst, beim Studium eines Kommentares zum I Ging, die mythische Ordnung und Bedeutsamkeit dieser Regeln als ein besonders ansprechendes und liebenswürdiges Gleichnis des Kosmos und der Einordnung des Menschen in die Welt erschienen, auch fand er uralt mythischen Volksgeist in dieser Tradition des Hausbaues wunderbar innig mit spekulativ-gelehrtem Mandarinen- und Magistergeist vereinigt" (265-266). In: Hermann Hesse, *Das Glasperlenspiel* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972).

[33] In this context, Bleicher's (1980) comment on Droysen applies equally to Husserl: "Droysen's *Historik* emerged in the course of a debate with Hegelian speculation and newly emerged positivism. He emphasized the importance of a factual basis – without, however, going so far as Ranke and his school who advocated the 'self-effacement' of the historian in order to arrive at a correct knowledge of the facts; […]" (18).

[34] As a corollary of its notion of *Sprachgeist* as pervading all spheres of human life, linguistic idealism, in general, and Vossler's position, in particular, implies a certain form of what Best and Kellner (1991) address as "pan-textualism," which "reduce[s] everything to discourse or textuality" (27). I will examine some of the implications of such pan-textualism with respect to Gadamer's work in the next section.

Toward the end of *Truth and Method*, Gadamer distances himself from the radical form of linguistic idealism advocated by Vossler and Croce: "We have discerned the speculative structure of the event of language both in daily speech and poetic speech. The inner resemblance that thus appears, linking the poetic word with everyday speech as an intensification of the latter, has already been noted, from its

subjective, psychological side, in idealistic philosophy and its revival in Croce and Vossler [Gadamer, note 11]. If we stress the other aspect, the fact of something's coming into language, we are preparing a place for the hermeneutical experience" (470-471). Because of his role as a critical commentator on the idealist tradition in language science, Gadamer's own work presents an instructive point of comparison for assessing the extent to which both Vossler's anti-positivist position and Gadamer's extended model of critical hermeneutics may be characterized as pan-textualist. For the above reference, see: Steven Best and Douglas Kellner, *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1991).

[35] For "spritual unity" (*geistige Einheit*), see: note 30, above.

[36] Vossler's use of the expression "Nachahmung" (mimesis) in this place does not sit well with established conventions in aesthetics, just as it does not with his later comments on Voltaire and those cases, where an aristic individual beginns to "mimic itself." In the present passage, mimesis is said to imply some degree of deviation from the original, willy-nilly constituting "new individual post-creations" (*neue individuelle Nachschöpfungen*) (37). In the later passage about the artist's tendency toward "self-mimicry" (*beginnt sich selber nachzuahmen*) (76-77), however, the notion of mimesis is used to stress the non-, or anti-individual, tendency toward passivity and convention. Vossler's conflicted notion of (self-)mimesis thus mirrors the fact that he does not fully reconcile the two senses of individuality implied by his account of "double individuality," which lies at the heart of his sketch for a new "idealistically oriented stylistics" (*idealistisch orientierte Stilistik*) (77).

[37] Vossler does not use the term "soul" quite as frequently and extensively as one might expect in his "manifesto" (45, 50, 53, 63, 65, 89, 98). Yet, the way in which it is featured indicates a national(ist) bias, which borders on positing a national subject similar to Wundt's general conception of a group subject, notwithstanding the fact that Vossler distances himself from Wundt at several points in the text. With respect to "soul," however, this theoretical distance seems to shrink: "Sollte nicht so etwas wie ein germanischer und nordischer Hauch in die lateinische Seele des heutigen Franzosen sich eingeschmeichelt haben?" (74).

[38] "Es gibt nur eine teilweise, aber keine reine Passivität; und diese teilweise Passivität ist eben die Einschränkung des Individuums durch die Gesamtheit *oder umgekehrt*" (96). I will return to this statement in more detail, in the next chapter.

[39] See: Arens (1989), pp. 131-146. Arens' study provides the theoretical foundation for my investigation carried out in the next section, as I will indicate at the crucial junctures of my argument.

Chapter Four

Paul: The Material Individual and the Open System

In light of the problems adhering to Vossler's notion of *Zusammenwirken*, discussed in the previous chapter, Cassirer's (tentative) criticism of Paul, already briefly introduced, actually appears more plausible, if leveled against Vossler's version of linguistic anti-positivism. Turning to Paul's own work, this impression is confirmed by the fact that he had already tightened several of the loose ends that were going to be loosened, again, by Vossler's critique of him.

More specifically, as we will outline in the present chapter, Paul is sensitive to the fundamental reciprocity inherent in all social communication phenomena. Concerning these routes of mutual influence, he avoids the one-directionality and one-dimensionality that undercuts Vossler's notion of "relative progress." Instead of placing the source of linguistic creativity and transformatory power in language development solely in the "soul" of the individual language user, Paul offers a more robust notion of collective meaning formation, in that he stresses the importance of material mediation of all communicative processes.

Thus going against the "primacy of the psychological," Paul carries out Steinthal's redefinition of the "soul" in ways that are more resourceful for a theoretically consistent, critical hermeneutics within a framework of material semiotics.[1] This chapter will thus argue that, by reconceiving the individuality of each language user vis-à-vis their respective language community, he paves the way for the later projects of

hermeneutic thinkers like Gadamer, on one hand, and post-structuralist thinkers like Deleuze and Kristeva,[2] on the other hand.

We will begin by turning to Paul's major work, his *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880)[3] in comparison to Husserl's model of the relation of mind and history, and to Gadamer's hermeneutics of understanding. Thereafter, we will move to a comparison of Paul with Wittgenstein, in order to outline what is at stake in Paul's more materialist – but not positivist – appropriation of a psychological-hermeneutic approach to meaning. Wittgenstein appears more transcendentalist, until we pursue Deleuze and Guattari's correction to his neglect of the communicative situation. Finally, in the last part of this argument, I will return to how the psychologist-empiricist debate about science engaged by these philologists (Vossler and Paul) recasts the history of phenomenology as we know it, and hence also sets the stage for Heidegger somewhat differently than has been assumed. In this regard, it is, once more, Schelling's thought that emerges as the central reference point.

Paul's *Prinzipien* and Husserl

Coming from a decidedly different point of emphasis than Vossler, even while working in much the same paradigm, Paul's analysis of linguistic evolution provides a conception of language use (*Usus*) that explains the production of new meanings in terms of the dynamic relation between *material individuals* and *open systems* of semiotic transaction, which continually (re)organizes and transforms the life-world of any given *Sprachgemeinschaft*. He thus redefines the positivist impulse along with the

psychologistic one that Vossler stressed, to the end of providing a science of language that, at best, overcomes the two.

"Semiotic transaction" here refers to the transfer and (partial) modification of cultural *eide*, in Husserl's sense, yet within a distinct historicized framework, much more explicit than the life-world and with much more weight on the empirical side of the communication than Vossler's idea of style would accommodate. Within the overall structure, or rather process of structuration, which Paul posits as unifying an experiential domain, these cultural images constitute *mobile units* that have two crucial effects.

First, as the material carrier of meaning they provide the element of *what is shared* in communication. They break the spell of Cartesian solipsism, because we no longer have to look for "other [immaterial] minds." Rejecting (doubt-stricken) self-consciousness as the ultimate warrant for existence, the Cartesian subject is dismissed in favor of the material individual, which cannot be defined in terms of conscious thought and introspection. Instead, the material individual, as implied by Paul's theory of language as communication, is a *Sprachzentrum* (to adopt and reinterpret Vossler's expression[4]), in which the combination of certain meanings is more likely than the combination of others. In this sense, each material individual, *qua* participant in *communication as semiotic transaction*, has a unique combinatorial profile which affects, and is affected by, the transfer and renegotiation of cultural images. In Paul's rendering, the features of such combinatiorial profile on the part of the individual language user are spelled out in terms of his notion of "semiotic matter" (*Vorstellungsmasse*), which I will examine in some detail, below.

Second, Paul's emphasis on reciprocity in semiotic transaction, and how the transfer of cultural images may change not only the structural profile of these images but also the combinatiorial profile of the "material pariticipants" in such communciation, points to an important extension of Husserl's view on the nature of cultural*eide* and their role as phenomenological signposts to particular experiential domains or life-worlds. As explained in the previous chapter, for Husserl these domains are fully integrated, which means that their horizon is closed. These worlds are not "frozen" or static, but the principles of their structuration are more or less fixed, isomorphic with the structures available in transcendental mind. For Husserl, this fixture is the enabling condition that makes ideational analysis possible in the first place. If the life-world, of which the cultural image under consideration is a structural sample, were not stable, the phenomenologist could not study the latter to access the former. No *eidos* can encapsulate the structural workings of an experiential domain exhaustively. Remember, the image of a medieval house is *not* a microcosmos of an entire medieval life world. Yet, if this world had no "stable style," the image could not even be used as an objective *Verweis* that would allow the phenomenologist to (re)construct the pattern of structuration for this domain *scientifically*.

Paul, by contrast, views each life-world as an *open system*, that is, a system of open-ended meaning production. Open-endedness, here means that *genuine innovation* can take place with respect to the structurational features of both particular cultural images and the particular life-world to which they belong, because neither is fully determined by the structural organization of the other. Genuine innovation, then, refers to the production of cultural items (including language items) that can take on a meaning

that was not predetermined by a fixed set of *combinatorial possibilities*. One of the main impositions of false limits, in this sense, would be conceiving of the meaning production within a life-world in terms of combining basic conceptual units, i.e., some kind of immutable "foundational concepts" or Platonic ideas.

For instance, if a rather austere experiential domain contained only four core concepts of this kind (say, justice, female, male, and work) there would be a limited number of possible combinations among them, that would yield different meaning combinations.[5] Husserl, to be sure, is not that simplistic a Platonist, that is, he is not committed to conceptual limits in the narrow sense just described. However, in terms of the general closure of experiential domains, his view does retain some problematic implications that Vossler tried to paper over. For Husserl, as they will be for Paul, the "foundational concepts" would have to be *perceptual categories*. Modelled on Kant's table of categories, in the *First Critique* (A80 / B106), the Husserlian phenomenologist does not proclaim a single table that would apply across all life-worlds. Instead, the post-Kantian ambition of this view is to ascertain a new table of perceptual categories for each life-world.

In this regard, Husserl belongs among the pioneers of taking a *regional ontology* as the unit of meaning. For him, these different category tables are not spontaneous concoctions of a creative mind, but – ideally – provide objectively accurate charts of the structural principles that engender and limit the particular perceptions that are available in a particular experiential domain.

As I mentioned earlier, the later Husserl of the *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925) appears willing to factor "cultural shadings" into his notion of perception. Yet

even within an extended framework of cultural perceptions, he insists on the "stable style" of each life-world. His overall conception of regional ontology thus remains restrictive insofar as no cultural *eidos* has the power to bend or modify the perceptual limits of the life-world of which it is an index. And it is this restriction that Gadamer, in *Truth and Method*, has in mind, when he critically remarks on Husserl's purportedly more one-sided focus on perception.[6] From this point of view, Husserl remains resourceful in light of his acumen in working out the methodological basis for a phenomenology of regional ontologies. At the same time, his view upholds certain restrictions that foreclose some of the new vistas of a new critical hermeneutics because of what may be called his persistent *perceptivism*, his willingness to discount historical forms of perception in favor of an overriding transcendentalist paradigm.

The restrictions of this kind of perceptivism, I believe, were already overcome by Paul's *Prinzipienlehre*. More specifically, Paul's position allows for the possibility of a life-world's immanent transformation or, if you will, *immanent revolution*. In using the term "revolution," I do not mean to qualify any such transformatory event that initiates the restructuring of experience in a specific region of cultural life as a conscious cause of political reform. On the contrary, more often than not these *initiatives* will not proceed, or at least not originate, consciously with a declared socio-political goal in mind. By speaking of "revolution," I simply mean to underscore the political relevance that any such *structural reform* holds or may acquire over time. Differently put, the structural order of a particular domain (of medieval experience, or any other) can be reorganized from within. In this view, cultural *eide* do have the power to affect and modify the basic experiential structure of the lifeworld of which they are part. On the flip side, each life-

world has the power to change "old" cultural *eide* and produce new ones in ways that are not predetermined by its unique but fixed table of categories of cultural perception, as Husserl would have it.

In taking a parallel position, Paul's *Prinzipien* can thus be said to provide a conception of genuine evolution in cultural perception, which will prove vital for the work of Cassirer and Gadamer. In the field of historical psychology and comparative linguistics, Paul's notion of communication as semiotic transaction surpasses Husserl's later phenomenological project, notwithstanding the commonality of their views with respect to regional ontologies. Regarding Gadamer's work in particular, Paul's Neogrammarian endeavor proves crucial, because his notion of language use – with its emphasis on material mediation – is key for understanding Gadamer's notion of *dialogue* and its "logic" of question and answer, an argument based closely on Heidegger's own idea of the *Ruf* or *call*.

Despite Gadamer's explicit statements to the contrary, his conception of dialogue is frequently misunderstood as a model for conscious, verbal communication between two (or more) personal interlocutors. However, Gadamer makes it clear that his actual model is the event of *reading* a text – he is taking a hermeneutic rather than an epistemological approach to the project. The resources as well as possible shortcomings, in terms of his alleged pan-textualism and his corresponding notion of *Schriftlichkeit*, cannot properly be assessed, in my opinion, if we do not take into account the implications of work Paul's work with respect to the material dimension of language as communication. Whether it is Gadamer's central image of the "fusion of horizons"[7] or his emphasis on tradition, which he inherited from Heidegger's prior treatment of

Überlieferung (as opposed to "mere" tradition),[8] Gadamer remains indebted to the Neogrammarians as the main "neglected" link between Humboldt's advances in the science of language at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the rise of a new critical hermeneutics at the beginning of the twentieth century. In the quarters of philosophy, Droysen, Dilthey, and – to a lesser degree – Vossler are commonly acknowledged as pivotal influences, whereas Paul has been consistently silenced over, along with the only renowned, philosophical advocate of his work, Ernst Cassirer.

Cassirer's Paul

Against the background of the above considerations, Cassirer's appreciation of Paul's work can now be brought into sharper relief as defining of what was at stake in the historical redefinition of science as a discipline of principles that we have been pursuing here. Somewhat in contrast to his isolated hint at Paul's propensity for a Herbart-inspired "psychologism" in the second study of *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences*, that was referred to above,[9] Cassirer gives Paul full credit for his theoretical advances in the volume's subsequent essay, "Concepts of Nature and Concepts of Culture":

> Paul is above all a historian of language – he is therefore not to be suspected of wanting to restrict the rights of the historical perspective in any way. But on the other hand, he emphasizes that without settling the fundamental questions, without establishing the general conditions of the historical process, no particular historical result whatsoever can be reached. The history of language, like the history of any other cultural form, must always be supported by a science which deals "with *the general living conditions of the historically evolving objects*, which examines those factors that remain constantly present in all change with regard to their nature and efficiency."[10] These constant factors can be found nowhere else but in psychology. *Paul thinks of psychology as the psychology of individuals and not, as Steinthal and Lazarus and later Wundt, as "social psychology."* The psychology of individuals is accordingly assigned the task of conducting the fundamental questions of the theory of language toward a solution: *"Everything revolves around deriving the development of language from the*

> *reciprocal effects that individuals exercise upon each other'*"" (64-65). [my emphases]

Clearly, Cassirer is *not* associating Paul with any metaphysics that would be bound to a conception of "things in themselves," as Vossler had charged.[11] Nor is he commiting the error of solipsism that Vossler arguably had, when he moved to the primacy of individual mind.

Instead, Cassirer credits Paul with a working notion of "historically evolving objects," the transformations of which can be understood within a framework of cultural analysis that combines the insights of individual psychology with a systematic account of the *principles* ("those factors that remain constantly present in all change") that underlie all shifts in our obeject-apprehension.

For my purposes of probing the Vossler-Paul-Cassirer constellation and then tracing it in Heidegger's early writings (third section), two things are of special importance here. First, in the context of "historically evolving objects," Cassirer links Paul's *Prinzipienwissenschaft* to Husserl's particular brand of anti-psychologism, proffered in the latter's *Logical Investigations* – another important clue that puts Cassirer's estimation of Paul in perspective. Second, in distinguishing Paul's deployment of psychology from the methods proposed by Steinthal,[12] Lazarus, and Wundt, Cassirer acknowledges Paul's stress on the crucial aspect of *reciprocity* in the course of meaning formation among different individuals within any given language community. Considering these two cornerstones of Paul's science of principles will thus allow us to critically reassess Vossler's notion of *Zusammenwirken* and his overall judgment on Paul in the concluding pages of his 1904 "manifesto." At the same time, focussing on these two aspects of Paul's theory will set the stage for the subsequent tracing of the Paul-

Vossler controversy, and their reception by Cassirer, as this debate underlies Heidegger's text.

Cassirer goes on to establish the connection between Paul and Husserl in a way that is particularly instructive, because it further corroborates the need for avoiding the neo-Kantian bypass, which I criticized in chapter one of the present study. Cassirer contextualizes Paul's work solidly among his contemporaries and then proceeds to indicate the repercussions of his methodological breakthrough, which would have had a direct impact on Husserl's and Heidegger's thought. Cassirer's synopsis sets the stage for his work:

> When Hermann Paul set forth his thesis in the beginning of his *Principles of the History of Language*, the struggle between the "transcendental" and the "psychological" methods in philosophy and in the general theory of science was at its height. On the one side stood the neo-Kantian schools, which insisted that the first and most important task of epistemological investigation is to distinguish between the *quid juris* and the *quid facti*. Psychology, as an empirical science, is concerned with *questions of fact*, which can never serve as norms for deciding *questions of validity*. Today, *this* separation between "logicism" and "psychologism," which for a long time determined the total character of philosophy, has to a certain extent receded into the background. […] Logic, so the extremists among the psychologists had concluded, is the theory of the forms and laws of thought. It is certainly a psychological discipline, insofar as the processes of thought and knowledge exist only in the psyche. [Cassirer note 13.][13] In his *Logical Investigations*, Husserl has exposed the paralogism that lay in this conclusion […] He pointed to the radical and irreducible difference between the form as "ideal unity of signification" and the psychological experiences, the "acts" of taking-as-true, of believing and judging, which refer to this unity of signification and have it as their object. [Cassirer note 14.][14] (65-66)

Cassirer is aware that Husserl's critique of psychologism is not easily applicable to the cultural sciences, where the role of psychological "acts" seems to be even more pervasive, thus posing an obstacle to Husserl's distinction at hand. "Certainly, in the domain of the cultural sciences it appears at first sight to be much more difficult to draw such a boundary. […] However, […] [h]ere, too, the domain of a pure "morphology" has

crystallized with ever increasing clarity, a morphology that employs other concepts than those of empirical psychology and that must be constructed by other methods" (66).

In other words, Cassirer makes a connection between Husserl's analysis of cultural form as "ideal unity of signification" and Paul's analysis of the "general living conditions of […] historically evolving objects," according to a science of principles. This clearly relates Paul's *Prinzipienwissenschaft* to Husserl's method of ideation, which we examined earlier. Against the background of this discussion, we can now say that the pivotal interface between Paul and Husserl consists in a tacit or overt affirmation of the *eidetic* character of historical objects (cf. the previous example of the cultural image of a medieval house, or Hesse's "Chinese House") which – upon phenomenological analysis – reveal a particular structure for the production of cultural meanings that emerge in different forms in different regional ontologies.

As previously emphasized, Husserl was not always equally willing to accommodate for the "cultural coloration" when he considered different perceptual modes as the structural gateway to different life-worlds, each of which he assumed to be stable in its epistemic "style." Yet we also saw that the Husserl of the *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925) was prepared to address the historical aspect of perceptual structuration, and in this context he is closest to Paul. With this qualification in place, we can acknowledge the methodological proximity between Paul and Husserl, without ignoring the fact that Husserl's conception of "pure subjectivity" and "stable style" tends to preclude, if not downright reject, a discussion of the evolutionary qualities inherent in the semiotic productivity of any given life-world and the unique constellation and interlocking of different cultural forms within it.

In this regard, then, Paul and the "basically ahistorical" Husserl generally agree on the semiotic power of eidetic items *qua* cultural objects, while they tend to disagree on the evolutionary traits of eidetic items qua historical objects. Continuing my introductory remarks to this section: for Husserl, systems of cultural meaning production retain the "monadic"[15] character of being fully integrated, that is to say, life-worlds are considered structurally organized systems that are semiotically productive but closed. Paul, by contrast, considers such cultural domains as *open systems*, in that different life-worlds can be distinguished in terms of their structurally different modes of signification, but no form of that signification by itself is fully integrated. Differently put, for Husserl, the range of availabe meanings is immanently fixed within the closed horizon of any experiential domain. For Paul, on the other hand, experiential domains are more developmental in character. They constitute processes of structuration, in which different structural patterns emerge as prominent at different times, without solidifying into a permanent perceptual structure that would fix the immanent limits of possible experience once and for all.

These differences notwithstanding, Paul and Husserl agree, at least to some extent, when it comes to the second issue under consideration, namely the reciprocal nature of semiotic activity within any particular life-world. In comparing Paul and Husserl with the neo-Idealist critique by Vossler, this basic feature of reciprocity becomes crucial when we translate the phenomenological analysis of experiential domains into the investigation of linguistic development within the life-world of a particular language community.

Focused as they are on the role of the individual, that is, of the individual language user, Paul and Husserl converge on a conception of semiotic activity that frees linguistic agency from the psychologistic constraints of individual consciousness. Instead they posit a notion of *material individuality*, where the individual is reconceived as a material *Sprachzentrum* that is subject to specific feedback effects from the group and other individuals. These reciprocal loops of influence go beyond Vossler's rather narrow model of linguistic transaction, in which "offers" of linguistic innovation are directed only from the creative individual at the group, but not vice versa.

Vossler's account of linguistic transaction, as we saw, is based on a conception of linguistic struggle that explains the possible incorporation of any newly proposed element through centrifugally expanding trials of public acceptance. Any *Sprachschöpfung* (language creation) starts as a local "abnormalcy" which, emanating from the creative individual, may or may not cause "concentric" ripple effects in the common language among the fellow speakers. Aside from the fact that, according to Vossler, most of these inventions do not make it out of the "children's rooms anywhere in the world," the main problem is that this picture of language development seems to reduce *Sprachgeist* to a centrifugal, one-way evolution rather than a dialogue.

This uni-directionality, or one-dimensionality, becomes especially problematic with respect to Vossler's own illustration of "Raphael without hands," where he failed to make a solid case for the claim that the "theoretical greatness" of a spiritually (*geistig*) talented individual was indepenent of the "practical handicap" of circumstantial inarticulateness, even if the latter implies complete barring from any medium of expression. Against the backdrop of the Paul-Husserl connection, we can now sharpen

our criticism of Vossler's neo-Idealist account of the inner activity of (the language) spirit, with respect to the notion of "the living conditions of […] historically evolving objects." Returning to Vossler's 1904 "manifesto," we find the most revealing passages of his critique of Paul in the final pages of his text:

> Wenn Hermann Paul in der Einleitung zu seinen "Prinzipien" behauptet, dass alle Sprachwissenschaft notwendig immer nur historisch sei, so lässt er eben die elementare Sprachwissenschaft, die nur erst *den Sinn*, aber noch nicht die Verwandtschaft *der Ausdrucksformen* untersucht, nicht zur Geltung kommen. Er nimmt die unerlässliche Vorstufe und Vorraussetzung als etwas Selbstverständliches hin und fasst lediglich das letzte Ziel der Sprachwissenschaft, die Erkenntnis der Entwicklung ins Auge. Als selbstverständlich vorauszusetzen ist jedoch nur die unbewusste αισϑησις, nicht die bewusste und kritische. Diese macht vielmehr einzig und allein das Wesen der Sprachwissenschaft aus. An Stelle der These Pauls: *alle Sprachwissenschaft ist historisch*, müssen wir die unsrige setzen: *alle Sprachwissenschaft ist ästhetisch*. […] Paul sagt es selbst in fetten Lettern: "*Das wirklich Gesprochene hat gar keine Entwicklung*" (p. 25).
> Eben deshalb, fügen wir hinzu, kann es zunächst auch nicht historisch, sondern nur erst ästhetisch betrachtet werden. (96) [first and second emphasis added]

These statements are telling because they show a fundamental misunderstanding on Vossler's part regarding Paul's use of the term "historical" in the central claim that all linguistic science is historical. As was shown by way of Cassirer's succinct synopsis of the methodological stakes of Paul's project, Paul's notion of "historical" method does *not* reduce linguistic inquiry to considerations of linear transition in language development. On the contrary, Paul goes to great length to insist that, if we do not also take into account those "factors that remain constant in all change with regard to their nature and efficiency," we will not be able to gain any insight whatsoever from our empirical observations and comparisons of different stages within linguistic evolution.

With reference to our prior comparison of Paul and Husserl, we can say that Vossler's criticism appears to be issued from a Husserl-like position that seeks to inforce

the semiotically unified character of any linguistic lifeworld. In other words, Vossler insists on the closure of any life-world's horizon of meaning, the immanent and purportedly ahistorical "Sinn […] der Ausdrucksformen" (significatory sense of forms of expression) as he puts it here. Vossler's critique of Paul's historicism thus ultimately misses the mark, because he does not see that Paul, in anticipatory extension of Husserl, detects a developmental dynamic *within* each linguistic life-world, resulting in a model of immanent semiotic evolution. This has nothing to do with, first, comparing different linguistic products of language communities across history and, then – too late, of course – asking about their internal structuration of cultural meanings.

Prior to Vossler, it was Paul who insisted on a systematic "morphological" (in Cassirer's sense)[16] account of the immanent evolution with respect to the semiotic power of different life-worlds. Each of these worlds, or experiential domains (with Husserl) is thus construed as engaged in an on-going process of meaning production that is structurally different from other such processes, not as "monadically sealed" but as uniquely open-ended. As far as the aspect of unique immanent structuration is concerned, Paul and Vossler (along with Husserl and Cassirer) are in general agreement. Yet their differences come into play with respect to the nature and degree of integration of theses structuration processes, which some of them (Vossler and the early Husserl) interpret in terms of closed experiential domains, while the others (Paul, the later Husserl, and Cassirer) view them as open horizons of immanent transformation.

Given such degree of agreement, it is not by accident that Vossler's criticism appears gratuitous, when he tries to turn Paul against himself. Vossler's use of one of the most central pronouncements of the *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* ("What is actually

said has no development" [*Das wirklich Gesprochene hat gar keine Entwicklung*] [28][17]) as evidence againts Paul's own theory is just not plausible.

Clarifying the ramifications of this dictum is crucial not only for a critical comparison of Paul and Vossler, but also to prevent the conception of the *material individual*, which I have extracted from Paul's view of language use, from the two possible, if contrary, misunderstandings that I have been discussing as central to the question of science, namely, in taking language as some kind of physicalism or psychologism. In fact, Paul refers to what I call material individuals variously as "mental organisms" (*psychische Organismen*) and "language organisms" (*Sprachorganismen*). More specifically, in his view, the material qualities of the individual language user are to be understood in terms of the structural organization of "representational (semiotic) matter" (*Vorstellungsmasse*) within each individual's "soul" (*Seele*; see quotations below). Given this wording, Paul's account runs the two-fold risk of being reduced either to some form of physicalism, if one overinterprets his present notion of "mass." Or, it may be reduced to some version of psychologism, if one overinterprets his present notion of "soul."

To avoid both of these misreadings, one has to take into account Paul's programmatic dictum in its entirety, as opposed to Vossler, who provides only half of it. Adding the first sentence that Vossler omits, Paul's claim reads: "Die geschilderten psychischen Organismen sind die eigentlichen Träger der historischen Entwicklung. Das wirklich gesprochene hat gar keine Entwicklung" (28). The different dimensions of Paul's conception of the "mental organism" have been worked out in acute detail in Arens' *Structures of Knowing* (1989), from which the following exposition is drawn.[18]

Arens' analysis of the different implications of Paul's view regarding the routes of communicative influence among such organisms strikes me as conclusive. My own contribution in this context is thus confined to the critical comparison of Paul and Vossler, and how their debate elucidates the discursive constellation of Cassirer, Heidegger, and Gadamer – Heidegger's gestures at distancing himself from the rest of the field notwithstanding.

In the present discussion, I cannot do justice to Arens' complex analysis. Instead, I want to focus on a particular line of argument in Paul's characterization of language as communication, which relates his notion of the "mental organism" to his conception of "evolving historical objects," which we saw Cassirer emphasize in connection with Husserl's ideational analysis of cultural *eide*.[19] With respect to these two connected thematic focuses, Paul delivers a model for "the interaction between culture and mind" (137), as Arens puts it, and thus the question becomes how individual mental organisms *receive*, *register*, and *communicate* cultural images among each other. And how do such organisms and images affect and transform each other in the process? Concerning reception, processing and registration of this sort, Paul explains:

> Representations are entered into consciousness in groups and therefore remain as groups in the unconscious. […] And not only individual words, but also larger series of sounds and whole sentences associate themselves immediately with the thought content that was placed in them. These groups, given at least originally by the outside world, organize themselves in the soul of each individual to much richer and more complicated connections which are completed only in the smallest degree consciously, and which then have further unconscious effects, in the greatest part never achieving even clear consciousness, and which are still nonetheless effective. (PS, 26).[20]

Critical to note is that Paul's original term for representation is *Vorstellung*. As is clear from the above, Paul does not restrict its meaning to conscious respresentations but, on

the contrary, underscores that, for the most part, the entering and registering of representational complexes in the mind proceeds unconsciously through what we would today identify as other semiotic processes. Importantly, Paul states that these complexes or "clusters," if you will, are not limited to word units but come in all shapes and sizes, including "larger series of sounds and whole sentences." Not just words, but more complex utterances, conventional signs, and even whole expressions carry such cultural weight.

What is more, these association patterns "are absolutely not to be confused with the categories which are abstracted in grammatical reflection" (PS, 27). So, not only do these registered representational units vary in size, they also cannot be mapped onto a grammatical chart that would distinguish the intake of verb phrases, noun phrases, sentential units, etc. According to Paul, these clusters defy any such grammatical dissection and classification, for the latter must be considered but an abstract imposition from retrospect.

Next, as far as the unconscious organization and linking of these complexes is concerned, no two individuals are alike. Moreover, "it is as significant as it is obvious, that each organism of representational groups is in constant change in the individual" (*Es ist ebenso bedeutsam als selbstverständlich, dass dieser Organismus von Vorstellungsgruppen sich bei jedem Individuum in stetiger Veränderung befindet*) (27). With respect to this dynamic and "idiosyncratic" processing, Paul elaborates:

> […] the organism of the groups of representations relating to language develops in each individual in idiosyncratic fashion, and also achieves an idiosyncratic form in each. Even if it should be composed in various individuals out of exactly the same elements, these elements will still be introduced in different order, in different groupings, with different intensity, into the soul with greater or lesser frequency, and will, therefore, form their mutual power relationships and thus

> their groupings differently, even if we do not account for the difference in the general and specific capacities of the individual at all. (PS, 27-28)[21]

Combined, the last two quotations indicate that, for Paul, language change springs from the interrelation between instances of individual language use and their cultural/linguistic environment. With respect to the last passage, Arens points out that Paul's "statement indicates that language use as conditioned by the environment has basic patterns in it, but that the weighting of these patterns is individual. A percentage prediction may be made about which pattern will occur, but this is not a unique, valid description of the minds of an age" (141). Also, Paul's last sentence suggests that his approach is no longer bound to the kind of faculty psychology that is still detectable in Vossler's characterization of *Sprachbegabung* as "language talent." While Paul does not discard the issue of differing linguistic capacities among language users altogether, he clearly shifts emphasis and focuses on the mutual influence between the dynamic patterns of (mostly unconscious) representational complexes within the individual mind, on one hand, and the dynamic patterns within the linguistic environment, on the other hand.

This evaluation of the relations between individuals and the group raises the issue of communication, because the notion of environment here refers to the linguistic activity on the part of the other members of a given linguistic community which surrounds the individual language user. Communication, in turn, points to one of the most important aspects of Paul's *Principles*, his stress on *material mediation* in all linguistic transaction. Mental contents, he holds, are never communicated directly but can be transmitted only through physical "products of human culture" (PS, 1). Here Paul's notion of "historically evolving objects" (ibid.) takes center stage, and one of the main challenges is not to

conflate his account of the "real bearers of historical development" (28) with the physical objects that serve as vehicles for communication.

The real bearers are only the mental organisms, which are engaged in the constant registering and rearranging of representational clusters, as described above. These organisms communicate through the production of physical objects (written texts as tangible scriptures, works of art in their fixed physicality, and the spoken word as acoustic phenomenon or sound image). In this regard, the aspect of dynamicity in *material mediation* cannot be reduced the static physicality of cultural products. Instead, such mediation is based on the referential character of these products. They always point beyond themselves toward a specific life-world and its unique mode of structuring experience.

This referential character of cultural products can again be illuminated, I suggest, through a comparison with Husserl's conception of cultural *eide*. Remember, that, for Husserl, no single perception of any object (be it a house or anything else) yields a cultural *eidos* yet. The latter can only be gleaned from a phenomenological test series of perspectival shifts. At the point where these shifts converge, the *eidos* emerges not as a pictorial representation (or a virtually photographic thought content of a picture remembered or imagined) but as a sample of the structuration pattern of a specific experiential domain.

The crux is that no single perception of any "physical" object, by itself, grants insight into a particular process of structuration. Accordingly, in extrapolating an *eidos* from a phenomenological test series, Husserl is not interested in issuing any judgment about the mind-independent physical reality of any "thing in itself" as the purported

substratum of each single perception (which is why I put "physical" in scare quotes in the preceding sentence). In contract, we have already observed that Cassirer, in his appreciative commentary on Husserl's approach,[22] stresses the fact that the phenomenologist is only interested in the particular experiential totality that a (cultural) eidos "signifies," not in the "reality" of the objects he perceives. In this vein, ideational analysis is indifferent to any form of naïve realism, just as it does not care to issue any kind of substance ontology, such as Cartesian dualism. Instead, it aspires to an *objective* perception of perception, to use our earlier phrase.[23] And just as Husserl is not interested in the physical reality of the object that purportedly "underlies" any single perception, so Paul is not interested in the static physicality of any cultural product or linguistic item, because it does not help to explain the possibility of language development. This shared indifference toward substance ontology, marks the important interface between Husserl's notion of *eidos* and Paul's notion of "historical objects."

The main difference between these authors, however, is that for Paul historical objects evolve, whereas for Husserl *eide* do not. Structurally, again, the horizon of each of Husserl's life-worlds is closed. By contrast, Paul conceives of life-worlds as *open systems*, where the material encounter between an individual mind and a historical object can modify the structural profile of the life-worlds, of which they are part, respectively.

To further clarify the character of the materially mediated intercation between individual minds and their cultural surrounding, we have to specify the notion of registration, in particular. To repeat one of Paul's most pertinent statements in this respect, "[r]epresentations are entered into consciousness in groups and therefore remain as groups in the unconscious. […] And not only individual words, but also larger series

of sounds and whole sentences associate themselves immediately with the thought content which was placed in them" (PS, 26).[24] Two crucial aspects deserve special attention, Paul's reference to "thought content" (*Gedankeninhalt*) and to "associat[ion]" (*sich assoziieren*). This diction would seem to raise some of the familiar, but all the more vexing issues that spring from a correspondence theory of representation and, by extention, a correspondence theory of truth. The main problem, according to such a theoretical framework, concerns the question as to how particular represenations or "thought contents" may correspond to those portions of mind-independent reality, which they are respresentations *of*. What, if any, are the criteria that determine the mapping or matching relation between particular representations and their "real" referent?

From Paul to Wittgenstein

Here it is not my goal to take on the debate over respresentation as correspondence in any comprehensive, much less exhausting way. I rest content with pointing to one particular attemp to come to terms with the workings of respresentation, which is particularly instructive for an evaluation of Paul's account of how respresentational clusters are entered into the individual mind. This attempt is put forth by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) in the "second section" (2-2.225) of his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1921).

Even within this segment, I shall restrict my focus to the relation that Wittgenstein posits between *Welt* (world) and *Wirklichkeit* (reality), while other important aspects will be left aside, as they are of no immediate assistance in bringing Paul's position into sharper relief. To be clear, by enlisting Wittgenstein in such selective manner, I do not

mean to issue a conclusive critique of his position. In fact, I think that the primary weakness of the passage under consideration consists not in its plain falsehood but in its inherent ambiguity. Because of that ambiguity and in light of Wittgenstein's notoriously condensed mode of presentation, in the *Tractatus*, his statements about the *World-Reality* relation *can* be interpreted in terms of what I consider, with Paul, a flawed view of transcendentalism with respect to cultural experience and communicative activity. And it is with respect to this feature that I want to use Wittgenstein as a foil. One of the merits of the present reference to the *Tractatus*, I suggest, is that it already points the way to an alternative reading of Wittgenstein that puts him in the direct vicinity of the phenomenological thought of Husserl and Mach. Their differences notwithstanding, both of these authors are sympathetic to Paul's model for a science of principles, especially as far as the linguistic import of their respective projects is concerned.[25]

Turning to the text of the *Tractatus*, we find that Wittgenstein's wavering between different world conceptions is accompanied by a correlative ambiguity, with respect to the relation between a "world" and its "metaphysical subject" (5.641). On one hand, Wittgenstein seems to posit a singular conception of *the* world (*die Welt*), as the one over-arching unity that comprises all possible realities. In this sense "world" stands for the totality of all realities. On the other hand, he appears to assume a pluralistic conception of an irreducible multitude of worlds, each of which comprises a certain subset of realities, without encompassing all such realities in their totality. Throughout the text, Wittgenstein thus keeps oscillation between the singular and the plural conception of world(s).

According to my reading, the ambiguity remains intact and so no conclusive judgment can be issued, resting on the text of the *Tractatus* alone. This notwithstanding, one can effectively extrapolate certain key traits of "solipsism" (*Solipsismus*) and "pure realism" (*reine[r] Realismus*) from Wittgenstein's view, which serve to document his theoretical proximity to a particular strand of phenomenology as well as to give a counter-example of how *not* to understand Paul's theory of language as communication.

What is more, following this strategy of "clarification by contrast" is not limited to negative insights alone. In combining Wittgenstein's own examples with the insights by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, in *What is Philosophy?* (1994 [orig. 1991]), we also receive constructive hints as to how we *should* understand Paul's view. In this context, I argue, Deleuze and Guattari deserve credit for illuminating the commonly neglected, or at least underplayed, Wittgenstein-Husserl connection, especially with respect to their analysis of the nature of concepts and concept formation, provided in chapter one and chapter two of their study.

One of the most problematic statements, concerning the ambiguity of world, is delivered in: 2.063: *Die gesamte Wirklichkeit ist die Welt* (The sum-total of reality is the world)."[26] The wording of this claim is perplexing because of the seeming redundancy of the phrase *gesamte Wirklichkeit*. The attribute does not seem to add anything unless we entertain some notion of "partial reality" or different (sub)divisions of reality which may or may not add up to a total domain of reality in its entirety (*Gesamtheit*). If we give Wittgenstein the benefit of the doubt and assume that his intended meaning is not redundant, the implicit notion of different divisions of reality still allows for two different interpretations with respect to the relation between reality and world. Based on a "thick"

notion of totality, the "sum-total of reality" could refer to *all* possible realities, in which case "the world" would be the *single*, over-arching unity of any reality whatsoever. Or, based on a "thin" notion of totality, the "sum-total of reality" could refer to all possible realities *relative* to a particular world, in which case "the world" would be one among others but still "complete" (*vollständig*; see: 4.26, below) by exhausting a specific subset of possible realities, such as, e.g., the reality of color, of sound, or of heat.

For the second interpretation in terms of "thin" totality to even make sense, we must assume that it excludes a possible alternative, namely an "incomplete" world, among other worlds that would somehow relate to a specific subset of realities but not exhaust it. My speaking of "exhausting" here refers to Wittgenstein's implicit criterion of *logical homogeneity* for a world to count as such, which is implied by his notion of "logical form" (4.12; 4.128). The unity of each world thus consists in its having a logical form, which guarantees that all realities that are correlated with this world have to be *logically consistent*. The theoretical link between logical homogeneity and logical consistency is provided by Wittgenstein's notion of *Elementarsätze* (elementary propositions) (4.21 ff.), which report basic facts (*Tatsachen*) with respect to a certain reality, e.g., color facts within a color reality. The logical form of any world, then, guarantees that any true elementary proposition is logically consistent with all other true elementary propositions stated about that world.

Against the background of these considerations, Wittgenstein's ambiguous line of argument, wavering between a "thick" and a "thin" notion of the totality of (a) world, proceeds according to the following steps:

2 Was der Fall ist, die Tatsache, ist das Bestehen von Sachverhalten.
(What is the case – a fact – is the existence of states of affairs.)

2.026 Nur wenn es Gegenstände gibt, kann es eine feste Form der Welt geben.
(There must be objects, if the world is to have an unalterable form.)

2.0271 Der Gegenstand ist das Feste, Bestehende; die Konfiguration ist das Wechselnde, Unbeständige.
(Objects are what is unalterable and subsistent; their configuration is what is changing and unstable.)

2.0272 Die Konfiguration der Gegenstände bildet den Sachverhalt.
(The configuration of objects produces states of affairs.)[27]

2.032 Die Art und Weise, wie die Gegenstände im Sachverhalt zusammenhängen, ist die Struktur des Sachverhaltes.
(The determinate way in which objects are connected in a state of affairs is the structure of the state of affairs.)[28]

2.034 Die Struktur der Tatsache besteht aus den Strukturen der Sachverhalte.
(The structure of a fact consists of the structures of states of affairs.)

2.04 Die Gesamtheit der bestehenden Sachverhalte ist die Welt.
(The totality of existing states of affairs is the world.)

2.061 Die Sachverhalte sind von einander unabhängig.
(States of affairs are independent of one another.)

2.062 Aus dem Bestehen oder Nichtbestehen eines Sachverhaltes kann nicht auf das Bestehen oder Nichtbestehen eines anderen geschlossen werden.
(From the existence or non-existence of one state of affairs it is impossible to infer the existence or non-existence of another.)

2.063 Die gesamte Wirklichkeit ist die Welt.
(The sum-total of reality is the world.)

Note that, in the above, I have quoted selectively from Wittgenstein, skipping over certain interim steps that are not directly relevant to my present criticism. Generally, this is risky business, but since my sole purpose in this place is to point to a specific ambiguity and tension among particular key concepts in Wittgenstein's text, I believe that this procedure is generally legitimate. To repeat, I do not aim at a complete

reconstruction of Wittgenstein's overall position, but at pinpointing a sore spot within his account of the relation between world and reality.

In the above quotations, we find a certain hierarchy of theoretical levels, not in terms of importance but in terms of scope. According to this hierarchy, the *smallest* unit to be considered in analyzing the *constitution* of the world are *Gegenstände* (objects), but it turns out that the smallest unit is not the most basic one. Conjointly, 2.026, 2.0271, 2.0272, 2.061, and 2.062 form the backbone of Wittgenstein's idiosyncratic adaptation of "logical atomism," which he had inherited, at least in part, from Bertrand Russell. Regarding this doctrine it is crucial that *Gegenstände*, or objects, are *not* the primary elements of *logical form* (4.12; cf. above), that is, they do not constitute "logical atoms" for Wittgenstein. Instead it is *Sachverhalte*, or states of affairs, that are logically most basic.

Yet, by itself, this latter claim is not conclusive, because here we encounter already the main ambiguity put forth in Wittgenstein's characterization of the nature of *Sachverhalte* and how they constitute the world. The problematic phrase is "bestehende Sachverhalte" in 2.04, which I used as my starting point for the present criticism of Wittgenstein. This phrase could refer either to the *configuration* of objects, which is subject to change (according to 2.0271), or, it could refer to the *structure* that governs the configuration of objects, which is not subject to change (as is intimated but not fully clarified by 2.032, 2.061, 2.062). If we do not distinguish between the two aspect of *variable* configuration and *stable* structure (which Wittgenstein does not, in this place), it is not clear what it means to speak of the world as constituted by the "totality of existing states of affairs" (*[d]ie Gesamtheit der bestehenden Sachverhalte*). More precisely, if

Sachverhalte, *qua* configuration of objects, are subject to change, one wonders what kind of stability, cohesion, or unity – if any – is implied by the notion of totality.

This problem appears aggravated by Wittgenstein's opening remarks at the very beginning of the *Tractatus*, where he describes the totality of the world, in a way that would seem to preclude us from referring to the stable nature of objects (2.0271) in order to clarify the meaning of the world's totality, as featured in section two: "1.1: Die Welt ist die Gesamtheit der Tatsachen, nicht der Dinge (The world is the totality of facts, not of things)." and "1.11: Die Welt ist durch die Tatsachen bestimmt, und dadurch, dass es *alle* Tatsachen sind (The world is determined by the facts, and by their being *all* the facts)." In this passage, the totality of the world is spelled as the *completeness* of the set of *all* facts. Thus restated in terms of completeness, the previous problem concerning the ambiguous nature of *Sachverhalte* becomes even more involved.

The configurational aspect of *Sachverhalte* seems to make the latter susceptible to change (2.0271 in conjunction with 2.0272). However, if any fact (*Tatsache*) consists in the existence of states of affairs (*Sachverhalte*) (2), the element of change or variability would seem to transfer from *Sachverhalte* to *Tatsachen*. And if that is the case, then it is not clear how we could ever take stock of the complete set of "all facts," if they are just as much subject to change as the states of affairs by which they are constituted. The same question can be raised from a different angle. In light of the previous remarks, Wittgenstein appears to be at odds with himself, if we compare the following claims:

1.1. Die Welt ist die Gesamtheit der Tatsachen, nicht der Dinge.
(The world is the totality of facts, not of things.)

2.022 Es ist offenbar, dass auch eine von der wirklichen noch so verschieden gedachte Welt Etwas – eine Form – mit der wirklichen gemein haben muss.

(It is obvious that an imagined world, however different it may be from the real one, must have *something* – a form – in common with it.

2.023 Diese feste Form besteht eben aus den Gegenständen.
(Objects are just what constitute this unalterable form.)

2.026 Nur wenn es Gegenstände gibt, kann es eine feste Form der Welt geben.
(Only when there are objects, does the world have an unalterable form.)

Given the fact that Wittgenstein uses the terms "Gegenstand," "Ding," and "Sache" interchangeably (see: 2.01, and my note 191), he appears to describe the constitution of the world in two incongruent, if not mutually exclusive, ways. According to (1.1.), the world consists in the totality of facts, *not of things*. Furthermore, each fact is constituted by "the existence of states of affairs" (2). However, states of affairs were ascribed a double-nature. With respect to the configuration of objects, they appeared variable and subject to change (2.0272). With respect to the way in which objects are connected (*die Art und Weise, wie die Gegenstände im Sachverhalt zusammenhängen*), the structure of states of affairs was directly linked to the structure of facts. (2.032). Yet as long as this double-nature of states of affairs is not sorted out, it is not clear how Wittgenstein can define the constitution of the world in terms of facts but not of objects, as proposed in (1.1).

Even if Wittgenstein does not directly contradict himself, what remains especially problematic is that the "existence" of objects is supposed to constitute the "unalterable form" of the world (*feste Form der Welt*) (2.023, 2.026), whereas the completeness of the world is supposed to consist in the totality of "all facts" (1.11), independently of the totality of all things, if there is such a thing (1.1). These passages give the impression that Wittgenstein is assigning different roles to the nature of objects. On one hand, they ground the world's unalterable form; on the other hand, they are irrelevant to the aspect

of completeness, implied by Wittgenstein's account of the world's totality. To be sure, unalterable form and complete totality may not mean the same thing for Wittgenstein, but then it is really not clear what he means by totality at all in his characterization of the constitution of the world.

My suggestion for amending this situation in Wittgenstein's text is to disambiguate the double-nature of *Sachverhalt* by reading this early part of the *Tractatus* as a case for *ideational analysis*, in Husserl's sense. According to this interpretation, Wittgenstein's account of the world as constituted by the totality of facts, in which the structure of facts interlocks with the structure of states of affairs, amounts to a specific conception of the closed horizon of any life-world that lends itself to scientific analysis. For Wittgenstein's *Gegensände* to ground the "unalterable form" of the world, they have to be understood as *eide*, as Husserl defines them. The connection to this particular methodological strand of phenomenology is in fact hinted at by Wittgenstein's conception of "formal concepts," presented later in section four of the *Tractatus*:

> 4.126 In dem Sinne, in welchem wir von formalen Eigenschaften sprechen, können wir nun auch von formalen Begriffen reden.
> (Ich führe diesen Ausdruck ein, um den Grund der Verwechslung der formalen Begriffe mit den eigentlichen Begriffen, welche die ganze Logik durchzieht, klar zu machen.) […]
> (We can now talk about formal concepts, in the same sense that we speak of formal properties.
> [I introduce this expression in order to exhibit the source of the confusion between formal concepts and concepts proper, which pervades the whole of traditional logic.]) […]
>
> 4.127 Die Satzvariable bezeichnet den formalen Begriff und ihre Werte die Gegenstände, welche unter diesen Begriff fallen.
> (The propositional variable signifies the formal concept, and its values signify the objects that fall under the concept.)
>
> 4.1271 Jede Variable ist das Zeichen eines formalen Begriffes.
> Denn jede Variable stellt eine konstante Form dar, welche alle ihre Werte

Besitzen, und die als formale Eigenschaft dieser Werte aufgefasst werden Kann.
(Every variable is the sign for a formal concept.
For every variable represents a constant form that all its values possess, and this can be regarded as a formal property of those values.)

4.1272 So ist der variable Name "x" das eigentliche Zeichen des Scheinbegriffes *Gegenstand*.
Wo immer das Wort "Gegenstand" ("Ding," "Sache," etc.) richtig gebraucht wird, wird es in der Begriffsschrift durch den variablen Namen ausgedrückt. […]
So kann man z.B. nicht sagen "Es gibt Gegenstände," wie man etwa sagt "Es gibt Bücher." […]
(Thus the variable name 'x' is the proper sign for the pseudo-concept *object*.
Wherever the word 'object' ['thing,' etc.] is correctly used, it is expressed in conceptual notation by a variable name.) […]
(So one cannot say, for example, 'There are objects,' as one might say, 'There are books.') […]

4.12721 Der formale Begriff ist mit einem Gegenstand, der unter ihn fällt, bereits gegeben. Man kann also nicht Gegenstände eines formalen Begriffes *und* den formalen Begriff selbst als Grundbegriffe einführen. […]
(A formal concept is given immediately any object falling under it is given. It is not possible, therefore, to introduce as primitive ideas objects belonging to a formal concept *and* the formal concept itself.) […]

Here Wittgenstein makes it clear that his earlier exposition, in section two, needs to be revised. The ambiguity that adhered to the double-nature of *Sachverhalt* is now clarified by disambiguating the (pseudo-)concept of *Gegenstand* (object). The latter, Wittgenstein insists, must not be understood and used as if it was a "concept proper" (4.126) like book (4.1272). To obviate the obfuscation of this difference in ordinary language, the expression "object" ought to be replaced by the variable name "x," according to a conceptual notation (*Begriffsschrift*) that is logically rigid (4.1272).

What is not immediately clear, however, is what Wittgenstein means when he asserts that "every variable represents a constant form that all its values possess, and this

can be regarded as a formal property of those values" (4.1271). In the present context of section four of the *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein exposes the ordinary notion of *Gegenstand* (object) as a pseudo-concept. But then we wonder how the "unalterable form of the world," which was predicated on the "existence of objects" in section two (2.026) relates to the "constant form" that any variable represents respectively (4.1271).

Clarification in this regard is all the more called for in light of the last claim quoted above, namely that "a formal concept is always already given along with any object falling under it" (4.12721).[29] This last statement perpetuates the ambiguity that was besetting Wittgenstein's presentation throughout section two. After driving a logical wedge between the lax use of object as a pseudo-concept and the proper use of it as a formal concept (to be designated by the variable name "x"), Wittgenstein now seems to reapproximate, or somehow link, the two different meanings of "object," when he says that one is "always already given along with" the other (ibid.). Or, one would like to know how his present reference to "any object falling under" a formal concept differs from using object as a pseudo-concept. The primary hint, in this place, is provided by (4.1271), which prepares the later formulation of "objects falling under a formal concept" in terms of "values being assigned to a variable name." Yet, the statement of (4.1271) poins us back, yet again, to the idea of "constant form" and our former question as to how it relates to the "unalterable form of the world" posited in (2.026).

The clearest answer to this question, I think, can be given by tying Wittgenstein's present criticism of *Gegenstand* as a pseudo-concepts back to his earlier remarks on the stable *structure*, versus the variable *configuration*, of *Gegenstände*. According to this interpretation, a formal concept is a *structural form* of experience that remains constant

throughout a series of different experiential "values." Insofar as these values are structured by the same form, they share a "formal property" (4.1271). From this vantage point, Wittgenstein's explication of formal concepts in terms of "constant form" (ibid.) proves very similar to Husserl's procedure of ideational analysis. More precisely, Wittgenstein's "formal concepts" are nothing else than Husserl's *eide*, and the different "values" that can be assigned to them correspond to what Husserl had described in terms of the perspectival shifts to which the phenomenologist subjects a given phenomenon.

This parallelism would also explain what Wittgenstein means when he claims that "a formal concept is always already given along with any object falling under it" (4.12721). Put in Husserl's terms, any such object stands for a single observation, a single phenomenon. As I discussed in detail, no single phenomenon by itself constitutes an *eidos*. However, Husserl believed, any phenomenon can be put through a phenomenological test series, from which the eidos would emerge. Any particular (cultural) *eidos* (remember Hesse's "Chinese House"), in turn, constitutes a structural sample of a particular experiential domain (such as, e.g., a particular Confucian life-world).

In fact, the parallels between these two authors extend even further, because in all this Wittgenstein shows the same penchant for *perceptivism* as did Husserl, before he broadenend his approach, especially in the *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925), to take into account the diverse "cultural colorations" of various phenomena. In the *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein does not yet make any such move. Instead, he models his life-world conception, implied by his account of the relation between formal concepts and the "constant form of the world," mostly on sense perception.[30]

An important difference, however, consists in the fact that Wittgenstein seems to be drawn to a certain kind of "pure realism" (5.64) that is not obviously compatible with Husserl's kind of *objective*, or scientific, phenomenalism. In fact, in section five, Wittgenstein approximates "pure realism" to "solipsism" (ibid.), culminating in claims such as: "Ich bin meine Welt. (Der Mikrokosmos.)" (5.63),[31] and "Das Subjekt gehört nicht zur Welt, sondern es ist eine Grenze der Welt" (5.632).[32] While Husserl would agree, at least in part, with Wittgenstein's professed anti-psychologism in this context, he would not endorse Wittgenstein's concomitant hint at solipsism.

As discussed previously, part and parcel of Husserl's phenomenological method was an agenda of making phenomenological research scientifically respectable. Ideational analysis is supposed to yield objective results. So the "limit" or *Grenze* (cf.: 5.632, above) of each world is a structural one, which can be clarified by extrapolating an *eidos* from a phenomenal test series. As a structural sample, to use our earlier expression, this *eidos* provides objective access to a particular experiential domain. For Husserl, any life-world can be unfolded, as it were, from within such an *eidos*. Accordingly, his view is one of what may be called objective immanence, which grounds the validity standards for phenomenological research in the objective structures of any experiential domain to be discovered only from within that domain. Even when he talks of the "monadic" character of these domains, he is making a case for immanence not solipsism. The immanent "limit" of any given life-world is a matter of objective structure, which makes certain *subject positions* available, including that of the phenomenological observer. Husserl's life-world is*not* grounded in *a* subject position as the "extensionless" center or zero-coordinate as Wittgenstein suggests, when he says:

5.64 Hier sieht man dass der Solipsismus, streng durchgeführt, mit dem reinen Realismus zusammenfällt. Das Ich des Solipsismus schrumpft zum ausdehnungslosen Punkt zusammen, und es bleibt die ihm koordinierte Realität.
(Here it can be seen that solipsism, when its implications are followed out strictly, coincides with pure realism. The self of solipsism shrinks to the point without extension, and there remains the reality co-ordinated with it.)

5.641 Es gibt also wirklich einen Sinn, in welchem in der Philosophie nicht-psychologisch vom Ich die Rede sein kann.
Das Ich tritt in die Philosophie dadurch ein, dass die "Welt meine Welt ist."
Das philosophische Ich ist nicht der Mensch, nicht der menschliche Körper, oder die menschliche Seele, von der die Psychologie handelt, sondern das metaphysische Subjekt, die Grenze – nicht ein Teil der Welt.
(Thus there really is a sense in which philosophy can talk about the self in a non-psychological way.
What brings the self into philosophy is the fact that 'the world is my world.'
The philosophical self is not the human being, not the human body, or the human soul, with which psychology deals, but rather the metaphysical subject, the limit of the world – not a part of it.)

To make the implications of such solipsism more concrete and to bring out the difference to Husserl more sharply, we can turn to one of the most famous pronouncements of the *Tractatus*: "[…] The world of the happy man is a different one from that of the unhappy man" (6.43). Here, Wittgenstein continues his anti-psychologistic account of the "philosophical self," as he extends his notion of the "metaphysical subject" to the realm of ethics.

To capture the implications of Wittgenstein's famous dictum for his conception of world, visà- vis Husserl's, it has to be quoted in context:

6.423 Vom Willen als dem Träger des Ethischen kann nicht gesprochen werden.
Und der Wille als Phänomen interessiert nur die Psychologie.
(It is impossible to speak about the will in so far as it is the subject of ethical attributes.
And the will as a phenomenon is of interest only to psychology.)

> 6.43 Wenn das gute oder böse Wollen die Welt ändert, so kann es nur die Grenzen der Welt ändern, nicht die Tatsachen; nicht das, was durch die Sprache ausgedrückt werden kann.
> Kurz, die Welt muss dann dadurch überhaupt eine andere werden. Sie muss sozusagen als Ganzes abnehmen oder zunehmen.
> Die Welt des Glücklichen ist eine andere als die des Unglücklichen.
> (If the good or bad exercise of the will does alter the world, it can alter only the limits of the world, not the facts – not what can be expressed by language.
> In short the effect must be that it becomes an altogether different world. It must, so to speak, wax and wane as a whole.
> The world of the happy man is a different one from that of the unhappy man.)

The last sentence is revealing, for it indicates that Wittgenstein conception of the world, now invested with ethical features, does not allow for immanent transformation. Whether on the level of sensual perception, or on the the level of "ethical perception" (according to Wittgenstein's overt conflation of "ethics [as] aesthetics"),[33] his view does not allow for immanent transformation. The horizon of any life-world is closed. For Husserl, it is, too, but he would reject the idea of fixed ethical transcendentals, as Wittgenstein presents them here.

By introducing this new dimension of transcendental analysis into his inquiry, Wittgenstein, I assume, is not giving up his express anti-psychologism. In other words, in the present context of ethics, he maintains his conception of the "philosophical self" as the "metaphysical subject" (5.641), which now assumes transcendent status. To be sure, "the unhappy man" is not an individual person that is manically depressed. Instead, the unhappy man stands for a life-world, or form of life, that is oriented by an unchanging transcendent entity (or value?, we might ask) that supposedly infuses all acts of perception within that world with a certain "formal" quality. Here, "formal" is thoroughly compatible with ethical import, since Wittgenstein is not interested in the

psychological upheavals and passions of particular individuals. Instead, the kinds of "passion" or "willing" that are available within a particular experiential domain are formally determined by the metaphysical subject that occupies the zero-point of that coordinate system (cf., 5.64, above).

The main problem withWittgenstein's account, I think, is the implausibly monolithic, homogeneous nature of both the metaphysical subject and the world, the perceptual "net" (6.341)[34] of which it casts from its zero-position. Meeting Wittgenstein on his own terms, this criticism must not resort to counter-examples from personal experience or (second-hand) reports about psychic episodes on the part of others. Thus the objection that no one is unhappy all the time would miss the point. Instead, Wittgenstein's main weakness, I argue, consists in the fact that unhappiness, or sadness, does not qualify as a life-world, much less as an "*unalterable* form of the world" (*eine feste Form der Welt*) (2.026) [emphasis added]. And at this point, Wittgenstein's argument converges with the larger discussion we are pursuing here: the question of the psychological or philosophical ties to culture through representation.

By his own standards, the scope of the "logical structure of sadness" is not equivalent to, e.g., the "logical structure of color" (*die logische Struktur der Farbe*) (6.3751). In fact, sadness as such is no *cultural logic*at all, that is, it cannot be considered the governing principle that organizes and structures a particular life-world. Upon scrutiny, Wittgenstein's famous dictum that "the world of the unhappy man is a different one from that of the unhappy man" is equal to saying "the world of blue is different from the world of yellow." The latter has to be rejected, because both of these pseudo-worlds are actually part of the same world, namely that of color. Here

Wittgenstein appears vulnerable to his own criticism of psychologism. Positing a "world of sadness," based on a transcendental fix point of sadness, seems motivated by the kind of psychological considerations that he expressly rejects (cf. 5.641). Hence, in keeping with Wittgenstein's own anti-psychologism, we do not belittle anybody's sorrow or depression, when we assert that "the world of the unhappy man" does not exist.

Instead, we have entered an intersection between a specific transcendental logic and a cultural one – an intersection that requires us to take recourse to yet another perspective on how transcendental and cultural logics intersect.

Deleuze and Guattari's Wittgenstein: A Return to Culture

The problematic character of a one-sided notion of the transcendent, as the centerpiece of Wittgenstein's commentary on human life-worlds, in general, and ethical worlds, in particular, can be further illustrated by saying that, in his view, "no happy face can turn up in the world of the unhappy man." This point is made (with somewhat different attributes) by Deleuze and Guattari in *What is Philosophy?* (1994 [orig.1991]). Their commentary is particularly instructive, not only because it points the reader to the connection between Husserl and Wittgenstein, in ways relevant to our discussion thus far. Their analysis also leads us back to Paul's conception of language as communication, and how his Neogrammarian-versus-neo-Idealist controversy with Vossler remained of vital importance not only for the phenomenology of Husserl but also for the next generation of purportedly renegade phenomenologists, including Wittgenstein and Heidegger.

Concerning the problem raised by Wittgenstein's famous dictum, Deleuze and Guattari speak of the "calm" and "frightened" aspects of different life-worlds (rather than happy and unhappy), but the primary issue is the same:

> Let us proceed in a summary fashion: we will consider a field of experience taken as a real world no longer in relation to a self but to a simple "there is." There is, at some moment, a calm and restful world. Suddenly a frightened face looms up that looks at something out of the field. The other person appears here as neither subject nor object but as something that is very different: a possible world, the possibility of a frightening world. This possible world is not real, or not yet, but it exists nonetheless: it is an expressed that exists only in its expression – the face, or an equivalent of the face. (17)

As this passage shows, Deleuze and Guattari are just as unconcerned with particular individual psychological episodes as is Wittgenstein (or Husserl, for that matter). What they are interested in is the susceptibility of life-worlds to "intrusions" by other life-worlds – other possibilities for life, other perspectives of knowledge that potentially can appear within the singular frame of reference. For them, there is no "metaphysical subject" occupying the zero-point of an experiential coordinate system, just as there is no "individual subject" that can be confronted as "an other" within this sytem. Instead, any given "field of experience" is viewed as a *structurally open system*, in which different subject positions become available over time.

An encounter with another subject is thus reconceived as a structural eruption, an area of unrest, where new possibilities are distributed. The "loom[ing] up of a frightened face" means that an experiential structure of "calm" is partially unravelled and re-organized so that one or several new and "fearful" subject positions become available. "There is" a regional disturbance, which is not relative to any particular subject that could speak of "my world," as Wittgenstein had previously put it. There are no subjective

boundaries that would either preclude or guarantee the occurrence of such a "frightened face."

The crucial feature of such a face is its "exist[ence] […] in expression." No (substance-) ontological claim is made about the existence of a fearful "person," "thing," or "object." Instead, the occurrence of such a face "or an equivalent of the face" consists in the *regional registration* of a new possibility. Such registering marks an event that does not belong to any particular person, nor does it constitute a psychological act of conscius perception. That is to say, registration of this sort may proceed unconsciously in its first instance. To count as a concrete possibility it is not dependent on individual acknowledgment by any particular "knowing subject" or perceiving mind. More precisely still, the concrete possibility of fear is not equal to, or dependent on, the conscious thought content of any individual mind. On the contrary, the (re)distribution of concrete possibilities is what enables new subject positions to come about, which may be occupied by new mindsets, new life-worlds of understanding. But what is such a "face," after all? And what does it mean to speak of the "equivalent of [a] face?"

A good example, I think, would be the spontaneous, unplanned proliferation of a religious symbol like the Christian cross. If one morning, in a certain life-world, the doors to every private household and/or every public building were "graced" with a crucifix, this might spawn an equal proliferation of frightened subject positions, in the face of what might look like a "Christian take-over" by the religious right. Here it makes no difference that, in "real life," such symbolic trends normally do rarely come about overnight, although this is generally possible. There might be a phase of symbolic incubation, if you will, before the manifestations of any such trend hit the public eye.

Of course, the same material manfestation on the *communal surface* of people's doors could be interpreted very differently and might restructure the culturally attested matrix of available sentiments in a certain area in a way that would spark waves of unheard-of solidarity and fellow-feeling. Or if the symbol is less powerful, this trend of displaying crosses could meet with widespread indifference, that is, with no conscious reaction whatsoever. Yet, even under these circumstances, it would still leave a material dent on the community's material plane of meaning formation, and be it only through the occupation of symbolic space that is blocked for other symbols as long as the crosses are hanging. In this case, the psychological surface phenomenon of general indifference does not preclude a material impact, because such symbolic "blocking" is still an active force. As Deleuze and Guattari might say, the effect of public indifference is, symbolically, different from the effect of public euphoria or fear not in kind but only in "intensity."[35]

The *materiality* of *concrete communication* that this differentiation points to thus refers to the occupation of symbolic space and the exercise of symbolic power by historical subjects, which always calls for a medium. As illustrated by the different possible impacts that a sudden "increase in crosses" may have on a certain community, the material dimension of such communication cannot be reduced to the physical make-up or the chemical composition of any particular item of cultural production (including doors and crosses). Rather, materiality comprises any concrete matrix of symbolic encryption, whether it is the surface of doors, the length of access ramps to interstate highways, the proximity of buildings, or the average wait period for a job application to be processed. Notice that none of these can be abstracted into general intervals of time and space. "Application time" is materially different from "restaurant time," and

"highway distance" is materially different from "neighborhood proximity," because their segmentation correlates to different possibilities. In "application time," ten additional minutes may not make much of a difference, unless it intersects with the "closing time" of a post office, from which an application has to be mailed. In "restaurant time," ten minutes of additionalwaiting may symbolize an insult to the customer, opening up different possibilities of conflict.

Most of these examples are trivial, of course, but they go to show that – with respect to material communication – space and time are always interlaced with symbolic activity organized by culture, which varies from region to region, or *von Gegend zu Gegend* as Heidegger would have said at some point in his career. Differently put, different regions are alive with different kinds and different intensities of meaning production, which is to say, they vary in their *semiotic productivity*.

Considering these different scenarios, then, "faces" stand for manifest expressions of alternative, yet unspecified meanings. The "sea of crosses," in our previous example, has no intrinsic meaning in itself, whether purportedly referring to religious fundamentalism, Christian charity, or perhaps Satanic solidarity (if, on one day, they are all turned upside down). For a face to count as such, it must constitute a structural intrusion within a particular life-world. In principle, then, anything can become a face, but different faces or face equivalents (like crosses) will prove distinctly powerful in different experiential domains, at different times. Accordingly, it is not only the meaning but also the intensity of such concrete expressions of new possibilities that is subject to change.

By contrast, Wittgenstein's separation of the "happy" and "unhappy world" precludes any such intrusion of another face from a different semiotic order. According to his implicit notion of a transcendental coordinator or "metaphysical subject," the range of possible effects that a material influx of crosses could have on the "unhappy life-world" of a given community is limited by the inherent structure or "stable style" (with Husserl) of their experiential domain. If anything, this world would have to undergo a change of limits, and thereby of its overall world-identity, in order to have any existence "outside" of sadness. As Wittgenstein says, it "waxes and wanes [only] as a whole" (6.43). Put in religious terms, Wittgenstein's metaphysical subject is an immutable deity, not the living god of Schelling and Tillich. The god of sorrow governs the world of the unhappy man, which cannot be transformed from within. If anything, one can only hope for a cataclysmic change-over, a "happy apocalypse" that would undo one world in its entirety and replace it with a different one – a Kierkegaardian leap on a cosmic scale.

This aversion to semiotic intrusion is also the target of Deleuze and Guattari's criticism of Wittgenstein, when they comment on his inconclusive treatment of the status of "the other," who is sometimes ranked as a subject and sometimes as but a special object among other objects. Before turning to their explicit reference to Wittgenstein, it is helpful to see how their critique is prepared for by linking "the concept of the other" to "real language or speech," for it is here that the connection to Paul comes into play:

> To begin with, the other person is the existence of a possible world. And this possible world also has a specific reality in itself, as possible: when the expressing speaks and says, "I am frightened," even if its words are untruthful, this is enough for a reality to be given to the possible as such. […] On this condition the other appears as the expression of a possible. *The other is a possible world as it* exists in a face that expresses it and *takes shape in a language that gives it a reality*. In this sense it is a concept with three indispensable components: possible world, existing face, and *real language or speech*. (17) [emphases added]

The reference to "real language or speech" is signifcant because it entails a broader conception of language, a language that is not limited to purposive verbal expression and conscious communication but emphasizes the *materiality of language*, which Paul had examined in terms of *language use* (*Usus*). As we have already seen, Paul's conception of *Usus* is not restricted to a simple pragmatics of language or linguistic instrumentalism that would prioritize conscious goals in communication as the ends to which language is fitted as a mere means. What he does emphasize is the mutual pressure relations between the individual language user and her linguistic environment.

For Paul, it is crucial that the dynamics which spring from the efforts to negotiate this reciprocal pressure are not reducible to language planning geared toward the kind of "herd harmony" that Nietzsche had militated against in the *Gay Science* (aphorism # 354). For this reason, Paul's conception of *Usus* as material language use does not conceive of communication as the inverse of conformism, which would inevitably squash individuality and creativity. He does not believe in the inevitable antagonism between the individual and the group, but rather sees the two as mutually constituting. According to his analysis of language as communication neither side of the linguistic transaction is in complete control of the other. In Arens' (1989) words:

> Paul's mind model accommodates the possibility of language variants and allows for individual differences. The norm of experience of an historical era is differentiated by the individual in the activities of the unconscious and systematic aspects of the "mental organism" or equilibrated state of mind constituting the language-user's ego. […] The group enforces regularity ("the unconsciousness of elements does not preclude an exact *control*" [PS, 53]). It guarantees a continuity of communications, while it also provides a clear base of expected usage which the individual may employ as a base for idiosyncratic explorations. A word in usage is tied up with expected representations and references for the community of users, but it is not exhausted by these expectations:

> Through the efficacy of groups, each individual is given the possibility and the occasion in generous quantity to reach beyond the norm already given in language. (PS, 114) (142-143)[36]

Accordingly, Paul's point of view does not promote the kind of "absolute" freedom that Vossler seems to seek.

To be sure, Vossler is not so naïve as to ascribe unrestricted reign to the individual in her use of language. In the context of communication, which inevitably involves others, he does not assert that we communicate just as we please. As was clear from our examination of his notion of the "centrifugal trials" of public acceptance, which every novel language item has to pass, he is well aware of the different pressure points in any communicative endeavor. However, Vossler parts ways with Paul by insisting that the individual is the sole source of innovation, and in this regard he enforces the old dichotomy between individual invention and public conformity. Vossler's picture of language use and meaning formation is not one of reciprocity. If a "frightened face" turns up in the middle of a "happy" environment, he holds, it could only have sprung from the mysterious depths of an individual soul – inspired by the "spirit of language" (*Sprachgeist*).

Deleuze and Guattari, in contrast to Vossler but much like Paul, do not accept the stark contrast of a creative individual that has to speak over against a solely stultifying group context. As the last quotation indicates, their conception of "real language or speech" (17) starts with the notion of an experiential field. This field does not belong to anyone, neither individual nor group, but constitutes the site from which different speaking subjects can emerge and where "others" can be recognized. "Otherness," we saw, is not the predicate of "alien selves," and thus has nothing to do with the problem of

"other minds" that remained unresolved in the second of Descartes' *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Thus we do not have to infer some kind of foreign, yet similar intelligence from "hats and clothes."[37] Instead, otherness consists in the concrete expression of new possibilities. Encountering "an other" thus refers to the *breaking in* of one possible world into another.

Earlier, I referred to this event of "breaking in" also as an "intrusion." The latter expression is useful, I think, in order to stress the eruptive nature of such an event, which brings about the regional unravelling of semiotic order. At the same time, we need to preclude two possible misunderstanding regarding this expression. For one thing, intrusion is not meant to connote hostility as, for instance, the military invasion of another country or the governmental invasion of one's privacy. For another, possbile worlds must not be construed as anthropomorphic agents that move about and take action as they "invade" each other. In this sense, invasion does not entail spatial movement (within a Cartesian coordinate system of Newtonian space), nor does it entail the intentionality of a planned, aggressive campaign.

We can clarify what the nature of such invasion actually amounts to, by considering those aspects of Deleuze and Guattari's theory that bear on their criticism of Wittgenstein. At the same time, this perspective will help substantiate the connection to Husserl and Paul:

> This concept of the other person goes back to Leibniz, to his possible worlds and to the monad as expression of the world. But it is not the same problem, because in Leibniz possibles do not exist in the real world. It is also found in the modal logic of propositions. But these do not confer on possible worlds the reality that corresponds to their truth conditions (even when Wittgenstein envisages propositions of fear and pain, he does not see them as modalities that can be expressed in a position of the other person because he leaves the other person oscillating between another subject and a special object). (17-18)

To understand the dynamics and the linguistic mediation that are involved when a possible world of "fear and pain" breaks into the semiotic order of a "fearless and painless" world, we have to attend to the basic aspects that distinguish one region or *Gegend* of semiotic productivity from another.[38] Deleuze and Guattari identify these aspects, when they explicate the vectors of what I have described as "invasionary" movement in terms of "plane" and "concept":

> Philosophical concepts are fragmentary wholes that are not aligned with one another so that they fit together, because their edges do not match up. They are not pieces of a jigsaw puzzle but rather the outcome of throws of the dice. They resonate nonetheless, and the philosophy that creates them always introduces a powerful Whole that, while remaining open, is not fragmented: an unlimited One-All, an "Omnitudo" that includes all the concepts on one and the same plane. It is a table, or plateau, or a slice; it is a plane of consistency or, more accurately, the plane of immanence of concepts, the planomenon. (35)

While parts of this statement may look quizzical at first, they become much less so, once we realize how similar Deleuze and Guattari's account is to the philosophy of Schelling and Cassirer. The "plane of immanence," I argue, is not essentially different from Cassirer's conception of symbolic form. Both authors, or author teams, refer to an idea of open unity, an open system for the production of concepts, which is governed by a particular cultural logic or "consistency." The connecting link between their respective projects is their shared indebtedness to Schelling's conception of positive philosophy, as I will show shortly.

According to the central idea of openness, then, what distinguishes this kind of consistency from logical consistency in Wittgenstein's sense is the possibility of mutual influence and "intrusion" among different worlds or planes. Technically, Deleuze and Guattari do not use the terms "world" and "plane" as fully congruent, insofar as "plane"

designates one of the two consituting aspects of a possible world, next to the aspect of "concept(s)." In this sense, the term "world" is more comprehensive" than the term "plane," while the two remain inseparable:

> When immanence is no longer immanent to something other than itself it is possible to speak of a plane of immanence. Such a plane is perhaps, a radical empiricism: it does not present a flux of the lived that is immanent to a subject and individualized in that which belongs to a self. It presents only events, that is, possible worlds as concepts, and other people as expressions of possible worlds or conceptual personae. (47-48)

Aside from indicating how the terms of "world" and "plane" interlock in Deleuze and Guattari's theory, this passage also features another term that presents the authors' alternative to anything similar to Wittgenstein's "metaphysical subject." Thus, when Deleuze and Guattari here equate the idea of possible worlds with the "conceptual personae" who populate one plane of immanence, they underscore that any talk about the world of "the unhappy man" must not be confined to the lived experience that is "individualized in that which belongs to a self." Nor must it be construed as "immanent to something other than itself," such as Wittgenstein's "metaphysical subject" as the transcendent coordinator and "limit" of a world, to which it itself does not belong.

Turning to the concept-aspect of possible worlds, Deleuze and Guattari's characterization of concepts as "fragmentary wholes," I take it, points us to one of the most pivotal traits of "invasionary" movement. Here one might be tempted to interpret the breaking of one world into another as the transfer of concepts. For instance, it seems suggestive to speak of a particular religious concept that "invaded" a particular art-world. By moving from one plane to another, one may think, a religious concept such as *aura* can "invade" a domain of artistic experience, where it will take on a different meaning. To make this example even viable, however, we have to stress that it does not ascribe an

intrinsic meaning (religious or not) to the concept of aura. From the perspective of *What Is Philosophy?,* the example would work just as well, if we assumed the opposite direction of invasion from a particular art-world into a religious experiential sphere. Even with this provision in place, Deleuze and Guattari would reject this notion of transferring concepts, since it distorts the nature of concepts and their involvement in concrete communication.

The pivotal point in this regard is that*concepts do not travel as concepts* from on world or plane to another. If they did, they could not become meaningful in the other world at all, that is, they could not be understood within a different order of meaning production. What makes "world traveling" possible is *material mediation*. What may be transferred from one world to another is concrete expressions or "faces." Faces are not concepts, but they can call for the production of new concepts with their appeal to various voices of discourse. To repeat, the happy face (be it a cross or anything else) that turns up in the world of the unhappy man does not have any inherent meaning attached to it which could readily be translated into a pre-given set of concepts. Instead, the concepts that are necessary for the unhappy man to make sense of this unfamiliar face are still to be produced on the plane of immanence that they share. Some of these new concepts may carry "happy" meanings, although there is no way to predetermine that they will. In this case, "happy" does not refer to some universal of happiness but simply means "not-unhappy," namely not restricted by the experiential structure of the particular, unhappy life-world under consideration.

In this context, Paul's notion of language as concrete communication shows its full relevance. Regarding the issue of how meaning is *registered*, his explanation of how

"representations are entered into consciousness" (PS, 26)[39] interlocks with what Deleuze and Guattari mean, when they characterize concepts as "fragmentary wholes," the "edges [of which] do not match up" (35) an therefore cannot be translated into any "net" (6.341) of "formal concepts," as Wittgenstein suggests in the *Tractatus*. In Paul's words:

> Grammar and logic do, therefore, not correspond, because the expansion and application of language does not proceed through strictly logical thought but through the natural, unschooled notions as masses of representations, which follow more or less logical laws not according to talent and education. […] Whoever considers grammatical forms only always in isolation, without their relation to the individual activity of the soul, will never come to an understanding of language development. (PS, 36)[40]

Conjointly, Paul's account of the material mediation of meaning and Deleuze and Guattari's analysis of how concrete expressions ("faces") may travel among different experiential domains to produce new concepts, yields a compelling conception of language as communication.

The particular merit of this conception is that it surpasses the Neo-Idealist notion of a speaking subject whose creativity is inevitably hampered by the mechanisms of group conformity. Instead of locating creativity only within the immaterial "soul" of the individual speaker (as Vossler still tends to do), this view stresses the *material individual* as the participant in an *open system* of meaning formation, whether we call it a "plane of immanence" or a "symobolic form." In this regard, Paul's work in the *Prinzipien* proves one of the most important precursors of Cassirer's *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* as well as of the kind of post-structuralism that is presented in Deleuze and Guattari's *What is Philosophy?* All three positions find new possibilities in the reciprocal nature of language use, according to which neither the group nor the individual is fully dominated by the other.

From this point of view *Sprachgeist* is no longer conceived as some spontaneous inspiration from out of nowhere. Instead, linguistic innovation as the driving force behind any language development consists in the construction of new concepts, which is always mediated by concrete expressions. The production and exchange of these expressions, qua cultural products, never fails to exceed the conscious intentions of their individual interpreters or enunciators. And this is why any system of concepts keeps "leaking," because it can never exhaust the meaning of the "faces" that provoked its construction in the first place.

Some Conclusions: From Paul to Schelling

The common denominator that underlies this conception of concrete communication among different possible worlds, I suggest, is Schelling's program of positive philosophy. As I demonstrated in chapter one, his *Philosophy of Revelation* features the idea of *transcendence within immanence* as one of its pathbreaking theoretical contributions. In fact, Schelling's thought here emerges as the initiation of a post-idealist philosophy of language, rather than as one of the fountainheads of "German Idealism."

Against the background of this particular post-idealist tradition, Cassirer never fails to acknowledge Schelling's influence on his philosophy of symbolic forms. In Deleuze and Guattari's work this influence is somewhat obscured by the fact that they tend to give center-stage to Spinoza, rather than Schelling who dedicated integral parts of his early carreer to critiquing Spinoza: "Spinoza was the philosopher who knew full well that immanence was only immanent to itself and therefore that it was a plane traversed by

movements of the infinite, filled with intensive ordinates. He is therefore the prince of philosophers" (48). At this crucial juncture of their text, however, it becomes apparent that Deleuze and Guattari go beyond Spinoza's insights in ways that were anticipated by the later Schelling's critical Christology:

> He [Spinoza] discovered that freedom exists only within immanence. He fulfilled philosophy because he satisfied its prephilosophical presuppositions. Immanence does not refer back to the Spinozist substance and modes but, on the contrary, the Spinozist concepts of substance and modes refer back to the plane of immanence as their presupposition. (48)

Such relocating of Spinoza's concepts "back to the plane of immanence," I would argue, is to be found less in Spinoza's writings themselves than it is in Schelling's critique of the remnants of "negative philosophy" in Spinoza's (and Kant's) thought, as I showed in chapter one.

Hence it is Schelling, rather than Spinoza, who prepared the way for Husserl's phenomenology and the "modern moment," in which philosophy aspires to "transcendence within the immanent":

> [W]hen immanence becomes immanent "to" a transcendental subjectivity, it is at the heart of its own field that the hallmark or figure [*chiffre*] of a transcendence must appear as action now referring to another self, to another consciousness (communication). This is what happens in Husserl and many of his successors who discover in the Other or in the Flesh, the mole of the transcendent within immanence itself. (46)
>
> In this modern moment we are no longer satisfied with thinking immanence as immanent to a transcendent; *we want to think transcendence within the immanent, and it is from immanence that a breach is expected*. Thus, in Jaspers, the plane of immanence is given the most profound determination as "Encompassing" [*Englobant*], but this encompassing is no more than a reservoir for eruptions of transcendence. The Judeo-Christian word replaces the Greek logos: no longer satisfied with ascribing immanence to something, immanence itself is made to disgorge the transcendent everywhere. (47)

Evidenced by this central passage, the assumption of a Christological subtext in *What is Philosophy?* is anything but far-fetchted. It can be gleaned directly from the trajectory of

modern philosophy, which the authors trace up to their own presentation of transcendence within immanence, which they choose to call the "plane of immanence" or the "planomenon" (35). To further strengthen this claim, and to substantiate my correlative suggestion that Schelling (not Spinoza) is the real "prince of philosophers," at least in the present context, consider Deleuze and Guattari's summary characterization of "*[t]he* plane of immanence [as] *interleaved*." Not only does this characterization show a strong affinity to Schelling's (and Cassirer's) thought, it also helps to specify my preceding reference to the idea of a multitude of *open systems*, and the "movement" of concrete expressions, or cultural products, among them:

> From chaos the plane of immanence takes the determinations with which it makes its infinite movements or its diagrammatic features. Consequently, we can and must presuppose a multiplicity of planes, since *no one plane could encompass all of chaos without collapsing back into it*; and each retains only movements which can be folded together. […] Every plane of immanence is a One-All: it is not partial like a scientific system, or fragmentary like concepts, but distributive – it is an "each." *The* plane of immanence is *interleaved*. (50)

This reference to "determinations taken from chaos" and to "infinite movements […] which can be folded together" is baffling at first. Yet, against the backdrop of our findings in chapter one, this statement can be read as very comparable to Schelling's solution to the *puzzle of creation*, namely how a finite world could be created "from" an inifinite god. The clearest indication of this parallel is given by Deleuze and Guattari's present remarks on chaos and how "no one plane could encompass all of chaos without collapsing back into it." What they are referring to, in my opinion, is something similar to Schelling's second potency (B).

Put in the language of the *Philosophy of Revelation*, remember how Schelling explained that God, upon being alerted to the possibility of His negation, could "over-

react" and assert Himself with cataclysmic "wrath," in which case no finite world or worlds would come about. In the face of an observable finite world, then, we must assume a third potency, or scalar power, that mediates and prismatizes God's wrath into a multitude of expressions of the spirit or *Geist*. This multitude is what Cassirer refers to as symbolic forms and what Deleuze and Guattari call planes of immanence. The vengeance of the stirred God has to be "folded" into movements of the spirit, "each" of which is still infinite but not unbound. Religious thought, for instance, can go on infinitely to create concrete expressions and construct new concepts, and so can artistic and scientific thought – each on its plane.

In every instance, the creative process is still infinite but not utterly boundless, because each plane is unified by its cultural logic. As the organizing principle of each form of the spirit, cultural logic thus refers to the selection and interpretation of specific concrete expressions, which prompt the construction of concepts that are unique to the respective plane of meaning formation. While concepts can be produced only *on* a specific plane, from which they cannot be removed without losing their meaning, the "traveling" of concrete expressions is possible. And whenever a concrete expression or "face" of one plane breaks into another plane, it disrupts the conceptual order of the latter and stimulates the production of new concepts. It is because of this double feature of plane-bound concepts and "inter-plane-tary" trafficing of concrete expressions that we can speak of *open systems*, which stimulate each other into a self-tranforming movement of meaning production – a material semiotics of concrete communication.

The plausibility of reading Deleuze and Guattari from such a Schellingean perspective is further supported by the authors' concluding remarks of their second

chapter, when they summarize their account of transcendence within the immanent in playfully religious language:

> We will say that *THE* [sic!] plane of immanence is, at the same time, that which must be thought and that which cannot be thought. It is the nonthought within thought. It is the base of all planes, immanent to every thinkable plane that does not succeed in thinking it. […] Perhaps this is the supreme act of philosophy: not so much to think *THE* plane of immanence as to show that it is there, unthought in every plane, and to think it in this way as the outside and inside of thought, as the not-external outside and the not-internal inside – that which cannot be thought and yet must be thought, which was thought once, as Christ was incarnated once, in order to show, that one time, the possibility of the impossible. Thus Spinoza is the Christ of philosophers, […] the infinite becoming-philosopher […]. (60)

Once again, Deleuze and Guattari's statements appear dauntingly paradoxical at first, but become immediately lucid, if read from the perspective of critical Christology, as their own reference to the incarnation of the Christ intimates. From this interpretive angle, the "nonthought within thought," "which cannot be thought and yet must be thought," is nothing other than the "unpreconceivable" that Schelling had asserted in the name of positive philosophy. "*THE* plane of immanence" is the gound of thinking, which the later Schelling explicates as the tranquil continuum, the unstirred God.

If this parallelism is valid, we can consider it the theoretical hub of a philosophical constellation that puts Paul, Husserl, Cassirer, and Deleuze and Guattari in different places on the same post-Schellingean "plane" of critical-Christological thought. And it is not despite, but because of their philosophical advance on this plane, that we may respectfully disagree with Deleuze and Guattari and re-claim the title of "the infinite-becoming philosopher" from Spinoza and give it to Schelling.

Heidegger belongs onto the same plane, although he never tired of disavowing his interlocutors, especially as far as his debt to Paul and Cassirer is concerned. Now that we have identified the discursive interfaces and the proto-post-structurualist current that

connect the Paul-Vossler controversy to Husserl's phenomenology and Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms, we are able to detect their vital role in the earliest of Heidegger's writings. Tracing this route of influence effectively undercuts Heidegger's proclaimed distance from Cassirer, as it demonstrates his persistent investment in a Neogrammarian body of thought all the way up to the *Prolegomena* and *Being and Time*.

Accordingly, Heidegger's development up to his magnum opus cannot be properly understood, I believe, if one takes a short-cut back to Humboldt, without registering the tension between Neogrammarian and Neo-Idealist tendencies in Heidegger's thinking, which I will indicate in the next section. Here, however, the Vossler-Paul debate points to the continuing methodological impact of their science debate for the context on which the next chapter will expand.

---

[1] See: Arens (1984): "Steinthal's redefinition of the "soul" echoes the traditional definition of the hermeneutic circle: the activity which is both producer and product at the same time. And in this movement, it is a product and producer of history, with language as primary vehicle and as historical artifact: "Sie [die Sprachphilosophie] soll die speciellen Principien für die Erforschung der Sprachen aufklären. […] Ihr Object ist nicht abstract und ideell, sondern die concrete Tätigkeit des Sprechens […]"" (p.17). "This reliance on the spoken word as an element of history is a significant step beyond the documentary stage of philology and the necessary consequence of asserting language as process" (107-108). In the first passage, Arens is quoting from: Heymann Steinthal, *Philologie, Geschichte und Psychologie in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen* (Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler, 1864).

[2] For Kristeva, see Katherine Arens, "The Linguistics of French Feminism: *Sémanalyse* as Critical Discourse Analysis," *Intertexts*, 2, No. 2 (Fall 1998): 171-184. The relevance of Paul's thought for Gadamer and Deleuze, respectively, will be addressed in the course of this chapter.

[3] Note that, in the first edition, the title was actually rendered: *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*, before the standard spelling was adopted for all later editions.

[4] This expression echoes Croce, who defines language as framed around, and framing, the "I" of grammatical communication.

[5] More specifically, there would be fifteen different, conceptual combinations. If we abbreviate the concepts under consideration as J(ustice), F(emale), M(ale), W(ork), these combinations can be listed as follows: J, F, M, W, JFMW, JFM, JFW, JMW, FMW, JF, JM, JW, FM, FW, MW.

[6] The following page numbers refer to: Gadamer (1989). The central citation reads: "In recent times *Edmund Husserl*, in particular, has directed his attention to this problem. In a series of many investigations he attempted to throw light on the one-sidedness of the scientific idealization of experience. [Gadamer: note 287.] To this end he gives a genealogy of the experience which, as experience of the living world,

precedes its being idealized by science. To me, however, he still seems dominated by the one-sidedness that he criticizes, for he projects the idealized world of exact scientific experience into the original experience of the world, in that he makes perception, as something directed toward merely external physical appearances, the basis for all other experience. […] Husserl's attempt to go back genetically to the origin of experience, and to overcome its idealization by science, obviously has to struggle especially with the difficulty that the pure transcendental subjectivity of the ego is not really given as such but always given in the idealization of language; moreover, language is already present in any acquisition of experience, and in it the individual ego comes to belong to a particular linguistic community" (347-348). – Note 287: Cf. his account in *Erfahrung und Urteil*, p. 42, and in his great work, *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie*, pp. 48 ff., 130 ff. [What is said here is based on a quite different concept of "founding."] Phenomenologically considered, "pure" perception seems to me a mere construction, which corresponds to the derivative concept of "presence-at-hand" – and consequently appears as a position left over from the latter's idealization in the theory of science.]

[7] For "horizon" see esp.: Gadamer (1989), pp. 245 ff., 302 ff; for "fusion of horizons," see: pp. 306 ff., and cf. esp. pp. 395 ff.

[8] For what Gadamer adopted from Heidegger, see: Gadamer (1989), pp. 269-270; for his own exposition of "The Rehabilitation of Authority and Tradition," see: 277-285.

[9] See: Cassirer (2000), p. 38.

[10] Cassirer does not provide a page reference in this place, perhaps because this significant phrase is taken from the very opening of the book that would be familiar to the reader, especially because of Paul's own emphasis of the statement in question. For the full quotation, see: "Die Sprache ist wie jedes Erzeugnis menschlicher Kultur ein Gegenstand der geschichtlichen Betrachtung; aber wie jedem Zweige der Geschichtswissenschaft so muss auch der Sprachgeschichte eine Wissenschaft zur Seite stehen, *welche sich mit den allgemeinen Lebensbedingungen des geschichtlich sich entwickelnden Objektes beschäftigt, welche die in allem Wechsel gleichmässig vorhandenen Faktoren nach ihrer Natur und Wirksamkeit untersucht*" (PrSp, 1). – Quoted in translation, in Arens (1989), p. 132-133: "Language is, like every product of human culture, an object of historical consideration, but just as for each branch of the human sciences [note: this translation ought to read: "historical sciences" (*Geschichtswissenschaft*) – MW], so, too, must the history of language be accompanied by a *science which deals with the general conditions of life of the object developing in history, and which investigates the factors regularly present in all change according to their nature and efficacy*" (PS, 1).

[11] Cf. chapter three, note 9, above.

[12] The contrasting with Steinthal calls for qualification, because Paul does adopt and develop certain aspects of Steinthal's theory, most notably with respect to the latter's conception of the "soul." Cf.: note 1, above.

[13] Note 13: Cf. Theodor Lipps, *Grundzüge der Logik* (Hamburg: Voss, 1893), pp. 1 ff. – As we shall see, Lipps is also featured extensively in Heidegger's dissertation.

[14] Note 14: Cf. Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, vol. 1, chap. 8, trans. John Findlay (London: Routledge and Kegen Paul, 1970). This reference is unclear in origin; it could not be Cassirer's own because it postdates his death, and so I believe it was added by the editor.

[15] For Husserl's claim that each system of meaning production constitutes a "monad," see: Husserl (1977 [1925]), p. 165.

[16] For "morphology," see: Cassirer (2000), p. 66.

[17] Vossler's page number for this central quote (p. 25) refers to the third edition of 1898, while I am using the fourth edition of 1909, in which the passage under consideration is found on p. 28.

[18] Arens takes up Paul again in: Katherine Arens, "On Rereading Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*," in: *Multiple Perspectives on the Historical Dimensions of Language*, ed. K. R. Jankowsky (Münster: Nodus, 1996), pp. 105-114.

[19] See: pp. 174-178, above.

[20] Quoted from Arens (1989), p. 140.

[21] Ibid., p. 141.

[22] Cf. Cassirer's comments on "the fundamental achievement of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology" (II, 12: note 7).

[23] See: chapter two, p. 110, above.

[24] For the first presentation of this quote, cf. p. 183, above.

[25] See: Arens (1989), and for Mach, in particular: Arens (1984).

[26] Here and in the following, the German quotations are from: Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus logico-philosophicus: Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1960). The English rendering is quoted from: Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (London/New York: Routledge, 1961/1974).

[27] Cf.: "2.01: Der Sachverhalt ist eine Verbindung von Gegenständen (Sachen, Dingen)." In the translation by Pears and McGuinness, this is rendered: "A state of affairs (a state of things) is a combination of objects (things)." The first parenthesis is an *ad hoc* adding by the translators, which they may have chosen to underscore the twofold occurrence of the term "Sach[e]" in the first noun phrase and in Wittgenstein's parenthesis, where he includes "Sachen" (literally, matters) as a synonym for "Gegenstände" (objects) and "Dinge" (things). Such close adherence to the recurrence of a single term is confusing, if not misleading in the present case, especially since in the first instance it has to be isolated from a compound noun. The main point Wittgenstein wants to make, in my opinion, is to stress the combinatiorial nature of "states of affairs" (*Sachverhalte*). The parenthesis toward the end, I think, is added by him in anticipation of his later criticism of a false understanding of *Gegenstand*, in which this term is corrupted by ordinary language and thus turned into a pseudo-concept (*Scheinbegriff*), whose meaning remains just as imprecise as that of *Sache* and *Ding*. For this criticism, see esp.: "4.1272: So ist der variable Name "x" das eigentliche Zeichen des Scheinbegriffes *Gegenstand*. – Wo immer das Wort "Gegenstand" ("Ding," "Sache," etc.) richtig gebraucht wird, wird es in der Begriffsschrift durch den variablen Namen ausgedrückt. […]."

[28] At this crucial point, the English translation overstates the connotations of the original, when it renders "*Die Art und Weise*" as "the determinate way," which is better translated as simply "the way," especially so, since it is not clear just how determinate the structure of *Sachverhalt* is, with respect to the costitution of of the world. Speaking of "determinate" in this place, reduces the ambiguity that keeps pervading Wittgenstein's diction, as I will show in detail.

[29] Here I have slightly modified the rather awkward translation by Pears and McGuinness, as quoted above.

[30] One of the clearest examples of this tendency in Wittgenstein's text, is given by his response to the question: "Where in the world is a metaphysical subject to be found?" Significantly, he approaches this issue through an illustration of "the eye," which is never seen in any "visual field" (*Gesichtsfeld*); see: 5.6331, 5.634.

[31] "I am my world. (The microcosm.)" (5.63).

[32] "The subject does not belong to the world: rather it is a limit of the world." (5.632).

[33] See: "Es ist klar, dass sich die Ethik nicht aussprechen lässt. – die Ethik ist transzendental. – (Ethik und Ästhetik sind Eins.)" (6.421). Translated as: "It is clear that ethics cannot be put into words. – Ethics is transcendental. – (Ethics and aesthetics are one and the same.)"

[34] "[D]en verschiedenen Netzen entsprechen verschiedene Systeme der Weltbeschreibung. […]" (6.341).

[35] See esp.: *What is Philosophy?*, pp. 39-40; cf.: *A Thousand Plateaus*, p. 238; and: *Anti-Oedipus*, p. 155. The respective page numbers refer to the following two works: Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987). Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H.R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983).

[36] On the same point, Arens explains earlier: "The development of the individual or of mental processes does not take place only in the face of pressures from the environment, as was the tacit assumption particularly for Wundt, but also under the pressures of social intercourse among individuals who share in the culture concerned. Neither the individuals nor the group can be classified in terms of a univalent typical soul; they must be distinguished only in terms of available interactions: 'Psychology never deals with the concrete form of a single human soul, but rather only with the general essence of spiritual processes. … That would be hypostatization of a series of abstractions, and the covering up of the true essence of the processes.' (PS, 10-11).Thus his [Paul's] psychology does not look for the individual at all, for the capacities are not real entities; they represent only familiar sets of processes" (134-135).

[37] In the context of his famous wax example, Descartes draws an analogy between perceiving an *object itself* (like a piece of wax) as opposed to its variable "external forms" (23), and perceiving other "men," as opposed to their outer appearance. For things like a piece of wax, the "external forms" refer to the variable sensory qualities that "came under the senses of taste, smell, sight, tough, or hearing" (21). All of these change over time, e.g., if we melt the wax. The wax changes appearances, just like people change clothes, or so Descartes' analogy suggests. The only persistent qualities of the wax are its being "extended, flexible, and mutable" (ibid.), and these cannot be perceived by our senses or by our power of imagination but can only be grasped by the mind.

In this sense, the senses convey only fleeting states in constant change. The human imagination, in turn, is too feeble to imagine all possible changes and thus deliver a comprehensive understanding of the wax, because "it [can take] on an even greater variety of dimensions than I could ever grasp with the imagination. It remains then for me to concede that I do not grasp what this wax is through the imagination; rather I perceive it through the mind alone" (22). The same "perception by the mind alone" is supposed to enable us to distinguish people from their clothes and from mere "automata" (ibid.).

However, Descartes never explains what the immutable qualities of "men" are, once we strip them of their clothes, which – if the analogy is to hold – would mean complete disembodiment. To see other people in their "nakedness" (23), like the wax, our mental perception would have to strip away not only their coats and hats but also their flesh and bones. Descartes never makes it clear how that stripping works, nor does he state what kind of "naked other" would remain, if such stripping was possible in the first place. To state the unsatisfactory passage in his text in full: "But then were I perchance to look out my window and observe men crossing the square, I would ordinarily say I see the men themselves just as I see the wax. But what do I see aside from hats and clothes, which could conceal automata? Yet I judge them to be men. Thus what I thought I had seen with my eyes, I actually grapsed solely with the faculty of judgment, which is in my mind" (22). The page numbers refer to: René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, trans. D. A. Cress (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 1993).

[38] Notice that the present reference to a world of fear and pain is used loosely for the sake of illustration. Deleuze and Guattari do not replicate the mistake we detected previously in Wittgenstein, when he posited the "world of the unhappy man" as homogeneous and insurmountably different from the "world of the

unhappy man." After all, the very idea of one world breaking into another is meant to amend Wittgenstein's unconvincing conception of a world's closure, which is entailed by his notions of "logical form" and "metaphysical subject." Clearly, then, Deleuze and Guattari speak of such worlds to show that they are neither as homogenous, nor as closed as the Wittgenstein of the *Tractatus* would have us believe.

[39] Cf. my extensive quotation from Paul, p. 183, above.

[40] Quoted in Arens (1989), p. 142.

Section III:

The Philosophical Rhetoric of Heidegger's Political Ontology

Chapter Five

Underway to *Being and Time*:

The Study of Meaning (*Bedeutungslehre*) and the Logic of Language (*Sprachlogik*)

While previous sections of the present discussion addressed the contexts in which Heidegger's works functioned, the present chapter will show how his specific approach to language and meaning evolved from his early writings on. We will start with his early critique of linguisitics/philology, reaching back as far as his 1913 dissertation and his 1916 *Habilitationsschrift*, which together constitute an early call for a subject of knowledge constituted differently than the model at play in the psychology and philology of the era. After that, I will turn to his *Prolegomena* (1925) in order to address how his turn away from philology allows him to refute Husserl and his model of intersubjectivity in understanding. Finally, in the concluding section of this chapter, I will return to the significance of these modes for the evaluation of Heidegger's project and its appeal to religion.

From the Dissertation (1913) to the Habilitation (1916)

Going back to Heidegger's early writings, we can distinguish a specific approach to what he ambiguously refers to as the science of language (*Sprachwissenschaft*), which I will highlight here merely by way of sampling some of the most prominent passages in this early phase of his work. Here, Heidegger's approach is marked by a vehement *anti-psychologism*, culminating in his critiques of Wilhelm Wundt, Heinrich Maier, Franz Brentano, Anton Marty, and Theodor Lipps. Heidegger's respective criticism of these

authors varies in emphasis and scope, but we can pinpoint one common denominator, in particular, that remains characteristic of this period of his nascent thought. In his dissertation, *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus* (1913),[1] it is put most succinctly in his critique of Wilhelm Wundt's conception of *Denkgesetze* (thought-laws):

> Unter der objektiven Allgemeingültigkeit der Denkgesetze versteht Wundt ihre *restlose Anwendbarkeit* auf alles, was in unsere Erfahrung eingeht. Die Erkenntnisobjekte sind deshalb dem logischen Denken konform, weil dieses seine Evidenz doch eben den Beziehungen verdankt, die uns mit den Erfahrungsgegenständen gegeben sind. Oben wurde die Evidenz durch das Postulat der Konformität der Objekte mit dem Denken begründet. *Hier wird umgekehrt durch die Evidenz die Konformität erklärt!*
>
> Auf diese Weise kommt überhaupt keine Begründung zustande, sondern Wundt bewegt sich allenfalls im Zirkel. Der letzte Grund hierfür ist nichts anderes als die Auffassung, die Denkgesetze seien Tatsachengesetze, die in der Natur unseres Geistes liegen. (88)[2] [first emphasis added]

Heidegger's main objection pertains to Wundt's empiricist method, which posits thought-laws as "completely applicable" (*restlose Anwendbarkeit*) to everything that can enter our experience.

Although Heidegger gestures at a possible circularity in Wundt's line of argument, he immediately specifies his criticism and makes it clear that Wundt's primary mistake is a misconception of thought-laws understood as laws-of-fact (or factual laws; *Tatsachengesetze*). In other words, Heidegger objects to Wundt's understanding of the kind of normativity that presumably governs our thought processes. Normativity or law-likeness is inherent in our mental processes and thus can be read off of them, at least under ideal conditions of observation. Heidegger finds this assumption illusory and holds that, if anything, such normativity could be an external standard for evaluating (*Forderung [an]*) the logical consistency of our thinking.[3] However, in the last analysis, he thinks that the problem of applicability is a pseudo-problem that is generated only by

Wundt's false understanding of mental normativity, which, in turn, springs from his misguided empiricist method.

In the dissertation, which addresses Wundt's work directly and in detail, Heidegger rests content with exposing internal inconsistencies according to a procedure of "immanent examination of Wundt's theory of judgment" (*Immanente Durchprüfung der Wundtschen Urteilstheorie*) (75). He does not proffer an actual alternative just yet. Accordingly, this work remains somewhat open-ended and closes with a "look ahead" (*Ausblick*) to the more comprehensive future project that would replace the flawed method of psychological empiricism, exemplified especially in the work of Wundt. Such an alternative is intimated in terms of a new *Bedeutungslehre* or interpretive semiotics writ large, which would determine the meaning of words in correlation to larger contexts of meaning production. The latter are referred to as "*Wirklichkeitsweisen*" (efficacies of reality, or, modes of reality).

Once again, contrasting his own prospective view, still to be specified, with any genetic schemes of explanation in historical psychology, Heidegger concludes his dissertation as follows:

> Die wahre Vorarbeit für die Logik und die allein fruchtbringend verwendbare wird nicht von psychologischen Untersuchungen über Entstehung und Zusammensetzung der Vorstellungen geleistet, sondern durch eindeutige Bestimmungen und Klärungen der Wortbedeutungen. Und erst wenn auf solcher Grundlage die reine Logik auf- und ausgebaut ist, wird man mit grösserer Sicherheit an die erkenntnistheoretischen Probleme herantreten können und den Gesamtbereich des "Seins" in seine verschiedenen Wirklichkeitsweisen gliedern, deren Eigenartigkeit scharf herausheben und die Art ihrer Erkenntnis und die Tragweite derselben sicher bestimmen können. Das Gesagte möge andeuten, dass die vorliegende Arbeit eine philosophische sein will, indem sie im Dienste des letzten Ganzen unternommen wurde. (186-187).

Again, at this point, it is not quite clear what Heidegger means by *Wirklichkeitsweisen*, nor what he has in mind when he speaks of the "last whole" (*das letzte Ganze*). The answer, at least in large part, is given in the second part of Heidegger's subsequent habilitation (*Habilitationsschrift*), *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus* (1916).[4]

Under the same rubric of *Bedeutungslehre* (study or science of meaning[s]), Heidegger explicitly returns in his 1916 *Habilitationsschrift* to the problem of applicability previously discussed in his dissertation work on Wundt. While he refines the problem in terms of categorial application, he stands by his initial judgment that this problem is a pseudo-problem engendered by erroneous methodology. Moreover, he now cashes in the *Ausblick* at the end of his doctoral thesis. In doing so he positions himself for the first time vis-à-vis the project of "logical grammar" (338).

At first glance, this may appear as a thematic shift away from Heidegger's previous work, as if he were moving from historical psychology to linguistics/philology. However, no such shift actually takes place between the dissertation and the habilitation. What may look like two debates in different disciplines are only so many facets of the same discourse in the era's complex field variously designated as comparative linguistics, developmental philology, and historical syntax, which was burgeoning in the second half of the nineteenth century. Focused on the question of scientific method, it marked one of the most powerful currents in the *Geisteswissenschaften* controversy, which threatened to invade the disciplinary territory of philosophy proper. This interdisciplinary movement aimed at redefining the science of language in conjunction with, rather than opposition to, the field of historical psychology. To this end, different rival projects were distinguished

within that field and appear as rivals still today. In terms of method, the two most prominent candidates for reforming the traditional conception of the historical sciences of language, in general, and historico-psychological research, in particular, were the theories offered by Wilhelm Wundt and Hermann Paul respectively. This constellation of revolutionizing *Sprachwissenschaft* points back to the groundbreaking work of the Humboldt and the Schlegel brothers.

Of special importance for Heidegger's philosophical beginnings and further development, however, is the additional twist that comparative linguistics had received in the later part of the nineteenth century through the so-called "Neogrammarian revolution" and the neo-Idealist reaction and counter-movement it provoked, which I discussed in the previous section. As we have seen, in this tense constellation, the theoretical debate between Wundt and Paul was followed by another controversy between Paul and Vossler, which re-ignited the same argument over method from a more philological angle. And it is the work of Vossler to which Heidegger expressly turns at a crucial juncture in his habilitation, when he delineates the methodological orientation of his own project in contradistinction to previous conceptions of what he refers to (tendentiously, against the accepted references in the history of philology) as "logical grammar":

> Die hier in Anlehnung and den Traktat des Duns Scotus aufgestellte Forderung einer logischen Bedeutungslehre scheint nun alle Irrtümer wieder zu Ehren bringen zu wollen, die man den logischen Grammatikern vorgeworfen hat und noch vorwirft.
>
> > "Die einfache Wahrheit, dass der sprachliche Gedanke eine Sache für sich, etwas Selbständiges und namentlich etwas wesentlich anderes als der logische Gedanke ist, diese einfache Wahrheit wird immer wieder verkannt. Demnach hat das Zwitterwesen der logischen Grammatik seinen Beruf verfehlt, seine Existenzberechtigung verwirkt." [here Heidegger inserts note 59]

The quotation within Heidegger's text is taken from Vossler's (1910) *Logos* article, and Heidegger supplements this quote with further and more extensive references to Vossler's work. This textual signpost clearly shows just how familiar Heidegger was with the discursive constellation at the intersection of historical psychology and comparative linguistics, which included most notably Wundt, Paul, and Vossler, among others. To show the degree of his technical command of the arguments at play in this massive redefinition of the language sciences, consider Heidegger's extensive note 59:

> K. Voßler,[5] Grammatik und Sprachgeschichte oder das Verhältniss von "richtig" und "wahr" in der Sprachwissenschaft. Logos I. 1910. S. 86.
>
> "An und für sich aber ist jedes Sprechen *alogisch*." – "Die Logik beginnt erst *hinter* der Sprache oder mittels der Sprache, aber nicht vor ihr oder ohne sie."
>
> Voßler, Positivismus und Idealismus in der Sprachwissenschaft. Heidelberg 1904. S. 25, 26.
>
> Am Schluss seiner Abhandlung "Das System der Grammatik" (Logos IV, 1913. S. 203 ff.), wo als "der wesentliche Gegenstand der Grammatik eine von aller geistigeren Tätigkeit und allem geistigen Leben abgelöste Sprache" studiert wird, schreibt derselbe Verfasser: "Wohl gibt es auch heute wieder Sprachphilosophen, die eine selbständige allgemeine reine, spekulative und universale Grammatik, eine Grammatik der Grammatiken [!] fordern. Aus meinen Betrachtungen werden diese Neu-Platoniker und Neu-Scholastiker gerade so klug werden wie ich aus den ihren" (a.a.O. S. 223).
>
> Durch das im Text Gesagte dürfte die Möglichkeit und Notwendigkeit *beider* "Standpunkte" erhärtet sein. (338-339)

Significantly, Heidegger presents his own work as some kind of middle path, if not compromise solution, between these classical and modern sciences of languages, a solution which is meant to retain the valuable resources of "neo-Platonism" and "neo-Scholasticism" as well as the valid parts of Vossler's trenchant critique of these two traditional trends in the philosophy of language und universal grammar.

After thus placing himself directly within the Neogrammarian/neo-Idealist context, he then sketches the tenets of a philosophically grounded *Bedeutungslehre* as follows:

> Die Forderung der Logik einer Grammatik braucht nicht die theoretische Meinung vorauszusetzen, der grammatische Sprachgebrauch lasse sich aus logischen Gesetzen ableiten. Die Frage, wie die Sprache geworden ist, welchen schöpferischen Faktoren sie ihr Dasein verdankt, ist kein Problem der Logik. Man mag über *Wesen, Aufgabe und Gliederung der Sprachwissenschaft* wie immer denken, zugegeben muss werden, dass die Sprachgebilde Bedeutungen haben. Und nur bei diesen setzt die philosophische Reflexion ein, um *reduktiv zu den kategorialen Momenten zurückzugreifen und sie vom System der Kategorienlehre aus zu würdigen.* Diese logischen Bedingungen der Sprache, genauer der Bedeutungen, dürfen aber nicht zu *sachlichen Ursachen* der *lautlichen Entwicklung* der Sprache und gar zu den einzigen umgedeutet werden. *Der Sprachgeist, der schöpferische Faktor der Sprachentwicklung, hat aber als Geist auch eine bestimmte, im besagten Sinne logische Struktur*; die und nur die will die Logik der Sprache herausheben. . . . Die Sprache wird also von der Bedeutungslehre nicht nach ihrem realen Dasein *erklärt*, sondern nur nach ihrer rationalen, d.h. den Inhalt betreffenden Seite hin *verstanden*. (339-340) [Heidegger emphasizes "sachliche Ursachen" {line 10}, "Geist" {line12}, "logische" {line 13}, "erklärt" {line 16}, "verstanden" {line 17}; other emphases added.]

This passage is remarkable in its density, as far as the juxtaposition and partial conflation of multiple language-philosophical discourses is concerned, not as a matter of obscure expression on Heidegger's part. In fact, except for one awkward sentence at the heart of this passage, to which I will turn shortly, his wording is quite lucid and actually very telling with respect to his *strategic omissions*.

At the beginning, Heidegger clearly distances his analysis from the "old" eighteenth-century debate over the "origins" of language, which a philosophical audience, including Heidegger himself, would have known through the work of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), Johann Georg Hamann (1730-1788), and Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803). While none of these authors was passé for Heidegger, the debate over language had taken a decisively different turn in the second half of the nineteenth century, especially against the backdrop of the seminal linguistic advances by Wilhelm von Humboldt.[6]

Yet, the "mediating" position of Humboldt between these two periods of language science has often obscured the crucial inventions and interventions in comparative linguistics that came *after* Humboldt and extended his pioneering work into new territories of *Sprachwissenschaft* with new philosophical stakes – Paul's and Vossler's work being cases in point. This overemphasis on Humboldt, at the expense of both his followers and detractors in the later nineteenth century, has led to a one-sided celebration of the "H-triumvirate," the so-called "Hamann-Herder-Humboldt" tradition whose legacy keeps affecting Heidegger scholarship to this day.[7]

Heidegger's explicit references and testimonies to his alliance with regard to this tradition have been instrumental, of course, in solidifying this legacy in philosophical quarters. The later Heidegger is always happy to remind his readers of Humboldt's "deep dark insights" that "we must never cease to admire."[8] It is not quite clear in these statements what is supposed to be so "dark" about Humboldt. In fact, if one reads neo-Idealists like Vossler, who followed in Humboldt's footsteps, the latter's thought would appear to be the very remedy against the "dark side" in linguistics around the turn of the century, namely by combatting those branches of historical positivism that are poised to "suffocate" and "deaden" the living spirit of language.[9] In contrast to Heidegger's recurrent Humboldt references, Vossler's influence will not be acknowledged in Heidegger's later writings. Yet the omission of his name does not reflect an omission of his thought, which keeps influencing Heidegger's quest for a new philosophical semiotics of *Geist*.

In the present passage under consideration, however, the most glaring omission consists in Heidegger's failure to mention the other side of this debate, especially as

represented by Hermann Paul, whose name is written all over Heidegger's present account of philosophical *Bedeutungslehre* vis-à-vis "logical grammar."

Unearthing the Neogrammarian Subtext of the Early Heidegger

In the context of the "essence, task, and [structural] organization of language science" (*Wesen, Aufgabe und Gliederung der Sprachwissenschaft*), the reference to "phonetic development" (*lautliche Entwicklung*) and the "creative factor in language development" mark an unmistakable reference to the Neogrammarians. This connection is all the more tangible in Heidegger's text, if presented right after cross-referencing Vossler's 1904 "manifesto," since the concluding part of the latter is dedicated to a critical exchange with Paul's position, which we examined earlier, in section two of the present project.

This *omission* must be viewed as *strategic*, if we consider the internal dynamics within the Wundt-Paul-Vossler constellation into which Heidegger is entering in these passages. Heidegger goes to great length to refute Wundt's historical-psychological project of genetic *explanation*. As a proposed alternative, Heidegger insists that a "categorial[ly]" sensitive study of meaning has to account for the "creative factor" in language as an evolving process. Approaching language as a process phenomenon that cannot be causally or genetically "explained" but has to be *understood* in terms of the *structures within transformation*, Heidegger opts for a semiotic methodology very much like the one that Paul had put forth in the course of his work in historical philology.[10] That is, he is at pains to underscore the creative aspects of understanding, the points

where the individual innovates over and above the common framework towards some more universal ground of meaning.

The methodological affinity between Heidegger and Paul is further supported by the fact that Heidegger retains some reservations toward Vossler's approach, even as he introduces the latter's critique of logical grammar in a favorable tone. In this vein, Heidegger is not prepared to wholeheartedly follow Vossler's glib dismissal of a "self-sufficient, general, pure, speculative and universal grammar," a "grammar of grammars." Instead, Heidegger's wording, relegated to a footnote, gestures at the possibility that some "neo-Platonist" or "neo-Scholastic" thought might still hold some resources for the philosophical semiotics he wants to evolve.[11]

In this passage, then, Vossler's neo-Idealism is deemed too radical and untempered and too dismissive of "categorial systematicity" to account for the structural as well as creative factors within a process ontology of language, according to a new kind of semiotics. It is important, however, not to overestimate what looks like a "scholastic relapse" toward universal grammar on Heidegger's part. While it is up for speculation, whether Heidegger's accommodation for possible neo-Platonist resources was a mere bow to the more theologically inclined philosophers among his colleagues or possible future employers,[12] the main concern lies with Heidegger's use of the term "logic" or "logical" in this context. The latter is crucial, because this surface diction has prompted the wide-spread prejudice that the young Heidegger's attack on psychologism was concomitant with a staunch commitment to "pure logic," which would make him look like a neo-Kantian under the determinant influence of Rickert (his habilitation advisor) or "like many of today's analytic philosophers."[13] Independently of any later *Kehre* (turn)

talk, this is the commonly accepted myth of Heidegger's logic-centered beginnings, under Rickert, before he turned to phenomenology, under and soon against Husserl.

However, if one reads the dissertation in conjunction with (the second part of) the habilitation where Heidegger finally provides a glimpse at his own program, this characterization is no longer plausible. And – to return to the focus of my first section – neither is Kisiel's favorite claim that "it all began in KNS 1919." Upon examining the young Heidegger's writings, we can say with more justification and textual evidence that it all began with Heidegger's encounter with late nineteenth-century psychology, in general, and the Neogrammarian-versus-neo-Idealist clash, in particular.

Heidegger thus enters his individual program through a controversy that revolves around two basic methodological alternatives: *empiricist historical psychology*, bent upon ascertaining the "thought-lawful" character of genetic-causal series in mental development (Wundt), on one hand; and *conceptual historical psychology*, which aims at detecting not laws but *principles* in mental development and cultural meaning formation (Paul), on the other hand.[14] Heidegger clearly opts for the latter without ever giving any credit to Paul, as opposed to Cassirer who always did.

This goes to show that Heidegger did *not* start out as a streamlining neo-Kantian, with a special penchant for scholastic logic and nominalism, his scholarship-related obligations notwithstanding.[15] Certainly, in his habilitation, Heidegger's choice of topic accommodates for the latter obligation and keeps alive the professional aspiration toward a chair in Christian philosophy. Yet, as far as his search for a new philosophical method is concerned, he is already groping for a new interpretive semiotics, as he enters a discourse of *Sprachwissenschaft* that points to Humboldt's comparative linguistics but

has now received a decisive twist through the Neogrammarian revolution and its immediate counter-movements.

Positioning himself over against the most visible interlocutors in that very discourse, then, Heidegger plainly rejects Wundt's method of genetic explanation. In doing so he forms a partial alliance with Vossler, one of the most vociferous spokesmen in opposition to such genetic reduction schemes. However, Heidegger shies away from Vossler's radical case for an overarching science of style, a systematic stylistics (*Stilistik*) that posits the rik of reintroducing some of the totalizing effects of positivism that Vossler himself set out to combat. Without entailing so much as complete rejection, Heidegger thus keeps his distance from this aspect of Vossler's project, which puts him in even greater proximity to the work of Paul, who actually was the prime detractor of Wundt at the time – a fact that Heidegger strategically omits.

When I presented the last extended quotation (p. 204, above), I remarked on its density in terms of content, while acknowledging Heidegger's fairly transparent mode of expression, with the exception of one sentence. So far we have discussed Heidegger's methodological approach to *Sprachwissenschaft*, in light of the discursive stakes of late nineteenth-century historical psychology and comparative linguistcs. Against this background, we can now attend to this specific, convoluted sentence at the heart of this crucial passage:

> Man mag über Wesen, Aufgabe und Gliederung der *Sprachwissenschaft* wie immer denken, zugegeben muss werden, dass die *Sprachgebilde Bedeutungen* haben. Und nur bei diesen setzt die philosophische Reflexion ein, um reduktiv zu den *kategorialen Momenten* zurückzugreifen und sie vom System der Kategorienlehre aus zu würdigen. (339)

In this programmatic statement about the scope of philosophical inquiry into "language formations" (*Sprachgebilde*), Heidegger's wording appears tortured, compared to the fairly transparent diction of the statements surrounding this sentence, aimed at recapturing something more apriorist, categorical, about language. On its own terms, the obscurity and vagueness of Heidegger's diction cannot be fully resolved with respect to this pronouncement, but will meet with some clarification in light of his concluding remarks at the very end of his habilitation study.

This opacity notwithstanding, the important thing to notice in this passage is that Heidegger speaks of "categorial aspects to be appreciated from [the perspective of] the system of the *study* of categories" (*kategoriale Momente […] vom System der Kategorienlehre aus zu würdigen*) [emphasis added]. He does *not* speak of any single or fixed categorical *system* or *table* of categories. Yet, up to this point, it is up for speculation whether the *Kategorienlehre* which Heidegger wants to promote is concerned with the *formation* of categories or the *use* of categories. The former resolution would be more ontological in character (and thus leaning toward the Vossler position), while the latter is decidedly epistemological (and much more in line with Paul's work).

Directly preceded by Heidegger's quote from Vossler (1904), all we can glean from the present statement is that he wants to maintain some aspect or degree of systematicity in the study of categories, which, presumably, Vossler does not sufficiently secure or accommodate for at all. At the same time, Heidegger's language remains suggestive enough with respect to the reading of the Humboldt-heritage that Heidegger shares with Vossler. In continuation of the programmatic statement just quoted, this heritage is intimated by Heidegger's remarks in terms of the "spirit of language": "Der

Sprachgeist, der schöpferische Faktor der Sprachentwicklung, hat aber als *Geist* auch eine bestimmte, im besagten Sinne *logische* Struktur; die und nur die will die Logik der Sprache herausheben" (339).

In regard to the specific meaning of "logical" in the present context, Heidegger points back to his express comment, in the preceding paragraph of his text. Still within the immediate commentary on Vossler, Heidegger distinguishes two different meanings of "logical," concerning the possibility or impossibility of "logical grammar":

> Soll der Begriff "logische Grammatik" besagen, die Grammatik müsse aus der Logik abgeleitet werden, dann liegt darin etwas Unmögliches. Wenn man nun aber darauf hinweist, dass logisch unwahre Urteile sich grammatisch völlig richtig ausdrücken lassen, und daraus schliesst: also ist die Grammatik nicht logisch, dann versteht man unter dem logischen bzw. alogischen Charakter der Sprache etwas ganz anderes, als was die *logische Bedeutungslehre* mit dem Ausdruck "logisch" meint. *Logisch und logisch sind in beiden Fällen nicht dasselbe*. (339) [emhases added]

Heidegger thus wants to put forth a "logical semiotics" (*logische Bedeutungslehre*), in which he is careful to distinguish his use of the term "logical" from those misguided usages that imply a conception of "logical grammar," in which grammar had to be derived from logic. (Yet he is not going as far as appealing to semantics.) Any such derivation Heidegger dismisses as "impossible." In this passage, Heidegger's insistence to keep the term "logical" already appears rather willful, given his own indication of possible, if not probable, misunderstanding.

As we saw, Heidegger then switches to an idiom clearly reminiscent of Humboldt (albeit a one-sided reading of Humboldt), when he moves on to characterize the "spirit of language" in terms of "*logical* structure." At this point, the reader wonders what work the adding of the attribute "logical" really does for Heidegger, for it seems that he might as well have skipped it and confined himself to a reference to "structure" alone. This

suspicion about *gratuitous terminology*, which is not motivated by methodological or philosophical content but deployed to some strategic end instead, is further supported by the way Heidegger proceeds to sketch the basic tenets of a new *Bedeutungslehre* that would accommodate for the spirit of language, i.e., for "the creative factor of language development" (339).

Remember the very end of the quotation that grounded my discussion of the Wundt-Paul-Vossler constellation, where Heidegger writes: "Die Sprache wird also von der Bedeutungslehre nicht nach ihrem realen Dasein *erklärt*, sondern nur nach ihrer rationalen, d.h. den Inhalt betreffenden Seite hin *verstanden*" (339-340).

Here, Heidegger performs yet another befuddling shift of terminology, when he equates "rational" (*rational*) with "content-related" (*den Inhalt betreffend*). Since the emphasis, according to Heidegger's own italics, is on "explanation" (*erklären* as Wundt would have it) versus "understanding" (*verstehen*), the reader's attention is drawn away from the aforesaid terminological slide; especially so, since Heidegger immediately shifts gears and interpolates a two-paragraph, "third party" commentary by Werner on Scotus.[16] Only after this interpolation does Heidegger finish his own line of thought concerning the new approach of *Bedeutungslehre*, in order to finish the chapter with yet another "side track" remark on Werner's systematic bias in his evaluation of Scotus's "logic of language" ("*Sprachlogik*").[17]

In this well-engineerd manner of presentation, Heidegger exacts his most crucial terminological maneuvers in a way that "mollifies" some of his conceptual transitions. He does so through an *internal shift* of emphasis within those paragraphs or sentences that are meant to convey his own position, combined with an *external shift*, that is, a

technique of alternation, by means of which Heidegger intercepts his own train of thought and stochastically returns to the surface text of the Scotus case study. At the same time he keeps progressing on the plane of his own methodological subtext, without letting his view congeal into a solid picture for the reader to critically examine.

As a case in point, Heidegger's present line of terminological shifts reaches an interim stop with a gesture at a "new dimension" of language philosophy that would lay bare the "last *theoretical* fundaments" of language. Heidegger thus rounds out his pending distinction between two senses of "logical,"[18] when he writes:

> Aber gerade psychologische und historische Untersuchungen über die Sprache gehören *nicht* in eine Sprachphilosophie. Diese hat ihre Probleme in einer ganz neuen Dimension zu suchen. Ihr obliegt die Herausstellung der letzten *theoretischen* Fundamente, die der Sprache zugrunde liegen. Ohne die eindeutige begriffliche Fassung von "Bedeutung überhaupt," "in der Bedeutung gemeinter Gegenstand," "Bedeutungskategorie," "Beziehung der Bedeutungsformen" ist der sichere Gang der Untersuchungen über die Sprache gar nicht möglich, abgesehen davon, dass die Bedeutungslehre durch die Lösung der namhaft gemachten Probleme einen fundamentalen Bezirk der Logik bearbeitet. (340)

Notice the ambiguity that adheres to Heidegger's phrase "fundamental region of logic" (*fundamentale[r] Bezirk der Logik*), which can be read in at least three different ways, in the present context. First, within the predetermined framework of logic proper as a philosophical discipline, the new method would work on, or in, one special area. Accordingly, *Bedeutungslehre* would be relegated to a sub-territory of logic.

Or, second, the new method might actually provide the very fundament for logic or, perhaps, different kinds of logic. Heidegger's diction is "perfectly" ambiguous in this regard. His use of the indefinite article, in speaking of "*a* fundamental area" of logic, would suggest the former reading. Alternatively, any reading that puts the emphasis on "a *fundamental* area" of logic starts to gravitate toward the second rendering, moving

apriorist in direction. There is also a third possible interpretation, according to which the new *Bedeutungslehre* makes one regional contribution to the foundation of logic, while other areas of that foundation will have to be grounded by other approaches or methods.

Regardless which of these three interpretive options the reader actually chooses, Heidegger has already succeeded at moving the terms of the language discussion away from "rational" and "content-related" to "theoretical" and "pre-logical" or "logic-founding." The last two terms are not used by Heidegger as such, but are my compressed rendering for his explication of the new *Bedeutungslehre* as an approach that "cultivates a fundamental region of logic" (*einen fundamentalen Bezirk der Logik bearbeitet*).

However, this progressive shift along the terminological trajectory of "logical" is not complete yet. It will come full circle some sixty pages later, toward the very end of Heidegger's habilitation project, when he takes stock of "the intimate connection between the problem of categories and the problem of judgment(s)":

> Der enge Zusammenhang zwischen Kategorien- und Urteilsproblem lässt dann auch das *Form-Materialverhältnis* und die *bedeutungsdifferenzierende Funktion des Materials* erneut zum Problem werden. Die Form-Materialduplizität ist heute ein ausschlaggebendes Mittel erkenntnistheoretischer Problembearbeitung, so dass eine *prinzipielle* Untersuchung über Wert und Grenzen dieser Dublizität unumgänglich geworden ist. (405) [second emphasis added]

Heidegger's comment on the "value and limits" of a basic "form-matter duplicity" (*Wert und Grenze dieser [Form-Material]Duplizität*) in epistemology, with respect to the "meaning-differentiating function of the material" that is in need of a principle-oriented inquiry, is perhaps one of the boldest instances of omitting the work of philologists like Hermann Paul who would argue the contrary. Heidegger's diction barely manages to conceal the fact that he is coopting Paul's methodology almost verbatim, while he still refuses to identify him (or any other Neogrammarian) by name.

Heidegger's methodological staging of the "meaning-differentiating function of the material," I argue, can hardly be read as anything but a slightly tweaked rendering of Paul's conception of *Vorstellungmasse* (semiotic matter).[19] I say tweaked, because of some remaining oddity in Heidegger's locution which, however, does not take away from the unmistakable coopting of Paul, whose work is here being used without any identification of the author. The oddity pertains to the phrase "*des Materials*" (see quotation, above). While it is common practice in German to use the definite article in reference to a general subject matter or type of entity (e.g., *die Materie* for "matter" as a technical term in physics), Heidegger's syntactic construction is still somewhat perplexing.

Insofar as his speaking of *das Material* (to use the nominative case form of Heidegger's genetive construction) follows immediately upon the phrase *Form-Materialverhältnis*, one is inclined to assume that Heidegger uses the same term twice in the same sense, within the same sentence. Even so, once we isolate the *Material*-component from the combined noun phrase *Form-Materialverhältnis*, the former seems to take on a special meaning in that the implied *materiality* gains new philosophical weight. The reason for this impression, at least in part, might be seen in the fact that the combined noun phrase is already peculiar. In the present epistemological context dealing with the relation between the "problem of categories" and the "problem of judgment," the reader is likely to expect a reference to the common *Form-Inhalt* (form-content) distinction. Instead Heidegger speaks of "form" and "material," and once such material is posited in isolation, it is no longer apparent what materiality Heidegger has in mind, while his use of the definite article suggests that he is still referring to a commonly

known philosophical subject matter. Although the meaning of the term may be unclear at this point, Heidegger has thereby extracted a new notion of materiality from the familiar form-content nexus. Breaking the formulaic mold, he thus departs from a classical locus of traditional epistemology while still invoking its authority over proper philosophical inquiry.

However, the "newly" extracted notion of materiality is not new, and it is not Heidegger's. Instead, it is a Neogrammarian import from Paul's work in historical philology, which broadened the notion of epistemological content into a specific conception of *semiotic materiality* as the centerpiece of a theory about the *material mediation of meaning formation* and transformation:

> What enables these physical products to serve as the means for transmitting representations to another individual is either an *inner*, *direct connection* to the representations (one should think, for example, of a cry of pain, a gesture of rage), or a *connection mediated through the association of ideas* […] Through this type of communication, no content of representation can be created anew in the soul. The content about which we are concerned must rather already be present there, and called forth through physiological stimulations. […] *The content of representations itself is uncommunicable*. *Everything which we believe we know about those of another individual rests only on conclusions about our own*. […] The greater the correspondence, the easier the understanding. (PS, 14-15)

In fact, in the last quotation from Heidegger, he himself makes a clear gesture at Paul's work through his express reference to a methodology that would examine such mediation of meaning in terms of structural "principles" (not laws!) governing a process of semiotic evolution.

Heidegger's remarks in this passage are a direct continuation of his earlier statements about "logical grammar" and philosophical method, textually anchored in his prime reference to Vossler. Against this background his present reference to "principles" (*prinzipielle Untersuchung*; Heidegger emphasizes the first word) establishes a clear

connection to the Neogrammarian discourse on method in comparative linguistics, as any participant in the debate over reforming *Sprachwissenschaft* would have recognized in 1916, when Heidegger published his habilitation, since several of the Neogrammarians' public statements had the subtitles of "investigations of principles." Given Heidegger's extensive work on Wundt and his detailed references to Vossler, it is simply not plausible to assume that he could have been oblivious to Paul's towering presence at the time. Hence, italicizing *prinzipielle* in a discussion of the material dimension of meaning formation, without mentioning Paul, cannot be interpreted as anything but a strategic omission on Heidegger's part.

The asserted thematic link between Heidegger's earlier comments on logical grammar and his present commentary on the meaning-differentiating function of "the material" is further corroborated in light of the baffling cluster of an alternative terminology that Heidegger uses to mark the conceptual challenges that the novel kind of *Bedeutungslehre* will have to take on. Remember how he proffered the signpost of such new route of inquiry, using scare quotes for every terminological item that alludes to his borrowing: "Ohne die eindeutige begriffliche Fassung von "Bedeutung überhaupt," "in der Bedeutung gemeinter Gegenstand," "Bedeutungskategorie," "Beziehung der Bedeutungsformen" ist der sichere Gang der Untersuchungen über die Sprache gar nicht möglich, […]" (340).[20]

The idiosyncratic character of Heidegger's vocabulary precludes conclusive judgment on the exact meaning of these new entries in his methodological dictionary. However, in light of our examination of his subsequent borrowings from Paul, it is especially the second item that appears much more revealing now. Arguably the most

awkward, at first glance, Heidegger's phrase "in der Bedeutung gemeinter Gegenstand" can thus be interpreted as a hint at Paul's conception of the material mediation of meaning.

According to the latter, meaningful items become identifiable only as they emerge from a dynamic background of semiotic matter (*Vorstellungsmasse*). In other words, what Heidegger here addresses as "intended object" (*gemeinter Gegenstand*) becomes available to a philosophical investigation into language only as embedded within a material-semiotic context, that is, within the material dimension of a process of signification – "within [an act of] signification" (*in der Bedeutung*), as Heidegger densely puts it.

As shown by these efforts at decoding Heidegger, some of his most cryptic prounouncements become much more transparent, if read through the lens of Paul's material semiotics. Discursively, the link to Paul, I argue, is conclusively established through the Wundt-Vossler connection, while the interpretive merit of exposing Heidegger as deeply indebted to the Neogrammarian project can be demonstrated only when it is brought to bear on the variegated fabric of Heidegger's text. In keeping with this approach, Heidegger's often opaque characterization of a historically critical, anti-psychologistic study of meaning can effectively be elucidated, once we undo his strategic omission of the actual pioneer of this project, Hermann Paul. Paul's material semiotics set the methodological standard for any opposition to empirical reduction schemes within historical psychology. Heidegger's account of the "meaning-diffentiating function of the material" is in unmistakable alignment with Paul's philosophical "divergence"[21] in

comparative language research, while he goes to great length to occlude the philological tradition from which he is drawing.

After thus locating Heidegger within the late nineteenth-century constellation of an interdisciplinary discourse that cuts across historical psychology and historical syntax, we can observe with greater clarity how he expounds his reterritorialization of philosophical logic over against the traditional conception of "logical grammar." His suspenseful dictum that, for a critical comparison of these two endeavors, "logic and logic are not the same" (339) receives its last rendition (at least, in his habilitation thesis) when Heidegger finally couches his sketch of a philosophically sound study of meaning in terms of the "translogical."

> Allerdings, durch ein Stehenbleiben innerhalb der logischen Sphäre des Sinnes und der Sinnstruktur wird eine endgültige Aufhellung dieser Frage nicht zu gewinnen sein. Man kommt allenfalls zu einer Potenzierung (Stockwerklehre der Formen bei Lask),[22] die fraglos das Bedeutsame leistet, in die *Strukturmannigfaltigkeit des Logischen* selbst hineinzuleuchten, die aber doch gerade das Problem der *bedeutungsdifferenzierenden Funktion des Materials* noch kompliziert und in eine neue Sphäre hineinversetzt, ohne die fundamentale Verschiedenheit des sinnlichen und unsinnlichen Materials genügend in Rechnung zu setzen.
>
> Man vermag die Logik und ihre Probleme überhaupt nicht im wahren Lichte zu sehen, wenn nicht der Zusammenhang, *aus* dem heraus sie gedeutet werden, ein *translogischer* wird. (405) [all emphases added]

Toward the end of his habilitation thesis, Heidegger thus cashes in his earlier gesture at the "logical structure" of *Sprachgeist*, that is, of "the creative factor in language development" (339).[23] Starting from this anticipatory characterization by Heidegger, we have followed the different stages of his progressive shifting along the terminological trajectory of "logical": from "logical structure" (*logische Struktur*) to "rational" (*rational*) as equated with "content-related" (*den Inhalt betreffend*) (340); onto "theoretically fundamental" ([*die*] *letzten theoretischen Fundamente*) and "logic-founding" ([…] *einen*

fundamentalen Bezirk der Logik bearbeitet) (ibid.); onto the "meaning-differentiating function of the material" (*die bedeutungsdifferenzierende Funktion des Materials*) (405); and finally onto the "translogical" (*translogisch*) (ibid.).

Along the way, we were able to indicate clear signs of Heidegger's theoretical debt to the Neogrammarian revolution in historical psychology, whose key contributor he strategically obscures, as he critically underscores the neo-Idealist position of Vossler without mentioning the latter's main interlocutor, Paul. In the course of locating Heidegger's discursive position in the context of reforming philosophical method for a new *Bedeutungslehre*, Paul's conception of the material mediation of meaning emerged as the crucial, but willfully cloaked subtext of Heidegger's endeavor to redefine the domain of logic for a reformed *Sprachwissenschaft*. Such scientific reform is intimated through a programmatic sketch of a historical semiotics that would determine the structural *principles* governing the on -going process language development, that is, the creative factor(s) of the "spirit of language" (*Sprachgeist*).

These terminological shifts become crucial as Heidegger emerges into his new program, a refutation of Husserl and Cassirer and their shared attention to the *forms of appearance* of cultural meaning rather than to questions of ontology.

The *Prolegomena* (1925)

In the text of the *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffes* (Prolegomena to the History of the Concept of Time),[24] Heidegger's wavering between Vossler and Paul takes on a new dimension. Heidegger will purposely shroud his direct exchange with the thought of these authors in order to distance his philosophical stance from the work of his

most distinguished contemporary Ernst Cassirer. More precisely, through increasingly bold manipulations and partial distortions of these Neogrammarian and neo-Idealist sources, Heidegger displaces what would otherwise be taken as indexes of methodological overlap to create an impression of "radical" philosophical difference. Heidegger's theoretical debts to Paul and Vossler are thus converted into signs of departure from Cassirer's project, by way of a calculated philosophical rhetoric that is as ingenious as it is deceptive.

In terms of organization, the *Prolegomena* is divided into two parts, a "preparatory part" (*vorbereitender Teil*) and a "main part" (*Hauptteil*). In the following, I will also refer to the former as the "first part" and the latter as the "second part." As I approach it, the preparatory part is not "just preparatory," both in its volume and content. Boasting close to a hundred and seventy pages, it already contains some crucial maneuvers on Heidegger's part as to how he positions himself vis-à-vis a philosophical tradition, which points from the Neogrammarian-Neo-Idealist controversy to the work of his mentor Husserl as well as to the philosophy of symbolic forms by Cassirer. In the preparatory part, then, Heidegger will "respectfully dismiss" Husserl in a manner that sets the stage for his less than respectful disposal of Cassirer's thought, in the main part.

While Heidegger appears humble when he points out that he still considers himself Husserl's student, who remains in the process of learning from his teacher,[25] he does not hesitate to point out that, after all, Husserl never managed to mover beyond Dilthey.[26] This posture of respectful dismissal toward his mentor is mirrored by the division of the first part into two further segments. Up to the end of § 10 (p. 139), Heidegger confines himself to a careful synopsis of Husserl's phenomenological project,

in general, and his method of ideational analysis, in particular. In the course of this segment, no direct criticism is leveled against Husserl. On the contrary, it is in the name of Husserl that Heidegger glibly discards the view of his former teacher, Rickert, whose "misunderstanding of phenomenology and intentionality" is exposed in § 5. b) (pp. 41-46).

Taking sides with Husserl, for the time being, Heidegger's exposition of the basic tenets of phenomenology mounts all the integral theoretical elements we discussed previously. In an attempt to defend the phenomenological method against a misunderstanding of its notion of intentionality, Heidegger rejects Wundt's criticism that all phenomenological insight is tautological in character. To say that a "representation is a representation of something," or that a "judgment is a judgment about something," does not seem to add anything that was not already implied in the notion of representation or judgment in the first place.[27] This estimation, however, misses the point, Heidegger holds. Once we have freed ourselves from the traditional array of "realistic or idealistic theories of consciousness" (47), we realize that the *intentional relation* (*intentionale Beziehung*) has nothing to do with conscious "acts" in terms of "perception, judgment, love, hate …" (ibid.). Instead what is necessary is a structural analysis of the intentional aspect of all phenomena.[28]

To illustrate the workings of this kind of analysis, and thereby clarify the "basic mode of intentionality" (*Grundverfassung der Intentionalität*), Heidegger turns to an "exemplary case of natural object-perception" (*exemplarische[r] Fall einer natürlichen Dingwahrnehmung*), the perception of a chair (48). The chair example[29] illustrates the very same working of ideational analysis that we examined previously with respect to the

perception of a medieval house (or a "Chinese House"), although Heidegger couches his account in a somewhat different language. To emphasize the point that no single perception constitutes an *eidos*, Heidegger speaks of any single percept as a mere "shading" or "off-shading" (*Abschattung*).[30] At the same time, he does not use the notion of *eidos* for his own exposition. Yet, this Husserlian notion is clearly implied by Heidegger's distinction between "phenomenon" in the "genuine Greek sense of the term" (112) as what is "revealed" (*Offenbares*) (113), according to the original structure "of showing-itself" (*des Sich-zeigens*), as opposed to phenomenon as "appearance" or "mere appearance." The latter is but a modification of the former, a *Schein* (113) or mere pretense. In this place, Heidegger treats himself to a terminological orgy,[31] but upon scrutiny the different aspects of "the structure of appearance as reference" ([*d*]*ie Struktur der Erscheinung als Verweisung*) (ibid.) merely restate the different stages, or levels, involved in the test series of perspectival shifting, according to Husserl's "rotation method." The phenomenologist has to distinguish single chair perceptions from the *eidos* of a chair, which emerges at the point of convergence of a sequence of perspectival rotations as a structural image (not as a mental picture!) of a particular experiential domain or life-world.

In short, phenomenology as Heidegger approaches it is concerned with structural sampling. His convoluted account of "the structure of appearance as reference" thus elaborates on the fact that the "intentionality" of any single perception has nothing to do with the "act" of a conscious subject that directs its epistemic gaze, so to speak, upon an object of perception, which it interprets to be *about* a portion of mind-independent reality. Instead, any percept points beyond itself, namely to an *eidos*. Any *eidos*, in turn,

constitutes the structural sample of a life-world. Any life-world, finally, can be conceived phenomenologically as the "appearing itself" (*das Erscheinende selbst*) (113), namely that, which is "revealed" by ideational analysis. *Verweisung* thus proves a matter of *indirect reference* or purposive eidetic detour. As an *eidos*, then, "the chair is no experience and no object of experience but, according to its mode of being, totally different from the mode of being of [any instance of] experience" (*Der Stuhl ist kein Erlebnis und kein Erlebnisding, sondern seiner Seinsart nach total verschieden von der Seinsart des Erlebnisses*) (137-138).

Significantly, Heidegger proceeds to conclude his synopsis of Husserl's method in terms of "immanent perception" (*immanente Wahrnehmung*), in which his wording is strongly reminiscent of Schelling's conception of positive philosophy:

> Andererseits ist alles Gegenständliche der sogenannten immanenten Wahrnehmung dadurch bestimmt, dass es von derselben Seinsart ist wie die immanente Wahrnehmung selbst. Darin liegt, dass der Gegenstand der immanenten Wahrnehmung *absolut gegeben* ist. Der Erlebnisstrom ist somit *eine Seinsregion*, die eine Sphäre *absoluter Position* ausmacht, wie *Husserl* sagt. […] Das besagt aber, wenn wir das Frühere zusammennehmen, dass die Sphäre des reinen Bewusstseins, die wir auf dem Wege der transzendentalen und der eidetischen Reduktion gewinnen, eine solche ist, die durch den Charakter des *Absolut-gegebenen* ausgezeichnet ist. (138) [second emphasis added]

Certainly, not everyone who uses the term "absolute" is thereby hearking back to Schelling or to some German-idealist context. In the present passage, however, it is clear that Heidegger addresses exactly those theoretical stakes in Husserl's point of view, which we analyzed previously along the Paul-Husserl-Wittgenstein trajectory.

The latter, in turn, again anticipate Deleuze and Guattari's critique of Wittgenstein that showed their rejection of a solipsistic "metaphysical subject" as the transcendental coordinator, or "zero-coordinate" of an experiential field modeled on a

Cartesian coordinate system. In this regard, the authors of *What is Philosophy?* proved in keeping with Husserl, notwithstanding their differences over the open or closed character of "possible life-worlds." As we saw, the connecting link between Husserl's phenomenology and Deleuze and Guattari's post-structuralist semiotics of immanent meaning (trans)formation and "world traveling" consists in their joint investment in a conception of "the transcendent within the immanent." This conception is construed as the theoretical marker of the "modern moment" in philosophy, which Deleuze and Guattari find enunciated fully for the first time in the work of Spinoza, whereas I suggest to credit one of Spinoza's most prominent critics with this pioneering role, Schelling.

In light of these considerations, we must reject Heidegger's rendering of Husserl's thought as just another, although more sophisticated, brand of Cartesianism:

> Hier lässt sich schon eine Verwandtschaft zu *Descartes* erkennen. Was freilich auf einer höheren Stufe der Analyse der Phänomenologie als das reine Bewusstsein herausgearbeitet ist, ist das Feld, das *Descartes* unter dem Titel der *res cogitans* vorschwebt, *das Gesamtfeld der cogitationes*, während die transzendente Welt, deren exemplarischen Index *Husserl* ebenfalls in der Grundschicht der materiellen Dingwelt sieht, bei *Descartes* als *res extensa* charakterisiert ist. Diese Verwandtschaft besteht nicht nur faktisch, sondern *Husserl* nimmt da, wo er sagt, dass diese Betrachtung zu einem Höhepunkt gediehen sei, ausdrücklich auf *Descartes* Bezug. Er sagt, dass nur zum Austrag komme, was *Descartes* in den *Meditationen*, *freilich in anderer Methode and philosophischer Absicht, eigentlich anstrebte*. (139) [fourth and last emaphases added]

Here we get a first taste of the corrosive effects of Heidegger's *philosophical rhetoric*, that is, a rhetoric that is fueled by the willful (mis)representation of other authors' methodologies, which Heidegger stages in specific ways to create philosophical tension between their work and his own. In particular, this enables him to create an impression of difference, departure, and innovation, where there is none. I say willful, because in

deploying this technique, Heidegger has no qualms gainsaying his own previous accounts of the author at hand, often within the same text.

The present passage is a case in point, for, according to Heidegger's own synopsis of Husserl's method in the earlier pages of the preparatory part of his study (originally delivered as a lecture course), equating Husserl's view with Cartesian metaphysical dualism can hardly be seen as anything but a fundamental distortion. Heidegger's main ruse is effected by means of the phrase "the entire field of the *cogitationes*" (*das Gesamtfeld der cogitationes*), which he attributes to Husserl as an analogue to Descartes' *res cogitans*. However, if Heidegger's own summary of Husserl's method of epoché is correct, then we must assert that Husserl never committed to any such single, overarching ontological horizon or *Gesamtfeld*, but maintained a view regional ontology within a framework of immanent transcendence (in the sense of Deleuze and Guattari). Consider Heidegger's statement, made only a few pages earlier:

> Darin zeigt sich das Eigentümliche, dass der Gegenstand der Reflexion, Akte, zur selben Seinssphäre gehört wie die Betrachtung des Gegenstandes. Reflexion und reflektierter Gegenstand gehören beide zu ein und derselben Seinssphäre; der Gegenstand, das Betrachtete, und die Betrachtung sind reell ineinander beschlossen. Gegenstand und Erfassungsart gehören zum selben Erlebnisstrom. Dieses reelle Beschlossensein des erfassten Gegenstandes in der Erfahrung selbst, in der Einheit derselben Realität, bezeichnet man als *Immanenz*. Immanenz hat hier den Sinn des reellen Zusammenseins des Reflektierten und der Reflexion. Damit ist eine besondere Mannigfaltigkeit eines Seienden, nämlich des Seins von Erlebnissen und Akten charakterisiert. (132)

This characterization, if accurate, makes it clear that Husserl was *not* given to the notion of a "*Gesamtfeld* of *cogitationes*," but maintained a view of different "planes of immanence," that is, a view of regional ontologies, where the "absolute position" (*absolute Position*) of each "region of being" (*Seinsregion*) (138) consists in a

transcendent within the immanent, not a zero-coordinate of transcendental subjectivity as Descartes and the Wittgenstein of the *Tractatus* would have it.

Heidegger's correlative claim that Husserl posits not only a metaphysical subject, in the above sense, but also a transcendent world similar to Descartes *res extensa* is equally unconvincing. It is implausible to claim that Husserl saw the "examplary index" of "the transcendent world" in the "ground-layer of the material thing-world" ([…] *die transzendente Welt, deren exemplarischen Index Husserl ebenfalls in der Grundschicht der materiellen Dingwelt sieht*) (139). Once again, Heidegger himself makes the case against this suggestion, when he explicates Husserl's working notion of epoché as follows, using his earlier example of the perception of a chair phenomenon:

> Diese Betrachtungsart des Aktes und seines Gegenstandes ist keine transzendente Erfassung des Dinges selbst; in dieser Betrachtung der Reflexion, sagt man, mache ich gewissermassen die Wahrnehmung, die konkrete Wahrnehmung selbst nicht mit; ich lebe nicht eigentlich in der Wahrnehmung des Stuhles, sondern in der Einstellung der immanenten reflektiven Erfassung der Stuhlwahrnehmung, *nicht in der Thesis der materiellen Welt*, sondern in der thematischen Setzung des sie erfassenden Aktes und ihres Gegenstandes, wie er im Akte da ist. Dieses *Nicht-Mitmachen der Thesis der materiellen Welt und jeder transzendenten Welt* wird als εποχη, Sichenthalten, bezeichnet. (135-136). [emphases added]

It is baffling to see how Heidegger can write this, in order to claim the exact opposite three pages later, when he approximates Husserl's understanding of different immanent realities to Cartesian dualism.

At this point we might wonder whether Heidegger's understanding of immanence, in Husserl's version or otherwise, is perhaps different from the post-Schellingean conception of immanent transcendence or "transcendence within the immanent" (Deleuze and Guattari). If so, his critique of Husserl would still be incorrect, but at least he could not be charged with wielding a willfully manipulative philosophical rhetoric over his

audience and readership. However, this line of defense seems blocked, if we notice just how keenly aware Heidegger was of the central importance of the immanent-transcendent relation in its full complexity: "Diese Scheidung [von Immanenz und Transzendenz] in zwei Seinssphären ist nun dadurch eine merkwürdige, dass gerade die Sphäre der Immanenz, die Erlebnissphäre, die Möglichkeit bestimmt, innerhalb deren überhaupt die durch die Kluft getrennte transzendente Welt gegenständlich werden kann" (134).

Furthermore, what is rhetorically remarkable about Heidegger's spurious presentation of Husserl as a more sophisticated Cartesian is the "casually self-undermining" character of its ending, when he admits that Husserl might have perceived some general kinship between his approach and that of Descartes, while the latter's endeavor proceeds "of course according to a different method and philosophical agenda" (*freilich in anderer Methode und philosophischer Absicht*). This phrase seems to suggest the opposite of the point Heidegger is making. After all, claiming that two authors are largely similar except for their different methods and agendas is either a contradiction in terms or a euphemism for their essential differences. If so, Heidegger's rhetorical performance cuts a rather weak figure, in this instance. While he may not be at his most brilliant in this passage (in the last chapter of the present study, I will point to much more impressive examples), it is still worth noticing that even here Heidegger avails himself of some careful preparation, which finesses what would otherwise appear to be a rhetorical blunder.

This preparation consists in Heidegger's pretense of speaking in Husserl's own voice. In other words, he gives the impression of letting Husserl speak for himself: "Diese Verbindung besteht nicht nur faktisch, sondern Husserl nimmt da, wo er sagt, dass

diese Betrachtung zu einem Höhepunkt gediehen sei, ausdrücklich auf *Descartes* Bezug" (139). Crucially, Heidegger does not provide any quote or reference to substantiate this supposedly self-professed connection between Husserl and Descartes. After quoting Husserl diligently in the course of summarizing his teacher's overall phenomenological method, Heidegger does not bolster his criticism in the same way. We have to take Heidegger's word for it that this is what Husserl said of himself. Differently put, Heidegger exploits Husserl's authority with respect to a right to self-editorship, in order to support a "factual" (*faktisch*) claim that would remain less than compelling, if it were not warranted by the voice of his target himself. In terms of rethorical technique, then, the "casually self-undermining" character of Heidegger's commentary on Husserl is effected by presenting his *criticism* in the form of implicit *self-criticism*Heidegger is just the messenger of what Husserl said, whithout necessarily being aware of the methodological implications of this "self-indictment."

By contrast, if we do let Husserl speak for himself through his own text, it becomes clear that Heidegger's proffered parallelism does not withstand scrutiny. As Elisabeth Ströker (1977) has pointed out, it is not very instructive, much less conclusive, to simply ascertain a general similarity between Descartes' methodical skepticism in the *Meditations on First Philosophy* and Husserl's phenomenological procedure of epoché.[32] Husserl thus distances himself from the Cartesian method, in § 10. (*Exkurs: Descartes' Verfehlen der transzendentalen Wendung*) of his *Cartesian Meditations* (first publication in French translation, 1931 [original manuscript, 1929]):

> Descartes hatte den ernsten Willen zu radikaler Vorurteilslosigkeit. Aber wir wissen durch neuere Forschungen, und insbesondere die schönen und tiefgründigen der Herren Gilson und Koyré, wieviel Scholastik im verborgenen und als ungeklärtes Vorurteil in Descartes' Meditationen steckt. […] Im

> Zusammenhang damit darf es auch keineswegs als selbstverständlich gelten, als ob wir in unserem apodiktischen reinen Ego ein kleines Endchen der Welt gerettet hätten, als das für das philosophierende Ich einzig Unfragliche von der Welt, und dass es nun darauf ankomme, durch recht geleitete Schlussfolgerungen nach den dem Ego eingeborenen Prinzipien die übrige Welt hinzuzuerschliessen. (25-26)
>
> Leider geht es so bei Descartes, mit der unscheinbaren aber verhängnisvollen Wendung, die das Ego zur *substantia cogitans*, zur abgetrennten menschlichen *mens sive animus* macht und zum Ausgangsglied für Schlüsse nach dem Kausalprinzip, kurzum der Wendung, durch die er zum Vater des (wie hier noch nicht sichtlich werden kann) widersinnigen transzendentalen Realismus geworden ist. (26)

The myth of Husserl's Cartesianism has proved quite resilient, especially among Heidegger scholars.[33] However, as Heidegger's own (!) characterization of Husserl's epoché, in 1925, and Husserl's actual (!) self-commentary, in 1929, demonstrate, Husserl does not endorse metaphysical dualism (Descartes) or its solipsistic inverse, metaphysical subjectivism as "pure realism (Wittgenstein). On the contrary, we find that Husserl rejects both of these as "non-sensical [forms of] transcendental realism."

The Historicity of Phenomenology: *Prolegomena*, 2

In the further course of the preparatory part of Heidegger's *Prolegomena*, this distortion and rhetorical manipulation of "immanent transcendence" becomes even more daring. In a passage where Heidegger quotes "profusely" from Husserl's *Ideen II* , he reiterates the charge of Cartesianism against his phenomenological mentor. This statement is especially signficant, because it strikingly illustrates the theoretical affinity between Heidegger and almost the entire post-Schellingean constellation, which has been identified and explored in this study: Schelling-Paul-Husserl-Cassirer. In criticizing Husserl's gravitating toward a "personalistic psychology" (*personalistische Psychologie*)

(167), inspired in particular by Dilthey's *Ideen zu einer beschreibenden und zergliedernden Psychologie* (1874),[34] Heidegger elaborates:

> Die personalistische Einstellung und Erfahrung wird als *inspectio sui*, als innere Betrachtung seiner selbst als des Ich der Intentionalität, des Ich als Subjekt der cogitationes bezeichnet. Hier ist schon durch den Ausdruck allein ganz deutlich an Descartes erinnert. Jedes solcher Ich hat zugleich seine Naturseite als Untergrund der Subjektivität. Geist ist kein abstraktes Ich, sondern die volle Persönlichkeit; Ich, Mensch, Subjekt als Personen können nicht darin aufgehen, Natur zu sein, da dann das fehlen würde, was der Nature Sinn gibt [Heidegger inserts note 11: Ideen II, S. 297].
>
> > "Nämlich, streichen wir alle Geister aus der Welt, so ist keine Natur mehr. Streichen wir aber die Natur, das "wahre," objektive-intersubjektive Dasein, so bleibt doch immer etwas übrig: der Geist als individueller Geist; nur verliert sich die Möglichkeit der Sozialität, die Möglichkeit einer Komprehension, die *eine gewissen Intersubjektivität des Leibes* voraussetzt." [note 12: a.a.O.] [emphasis added]
> >
> > "Im Bewusstseinslauf des Geistes bekundet sich aber in jedem Falle seine Einheit, seine Individualität." [note 13: a.a.O., S. 297 f.]
> >
> > Der Geist hat ungleich den Dingen in sich selbst seine Individualität. [note 14: a.a.O., S. 298 ff.]
> >
> > "*Geister sind eben nicht Einheiten von Erscheinungen*, sondern Einheiten von absoluten Bewusstseinszusammenhängen," [note 15: a.a.O., S. 301] – immanent Gegebenes. (170)

Facing such a battery of quotes, one would assume that Heidegger is presenting a solid case, almost too generous in his provision of textual evidence. The opposite is actually the case, for Heidegger immediately resumes his former line of critique, which reduces Husserl to a modern-day Descartes.

After such copious referencing, Heidegger's follow-up commentary seems laconic. Yet appearances are once again deceiving, as he swiftly attaches some further remarks as to how Husserl's position has inherited its short-comings from a nineteenth-century debate over psychophysicalism. Presented in the manner of an afterthought, this kind of intellectual-historical "footnote" is all the more deserving of our attention, since most of them will be eliminated from *Being and Time*, which may be seen as the

"revised" version of the *Prolegomena* as the "*Urform*" of Heidegger's magnum opus, as Gadamer called it.[35] Thus Heidegger continues:

> Das ist dieselbe Überlegung bezüglich des reinen Bewusstseins als Residuum der Weltvernichtung. *Husserl* kommt hier nur wieder auf seine Unterscheidung des Seins unter anderem Titel zurück. Es bleibt ontologisch alles beim Alten. […] Deutlich wird hier der Einblick, wie diese Analyse der Person wieder zurückläuft, wie sie letztlich and *Descartes* orientiert ist. Die Bestimmungen über die Person und ihre Konstitution laufen in charakteristische Überlegungen, in die Frage des Ineinandergreifens von personalistischer und naturalistischer Einstellung aus. Gefragt wird nach dem Verhältnis von Seele und Leib, geistiger und physischer Natur, gefragt wird nach dem alten Problem, das im 19. Jahrhundert viel diskutiert wurde, nach dem psychophysischen Parallelismus, letztlich aber bestimmt die Relativität der Natur und die Absolutheit des Geistes. (170-171).

As for the repeated charge of Cartesianism, none of the quotes that Heidegger provides corroborates his claim about Husserl's project. On the contrary, not only do these text excerpts gainsay Heidegger's point, they put Husserl on a post-Schellingean "plane," in the direct vicinity of Paul and Cassirer. Above all, Husserl's speaking of "a certain intersubjectivity of the body" (*eine gewisse Intersubjektivität des Leibes*), in the context of "possible sociality" (*die Möglichkeit der Sozialität*) sounds very similar to Paul's conception of the material mediation of meaning in the course of concrete communication.

In this sense, the "intersubjectivity of the body" can be understood as referring to the kind of *semiotic matter* that is constantly being reshaped within every individual "mental organism," in Paul's sense, as well as to the materiality of *concrete expressions* as the shareable medium of communication and meaning transfer from one possible world to another. According to this interpretation, Husserl's characterization of "the spirit as individual spirit" is compatible with the notion of the *material individual* as the actual agent of semiotic evolution and language development.

At the same time, Husserl's hint at a plurality of "spirits" (*Geister*) may well be seen as an acknowledgment of the multitude of "planes of immanence." By insisting on the inherent plurality of the "planomenon" (Deleuze and Guattari), in turn, one displays sensitivity to Schelling's Christological puzzle of creation and his critical claim that the creativity of spirit calls for a scalar power, or "third potency," which prismatizes (God's) infinite creativity into different worlds, each following its own cultural logic of concrete expression and concept construction.

Next, Heidegger's "footnote" to intellectual history with respect to the nineteenth-century debate over "the old problem [of] psychophysical parallelism," continues the *false story* with which he *opened* the *Prolegomena*. This opening is remarkable for its blatant omission of both the work of hermeneutically critical historians like Droysen, and the work on new methodological standards of scientificity in the humanities by historical philologists like Paul:

> Die wissenschaftliche Lage um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts ist nur in den Hauptzügen im Hinblick auf die Art und Tragweite der Erneuerung der philosophischen Wissenschaften zu charakterisieren. […]
>
> Die historischen Wissenschaften verzichteten überhaupt auf eine philosophische Besinnung. Sie lebten hinsichtlich ihrer allgemeinen geistigen Orientierung in der Welt von *Goethe* und *Lessing*; allein entscheidend galt ihnen die konkrete Arbeit, und das besagt, die *Tendenz auf "Tatsachen."* Das erforderte die Erledigung einer ersten Aufgabe in der Geschichte: die Erschliessung und Sicherung der Quellen. Damit ging Hand in Hand die Ausbildung der *philologischen Kritik*, der Technik der Interpretation. Die sachliche Interpretation, das, was man die "Auffassung" des in den Quellen vorgegebenen Materials nennt, blieb hinsichtlich ihrer methodischen Leitung und ihrer *Prinzipien* der jeweiligen geistigen Existenz des Historikers überlassen; die Auffassung wechselte je nach den Impulsen, die in ihm lebendig waren. Diese waren verschieden und wurden seit den siebziger Jahren wesentlich aus der Politik genährt. Daneben gab es eine kulturgeschichtliche Richtung. Daher entstand in den achtizger Jahren eine Diskussion, ob Geschichte Kulturgeschichte oder politische Geschichte sei. Nicht vorgedrungen ist man in die *prinzipielle* Sphäre, weil jedes Mittel dazu fehlte. Das zeigt aber, dass das Grundverhältniss des Historikers zu seinem Gegenstande unsicher und allgemeinen bildgungsmässigen popolären Überlegungen überlassen

> war. Dieser Zustand herrscht heute noch, wenn auch beide jetzt unter dem Titel der Geistesgeschichte zusammengenommen werden. (14-15) [last three emphases added]

In Heidegger's perspective on the *Geisteswissenschaften* debate in the nineteenth-century, then, the "historical school" (Ranke, Droysen) apparently did not exist. Even Dilthey, whom Heidegger will mention later,[36] is not worth acknowledging at this point, when it comes to the general advances (or lack thereof) in the historical sciences in the 1870s and 1880s. Similarly, the "public appearance" of the Neogrammarians, in 1871, never seems to have taken place. Instead, the (second half of the) nineteenth century was pervaded and weakend by a general trend of *Bildungshumanismus* and neo-Classicism, hearking back to the era of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781).

More specifically, Heidegger's recurrent use of the term "principles" *(Prinzipien)* and "principle-oriented" (*prinzipielle*) reinforces my earlier claim that Heidegger's consistent passing over Paul's work (or that of other Neogrammarians) is nothing short of willful. As I mentioned before, Paul had no monopoly over the expression "principle." The latter was a technical term and common currency in comparative linguistics and language science (*Sprachwissenschaft*), at the time. However, Paul was certainly the one who championed the term through the title of his widely received book, which had gone through five editions by 1920. As I showed in the previous section, Heidegger had read Vossler extensively by the time of his habilitation (1916), if not before, including especially Vossler's polemic "manifesto" (1904), with its explicit, if not compelling, attack on Paul in the conclusion. By 1925, Heidegger was thus more than aware of Paul's eminent standpoint in the field of philological research and language development.

Hence, for him to speak of "philological critique" in the 1870s and 1880s as oblivious to "principles" (*Nicht vorgedrungen ist man in die prinzipielle Sphäre, weil jedes Mittel dazu fehlte*), has to be seen as either careless or strategic. Given the diligent construction and rhetorical precision of Heidegger's texts, including his lectures, I find the explanation in terms of carelessness highly unlikely.

What is more, Heidegger not only disavows the Neogrammarian conception of concrete communiction and the material mediation of meaning in Husserl's work, he actually incorporates it into his own account of "the essence of language," in the main part of the *Prolegomena*. In doing so, Heidegger promotes the familiar Humboldt-shortcut that I explained earlier as a tool to efface later developments in the philosophy of language. Accordingly, he will engage insights that have met with greater clarification only in the second half of the nineteenth century, but reference only Humboldt by name:

> Mit dieser eigentümlichen Seinsart, die *die Alltäglichkeit im Man als besorgendes miteinander Aufgehen in der Welt* kennzeichnet, ist nun auch eine alltägliche Art der Selbstauslegung des Daseins vorgegeben. Sofern Dasein in der Welt sich primär begegnet, und aus der miteinander besorgten Welt *die Öffentlichkeit selbst Daseinsziele und Daseinsauffassung bestimmt*, werden auch vermutlich alle fundamentalen Begriffe und Ausdrücke, die das Dasein zunächst für sich selbst ausbildet, im Blick auf die Welt, in der es aufgeht, gewonnen sein. Dieser Tatbestand, der sich in der *Sprachgeschichte* ganz deutlich zeigen lässt, bedeutet aber nicht etwa, wie man gemeint hat, dass die Sprachen zunächst nur an den materiellen Dingen orientiert seien, und dass die sogenannten "primitiven" Sprachen gewissermassen über die Auffassung der materiellen Dinglichkeit nicht hinauskommen. Das ist eine völlige Verwirrung der Interpretation des Sprechens und der Selbstauslegung. (342-343) [first and second emphasis added]

A few lines down, Heidegger's only author reference in this context is to Humboldt and one of his examples concerning a language that seems to replace all personal pronouns (*Personalpronomina*) with adverbs of location (*Ortsadverbien*). This phenomenon has sparked a controversy as to whether the original meaning of these expressions was

adverbial or pronominal in character. While such a difference may be of interest from a grammatical point of view, Heidegger holds, "the argument is moot eventually" (*der Streit ist am Ende ohne Boden*), from a philosophical point of view, once we realize that all expressions of that kind are "adverbs of Dasein" (*Daseinsadverbien*), which entail only so many facets of the "orientation toward Dasein" (*Orientation auf das Dasein*) (343).

More importantly for our purposes of extracting Heidegger's implicit notion of concrete communication, this passage forges an intimate link between "speech" (*Rede*), being-with-one-another (*Miteinandersein*), and "the They" (*das Man*), popularly notorious from *Being and Time* Significantly, in the *Prolegomena*, Heidegger has not yet truncated *das Man* to being associated mostly with *Gerede* (chatter) rather than *Rede* (speech). Because of this truncating in *Being and Time*, Heidegger's repeated claim that his use of the expression *das Man* is not meant as one-sidedly negative is never quite convincing. Considering the text of the *Prolegomena*, however, this claim is much more plausible.

In the last quotation, Heidegger ascribes to "the public itself" (*die Öffentlichkeit selbst*) the power to "determine goals and apprehensions of Dasein" (*Daseinsziele und Daseinsauffassungen [zu] bestimm[en]*) (342). At this point, the *communal* aspects of "the public," "being-with-one-another," along with the *communicative* aspect of "speech" are all part of the same structure of "being-in-the-world." Clearly, group communication is not immediately identified with mechanisms of social conformity and distortion or leveling of meaning. This readiness on Heidegger's part to view socially mediated

speech as something neutral or positive is even more evident, when he extends his prior remarks as follows:

> Wie wir noch sehen werden, gehören die Sprache und die Rede selbst zum Dasein als In-der-Welt-sein und Miteinandersein, und wir werden sehen, *wie von da aus notwendig bestimmte Selbstauslegungen des Daseins*, bestimmte Begriffe, die das Dasein von sich selbst bildet, *vorgezeichnet sind*, ohne dass man sagen kann, diese Begriffe seien primitiv. Wenn man diese phänomenalen Strukturen des Miteinanderseins im Man und des Aufgehens in der Welt im Blick behält, dann hat es nichts Rätselhaftes mehr, dass das Dasein, sofern es sich selbst ausdrücklich meint und sich selbst ausspricht, eigentümliche Bedeutungen und Auslegungssinne gebraucht. (343)

Besides confirming the neutral, if not positive rendering of *das Man*, this last passage provides another important clue about Heidegger's unacknowledged debt to Paul and his brand of Neogrammarian thought, the aspect of *partial limitation* implied by the notion of material meaning and concrete expression, as I have used it so far. When Heidegger speaks of "certain self-interpretations of Dasein" as "necessarily pre-figured" (*wie von da aus notwendig bestimmte Selbstauslegungen des Daseins* […] *vorgezeichnet sind*) by the language and speech aspect of being-in-the-world, I suggest, he is talking about something like *open structures* of meaning formation.

If this is a plausible reading, then Heidegger's somewhat puzzling reference to "idiosyncratic meanings and modes of interpretation" (*eigentümliche Bedeutungen und Auslegungssinne*) explicates the discursive nature of Dasein as something similar to "planes of immanence" (Deleuze and Guattari), which are both infinte and yet not completely boundless, since each is governed by its own cultural logic. What is more, there is no fixed hierarchy among such planes, which would justify calling the meaning production on one of them "primitive" in comparison to others.

Still, the affinities between Heidegger's account of how Dasein communicates with itself and Paul's conception of language as communication does not stop here. The emphasis on materiality of meaning (as opposed to the mere "apprehension of material thinghood" [*Auffassung der materiellen Dinglichkeit*] (342)], is carried further in Heidegger's notion of the "grounding nexus" (*Fundierungszusammenhang*), according to which talking-to (*Ansprechen*) is grounded in being-in (*In-sein*), which is the primary quality of *Dasein* in its immanent "horizon:"

> Die primäre Form aller Auslegung als der Ausbildung des Verstehens ist *das Ansprechen von etwas aus seinem "Als-was" her, das Ansprechen von etwas als etwas*, d.i. ein Appräsentieren im Besprechen des so im primären und leitenden Anspruch Appräsentierten. […]
>
> In dem zuletzt Gesagten aber liegt für uns etwas Wesentliches: Wortausdruck – Sprache – ist nur, sofern es dieses Ansprechen gibt, uns solches Ansprechen von etwas als etwas ist nur möglich, sofern es Auslegen gibt, Auslegung ist wiederum nur, sofern es Verstehen gibt, und Verstehen ist nur sofern das Dasein die Seinstruktur der Entdecktheit hat, d.h. das Dasein selbst als In-der-Welt-sein bestimmt ist. Mit diesem *Fundierungszusammenhang* der einzelnen Phänomene: Ansprechen, Auslegen, Verstehen, Entdecktsein, In-Sein, Dasein ist zugleich die *Sprache* definiert, bzw. der Horizont vorgegeben, aus dem heraus das Wesen der Sprache allererst gesehen und bestimmt werden kann. Sie ist nichts anderes als eine ausgezeichnete Seinsmöglichkeit des Daseins selbst, wobei Dasein in der bisher explizierten Struktur zu nehmen ist. (360) [second emphasis added]

The beginning of this passage is quizzical, when Heidegger speaks of the "talking-to of something from out of its "as-what," talking-to of something as something." In my opinion, "talking-to" means nothing else than the encounter with a concrete, but not-yet interpreted expression – the looming up of a "face" that breaks into our life-world. We feel addressed by it, just as we address it by staring at it. It is only in the very event of such "mutual response," which must not be confused with a conscious dialogue (as Gadamer would point out),[37] that we come about as "viewing subjects" in the first place. In this sense, mutual response is equal to mutual constitution. There are no knowing or

talking subjects prior to any such encounter, the *reciprocity* of such concrete communicative clashes (or "invasions" of world) is basic.

In the course of such an encounter, the semiotic structure of a life-world unravels in a certain region where new subject positions become available, which can be occupied via (self-)interpretation ([*Selbst*-]*Auslegung*) and understanding (*Verstehen*). While Heidegger's list of links may suggest a linear causal process, it is important to underscore that this "grounding nexus" is more of a force field than a rope or chain (reaction). For example, it would not make sense for Heidegger to fully separate and then re-chain *Ansprechen* (talking-to), *Entdecktsein* (being-discovered), and *In-Sein* (being-in), or *Auslegen* (interpret) and *Verstehen* (understand). These aspects are only so many facets of a multifarious process of meaning formation on a plane of immanence. To speak of an event of talking-to, as opposed to not talking-to – or better, less talking-to – only refers to differences in communicative intensity. Since not all regions of any plane of immanence are being equally "invaded" by concrete expressions form other possible worlds. As noted earlier, everything can become a face, but not everything looms up with equal expressive or "facial" force. (In our previous illustration, the "crosses on our doors" may go unrecognized for the time being. Materially, they are still engaged in the struggle over symbolic space, but they are not "talking-to" us just yet.)

At this point, it has become clear that Heidegger's analysis of the essence of language in terms of *Dasein*'s immanent self-interpretation and self-transformation is very parallel to Paul's analysis of *language development*. The concreteness of communication is acknowledged by Heidegger even more, when he restates his

characterization of the dynamics of talking-to, in terms of communication or in-forming[38] (*Mitteilung*; lit. sharing or passing on information) and participation (*Teilnahme*):

> Die Rede ist als Seinsart des Daseins qua Mitsein wesentlich Mitteilung, so dass in jeder Rede das, worüber die Rede ist, durch das, was gesagt ist, durch das Gesagte als solches, mit den Anderen *geteilt*wird. […] In der Rede als Mitteilung vollzieht sich eine Aneignung der Welt, in der man im Miteinandersein immer schon ist. Das Verstehen der Mitteilung ist die *Teilnahme am Offenbaren*. […] Mitteilung muss aus der Struktur des Daseins als mit dem Anderen sein verstanden werden. Sie ist nicht so etwas wie ein Transport von Erkenntnissen und Erlebnissen aus dem Innern des einen Subjektes in das Innere des anderen, sondern sie ist das Offenbarwerden des Miteinanderseins in der Welt, und zwar aus der entdeckten Welt selbst her, die im Miteinandersprechen offenbar wird. Im Miteinandersprechen über etwas werden nicht Erlebnisse hin und her zwischen Subjekten ausgetauscht, sondern im Sprechen miteinander ist das Miteinandersein bei der besprochenen Sache selbst, und erst aus dieser her – im je schon Mitsein in der Welt - erwächst das Sichverstehen. (362-363)

Here we find Heidegger in basic agreement with our previous claim that it is only through concrete expressions that possible worlds can communicate, and since any other person is a different possible world (rather than a bodiless mind, immaterial soul, or Descartes' "naked self"), "we" as Dasein can also communicate only by breaking into another structure, regardless whether such "invasion" generates hostile or friendly (or any other meaning) over time. We communicate by impacting and reshaping the "semiotic matter" (*Vorstellungsmasse*) that constitutes the other's "mental organism" (Paul).

Another remarkable detail about this last passage consists in Heidegger's choice of religious language. In fact, his present construal of *Rede* as *Mitteilung*, and of *Mitteilung* as *Teilname am Offenbaren* is reminiscent of Schelling's philosophy of revelation in a way that goes beyond superficial terminological resemblance. Against the backdrop of the post-Schellingean constellation delineated in the last chapter, Heidegger's characterization of *speech as material revelation* locates him firmly on the "plane" of critical Christological thought, concerned with the puzzle of creation, which

took different shapes in the pen Paul, Husserl, Cassirer, and Deleuze and Guattari – a discursive locus that Heidegger sought to occlude rhetorically, while drawing from it philosophically.

Recognizing Heidegger's Masks: Some Conclusions

Upon scrutinizing some of Heidegger's most important early writings, his dissertation (1913) and his habilitation (1916), we found the myth of his "initial neo-Kantianism" disproved. Neither was he as taken by the work of Emil Lask as Kisiel (1993) would want us to believe, nor is it the case that "Heidegger sounds like many of today's analytic philosophers" in these writings, as Polt (1999) intimates.[39] Instead, Heidegger shows himself deeply involved with the nineteenth-century *Geisteswissenschaften* debate over the possibilities for reforming the science of language in tandem with the science of history. More specifically, Heidegger's thought diplays a strong investment in the controversy between the Neogrammarians and their neo-Idealist detractors, representend by Hermann Paul and Karl Vossler as their most influential spokesmen.

With respect to Paul's work in particular, Heidegger's rhetorical gestures at theoretical distance and departure from philosophical tradition become increasingly daring. Vossler is still mentioned at a crucial juncture in Heidegger's habilitation, but will vanish into anonymity in the subsequent writings. Paul, by contrast, is never ever mentioned while Heidegger keeps drawing from his body of thought, most noticeably in the *Prolegomena* (1925). In the text of this lecture course, it is only through the simultaneous disavowal of Droysen, Dilthey, and Husserl that Heidegger's philosophical

rhetoric manages to keep his debt to nineteenth-century "philological critique" and "historical psychology" from becoming too prominent. However, once we zero in on the central conception of *concrete communication* and the *material mediation of meaning* the façade of Heidegger's radical new beginning becomes porous.

The most glaring lacuna in Heidegger's rhetorical shield, in this regard, is perhaps what looks like a close-to-verbatim quote of Paul's famous dictum in the *Prinzipien*,[40] which Vossler (1904) had treated explicitly. As demonstrated earlier, Heidegger had read Vossler, and at a crucial juncture toward the end of the *Prolegomena*, he states:

> *Als Gesprochenheit wächst die Sprache nicht mehr, aber trotzdem kann sie noch als Rede und Ausgelegtheit lebendig sein*. Der "Tod" einer Sprache schliesst die "Lebendigkeit" der ihr zugehörigen Rede und Entdecktheit nicht aus, gleichwie gestorbenes Dasein geschichtlich noch in einem eminenten Sinne lebendig werden kann, vielleicht viel eigentlicher als in der Zeit, als das Dasein selbst eigentlich war. (374) [emphasis added]

In my reading, this is an accurate paraphrase of Paul's conception of language development, which takes place on the level of "mental organisms" who impact each others *Vorstellungsmass* through communication via concrete expressions (Heidegger's *Rede und Entdecktheit*). In this passage, Heidegger projects this account of "living language" as communication onto a broader plane of historical existence (*Dasein*'s historicality), but the theoretical fundament remains Paul's notion of the material mediation of meaning, which can never be exhausted by the more or less rule-governed layer(s) of conscious dialogue.

It is only after rhetorically disarming, and simultaneously coopting, this semiotic tradition that Heidegger can proceed to bypass the work of Ernst Cassirer as flippantly as he does in the main part of the *Prolegomena*. In *Being and Time*, by comparison, he is

less audacious and faints "general agreement" with Cassirer.[41] About a year earlier, in the *Prolegomena*, he is less polite:

> Man sieht übrigens, dass die universale Tragweite solcher Phänomene wie Zeichen und Symbol leicht Veranlassung gibt, sie zum Leitfaden einer Interpretation des Alls des Seienden, der Welt im ganzen, zu verwenden. Kein Geringerer als *Leibniz* versuchte mit seiner *Characteristica universalis* eine Systematik des Alls des Seienden aus der Orientierung am Phänomen des Zeichens. Neuerdings hat dann *Spengler* die Idee des Symbols nach dem Vorgang von *Lamprecht* für die Geschichtsphilosophie und Metaphysik überhaupt verarbeitet, ohne eine eigentlich wissenschaftliche Klärung der damit bezeichneten Phänomengruppe zu geben. Zuletzt hat *Cassirer* in der Schrift "Philosophie der symbolischen Formen" [note 1] die verschiedenen Lebensgebiete Sprache, Erkenntnis, Religion, Mythos unter der Grundorientierung als Ausdrucksphänomene des Geistes zu deuten gesucht. Er hat zugleich versucht, die *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, die *Kant* gegeben hat, zu einer *Kritik der Kultur* zu erweitern. Auch hier ist das Phänomen des Ausdrucks, des Symbols im weitesten Sinne, als Leitfaden genommen, um von da aus all Phänomene des Geistes und des Seienden überhaupt zu deuten. Die universale Verwendbarkeit solcher formaler Leitfäden wie "Gestalt," "Zeichen," "Symbol," täuscht dabei leicht über die Ursprünglichkeit oder Nichtursprünglichkeit der damit erreichten Interpretation hinweg. Was für ästhetische Phänomene angemessener Ansatz sein kann, kann für andere Phänomene gerade das Gegenteil einer Aufklärung und Interpretation bewirken. (277) [note 1: E. Cassirer, Philosopie der symbolischen Formen, 1923]

Heidegger has no qualms at listing Cassirer in one breath with Spengler, as if Cassirer were just the last representative of a lost cause that began venerably with Leibniz but soon deteriorated to the theoretical level of popular writers like Spengler "and" Cassirer.

On a more substantial note, this statement is somewhat ironic because Heidegger's criticism of Cassirer deploys a line of argument that Cassirer himself generally endorses, expressed succinctly, e.g., in his 1942 criticism of Benedetto Croce, Vossler's leader and ally in the fight for a new "stylistics." As Cassirer states in his essay, "The "Tragedy of Culture"":

> This fundamental notion prevails even in Lessing, although he gives it a considerably freer formulation. He concedes the genius the right to extend the limits of the individual genres; but he does not believe that these limits can in

> principle be annulled. Modern aesthetics has attempted to treat all these fixed differences as mere ballast that we must simply throw overboard. Benedetto Croce has gone the farthest in this respect. He declares all classification of the arts and all distinctions of genera of art to be mere nomenclatures, which can serve a practical purpose but which lack any theoretical significance. […] (119)
>
> If this were true without qualification, it would lead one to the strange conclusion that by calling Beethoven a great musician, Rembrandt a great painter, Homer a great epic poet, and Shakespeare a great dramatist, we would merely be referring to unimportant empirical circumstances, which are insignificant from the *aesthetic* point of view and are unnecessary to their characterization as *artists*. If there is only "the" art on the one hand, and the individual on the other, then the medium in which an individual artist wants to express himself is relatively accidental. […] However, such a conception would not, it seems to me, do justice to the artistic process. For it would break the work of art into two halves, which would stand in no necessary relation to each other. In truth, however, the particular mode of expression not only belongs to the *technique* of the formation of the work but is already part of the *conception* of the work of art itself. (120)[42]

Clearly, Cassirer is opposed to any totalizing aesthetics that would level all differences in terms of expressive medium. The above statement is not only a clear objection to Vossler's notion of "Raphael wihtout hands," it also show that Cassirer's general emphasis on the materiality of meaning, via concrete expression, does in no way issue a "formal guideline" (*formaler Leitfaden*), with universal pretense, which Heidegger attibutes to him in the *Prolegomena*. Heidegger's criticism is unwarranted and not supported by his own prior comments on the role of symbols, in the context of his distinction between two senses of "phenomenon."[43]

Next, one of the main discoveries about the "Urform" of Heidegger's breakthrough work[44] consists in the favorable featuring of group communication in the *Prolegomena*, which contrasts with his truncated version thereof, delivered in *Being and Time*. In the *Prolegomena*, we saw, "speech," "being-with-one-another" and the public determination of goals and self-understanding on the part of *das Man* are productively intertwined in the "founding nexus" of Dasein, namely its multifarious stucture of being-

in-the-world. Considering the workings of group communication and the production of new meanings, Heidegger's account of the "essence of language" turns out to be based on a central notion of "immanent transcendence," which we traced previously through the workings of Schelling, Paul, Cassirer, and Deleuze and Guattari.

By way of comparison we might say that, in the *Prolegomena*, Heidegger subscribes to a theory of language as communication, which betrays the methodology of Hermann Paul, who is theoretically engaged but rhetorically silenced. In *Being and Time* (§ 34.), the treatement of *Rede* no longer shows the same breadth, as the speech in the arena of *das Man* becomes more and more reduced to *Gerede*, as one of the "fallen modes" of language (§§ 35-37). Following this tendency, Heidegger gravitates toward a neo-Idealist critique of social language use, which pits the creative individual against the "deadening" conformism of the group, much as Vossler did in his 1904 "manifesto."

In another rhetorical twist, Schelling's philosophy of revelation is echoed in Heidegger's further elaboration on the material dialogics of "talking-to" (*Anrede*), which are spelled out as in-forming (*Mitteilung*) and "participation in the revealed" (*Teilnahme am Offenbaren*). The encounter with concrete expressions, or "faces," is couched in a theological idiom that seems to allow for a religious dimension in the self-interpretation of *Dasein*. In other words, at the heart of his own theory of language he accommodates for a religious "plane of immanence." However, this does not keep him from discarding religion as a discourse that is unfit to produce phenomenological and philosophical insights. Theoretically committed to speech as a process of revelation, Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric takes up the cause of *phenomenological atheism*:

> Wir haben uns das Prinzip der phänomenologischen Forschung klar gemacht und zwar so, dass wir aus der faktischen Arbeit zunächst die Hauptleistungen

> heraushoben und versuchten, diese einheitlich zu sehen, d.h. zu bestimmen, dass mit der Intentionalität das eigentliche Sachfeld gewonnen ist, […] Damit ist die Aufgabe der Philosophie seit *Plato* überhaupt erst wieder auf wirklichen Boden in dem Sinne gebracht, dass jetzt die Möglichkeit einer Kategorienforschung besteht. Die Phänomenologie wird diesen untersuchenden Gang, solange sie sich selbst versteht, beibehalten gegenüber aller Prophetie innerhalb der Philosophie und gegenüber aller Tendenz auf irgendwelche Lebensleitung. *Philosophische Forschung ist und bleibt Atheismus*, deshalb kann sie sich die "Anmassung des Denkens" leisten, nicht nur wird sie sich sie leisten, sondern sie ist die innere Notwendigkeit der Philosophie und die eigentliche Kraft, und gerade in diesem Atheismus wird sie zu dem, was ein Grosser einmal sagte, zur "Fröhlichen Wissenschaft." (109-110).

Through this plea for (re)territorialization, Heidegger absolves the phenomenologist from providing guidance in life (*Lebensleitung*). In the same breath, religion (or any kind of theism) is declared unfit for doing "proper" philosophical work. Purportedly invoking Nietzsche's authority as a philosophical "giant" (*ein Grosser*), Heidegger holds that religion can never be a "gay science." However, if phenomenology holds the key to the dynamic structures of meaning formation, including social meaning formation, it is not clear how anyone or any field could provide guidance in life without being assisted by the phenomenologist or doing phenomenology themselves. In this sense, Heidegger's general case against "prophecy in philosophy" appears to create a dangerous void. Phenomenology is not obliged to be socially activist, and – via disciplinary decree – no other domain of meaning production (or meaning discovery) is authorized to step in. Aside from sitting ill with Heidegger's (1925) view of language as revelation, phenomenological atheism of this sort is far from being neutral and harbors political dangers that will become apparent in Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*, to which I turn in the next and final chapter of the present study.

[1] Martin Heidegger, *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus: Ein kritisch-positiver Beitrag zur Logik*. Dissertation, Freiburg i. Br. 1913 (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1914); reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 1), pp. 59-188.

[2] The page numbers refer to the general pagination of this volume of the *Gesamtausgabe* (GA 1), not to the additional marginal pagination, which indicates the page numbers of the previous 1972 edition of Heidegger's *Frühe Schriften*.

[3] In chapter one of division five (*V. Abschnitt*) of his dissertation, Heidegger takes stock of the general results of his preceding criticisms of various individual authors. Significantly, at this juncture he returns to Wundt, with whom he began his inquiry. In this place, Heidegger issues a concession which, upon scrutiny, comes close to patronizing the author he is criticizing. He allows for the possibility of transforming Wundt's theory into something useful for developing a new theory of judgment, if only the author would "skip over," or abandon his central tenets:

> Die psychologische Tatsache, dass beim Urteilen ein Zusammen von Vorstellungen gegeben ist, hat Wundt veranlasst, der Lehre vom Urteil überhaupt, der Darstellung der "logischen Formen," eine genetische Untersuchung der Vorstellungen und Vorstellungsverbindungen vorauszuschicken. Die Tatsache der Vorstellungsverbindungen im Urteil bietet aber auch den Ausgangspunkt für eine Untersuchung darüber, wie sich im Urteil das urteilende Ich zu diesen Vorstellungsverknüpfungen verhält. Diese Verknüpfungen lösen im Subjekt ein Zwangsgefühl aus, es kann nicht anders als sie anerkennen. Und dieses psychisch erzwungene Zustimmen wird als das Wesen des Urteils betrachtet. In einer solchen Art der Betrachtung des Urteils steckt von vornherein ein richtiger Gedanke, insofern auf *das* der Blick eingestellt wird, *was* sich bei der Urteilstätigkeit darbietet; dieser Theorie wird es somit auch leichter, einer logischen Auffassung des Urteils näherzukommen. Das realpsychische Sichdrängen, Verknüpfen und demzufolge Zwangsauslösen der Vorstellungen braucht nur gleichsam übersprungen zu werden. Man erkennt dann das im Urteil Gedachte, das Gegenständliche rein als solches, das nichts Psychisches mehr ist und nicht psychische Reaktionen auslöst. Das Verhältnis des an die Stelle der Vorstellungsverknüpfung getretenen Gegenstandes zum urteilenden Subjekt ist kein Auslösen eines Zwanges, sondern erhält den Charakter der *Forderung*. Wird aber trotz dieser wesentlichen Um- und Fortbildung der Urteilslehre *das Wesen des Urteils in dem vom Gegenstand geforderten Verhalten des psychischen Subjekts gesehen, dann ist der Psychologismus nicht überwunden*. (163-164)

[4] Martin Heidegger, *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus*. Habilitationsschrift, Freiburg i. Br. 1915. Note that the final chapter was added later for the printed version](Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1916); reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 1), pp. 189-411. – For Heidegger's mistake in identifying the author of the treatise that marks the focus of his habilitation, see: John Caputo, *The Mystical Element in Heidegger's Thought* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1986): "Heidegger's *Habilitationsschrift* is a study of a medieval treatise entitled *De modis significandi*, composed by a fourteenth-century Scotist (Thomas of Erfurt), though wrongly attributed by Heidegger to Scotus himself" (145). Here, Caputo inserts note 4: "Martin Grabmann, Mittelalterliches Geistesleben (München: Huebar Verlag, 1926), Band I. See Grabmann's reference to Heidegger on pp. 145-46" (275). This reference contains a typo. The publishing house belongs to: "[Max] Hueber," cf. the entry in note 5, below.

[5] The spelling of Vossler's last name varies among different publications. The 1904 "manifesto" renders the author's name "Voßler," which is also the spelling that Heidegger adopts in this place. The other spelling with double "s," is found, e.g., in: Karl Vossler, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprachphilosophie* (München: Hueber, 1923). As in the previous section and throughout this study, I keep the second spelling of Vossler's name.

[6] See again: Hans Arens, *Sprachwissenschaft: Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1974).

[7] See, e.g.: Cristina Lafont, *The Linguistic Turn in Hermeneutic Philosophy*, trans. J. Medina (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1999).

[8] See: Martin Heidegger, *On the Way to Language* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 136.

[9] Cf. one of Vossler's (1904) most polemic passage, in which he avails himself of particularly violent language, bringing about an ominous "style" of "cemetery" imagery. His comparison of language parts to dead body parts is as gripping as his reference to "numbered mass graves" is disturbing: "Eine Sprache als Konvention und Regel betrachten, heisst also, sie unwissenschaftlich betrachten. Ergo ist Syntax überhaupt keine Wissenschaft – so wenig als Flexionslehre und Lautlehre. Dieses ganze Feld grammatischer Disziplinen ist ein von nimmermüden Positivisten angelegter unermesslicher Kirchhof, wo allerhand tote Sprachteile in Massen- und Einzelgräbern hübsch gebettet liegen, und die Gräber sind mit Aufschriften versehen und numeriert. – Wem hat nicht schon der Modergeruch dieser positivistischen Philologie beklemmend auf die Brust gedrückt!" (38).

[10] In the further course of his career, Heidegger will use such disciplinary labels vaguely but strategically, by suggesting an opposition of his thinking to historical philology, in particular, and "mere language philosophy," in general. In doing so, however, he never distinguishes any discursive constellations and opposing factions within the former or specifies the context and the proponents of the latter. In this mode of decontextualized presentation, his remarks often gain an air of *unprovoked* criticism that tends to foreclose further investigation into these disciplinary formations. Yet, this does not cancel the rhetorical effect of vehemently, if not transparently, distancing Heidegger from certain disciplines, a testimony to the territorial independence of first philosophy and to the status of Heidegger as a "radical" whose commentary reaches us from an intellectual space beyond disciplinary, scientific infighting. Cf. his critical remarks on "historical philology" in the preface to the second (1950) edition of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (GA 3, XII); and his comparable dismissal of "mere language philosophy" (*blosse Sprachphilosophie*) in the *Letter on Humanism* (1949) (GA 9, 318).

[11] Cf. p. 233, above.

[12] As Rüdiger Safranski relates: "Der frisch promovierte Doktor der Philosophie sitzt an seiner Habilitationsarbeit über die DIE KATEGORIEN- UND BEDEUTUNGSLEHRE DES DUNS SCOTUS. Das Schätzler-Stipendium, von dem er einstweilen sorgenfrei leben kann, verpflichtet ihn auf die philosophische Verteidigung des *Wahrheitschatzes der Kirche* in Gestalt des Thomismus. Wenn er sich beeilt, hat er Chancen, den immer noch unbesetzten Lehrstuhl für Christliche Philosophie zu bekommen. Die Dinge stehen nicht schlecht. Da beginnt der Krieg" (75). In: Rüdiger Safranski, *Ein Meister aus Deutschland: Heidegger und seine Zeit* (München: Carl Hanser, 1994).

[13] This misleading characterization is promulgated by Richard Polt in his otherwise instructive introduction: "The German educational system requires that prospective university teachers produce two substantial theses, a dissertation and a *Habilitationsschrift*. The industrious Heidegger finished his dissertation in 1913 and titled it the *The Theory of Judgment in Psychologism: A Critical-Positive Contribution to Logic*. His *Habilitationsschrift* (1916) was titled *Duns Scotus' Theory of Categories and Meaning* [Here Polt inserts note 10]. There is no need for us to review the complexities of these early works. But it can be helpful to look at some basic features of young Heidegger's philosophical orientation, as they will help us understand the dramatic shift that was soon to occur in his thought. – This shift is indeed dramatic, for the mature Heidegger is famous for his explorations of the history of language and his plays on words, and he is infamous for his pronouncement that "the idea of 'logic' itself disintegrates in the turbulence of a more original questioning" [note 11]. But young Heidegger calls his dissertation a "contribution to logic," and he seems to identify logic with philosophy itself. He often stresses that logic has nothing to do with grammar or etymology: the meaning of a statement is independent of the peculiarities of the language in which it is expressed [note 12]. Heidegger sounds like many of today's analytic philosophers when he says it is the logician's duty to strive for "unambiguous definitions and clarifications of the meanings of words" [note 13]. – What does Heidegger mean by "logic"? Today we usually think of logic primarily as formal, symbolic logic. Heidegger is aware of the advances in symbolic logic made by Frege and Russel, but he

thinks that this approach to logical problems is too limited [note 14]. Logic in the broader sense studies "the conditions of knowing in general. Logic is theory of theory" [note 15]. In other words, the job of logic is to explain how theoretical claims can be meaningful and true" (11). – Note 10: Neither text has been published in English translation. The originals can be found in *Frühe Schriften*, GA 1. Note 11: "What is Metaphysics?" in *Basic Writings*, p. 107. We will take a close look at this claim in Chapter 5. Note 12: GA 1, pp. 32, 103, 302, 338, 340. Note 13: *Ibid*., p. 186. Note 14: *Ibid*., pp. 42-43. Note 15: *Ibid*., p. 23. – To be fair, there may be practical and pedagogical reasons as to why an introductory study does not focus on exactly those early writings by a certain author, which are not availabe in translation. However, Polt's speaking of an "indeed dramatic shift" remains false. According to the view argued in this study, no such shift occurs. If anything, Heidegger shifts emphasis in obfuscating his nineteenth-century sources in the areas of comparative linguistics and historical psychology.

[14] Here I return to the distinction between "empirical psychology" and "conceptual psychology," which I previously adopted from Arens (1989); see: chapter two, p. 92, note 26, above.

[15] Cf. note 12, above.

[16] What is remarkable about this injection, too, is that Heidegger slips in another hint at his own alternative conception, when he refers to the "idiosyncrasy of the scope of meaning as the actual "expressing layer"" (*die Eigentümlichkeit des Bedeutungsbereiches als der eigentlich "ausdrückenden Schicht"*). Yet this suggestive notion of layer(s) of meaning is not explicated any further at this point, but merely used as a rhetorical means to stress – suggestively but vaguely – the difference between his view and Werner's: "Werner bezeichnet den Traktat des Scotus als "die Hauptleistung des scholastischen Mittelalters auf dem Gebiete der Sprachlogik, d.i. des Versuches der Ineinsbildung von Grammatik und Logik." [Heidegger note 60: Die Sprachlogik des Duns Scotus. S. 549.] Scotus will nicht "die Grammatik in die Logik hineinbilden," sondern die logische Struktur der Bedeutungen verstehen. Werner übersieht die Eigentümlichkeit des Bedeutungsbereiches als der eigentlich "ausdrückenden Schicht." – Er will sich zwar "auf ein Urteil über den sachlichen Wert" des Traktats nicht einlassen, bemerkt aber, dass "eine vom Standpunkt des mittelalterlichen Denkens abgefasste Sprachlogik nicht auf den Namen einer Sprachphilosophie im heutigen Sinne des Wortes Anspruch machen könne;" eine solche hat nach seiner Meinung auf "die genetische Entwicklung der Sprache" zu achten. [Heidegger note 61: a.a.O. S. 550.]" (340).

[17] "Es zeigt übrigens das Urteil Werners über die "Sprachlogik" des Scotus, wie sehr die Werturteile in der Geschichte der Philosophie vom eigenen systematischen Standpunkt abhänging sind. Ist dieser theoretisch nicht haltbar, dann muss auch das historische Werturteil einer Revision unterzogen werden. – Inwieweit nun Duns Scotus mit den Einzelausführungen des Traktats das Richtige getroffen hat, wird sich in dem nun folgenden Kapitel über seine Formenlehre der Bedeutungen herausstellen" (340-341).

[18] "Logisch und logisch sind in beiden Fällen nicht dasselbe" (339), cf. p. 241, above.

[19] As noted earlier (see: chapter four, p. 183-184, above), the German term *Vorstellung* has connotations of both representation and imagination. Hence, translating it simply as representation would be misleading in the present context, especially with respect to Paul's specific account of how such "representation/imagination-matter" functions in the transformatory processes of meaning formation, in general, and linguistic evolution, in particular.

[20] Cf. quotation, p. 243, above.

[21] Cf., again, Arens (1996), pp. 105-106.

[22] This central passage, as integral part of Heidegger's conclusion to this work, provides clear evidence that,*contra* Kisiel, Lask is appreciated but already out of the picture, as early as 1915 (or 1916, if we go by the publication date of this text, rather than its first submission to the habilitation committee at Freiburg.)

[23] Cf. quotation, pp. 240-241, above.

[24] Martin Heidegger, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (GA 20). As Petra Jaeger notes in the afterword by the editor (*Nachwort des Herausgebers*) at the end of this volume of the *Gesamtausgabe*: "Martin Heidegger hielt die unter dem Titel "Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs" angekündigte Vorlesung im Sommer-Semester 1925 als vierstündige Lehrveranstaltung an der Marburger Universität. Der Untertitel lautete: "*Prolegomena zu einer Phänomenologie von Geschichte und Natur*"" (443). […] "Da Heidegger nicht mehr zur Ausführung der zentralen Thematik der *Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* gelangte, erschien es angebracht, bei der Veröffentlichung der Vorlesung den ursprünglichen Titel abzuändern in "*Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*;" denn diese "*Prolegomena*" sind ausgearbeitet und wurden vorgetragen" (444). – Here and in the following, I shall refer to Heidegger's text also simply as "Prolegomena," in keeping with the title of the present subsection of this chapter.

[25] "Es bedarf wohl kaum des Geständnisses, dass ich mich auch heute noch *Husserl* gegenüber als Lernender nehme" (168).

[26] "*Husserl* kommt über *Dilthey* nicht hinaus, so überlegen seine Analysen im besonderen gewiss sind. Im Gegenteil, ich möchte mindestens nach meiner Auffassung von *Dilthey* vermuten, dass *Dilthey* zwar die Seinsfrage nicht stellte, auch die Mittle dazu nicht hatte, dass in ihm aber die Tendenz dazu lebte. Bei der grossen Unbestimmtheit der *Diltheyschen* Formulierungen gerade in der Dimension der fundamentalen Phänomene ist es unmöglich, das Vorhandensein dieser Tendenz objektiv zu belegen" (173-174).

[27] The translations of Heidegger's text are my own. In the original, the full passage under consideration reads as follows: "So fundamental die Intentionalität ist, so leer bleibt sie auf den ersten Blick. Wir sagen einfach: Vorstellen ist Vorstellen von etwas, Urteilen ist Urteilen über etwas usw.; man sieht nicht recht ein, wie von solchen Strukturen eine Wissenschaft möglich sein soll. Diese Wissenschaft ist offenbar zuende, bevor sie eigentlich angefangen hat. Das scheint in der Tat so zu sein, als wäre diese phänomenologische Feststellung der Intentionalität eine Tautologie. So hat *Wundt* früher schon gesagt, die ganze phänomenologische Erkenntnis lasse sich reduzieren auf den Satz: A = A. Wir wollen versuchen zu sehen, ob nicht sehr vieles zu sagen ist und am Ende das meiste noch gar nicht gesagt ist" (47). – Cf. Heidegger's previous remarks on *intentio*, which are also meant to deflect the suggestion that phenomenology is a trivial endeavor: "*Intentio* besagt dem Wortsinne nach: *Sich-richten-auf*. Jedes Erlebnis, jede seelische Verhaltung richtet sich auf etwas. Vorstellen ist ein Vorstellen von etwas, Erinnerung ist Erinnerung von etwas, Urteilen ist Urteilen über etwas, Vermuten, Erwarten, Hoffen, Lieben, Hassen – von etwas. Man wird sagen das ist eine Trivialität, sie ausdrücklich noch betonen, keine sonderliche Leistung, die gar die Bezeichnung einer Entdeckung verdiente. Gehen wir jedoch dieser Trivialität etwas nach und stellen wir heraus, was sie phänomenologisch meint" (37).

[28] "Das bisher über die Intentionalität Gewonnene ist formal gesprochen leer, aber das eine ist schon deutlich, dass for allem der Strukturzusammenhang selbst frei vergegenwärtigt werden muss, ohne dass wir realistische oder idealistische Theorien über das Bewusstsein im Hintergrunde haben, dass wir lernen, die Gegebenheiten als solche zu sehen und zu sehen, dass Beziehungen zwischen Verhaltungen, zwischen Erlebnissen, selbst nicht Komplexionen von Dingen sind, sondern dass die Beziehungen zwischen den Verhaltungen selbst ihrerseits wieder intentionalen Charakter haben, dass die ganzen Beziehungen des Lebens in sich selbst durch diese Struktur bestimmt sind. (46-47) […] Von hier aus können wir zugleich terminologische Fixierungen gewinnen, um einen Ausdruck zu verstehen, der in der Phänomenologie oft gebraucht und ebenso oft missverstanden wird: Es handelt sich um den Begriff des *Aktes*. Die Verhaltungen des Lebens nennt man auch Akte: Wahrnehmung, Urteil, Liebe, Hass … Was besagt hier Akt? Nicht etwa Tätigkeit, Vorgang oder irgendeine Kraft, sondern die Bedeutung von Akt meint lediglich intentionale Beziehung. Solche Erlebnisse sind Akte, die den Charakter der Intentionalität haben. Man muss diesen Aktbegriff festhalten und nicht mit anderen konfundieren" (47).

[29] For the first presentation of the chair example, see: p. 37 of Heidegger's text.

[30] As Heidegger explains in § 6.: "Bei Gelegenheit der Charakteristik des Zusammenhangs der Weisen des Vorstellens zeigte sich unter diesen eine bestimmte Stufenfolge vom blossen Leermeinen (signitiven Akten) zum originär gebenden Wahrnehmen (intuitiver Akt im engsten Sinne). Leermeinen ist in seinem Sinne unerfüllt, es hat sein Vermeintes im Wie der Unerfülltheit. Leermeinen bzw. Vermeintes kann sich in gewisser Weise in der anschaulichen Vergegenwärtigung erfüllen. […] Aber so gross auch die Vollkommenheit der Fülle sein mag, sie zeigt eine Differenz gegenüber der Fülle der Wahrnehmung, die das Seiende leibhaft gibt. Aber auch in dieser, sofern wir uns an die sinnliche Wahrnehmung materieller Dinge halten, ist sie nicht total; sie gibt zwar das Seiende originär, aber doch immer nur von einer Seite. So adäquat eine Wahrnehmung sein mag, das wahrgenommene Seiende zeigt sich immer nur in einer bestimmten Abschattung" (65).

[31] "*Schein* ist eine Modifikation des Offenbaren, Offenbares, das es zu sein prätendiert, aber nicht ist. Der Schein ist *nicht* Phänomen in diesem privativen Sinne; er hat den Charakter des Sichzeigens, aber das, was sich zeigt, zeigt sich *nicht* als das, was es ist; während Erscheinung gerade die Darstellung des wesenhaft gerade nicht Offenbaren ist. Schein geht so immer zurück auf Offenbares und schliesst die Idee des Offenbaren in sich. Nun aber wird zugleich deutlich, dass eine Erscheinung, ein Symptom, nur das sein kann, was sie ist, nämlich Verweisung auf etwas anderes, was sich nicht zeigt, dadurch, dass das Erscheinende selbst sich zeigt, d.h. dass das, was sich als Symptom gibt, Phänomen ist. Die Möglichkeit der Erscheinung als Verweisung von etwas auf etwas liegt darin, dass das Etwas, das verweist, sich selbst an ihm selbst zeigt. Anders gewendet: die Möglichkeit der Erscheinung als Verweisung ist fundiert in dem eigentlichen Phänomen, d.h. im Sich-zeigen. Die Struktur der Erscheinung als Verweisung setzt in sich selbst schon die ursprünglichere des Sich-zeigens, d.h. den eigentlichen Sinn von Phänomen voraus. Etwas kann nur als Sich-selbst-Zeigendes verweisend sein" (113).

[32] As she explains critically, in the preface (*Einleitung*) to Husserl's *Cartesianischen Meditationen*: "So folgenreich und letzthin entscheidend nun zwar für Husserls Idee der philosophischen Letztbegründung sich die Entdeckung des Ich als eines transzendentalen Ego, die Freilegung seines Erfahrungsfeldes sowie, in ihrem Gefolge, die der transzendentalen Intersubjektivität erweist, so wenig darf jedoch ausser acht gelassen werden, […] [d]ass […] Cartesischer Zweifel und Husserlsche Epoché sich nicht einfach nur gradweise in der Radikalität des Fragens unterscheiden, aus der dann im letzteren, konsequenteren Falle die Freilegung des transzendentalen Untersuchungsfeldes bloss "resultierte," sondern dass Zweifel und Epoché *sinnverschieden* sind. […] Denn für Husserl steht von vornherein nicht in Frage, *ob* die Welt ist, sondern *wie* sie *für das Bewusstsein* da ist. Gesucht wird mithin in der Phänomenologie auch nicht nach "Beweisen" für ihre Existenz, sondern gesucht wird nach Wegen der *Klärung* des *Sinnes* aller einschlägigen Existenzbehauptungen und Existenzmeinungen. […] Dass in Husserl's Epoché alle Seinsetzungen nebst allen impliziten Seinsmeinungen "auszusetzten" [sic.] sind, dass ihre Enthaltung, Inhibierung gefordert wird und die Welt "dahingestellt" bleibt, hat bei Husserl keinen skeptischen, sondern den positiven Sinn, dass sie in ihrem Bestande nicht angetastet und nicht einmal vorübergehend der methodischen Fiktion des Umsturzes unterworfen wird, sondern dass sie so gerade "Gegenstand," noematisches Korrelat des transzendentalen Bewusstseins, werden soll" (XXIII-XXIV). "Darin liegt das entscheidend Neue der Husserlschen Phänomenologie gegenüber Descartes' Unternehmen. […] Indem aber Husserl es so darstellt, als habe Descartes nur seine eigene Entdeckung nicht entdeckt, bleibt jedoch verborgen, dass Descartes' Zweifel, phänomenologisch gesehen, lediglich eine Modalisierung der "Urdoxa des schlichten Weltglaubens" und mithin untauglich ist, diesen ausser Funktion zu setzen. Gerade darum aber geht es in Husserl's phänomenologischer Reduktion" (XXIV). See: Edmund Husserl, *Cartesianische Meditationen* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1977).

[33] Cf., e.g., the popular book by: John D. Caputo, *Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction, and the Hermeneutic Project* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).

According to the view argued in this study, Caputo's view is mistaken, when he asserts: "The idea of presuppositionlessness arises only when Husserl wants to characterize the nature of phenomenology as science. At this point he has recourse to the inherited idea of Cartesian science, not in the sense of a deductive system, from which he expressly departs, but rather in the sense of achieving an absolutely indubitable and presupposition-free beginning. This ideal does not arise from concrete phenomenological inquiry. It has no correlate in the way intentional life is lived in ordinary, prescientific experience. Husserl

asks us to believe that scientific consciousness is free from the very conditions which make consciousness in general possible in the first place. He asks us to believe, in effect, in two selves, one conditioned and finite, the other unconditioned and free from limitation. And while he means to say that there is but one self, he ends up unable to deliver on that claim. [Here Caputo inserts note 16: Husserl distinguishes two levels of consciousness, reflecting and reflected upon, in one and the same ego; he denies that there are two different selves; see *Cartesian Meditations*, § 15.]" (55).

Caputo's main shortcoming, in my opinion, is that he fails to appreciate the role and meaning of an *experiential field* as the "indubitable and presupposition-free beginning," in Husserl's account of transcendental subjectivity. In keeping with my earlier discussion of possible worlds, Husserl's regional ontology is generally comparable to Deleuze and Guattari's post-structuralist account of different "planes of immanence," which does not posit either an absolute subject or an absolute object (*the* world). Differently put, when Caputo speaks of Husserl's purported notion of a second self that is "unconditioned and free from limitation," he glosses over the distinction between infinite and boundless. For Husserl, each experiential field, is "unconditioned by a transcendent fix point (whether "metaphysical subject" or mind-independent world-substance)" but is bound by its "stable style" of structure, its own "cultural logic," as Cassirer would say. – To repeat, I think Husserl remains vulnerable to the charge of *perceptivism*, which informs his conception of life-worlds with closed horizons, but he is not vulnerable to metaphysical dualism, or a double notion of self, as Caputo suggests.

Turning to one of Caputo's later remarks on the same issue, we might say that Husserl is not susceptible to "Heidegger's objection," while he may well be susceptible to "Derrida's objection": "The work of redescribing what "reason" means and of liberating it from metaphysics and dogmatism is beginning to catch on. Husserl wanted to liberate rationality from the deductive model that had come to dominate all discussions of reason from Descartes on and to replace it with an intuitive model. Reason for him is an evidential system, an interconnectedness of experience with intuitive credentials which makes up the ordered panorama of the sciences and their foundation in transcendental life (*Ideas I*, Part IV). Transcendental phenomenology is everything that reason and metaphysics want, but without the idle constructs of groundless theorizing (*Cartesian Meditations*, §64). Eventually, however, Husserl's liberation ended up in a new subjugation of reason to intuition which tied the hands of reason in a new way, by demanding a transcendental self-justification of it (Heidegger's objection) and by precluding the free manipulation of signs which do not require intuitive redemption (Derrida's objection)" (219).

Here it is worth emphasizing that even "Derrida's objection" needs qualification, because the transfer of meaning from one possible world to another is not completely free but subject to material mediation. In this regard, the semiotic potential of "concrete expressions" (cf. previous chapter) always transcends the conscious intentions of interpreting subjects but it is never "absolutely free," never without any *material* boundaries. Instead, concrete expressions are open structures. If Derrida's objection to the requirement of "intuitive redemption" also rejects any limits with respect to the irreducible materiality of meaning, then his objection to Husserl (in Caputo's rendering) is just as flawed as Heidegger's.

[34] For Heidegger's account of Dilthey's influence on Husserl, see esp.: *Prolegomena*, pp. 163 ff.

[35] For the details of this assessment, see: Theodore Kisiel, *Heidegger's Way of Thought* (New York: Continuum, 2002), p. 36, note 1. Note that Gadamer explicitly refers to the text of Heidegger's public lecture in 1924, which I discussed in detail in chapter two. Here and in the following, my applying the label of *Urform* to the *Prolegomena* (1925) differs from Gadamer's original account, insofar as I consider the Prolegomena as the crucial prototype-version on the way to *Being and Time*.

[36] See esp.: pp. 161 ff.; cf. note 26, above.

[37] Cf. my earlier commentary on Gadamer's stress on written textuality *(Schriftlichkeit*), as the core meaning of dialogue, rather than conscious verbal exchange, pp. 173-174, above.

[38] I choose this neologism as a translation of *Mitteilung* in order to stress the materiality involved in the circulation or traveling of not-yet interpreted information. From the standpoint of material semiotics, "in-forming" adequately captures the mutual material impact, or indentation, if you will, that springs from the

encounter with a concrete expression. The face that invades my world leaves a mark on me, just as my confrontation with it cannot fail to "ingrave" or "in-form" a trace on this face.

[39] See: Polt (1999), p. 11; cf. note 13, above.

[40] "Das wirklich gesprochene hat gar keine Entwicklung" (*what is actually spoken has no development at all*) (PS, 28).

[41] See: Martin Heidegger (GA 2), p. 51, note 1: "Neurdings hat *E. Cassirer* das mythische Dasein zum Thema einer philosophischen Interpretation gemacht, vgl. "Philosophie der symbolischen Formen." Zweiter Teil: Das mythische Denken. 1925. Der ethnologischen Forschung werden durch diese Untersuchung umfassendere Leitfäden zur Verfügung gestellt. Von der philosophischen Problematik her gesehen bleibt die Frage, ob die Fundamente der Interpretation hinreichend durchsichtig sind, ob insbesondere die Architektonik von *Kants* Kritik d. r. V. und deren systematischer Gehalt überhaupt den möglichen Aufriss für eine solche Aufgabe bieten können, oder ob es hier nicht eines neuen und ursprünglicheren Ansatzes bedarf. Cassirer sieht selbst die Möglichkeit einer solchen Aufgabe, wie die Anmerkung S. 16 f. zeigt, wo C. auf die von Husserl erschlossenen phänomenologischen Horizonte hinweist. In einer Aussprache, die der Verf. gelegentlich eines Vortrages in der Hamburgischen Ortsgruppe der Kantgesellschaft im Dezember 1923 über "Aufgaben und Wege der phänomenologischen Forschung" mit C. pflegen konnte, zeigte sich schon eine Übereinstimmung in der Forderung einer existenzialen Analytik, die in dem genannten Vortrag skizziert wurde."

[42] Quoted from: Cassirer (2000).

[43] "Das Charakteristische der Verweisungsfunktion in der Erscheinung, im Erscheinen, ist die Funktion der *Indizierung*, *der Anzeige von etwas*. Anzeigen von etwas durch ein anderes besagt aber gerade, es nicht an ihm selbst zeigen, sondern indirekt, vermittelt, symbolisch darstellen. Wir haben hier also einen ganz anderen Zusammenhang unter dem, was wir mit Erscheinung meinen; beim Phänomen haben wir gerade keinen Verweisungszusammenhang, sondern die ihm eigentümliche Struktur des Sich-selbt-zeigens. Es wird nun darauf ankommen, dass wir den inneren Zusammenhang zwischen Phänomenen in diesem echten Sinne und Erscheiungen gegenüber Schein abgrenzen" (112-113). Notice that "symbolic (re)presentation" (*symbolisch darstellen*) is linked to the notion of *Erscheinung*, and the referential character (*das Charakteristische der Verweisungsfunktion*) of the latter is made possible only by the fact that there is something that "reveals" itself (113), to which the *Erscheinung* can refer. In short, referentiality presupposes revelation. But this does not meant that the referential function of *Erscheinungen* is superfluous, since *revelation* is never direct, immediate, or complete – the need for symbolic mediation remains fully intact at this point. Considering these remarks, combined with Heidegger's later explication of concrete communication as revelation (pp. 360 ff.), it is not at all clear how Heidegger's use of symbol is different from Cassirer's. On the contrary, whenever he puts forth his own account of the "essence of language" or the self-interpretation (*Selbstauslegung*) of Dasein, he seems very much in tune with a material-semiotic tradition that points from Schelling, over Paul, to Husserl and Cassirer. To easily dispose of Cassirer as just another Spengler, as Heidegger does (p. 277) is anywhere between self-undermining and scholarly insincere.

[44] To repeat, for my specific use of the expression "Urform" (as different from Gadamer's use), see: note 35, above.

Chapter Six

Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*:

Concluding Remarks on the "Vital Anecdote" in a Demonic Text

If the earlier chapters of this study have set up the problem of the rhetorics from which Heidegger borrowed, the present chapter has a different function, moving into the heart of Heidegger's most familiar and most controversial writings. Starting with the 1949 *Brief über den Humanismus*, it sets up Heidegger's paradigm for a new theology of reading, which finds and circulates its meanings in concrete expressions of culture, including most importantly poetry and what I will explicate as "vital anecdotes" – a paradigm that will "recur" in *Being and Time*, in modified form. To make this case, I will open out the *Letter* as predictive of how he manipulates ethics in the text to enact a "theft of faith," Heidegger will, once again, deny his roots in a post-Schellingean discourse, as he undercuts his own previous sketch of a material dialogics, in favor of a rhetorically amplified form of nationalist language cult. My conclusion will recapture the Christological interest in concrete communication and its potential for resisting structural corruption through the demonic effects of political idolatry. In particular, from the discussion of Heidegger's *Letter*, I will extrapolate a line of questioning that proposes a critical rereading of *Being and Time* focused on the sign-character of *Zeug* (equipment) and its moral implications for a new materialist semiotics, concerned with the structural dynamics that underly the use of religious language.

Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism* (*Brief über den Humanismus*; hereafter also referred to as: *Humanismusbrief*) (1949 [written 1946]) may well be seen as one of Heidegger's most controversial writings, for at least three related reasons.

First, it was conceived and delivered within the politically tense atmosphere of the immediate postwar years. Against the jagged landscape of rubble and debris, Heidegger's *Brief*constitutes an eminent instance o f philosophical *Trümmerliteratur*, which stands out from the body of literature that was later subsumed under the name of this genre.[1] Second, at this crossroads between the numbing effects of political catastrophe and the first stirrings of cultural reconstruction, the *Letter on Humanism* turns to the question of *human dignity*in a provocative and seemingly paradoxical manner, as Heidegger objects to humanism in the name of humanism. Third, within the corpus of Heidegger's writings, the present text marks one of the few instances where he expressly addresses the possibility and limits of "ethics" in relation to the project of "fundamental ontology" familiar from his project of *Being and Time*.

Let us now turn to the *Letter* to see the mature form of the arguments that I have been tracing to this point.

From *Ansprechen* to *Ankunft*: Heidegger's Language of Cultural Nationalism

Considering the time when Heidegger originally put the *Humanismusbrief* on paper, in 1946, it appears significant that the Letter was conceived simultaneously with several other eminent, philosophical commentaries such as Karl Jaspers' (1883-1969) study on *Die Schuldfrage* (*The Question of [German] Guilt*),[2] Max Picard's (1888-1965) *Hitler in uns selbst* (Hitler in Ourselves),[3] and Ernst Cassirer's *The Myth of the State*,[4] all

of which appeared in the same year. Put forth in the shared social climate of political and moral dis- and reorientation, these philosophical statements offer different perspectives on the postwar situation. In this vein, they set the paradigm for different approaches to what was later called *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (coping with the past), focused on the problem of regaining a political and cultural identity, after twelve years of intellectual isolation and the trauma of the death camps.

As is well known, the main thrust of Jaspers' book consists in his rejection of the notion of collective guilt, in favor of an account of individual responsibility, a statement that was going to fuel the discussion well into the 1960s.[5] Cassirer's book proffers a cultural semiotics that stresses the political implications of his earlier work in the *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (1923-1929), as he now examines "The Technique of the Modern Political Myths."[6] Picard's text, finally, puts forth a specific kind of phenomenological ethics, a *Dasein*'s analysis concerned with the dangers of *political idolatry*.[7] In this analysis, Picard's draws on a conception of *the demonic* which strikes me as directly inspired by Paul Tillich's 1926 essay by the same title,[8] although Picard does not acknowledge Tillich.[9]

Considering these texts, and the fact that the Davos disputation confronted Cassirer and Heidegger as the two most famous philosophers of the age, it is worth noting that Cassirer does not criticize Heidegger as harshly as one might expect. Instead of declaring him a Nazi philosopher, Cassirer characterizes Heidegger as an adept of philosophical *fatalism*, which easily lend itself to being utilized by the propaganda machinery of the National Socialists, without being identical with, or reducible to their ideological perversions.[10] Picard is less subtle in his philosophical distinctions, when he

aligns Jaspers and Heidegger under the general rubric of *Existenzphilosophie* and jointly charges them with nihilism.[11] Such oversimplification notwithstanding, Picard's book remains relevant in his account of the "Nazi world" as a "world of discontinuity." As long as we recognize his theoretical debt to Tillich and Cassirer, Picard's characterization of "Hitler's face"[12] provides one of the most gripping illustrations of the violent manifestations of political idolatry, a disturbing description of idolatrous "physiognomy" (pp. 26 f.) within a structuralist framework.

Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*, then, differs from the statements of these authors in some obvious and some not so obvious ways. To begin with, Heidegger's involvement with the Nazi regime remains the subject matter of extensive debate, and over the last ten to fifteen years it has dominated Heidegger scholarship, especially in an Anglophone context. Sparked in large part by the publication of Victor Farias' book *Heidegger and Nazism* (1989 [French orig., 1987]), this focus on Heidegger's politics actually marks the fourth wave of a recurrent criticism since the end of World War II, as Hugo Ott has pointed out.[13]

At the heart of this on-going controversy lies the fact that Heidegger never recanted. More specifically, in the widely discussed *Spiegel*-interview (conducted in 1966, but not published until Heidegger's death in 1976), Heidegger did not seem to add significant qualifiers to, much less withdraw, his notorious remark, made in 1953 (1935), about "the inner truth and greatness of this movement [National Socialism] (namely, the encounter between global technology and contemporary man)."[14] Needless to say, in 1946 one could not make such pronouncements.

However, while it thus comes as no surprise that Heidegger would have taken a very different route to "coping with the past" right after the war, pointing to his lingering attachment to what he might have seen as the "philosophical resources" of National Socialism does not yet capture the complex texture of the *Letter on Humanism*. The latter, it can be shown, comprises a vibrant mixture of at least four different, though related debates about cultural meaning, and their particular discourses, which Heidegger effectively intertwines to appropriate the resulting amalgam as a philosophical discourse of his own: a humanism debate, a debate about the status of philosophy as a science, a debate about literature, and a critical aesthetics debate.[15]

For my present purposes, I shall confine my inquiry to the first debate on humanism, the complex nature of which deserves separate treatment with respect to Heidegger's "theft of faith," that is, his attempt to deprive certain sites of religious meaning production of their social power. Most importantly, in this arena of cultural discourse, Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric creates a tension between religious and political meanings, resulting in a polyvocal message flexibly tailored for different factions among his (German) postwar audience.

Due to its deployment of *calculated ambiguities* (see below), different parts of the *Brief über den Humanismus* can be read variously as expressions of stoic acquiescence or the "proper silence" ("*das rechte Schweigen*" [344]), as strategic advice for "(re)armament" (*Zurüstung* [ibid.]), or as an agitating call for "open resistance" (*durch einen offenen Widerstand* [346]) – to the allied forces, or whomever else the reader may intuit. Of course, these initiatives are not plainly delivered in the context of political action but coded as possible "modes of thought."[16] Accordingly, the *Brief*cannot be

decoded conclusively so that it would yield a single, consistent message, as Heidegger's language keeps hovering between connotations of *comfort*, *combat*, and *conspiracy*.

This textual situation notwithstanding, one can extrapolate a thematic strand from Heidegger's text as exemplary of the kind of *political idolatry* that Tillich, Cassirer, and Picard tried to expose and obviate in their respective works. In this respect, Heidegger's *Letter* emerges as a *demonic* document, in Tillich's sense of the term:

> In diesen [dämonischen] Wirklichkeiten ist überall die gleiche Spannung enthalten […]: die übergreifende Form, die ein gestaltendes und ein gestaltzerstörendes Element in sich vereinigt, und damit ein Gegen-Positives, eine positive, d.h. formschaffende Formwidrigkeit. […]
>
> Die Spannung zwischen Formschöpfung und Formzerstörung, auf der das Dämonische beruht, grenzt es ab gegen das Satanische, in dem die Zerstörung ohne Schöpfung gedacht ist. (44-45)[17]

For Tillich, the demonic cannot be conceived as pure evil, since it may approach the satanic but can never reach it. The satanic stands for sheer destruction or absolute negation but as such it does not exist. "[…] denn das Satanische hat keine Existenz wie das Dämonische, Um Existenz zu haben, müsste es zur Gestalt kommen können, also einen Rest von Schöpfung in sich tragen" (45). The demonic, on the other hand, maintains a hybrid nature, it is creatively destructive (*formschaffende Formwidrigkeit*) and, above all, it is dialectical.[18]

In Heidegger we will detect this dialectical feature with respect to how he suspends the notion of Being between a cultural essence and absolute exteriority. Being does not itself amount to a cultural essence but it can "call" on it. In fact, almost all we will find out about Being is that it does address cultural communities selectively, or so Heidegger would want us believe. It is the closest, the farthest, it is nearness itself.[19]

To start with "half" of the dialectic of Being, we can say that, what is demonic about Heidegger's view, is its tendency to essentialize German culture by positing it as an absolute that is exempt from the critical and transformatory feedback effects of concrete communication. In other words, under the pretense of reconceiving the "humanitas" (319) of humanity, Heidegger effectively insulates German *Wesen* from the dynamics of *reciprocal* invasion among different possible worlds, culminating in the pivotal statement:

> Das "Deutsche" ist nicht der Welt gesagt, damit sie am deutschen Wesen genese, sondern es ist den Deutschen gesagt, damit sie aus der geschickhaften Zugehörigkeit zu den Völkern mit diesen weltgeschichtlich werden (vgl. zu Hölderlins Gedicht "Andenken." Tübinger Gedenkschrift 1943 S. 322). Die Heimat dieses geschichtlichen Wohnens ist die Nähe zum Sein. [Here Heidegger inserts note a: Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit, 1. Auflage 1947: Als diese Nähe verwahrt und birgt sich das Sein selbst.] (338)
>
> "German" is not spoken to the world so that the world might be reformed [better: might recover][20] through the German essence; rather, it is spoken to the Germans so that from a fateful belongingness to the nations they might become world-historical along with them. [the translators insert note 4: Cf. Hölderlin's poem "Remembrance" [*Andenken*] in the *Tübingen Memorial* (1943), p. 322. [Hamburger, pp. 488ff.]

In this spirit, Heidegger promotes a form of *cultural nationalism*, traces of which could already be detected in Vossler (1904).[21] To be sure, Heidegger would immediately point out that "essence" (*Wesen*) is not intended to designate any metaphysical substance. However, as the above passage shows, even if we understand Heidegger's reference to "German" ([*d*]*as "Deutsche"*) in terms of a process phenomenon of cultural evolution, it is clear that Heidegger wants to keep "German evolution" separate from other cultural processes or influxes.

Along this line of argument, Heidegger now rejects the kind of communication he had imported from Paul's *Prinzipien* into his own *Prolegomena* (1925). While his earlier

notion of "talking-to" (*Ansprechen*) entailed the openness requisite for being addressed by the concrete expressions or "faces" of other life-worlds, Heidegger now imposes a double restriction, according to his present definition of "language [as] the clearling-concealing advent of Being itself" (*Sprache [als] lichtend-verbergende Ankunft des Seins selbst*) (326). The former conception of *Ansprechen*, in the*Prolegomena* , views language as concrete communication, a material dialogic carried by unrestricted "world traveling" among different planes of immanence. The later conception of *Ankunft*, in the *Letter on Humanism*, isolates "the German," in the sense of essence and/as language, from other languages. Remember, according to Heidegger's 1925 reference to Humboldt, the use of *Daseinsadverbien* (adverbs of Dasein, in the sense of orientations of Dasein) cuts across all linguistic boundaries, the enforcement of which Heidegger belittled as the petty business of grammarians.[22] In 1946, it would seem, he entertains the possibility that there is a difference between German *Daseinsadverbien* and, presumably, American, French, British, or Russian ones.

At the same time he excludes "plants and animals" (*Gewächs und Getier*) (326) from the realm of language altogether. While these further exclusions may attract criticism in its own right, it is important to notice that, rhetorically, the communicative discrimination against vegetative and animal life serves Heidegger as a red herring to withdraw attention from his politically more aggressive discrimination against other *human* communities of language. In adopting a diction that bears overtones of man as the crown of creation, Heidegger appears to make the case for a united front among humans "against" the rest of God's creatures. This impression is deceptive, however, since Heidegger immediately begins to draw boundaries within the human speech community

as well. In his complaint about a deterioration of "thinking" into a mere "cultural bustle" (*Kulturbetrieb*), Heidegger elaborates:

> Man denkt nicht mehr, sondern man beschäftigt sich mit der "Philosophie." Im Wettbewerb solcher Beschäftigungen bieten sich diese dann öffentlich als ein …ismus an und versuchen, sich zu überbieten. Die Herrschaft solcher Title ist nicht zufällig. Sie beruht, und das vor allem in der Neuzeit, auf der eigentümlichen *Diktatur der Öffentlichkeit*. […] Diese [Verknechtung an die Öffentlichkeit] selbst ist aber die metaphysisch bedingte, weil aus der Herrschaft der Subjektivität stammende Einrichtung und Ermächtigung der Offenheit des Seienden in die unbedingte Vergegenständlichung von allem. *Darum gerät die Sprache in den Dienst des Vermittelns* der Verkehrswege, auf denen sich die Vergegenständlichung als die *gleichförmige Zug·nglichkeit von Allem für Alle* unter *Missachtung jeder Grenze* ausbreitet. So kommt die Sprache unter die *Diktatur der Öffentlichkeit*. (317)

Heidegger's repeated reference to the "dictatorship of the public" restages his notion of *das Man*, in the truncated version of *Being and Time* rather than the more comprehensive version of the *Prolegomena*, but in this place it receives yet another twist. As one of the prime examples of Heidegger's rhetorical finesse, he delivers a *peculiar* intertwining of what is normally considered direct opposites within the political arena of language use. If we are to believe Heidegger, the new *dictatorship* comes in the guise of *diplomacy* (*Vermittlung*; lit. mediation). Diplomacy, in turn, is linked to *democracy*, intimated by the phrase "equal access to everything for everybody" (*gleichförmige Zugänglichkeit von Allem für Alle*). Such communicative infrastructure (*Verkehrswege*) is denigrated as the road to objectification (*Vergegenständlichung*), which "disrespects all boundaries" (*Missachtung jeder Grenze*).

Concrete communication among different life-worlds, then, especially if it serves democratic ends and political diplomacy, is no longer welcomed as a medium of *Ansprechen* ("talking-to") but criticized as an obstacle to the clearing-concealing *Ankunft* (advent) of Being itself. "Language is the house of being" (*Die Sprache ist das Haus des*

Seins [313]), but the culture-nation (*Kulturnation*) of Germany, the self-declared land of "poets and thinkers" ought to guard its own, which is not for everyone to share: "Die Denkenden und Dichtenden sind die Wächter dieser Behausung" (ibid.).[23]

In Heidegger's text, this message of cultural nationalism is rhetorically attenuated by a series of *calculated ambiguities* that ensure that his plea for guarding and fostering a German essence does not assume an air that is (too) pompous or even imperialist. Given the dire circumstances of his audience, Heidegger aims for a "style" of *dignity*, *modesty*, and *austerity*. During the "rubble years" of the immediate postwar period (*Trümmerjahre*),[24] dignity is Heidegger's rhetorical alternative to guilt or shame, in the first round of the discussion over "coping with the past." The right dose of "quiet arrogance" or "proper silence" (cf. above), we might say, is his recipe for keeping his style of austere dignity from sliding into an idiom of pride, humiliation, or depression. Walking such a thin line, stylistically, Heidegger surrounds the *Würde* motif with an array of calculated ambiguities, setting off a dialectic according to which certain qualities or traits keep collapsing into their opposites:

> Der Mensch ist nicht der Herr des Seinenden. Der Mensch ist der Hirt des Seins. In diesem "weniger" büsst *der Mensch* nichts ein, sondern er gewinnt, indem er in die Wahrheit des Seins gelangt. Er *gewinnt die wesenhafte Armut des Hirten, dessen Würde darin beruht, vom Sein selbst in die Wahrnis seiner Wahrheit gerufen zu sein*. Dieser Ruf kommt als der Wurf, dem die Geworfenheit des Daseins entstammt. Der Mensch ist in seinem seinsgeschichtlichen Wesen das Seiende, dessen Sein als Ek-sistenz darin besteht, dass er in der Nähe des Seins wohnt. Der Mensch ist der Nachbar des Seins. (342)

Within a few sentences, Heidegger establishes a network of surprising connections, swiftly combining what would appear to be mutually exclusive. To begin with, dignity is linked to poverty. Whether one finds some religious overtones in this or not (poverty as a Christian virtue), this relation is not dichotomic. Poverty may make it hard to maintain

dignity, or, if wealth increases the chances of (moral) corruption, the opposite may be the case. At any rate, these two attributes are generally compatible.

The actual twist occurs, when Heidegger turns poverty into gain, in the image of the shepherd[25] who becomes dignified through the calling of Being. Material poverty is compensated through spiritual wealth, yielding a state of dignity, as man "dwells in the nearness of Being" (*in der Nähe des Seins wohnt*). Here it is worth noticing that, in the real-life poverty of 1946, the theme of dwelling takes on a very tangible meaning. Since accommodations were sparse and shelter was not a matter of course in several parts of Germany at the time,[26] the concept of neighbor (*Nachbar*) gained new importance and, under favorable circumstances, a new ring of local solidarity.

Analogously to the dialectic between poverty and wealth, Heidegger blurs the distinction *activity* and *passivity* which gets condensed into his befuddling phrase of an "achievement [of] letting" (313). Humans achieve letting themselves be claimed by Being, and they do so in, or through, thinking. Thinking is thus presented as a unique kind of action (*Aktion*, *Handlung*), the efficacy of which defies the usual distinction between active and passive mode:

> *Das Denken wird nicht erst dadurch zur Aktion, dass von ihm eine Wirkung ausgeht* oder dass es angewendet wird, Das Denken handelt, indem es denkt. Dieses Handeln ist *vermutlich das einfachste und zugleich das höchste*, weil es den Bezug des Seins zum Menschen angeht. Alles Wirken aber beruht im Sein und geht auf das Seiende aus. Das Denken dagegen lässt sich vom Sein in den Anspruch nehmen, um die Wahrheit des Seins zu sagen. *Das Denken vollbringt dieses Lassen*. (313) [emphases added]

Embedded in this passage, we find yet another merger of opposites in Heidegger's characterization of "the act of thinking" as both "the most plain and at the same time the most refined" (*das einfachste und zugleich das höchste*; lit. "the simplest and at the same

time the highest").[27] Perhaps most pertinent to the immediate postwar situation in the aftermath of political catastrophe, Heidegger appears to turn tragedy into triumph, failure (*Scheitern*) into success – even a "gift" (*Geschenk*). The importance of this equivocation, in particular, is indicated by the fact that Heidegger resorts to more violent and more dramatic language than in the other instances of dialectical dichotomies, listed thus far. Still speaking as if only about the "act" of thinking as opposed to mere "philosophizing," Heidegger adds a tone of sarcasm (according to my reading of the first sentence) and declares:

> Solange die Philosophie jedoch sich nur damit beschäftigt, ständig die Möglichkeit zu verbauen, sich erst auf die Sache des Denkens, nämlich die Wahrheit des Seins, einzulassen, steht sie gesichert ausserhalb der Gefahr, jemals an der Härte ihrer Sache zu zerbrechen. Darum ist das "Philosophieren" über das Scheitern durch eine Kluft getrennt von einem scheiternden Denken. Wenn dieses einem Menschen glücken dürfte, geschähe kein Unglück. Ihm würde das einzige Geschenk, das dem Denken aus dem Sein zukommen könnte. (343)

To be sure, not all of the above, calculated ambiguities are equally mysterious. Illustrated through my own interpretation of Heidegger's poverty-wealth relation, in terms of material poverty and spiritual wealth, e.g., some of these dialectical dichotomies do not seem necessarily paradoxical. Whenever the terms of the relation under consideration allow for a further distinction, the initial tension appears resolvable. What renders the *Letter on Humanism* one of Heidegger's most conflicted writings, however, is the fact that the most central ambiguity he engages does not allow for any such solution – the relation between the *human* and the *inhuman*.

As I intimated at the beginning of this chapter, what makes the *Letter* such a provocative piece is Heidegger's way of turning humanity against itself, or more precisely, of turning humanity against humans. In this case, no variation or subdivision

on either side of the relation is available. To be clear, we must not hastily assume that being human is a monolithic quality, some thoroughly homogeneous property, for if we did, Heidegger would rightly point out that we were making a metaphysical commitment that he does not motivate in his text. This much we can grant Heidegger, irrespective of the more general question as to whether he manages to deliver a notion of humanism that is no longer metaphysical at all, which he puts forth as his declared goal in several passages of the *Humanismusbrief*. The need for "overcoming humanistic metaphysics," is stated most directly as follows:

> Jeder Humanismus gründet entweder in einer Metaphysik oder er macht sich selbst zum Grund einer solchen. Jede Bestimmung des Wesens des Menschen, die schon die Auslegung des Seienden ohne die Frage der Wahrheit des Seins voraussetzt, sei es mit Wissen, sei es ohne Wissen, ist metaphysisch. Darum zeigt sich, und zwar im Hinblick auf die Art, wie das Wesen des Menschen bestimmt wird, das Eigentümliche aller Metaphysik darin, dass sie "humanistisch" ist. Demgemäss bleibt jeder Humanismus metaphysisch. (321).

This argument appears strikingly circular. Heidegger begins with the claim that "any Humanism is either grounded in a metaphysics, or makes itself into the ground of some [kind of metaphysics or other]" (*gründet entweder in einer Metaphysik oder macht sich selbst zum Grund einer solchen*). In the middle of the argument, he relies on a *non sequitur*, when he infers from the (purported) fact that, what is peculiar about all metaphysics is its being "humanistic" (*das Eigentümliche aller Metaphysik [zeigt sich] darin, dass sie "humanistisch" ist*), the inverse claim that any humanism is metaphysical. Logically this does not follow. Even if it were true that all metaphysics is "humanistic," it is still possible that one or several kinds of humanism are not metaphysical; unless, of course, we already assume the latter, as Heidegger seems to do with his first sentence in

the above quote. In this case, however, the argument simply turns back to its initial claim and thus proves circular.

Notice, however, that this does not immediately disprove Heidegger's overall agenda. So far, Heidegger has failed to show how we can "overcome humanistic metaphysics" or "metaphysical humanism." Yet, in itself, this does not address his other central claim that his alternative notion of humanism (metaphysical or not) is not inhuman. Unless, we presuppose that any metaphysical humanism, by virtue of being metaphysical, inevitably turns into its opposite, the problems pertaining to the relation between the human and the inhuman, in Heidegger's account, are not predetermined by his failure to show that all forms of traditional humanism are metaphysical. In other words, the concern that Heidegger's alternative form of humanism – if we still want keep this term, in the first place[28] – is inhuman, is not dealt with merely in light of the fact that Heidegger has not delivered a consistent argument for "overcoming metaphysical humanism" thus far. This is so because there is no direct link between metaphysical and inhuman. These intricacies are not thoroughly examined by recent commentary on the *Humanismusbrief*,[29] although the complications do not stop here.

In fact, at his point we have to pause once more, because things get even more involved. While Heidegger's argument about old versus new understandings of humanism does not claim, much less establish, that there is a necessary connecting between being-metaphysical and being-inhuman, he does imply that there might be a scale of different degrees of humanity or being human. Differently put, Heidegger implies that some forms of humanism are less human than others, insofar as they are "less essentially human" than others:

> Es [das Wort "Humanismus"] hat ihn [seinen Sinn] verloren durch die Einsicht, *dass das Wesen des Humanismus metaphysisch ist und das heisst jetzt, dass die Metaphysik die Frage nach der Wahrheit des Seins nicht nur nicht stellt, sondern verbaut*, insofern die Metaphysik in der Seinsvergessenheit verharrt. Allein eben das Denken, das zu dieser Einsicht in das fragwürdige Wesen des Humanismus führt, hat uns zugleich dahin gebracht, das Wesen des Menschen anfänglicher zu denken. Im Hinblick auf *diese wesentlichere Humanitas* des homo humanus ergibt sich die Möglichkeit, dem Wort Humanismus einen geschichtlichen Sinn zurückzugeben, der älter ist als sein historisch gerechnet ältester. (345) [emphases added]

Here Heidegger speaks of a "more esssential humanitas" (*wesentlichere Humanitas*), which would pull traditional metaphysical humanism out of its forgetfulness of Being. In this passage, then, metaphysics is associated with forgetting about Being, which entails a lesser, namely "less essential," meaning of humanity or being-human. Hence, it is with this hint at different degrees of humanity in mind that we have to turn to those statements on Heidegger's part, through which he defends himself against the anticipated charge that his critique of traditional, metaphysical humanism amounts to a wholesale rejection of humanism. If this were the case, the accusation holds, then Heidegger's purportedly post-metaphysical humanism would be no humanism at all. Instead he would be making a case for something inhuman, which merely usurps the name of a humanist cause.

At this point the textual situation in Heidegger's *Letter* becomes increasingly *demonic*. Against the backdrop of his already disquieting suggestion that there may be different degrees of human-ness, Heidegger takes it one step further when he, paradoxically, subordinates humans to humanity – a "more essential humanitas," as intimated by the last quotation. At first, we might have feared that Heidegger's *distinction of degree* would be just a philosophical cover up for some inhuman elitism, which ranks certain kinds of humans above others, regardless whether such ranking is based on some racist "biology" (which Heidegger openly rejects) or whether such

differences in essence are spelled out in a "historical sense" (345). Heidegger distinguishes "*Geschichte*" from a mere "historical calendar" or linear ordering of events (*historisch gerechnte*). Still, the meaning of "historical", in the context of different degrees of humanity, remains opaque.

At the same time, it does tend to support, however vaguely, Heidegger's implicit conception of cultural nationalism. While the standard for "ranking" is still as obscure as it is disturbing, the reference to different historical essences (*Wesen*) within humanity, clearly enforces the isolationist, or exclusionist, aspect of *Kulturnation*. Heidegger does not use this term, but it is apparent that some such conception informs his account of how a post-metaphysical humanism is supposed to be more "original" (anfänglicher [345]) and, again, more "historical." This sort of a "more" human historicality retains a linguistic dimension, captured in the image of the shepherd who is dignified by, and dependent upon, the language-coded calling (*Ruf*) of Being. To repeat, "the 'German' is not spoken to the world […], but it is spoken to the Germans, […]" (338). Language is a destiny, and it is not shared by all humans alike. According to this double-gesture at *linguistic exclusionism* as well as *linguistic imperialism*, different language communities have different world-historical missions.[30]

Communicative Spatiality and the Grave of Poetry

Heidegger realizes from the first that language and rhetoric are the keys to understanding the human condition. In making his case for a postmetaphysical, "more essential," and "more historical" humanism, Heidegger is aware of the immediate danger of falling into a rhetoric of the inhuman. As noted earlier, the special difficulty in this

context springs from the fact that the human-inhuman relation does not easily lend itself to the dialectical twist we saw Heidegger exploit in his treatment of the relations of wealth and poverty, activity and passivity, even success and failure. Each of these conceptual couplets offered sufficient leeway to make a more or less plausible case as to how one could be poor in one regard, but rich in another, etc. Yet for humanity and its opposite no such dialectic is readily available, which would seem to drastically restrict the quest for "alternatives." And Heidegger quickly lays his finger on this issue:

> Soll aber der Mensch noch einmal in die Nähe des Seins finden, dann muss er zuvor lernen *im Namenlosen zu existieren*. Er muss in gleicher Weise sowohl die Verführung durch die *Öffentlichkeit* als auch die Ohnmacht des *Privaten* erkennen. Der Mensch muss, bevor er spricht, erst vom Sein sich wieder *ansprechen* lassen auf die Gefahr, dass er unter diesem *Anspruch* wenig oder selten etwas zu sagen hat. [...]
>
> Liegt nun aber nicht in diesem *Anspruch* an den Menschen, liegt nicht in dem Versuch, den Menschen für diesen Anspruch bereit zu machen, eine Bemühung um den Menschen? […] So bleibt die *Humanitas* das Anliegen eines solchen Denkens; denn das ist Humanismus: Sinnen und Sorgen, dass der Mensch menschlich sei und nicht *un-menschlich*, "*inhuman*," das heisst *ausserhalb seines Wesens*. Doch worin besteht die Menschlichkeit des Menschen? Sie ruht in seinem Wesen. (319) [all emphases added]

This passage, I argue, is absolutely crucial for unlocking the rhetorical structure of Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*, although, taken by itself, it is only half of the story. More precisely, the first part of it provides an unmistakable indication of Heidegger's occluded dialogue with the Young Hegelians and their "other mentor" (besides Hegel as inspiration and target), Schelling.

Here we find one of the few clear indications in the *Letter* about the actual task that a new kind of humanism has to meet, irrespective of whether we label it "metaphysical" or "postmetaphysical." The task is to determine a mode of human communication that can give meaning to people's lives, beyond the dichotomic confines

of private and public "existence." The main challenge for a Young-Hegelian kind of *Existenzphilosophie* (in contradistinction to a Sartrean existentialism) is to determine and explore a *communicative spatiality*, as Heidegger intimates at the very beginning of the *Humanismusbrief*, in terms of his famous key phrase of "language as the house of being" (313).

In the second part of the above quotation, Heidegger specifies this spatiality, when he equates "in-human" with "out-of-human-essence" (or external to human essence). Bracketing, for the moment, the question what exactly that means, we may note that *inhumanity* is associated with *exteriority*. Correlatively, one would assume, *humanity* is bound to *interiority*. In other words, on this general level of communicative spatiality we find that at the heart of Heidegger's call for a new humanism lies a call for *immanence*. Any attempt at being "more human" thus implies trying to be "more immanent" or more sensitive to immanence. Here we already catch a glimpse at the connection to Schelling's critical Christological thought. But soon Heidegger's orientation will take a different turn, as he redirects the Young-Hegelian route to immanence in a way that will distort, and suspend, the critical-Christological stakes of the debate over a new humanist paradigm of communication – a clear gesture at his "theft of faith."

The distortive transition from Heidegger's Young-Hegelian roots to some demonic corruption thereof is effected by his equivocal interchange of *Ansprechen* (talking-to) and *Anspruch* (demand). As I mentioned earlier, the human-inhuman relation is rather "cumbersome" for the rhetorical technique, which Heidegger deploys throughout the *Letter*, when he blends conceptual opposites into a dialectical swirl. (To the aforesaid

"swirls" of poor-wealthy, active-passive, successful-failing, we might add simple-mysterious[31] and progressive-stagnant.[32]) The terms "human" and "inhuman" are so morally loaded that they do not blend well. This is not a trivial thing to say, after it was shown that there are other, less "intense" oppositions which can be blended quite effectively.

Faced with this rhetorical obstacle, the *Ansprechen-Anspruch* relation, I argue, is Heidegger's most effective detour device for still blending the human and the inhuman, after all. The surface tension of the humanism debate is thus neutralized by transposing a moral polarity onto a plane of communication. As we shall see, the moral conflict has by no means disappeared, but it is now sufficiently withdrawn from the surface of the text to be manipulated or "swirled."

To this end, Heidegger takes full advantage of the "obvious" etymological and semantic proximity, if not identity, between *Ansprechen* and *Anspruch*. To be clear, I do not think that any reader (native speaker or not) will be duped into assuming complete congruence in meaning among these terms. Instead, what is important for Heidegger's detour device to work is that, on the face of it, the two expressions are "close enough" to be set in motion with on another, so to speak. In other words, rhetorical success does not depend on actual congruence but on tentative compatibility.

In fact, upon close inspection, it does not seem all that far-fetched to claim a communicative link between *Ansprechen* and *Anspruch*, because *demanding* appears to be a subtype of *talking-to*. If that were to be the case, one could aptly describe the relation between these two communicative modes as one of subsumption or special instantiation. Demanding can be subsumed, as special instance, under the broader notion

of talking-to. However, this interpretation is not tenable, although Heidegger's entire case for a different understanding of humanism as a more essential humanitas rests on it. The entanglement of *Ansprechen* and *Anspruch* is the spurious backbone of Heidegger's moral argument which, of course, he would not call moral but a matter of care.

The spuriousness of Heidegger's communicative detour can be brought out as follows. The expression *Ansprechen* still belongs to the conception of material communication, which we located and explored in some detail in Heidegger's *Prolegomena*. The decisive quality of this mode of human existence or Dasein, in terms of communicative space, is the aspect of inherent *reciprocity*, previously discussed as the mutual trace left by "in-forming" (*Mitteilung*). (If a "face" from another life-world breaks into my experiential domain and starts talking-to me, it will leave an imprint on me just as it will receive a mark from me.)

The term *Anspruch*, by contrast, belongs to a new vocabulary, which bespeaks a new paradigm of communication space. Its primary spatial aspect is *one-directionality*. A demand can be said to expect compliance but as an act of communication it does not open itself up to feedback effects of meaning. In this sense a demand, or command, is not material in the same way talking-to is. The "locution" from which the command is issued is not concrete, which means, it is not localizable on a particular plane of immanence. The communicative spatiality of *Anspruch*, in Heidegger's sense, is *absolute exteriority*, a transcendent, not an "immanent transcendent." Thus understood the source from which the command emanates can be viewed as a *void*, a no-place, or "nothing" (*Nichts*), from which a command raises its "faceless voice."

Heidegger's own phrasing in the last quotation is telling, when he speaks of "existence in the nameless" (*im Namenlosen zu existieren*), for it is not only the (German) individuals that are assigned a nameless mode in their (pseudo-) communication with Being. Their lack of name is but the mirror image of the *anonymous authority* of Being itself. In this context, speaking of "names" does not refer to personal proper names. Instead, within concrete communication, a name is an index of unique immanence, the designator of one's own or an other's possible world, which may not be interpreted yet, but which is already concrete. When a possible world breaks into another, mutual in-forming *(Mitteilung*) takes place, leaving a trace on both sides of the communicative encounter.

Stated in the language of our previous example in section two, the reciprocity of naming implies that the crosses on our doors are actually impacted by our reaction to them. Stuck on our communal surface, they do not command anonymously, as if from out of nowhere. Surely, we could not just fancy them into existence, but the *meaning* of their presence on our plane of immanence is determined, not exhausted, by our reaction to them. Conversely, it is only in the course of our response that "we" emerge as solidaric, paranoid, or maybe indifferent subjects. At any rate, the crosses leave their mark, but they can only do so through material mediation.

Concrete expressions are concrete only insofar as they enter a possible world, in which they can be recognized an interpreted. Heidegger's Being never enters into any world, but only commands them from an insurpassable distance. As its "guardians" we may "dwell" in its nearness (*Nähe*), but humans are never on the same plane with Being. The shepherds become sheep and flock around an empty space, *a tombstone with no*

name on it. They "exist in the nameless," because Being is not a concrete reference point, from which they could take their bearing and localize themselves as "more historical" individuals or otherwise.

My cemetery image of a tombstone with no name is deliberate, and it should not be mistaken for some gothic hint at Heidegger's nihilism. In my reading, Heidegger is not a nihilist, but a cultural nationalist. Accordingly, when I spoke of Heidegger's conception of *Anspruch* as creating a communicative void or "nothing," this analysis must be reinserted into Heidegger's agenda of German essentialism. Heidegger's entire rhetorical edifice is suspended between these two poles of the anonymous authority of Being and the cultural mission of "the German." In recognizing this, we have to immediately qualify the metaphor of a nameless tomb.

More accurately, then, we should say that Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric twists and turns around a headstone, on which he sometimes writes a name, which he will erase and re-inscribe perpetually. The name on the headstone is, of course, Hölderlin (on "lesser" occasions replaced with Rilke, Trakl, and George). Hölderlin is Heidegger's "door," which he opens to the Germans but closes shut to any other culture-nation, especially the French, of whom he says that "when they begin to think they speak German."[33] As *the* German poet, Hölderlin is Heidegger's *conceptual persona*, as Deleuze and Guattari would recognize. That is to say, the body of German poetry, exemplified by Hölderlin's work, is the communal surface, on which the German shepherds may gather, the possible world in which they emerge as dignified. If Heidegger did not allow for any such concrete poetic reference point, the preacher of Being would indeed be a nihilist.[34]

The relevance of the tombstone image, then, for Heidegger's account of a new humanism as a new form of human communication is instructively captured by the Girard scholar, Gil Bailie. In chapter twelve of his book, *Violence Unveiled*, Bailie proffers a section in which he provides an account of "the empty tomb" as an illustration of the dynamic structures of symbolic violence. Openly drawing from the work of René Girard, Bailie uses the tomb metaphor to illustrate how any (communication) community is both united and threatened by acts of symbolic violence:

> Because culture begins, so to speak, at the grave site, tombs and graves have tended to provide existing cultures with an ideal venue for "prodding wrath toward its just devotions," and reviving cultural solidarity. The use of graves for deflecting moral responsibility for violence onto others is an explicit concern of the New Testament, and this concern sheds light on the structural significance of the empty tomb story.
>
> Tombs function to extinguish precisely that recognition of complicity. By decorating the tombs of past victims, those morally troubled by acts of collective violence can bemoan the violence and shift responsibility for it to others without having either to acknowledge or to renounce their own complicity in the violence.
>
> The discovery of the empty tomb meant that Jesus' corpse and its resting place could not be made into a shrine and become the locus for a new religious cult. (230-231)[35]

Here I cannot engage Bailie's complex analysis and its sources in Girard's theory of sacred violence. Instead, I want to suggest that his account of the symbolic stakes of "the empty tomb" can be used to explicate the implications of Heidegger's double-edged rendering of a more essentially human mode of communication, which oscillates between the model of *Ansprechen* and the model of *Anspruch*. As noted earlier, the communicative spatiality of *Ansprechen*, or talking-to, is one of open interiority or immanence, whereas the communication space entailed by *Anspuch* , or demand, is one of absolute exteriority or transcendence. The former grounds a reciprocal mode of

material communication, the latter grounds a one-directional mode of immaterial and anonymous command.

Translated into the language of Bailie's gravesite imagery, communication as talking-to has the symbolic structure of an "empty tomb," which resists "be[ing] made into a shrine." Communication as demand, on the other hand, structurally resembles a "occupied tomb" [not Bailie's term] that is filled with a transcendental substance like the dead body of "*the* German poet, " which can easily be turned into an object of cult or zealous reverence. In its double role as an unquestionable authority and a cultural mission, sometimes *the* German poet has a name and sometimes he does not, depending on its symbolic-structural modulation.

The latter notion, as I use it here, speaks to the fact that the phrase "the German poet" instantiates the three different aspects of any single cultural *eidos*, of the sort that the Husserl of the *Phenomenological Psychology* (1925) was willing to consider in his quest for objectivity in historical science. This speaks to the fact that all cultural *eide* are *trinitarian* in their symbolic structure, in that they allow for, but are also confined to, three basic possibilities of shifting emphasis symbolically.

According to the first modulation, or accent (to borrow Vossler's [1904] term), "*the* German poet" stands for Being, an anonymous authority, a mere "The" that is not even specifiable as anything like the "the poet," "the king," or "the God." All of these qualifiers are already too restrictive. This paradoxical enunciation of a definite article without a noun to be determined by it, is Heidegger's Being or Being as such, which lacks any meaning. It is a grammatical promise that is not kept. Due to syntactical habit, a definite article incites a certain expectation level of concretization, which is not met in

this case. Being as the "The …" is a rhetorical gesture of infinite postponement, which never even specifies what is being postponed. It is a grammatical hoax, the empty shell of the "gift" of language, the clearing-concealing advent (*lichtend-bergende Ankunft*) that never comes.

What is crucial to notice about the cultural *eidos* of the "The…" is that it has no name (be it Hölderlin or any other) but still has a dynamic symbolic structure, thus exercising symbolic power. A vacuous gesture is still a gesture; it has a trajectory if not a specific content. In fact, Heidegger's rhetorical celebration of such vacuous gesture may well be seen as one of his most idiosyncratic cooptions of critical Christology in the form examined in chapter one of this study. Upon scrutiny, the "The…" is no different from Schelling's tranquil continuum, it is absolute homogeneity. The main difference is that Schelling never encouraged anyone to revere this continuum as such or to feel dignified by it. In this regard, he would reject Heidegger's talk about "dwelling" in the "nearness" to Being. Since the tranquil continuum is pre-spatial (prior to regional "inflammation" through the sting of the first potency), it does not make sense to speak of nearness in relation to absolute continuity. Hence, Heidegger's notion of *Nähe* proves to be a rhetorically stylized *Daseinsadverb* void of any meaning. Similar to the symbolic structure of the "The…," any reference to *Nähe*, in Heidegger's sense, amounts to saying "Close to …" – the "accent" is the same in both cases, and so is the false promise.

As for the second modulation, "the *German* poet" designates a type of cultural *eidos* that has the structure of cultural essentialism or nationalism, positing a cultural essence. Such positing calls for a proper name to be written on the headstone not of an individual person but of a self-declared *Kulturnation*. To this end, Hölderlin is buried

and his "occupied grave" is turned into a linguistic-religious shrine, marking the destiny and destination of the kind of poetic pilgrimage that Heidegger encouraged in the *Spiegel*-interview.[36] Hölderlin can be interpreted only by the Germans, but never be translated into other languages.[37] The horizon of the nation's linguistic life-world is closed. Translation is a sacrilege.

Considering the third modulation, finally, the symobolic structure of the cultural *eidos* of "the German *poet*" engenders the form of concrete communication that Paul explicated in his *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Hölderlin has left his grave and is no longer in the sole possession of his Graeco-German "guardians" (*Wächter*).[38] Yet, he can be resurrected from his cultural tomb and German enclosure only by becoming a concrete expression, or rather many expressions, the meaning of each of which will transform any time it breaks into a new life-world. To come to life again and again, Hölderlin has to multiply, just as Schelling's unpreconceivable God has to be prismatized into different modes of spiritual activity for creation to be possible. The Poethead, if you will, has just as infinitely many faces as the Godhead in Schelling's *Philosophy of Revelation*, because revelation is inherently pluralistic, in the medium of poetry or any other "symbolic form" (Cassirer).

Approaching the *Letter on Humanism* from the perspective of eidetic modulation, we find all three "accents" represented in this text. The first accentuation is noticeable in all those passages where Heidegger emphasizes the importance and dignity of Being or Humanitas over the dignity of human beings:

> Das auch heute erst noch zu Sagende könnte vielleicht ein Anstoss werden, das Wesen des Menschen dahin zu geleiten, dass es denkend auf die es durchwaltende Dimension der Wahrheit des Seins achtet. Doch auch dies könnte jeweils nur dem Sein zur Würde und dem Da-sein zugunsten geschehen, das der Mensch eksistierend

> aussteht, nicht aber des Menschen wegen, damit sich durch sein Schaffen Zivilisation und Kultur geltend machen. (329).

Human existence is subordinated to the "dignity of Being" (*dem Sein zur Würde*). Against the background of our previous considerations about the pervasive religious import of Christology into the *Letter*, we can explicate the above statement as a prayer's guide. In keeping with my preceding comment on the first accent, out of three modular possibilities, we can translate Heidegger's idiom into Schelling's language and say that Heidegger's present remarks encourage the reader to pray to the tranquil continuum. He wants us to solemly say "The…" or "Close to…" and feel dignified. Schelling would be appalled and Milan Kundera would charge us of shedding "the second tear that makes kitsch kitsch,"[39] because praying to the continuum can only mean one of two things. Either we do not know what we are doing or we are praying to ourselves. More precisely, we are praying to our prayers, worshipping our own worship. Basking in the nearness of Being is idolatry, since our payers are pointing back at us.

This form of idolatrous prayer, or "thinking" *qua* meditation over Being, must not be taken in a directly personal sense. Accordingly, the implied notion of self-worship does not point to an individual human self, or aggregate of selves, given to philosophical narcissism or the megalomania of hubris. After all, Heidegger goes to great length to debunk any metaphysics that is based on, or promotes a false emphasis on the human (epistemic and/or psychological) self or human subjectivity writ large. To repeat, in the passage at hand, Heidegger places the dignity of Being above the dignity of human beings. Yet, he does so in such a way that, whenever human worship or "thinking"

attempts to relate to Being, these efforts are deflected, and the ensuing production of religious meanings infuses human dignity with an aspect of idolatry or *Götzendienst*.

Uttered into the non-spatiality (or pre-spatiality) of the tranquil continuum, our prayers are distorted because claiming "nearness" to the non-spatial is a meaningless – but not powerless – religious gesture. "We" neither identify (approximate) nor distance ourselves from the divinity of Being, and yet we claim some kind of meaningful relation to it, in the name of "dignity." Humanity is dignified not in itself but only in its "care" for the dignity of Being. We are guarding not an empty place but a no-place, a void of meaning. According to this dialectic between the spatial and the non-spatial, the discursive power of *thinking's "achievement of letting"* (313) begins to self-corrupt, thus instantiating the creatively destructive workings of the demonic as *formschaffende Formwidrigkeit* (Tillich). The discourse of dwelling and nearness, in Heidegger's present rendering, becomes a site for *demonic prayer*.

In this sense, we can fully embrace the Heideggerian de-emphasis of human subjectivity and still charge that Heidegger, at central junctures in the *Letter on Humanism*, engages a new religious idiom that speaks in an idolatrous voice. The discursivity of dwelling initiates a mode of religious meaning production that transposes the conceptual persona (Deleuze and Guattari) of the guardian into new subject positions for new achievements-of-letting. The new guardians do not just guard themselves, nor can they guard Being in any direct sense. Instead, in the paradoxical sphere of "nearness" toward what is beyond space, both closest and farthest, they guard *their guarding* of Being and become idolaters.

The second modular mode is implied by Heidegger's claim, quoted before, that "the 'German' is not spoken to the world […], but [that] it is spoken to the Germans […]" (338). Put in terms of our analysis of the symbolic role of Hölderlin in Heidegger's text, the accent has shifted to "the *German* poet." Thus oriented the poetic or linguistic *eidos* at hand, is prone to produce meanings of cultural nationalism.

The third modulation, in turn, echoes through those passage where Heidegger speaks in a Schellingean voice and describes the most human, that is, most "essential" mode of Dasein as "ekstatic in-standing" (*ekstatisches Innestehen*), which I interpret to be very similar to Schelling's notion of "the transcendent within the immanent," which Deleuze and Guattari presented as (Spinoza's) main contribution underway to the "modern moment" in philosophy. In the *Letter*, we find a rendition of the same contribution:

> [D]er Mensch west so, dass er das "Da," das heisst die Lichtung des Seins, ist. Dieses "Sein" des Da, und nur dieses, hat den Grundzug der Ek-sistenz, das heisst des ekstatischen Innestehens in der Wahrheit des Seins. Das ekstatische Wesen des Menschen beruht in der Ek-sistenz, die von der metaphysisch gedachten existentia verschieden bleibt. (325)

Significantly, the first sentence tends to identify the essence (*Wesen*) of human being with the clearing of Being. Within this formulation, Heidegger could not drive the same wedge between the dignity of humans and the superior dignity of Being, as he did in the earlier quotation, which I discussed in terms of idolatrous prayer and demonic spatiality: "Doch auch dies könnte jeweils nur dem Sein zur Würde und dem Da-sein zugunsten geschehen, das der Mensch existierend austeht, nicht aber des Menschen wegen, damit sich durch sein Schaffen Zivilisation und Kulture geltend machen" (329). Instead, if the

essence of man is inseparable from the clearing of Being, then the "advent" (*Ankunft*) of Being can take place only on a plane of immanence.

To meet with the Poethead of Hölderlin, therefore, we have to encounter a concrete face that talks-to us in a mutual encounter of in-forming. Pretending to "dwell" in the "nearness" of Being is the inconsistent attempt to approximate absolute exteriority – a pretense of communication, a self-addressed prayer, a demonic instance of idolatry.

Some Conclusions about A Temporary Remedy to the Demonic: "Vital Anecdotes"

Taking stock of the dialectic between *Ansprechen* und *Anspruch*, as well as of the dynamic, trinitarian structure of all cultural *eide*, the text of the *Humanismusbrief* seems to leave us with an uneasy mixture of communicative modes. These, then, are the keys to how Heidegger ties a philology to a Christology for his particular aims, and in order to manufacture his distinctive corrective for phenomology. If any *eidos* of the form "the German poet" remains subject to three irreducible possibilities of shifting accentuation, we appear to be confined to a position of phenomenological observation. In this position we can but watch how prayers to the tranquil continuum transform into pleas for cultural nationalism which, at times, turn into events of concrete communication.

What is worse, these three vectors of cultural orientation and meaning formation do not seem to balance each other on their own. On the contrary, Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric proves very efficient in promoting the second accent of cultural nationalism through its technique of "swirling" conceptual pairs like active-passive, success-failure, etc. Via a detour, this technique even allowed him to gloss over a seemingly more robust moral tension, as he managed to project the human-inhuman

relation from a plane of ethical discourse onto a more "neutral" plane of communicative discourse.

Arguably, Heidegger did not succeed at palming off the unethical as ethical through the direct inversion of purportedly fixed moral standards. Instead, the rhetorical power of his *Letter* showed itself in the capacity to *suspend the ethical* (to borrow Kierkegaard's phrase). Whenever, the first modulation of cultural accent eclipses the other two, the readers are encouraged to idolatry by praying to the tranquil continuum and, eventually, to themselves. Similarly, as soon as the second modulation overpowers the other two, a grave is filled with transcendental substance, in a promotion of cultural essentialism and religious enshrinement (Bailie). Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric does not directly dictate to do "evil." Instead it is prone to lure its audience in a demonic realm of meaning formation, where symbolic violence is more likely to turn physical and be unleashed with a vengeance. For those who believe that Hölderlin can and ought to be translated into other languages, the question becomes whether there is any, however temporary, antidote against demonic rhetoric in Heidegger's mold. Is there a symbolic means of resistance that would keep us, at least partially, from gravitating toward "the occupied tomb"?

Going against the grain of Heidegger scholarship, which tends to either completely demonize or exonerate Heidegger, I suggest that his text provides a possible remedy to its own tendencies of symbolic corruption. A temporary safeguard against the kind of idolatry stimulated by Heidegger's demonic rhetoric, then, is contained in the *anecdote* of Heraclitus, which is imparted toward the end of the *Humanismusbrief*. The anecdotal structure of this segment stands out, because it proves largely immune to

Heidegger's rhetorical ruses of distortion. This is remarkable, in that Heidegger is surely not delivering this piece in a neutral manner. On the contrary, he immediately engages in spurious etymology, when he prefaces the anecdote with the Heraclitus*Fragment 119*, which consists of only three words: ηϑος ανϑρωπω δαιμων.

The standard translation, Heidegger assures us, would renders this short sentence "the character peculiar to humans is their own demon" (*Seine Eigenart ist dem Menschen sein Dämon*). He then interpolates a short story (*Geschichte*)[40] about Heraclitus, as related by Aristotle, in *De partibus animalium*, A 5, 645a 17:

> The story is told of something Heraclitus said to some strangers who wanted to come visit him. Having arrived, they saw him warming himself at a stove. Surprised, they stood there in consternation – above all because he encouraged them, the astounded ones, and called for them to come in, with the words, "For here too the gods are present."[41]

Heidegger zeros in on the last sentence, in Greek: ειναι γαρ και ενταυϑα ϑεους, which he brings to bear on the original fragment, now translated as: "The (un-eerie) abode is for humans the openness for the nearing essence of god (of the eerie)."[42]

As his etymological key moves, Heidegger, first, translates ηϑος as "abode" rather than "character," thereby substituting a spatial term for a tendentially psychological or attitudinal term; and, second, he renders the demonic connotations of δαιμων parenthetical, thereby effectively approximating, if not conflating, δαιμων and ϑεος, which changes the religious overtones and intensity of the more common translation of *Fragment 119*.

However, in drawing attention to the Heraclitus anecdote in conjunction with the fragment, I am not primarily interested in Heidegger's etymological extravagance. As the preceding remarks suggest, Heidegger's (re)translation of the fragment in light of the

last sentence of the anecdote is highly unorthodox, at best, and willfully distorting, at worst. What I am interested in is the difference in *semiotic resilience*, displayed by the anecdote in comparison to the three-word fragment. Despite Heidegger's etymological onslaught, which he levels against both textual items, the anecdote of "Heraclitus by the stove" and his discombobulated visitors is less vulnerable to Heidegger's conceptual slides.

More precisely, it is easier for him to select and highlight a concept like *ethos* and reinterpret it in isolation, in spurious ways. Yet he cannot dissociate, dissect, and reshape an anecdote in the same way. The reason for this can be seen in the fact that anecdotes do not easily fit conceptual grids or hierarchies, nor do they have a clear plot structure like narratives, at least if we tie the latter to a requirement of having a more or less distinct beginning and end. Anecdotes resemble open scenes more than they do integrated stories. Certainly, the general notion of story does not necessarily imply any such structural closure. Within the variegated genre of short stories, for example, open-ended plots may be a fairly frequent phenomenon. For my purposes, then, I am using the expressions "narrative" and "story" in an overtly reductive way, to bring out a general contrast between open and closed structures of meaning formation, in the context of philosophical rhetorics as powerful as Heidegger's.

Particularly, the personae that occur within an anecdotal open-ended structure are interwoven with the structural texture of the anecdote so that they cannot be directly emulated. In this sense, "Heraclitus by the stove" is not a person but a concrete expression in the sense discussed in the second section of this study, namely, with respect

to the material mediation of meaning. "Heraclitus by the stove" is a possible world and does not stand for a mental state, a readily identifiable character trait, or a moral quality.

To be sure, in the *context* of the *Letter on Humanism*, and *after* Heidegger spent about forty pages modulating a rhetoric of cultural nationalism, the Heraclitus anecdote could easily be read as a mini-parody of the postwar situation of occupied Germany, in which the freezing Heraclitus represents the torn *Kulturnation* of German thinkers, while the nosy visitors stand for the ally powers and their ignorant "dictatorship of the public" (*Diktatur der Öffentlichkeit*) (317).

However, even if such a reading was intended by Heidegger, we see that he had to do a lot more preparatory work to achieve this effect and the final result is still less baffling than his dizzying generation of conceptual swirls. "Heraclitus by the stove" persists as a concrete site of meaning formation that remains open for the readers to construct their own concepts. In this manner, the scene at the stove could be interpreted variously as an event of hospitality, philosophical mockery, or perhaps a certain form of cheerful paganism. Above all, one cannot directly identify with the philosopher or his visitors, since neither party has a clear profile in isolation from the material setting that binds them.

Because of these features of semiotic resilience and productivity, I view Heidegger's Heraclitus anecdote as an example of a *vital anecdote* of the kind described by Deleuze and Guattari, in *What is Philosophy?*:

> And there are *existential features*: Nietzsche said that philosophy invents modes of existence or possibilities of life. That is why a few vital anecdotes are sufficient to produce a portrait of philosophy, like the one Diogenes Laertius knew how to produce by writing the philosophers' bedside book or golden legend – Empedocles and his volcano, Diogenes and his barrel. It will be argued that most philosophers' lives are very bourgeois: but is not Kant's stocking-suspender a

> vital anecdote appropriate to the system of Reason? [note 8][43] […] These anecdotes do not refer simply to social or even psychological types of philosopher (Empedocles the prince, Diogenes the slave) but show rather the conceptual personae who inhabit them. Possibilities of life or modes of existence can be invented only on a plance of immanence that develops the power of conceptual personae. (72-73)

The examples listed by the authors, in this passage, are quite comparable to Heidegger's depiction of "Heraclitus by the stove." None of these anecdotes has a clear moral story to tell, and neither delivers an explicit defense of the human against the inhuman. Instead, they all are concrete expressions of a "face" that looms up in our life-world, a dynamic open structure from which we can construct new concepts and thereby go against the propensity toward any demonic fixture of meaning.

Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism* thus proves a great example of both the demonic and the remedial tendencies that can be gleaned from our semiotic transactions, in which we keep encountering concrete expressions of other possible life-worlds. This is a microcosm of the epistemological moves he employs throughout his later writings to characterize *Being*. The special gain of reading the *Humanismusbrief* against the background of our previous findings in section one and section two, in consequence, is that it allows us to identify the ethical stakes that underlie Heidegger's philosophical rhetoric, when he sets out to turn humanity against humanity. The challenge of this largely Young Hegelian project, in the footsteps of Schelling, consists in finding a new paradigm of language as concrete communication, which surpasses the traditional distinctions between private and public modes of human speech in order to open up new sources for religious meaning production.

The methodological blueprint for this paradigm, we found, was provided by Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, which Heidegger engages at crucial

junctures in his habilitation (1916) and especially in the *Prolegomena* lecture course (1925), one year before the publication of his magnum opus. In so doing, Heidegger's theoretical viewpoint remains evasive. Not only does he blatantly gloss over his debt to the Neogrammarian revolution in comparative linguistics and historical psychology. He also keeps wavering between an emphasis on those theoretical elements that he imports from Paul, as opposed to those elements that he takes over from one of Paul's most acclaimed critics in the *Sprachwissenschafts*-controversy of the day, Karl Vossler.

By tracking these sources in Heidegger's early thought and bringing them to bear on Heidegger's politically most aggressive text, the *Letter on Humanism*, we were able to identify a persistent theme complex that remains at the center of his work, namely the problem of political idolatry and ineradicable symbolic violence. From this perspective our findings suggest a new reading of *Being and Time*, focused on the "demonic" tendencies (Tillich) in concrete communication and the search for a possible, if only temporary remedy.

More specifically, by using our findings about the material mediation of meaning in the course of concrete communication, we can apply our notion of "vital anecdote" (exemplified by "Heraclitus at the stove") back to the troubled relation between *Zeug* (equipment or "equipmedley")[44] and *Werkzeug* (tools), in Heidegger's breakthrough work. Most commentators tend to reduce the former to the latter and thus confine their analysis to *Werkzeug* primarily.[45] In this regard, Heidegger's famous image of a *breaking hammer* has been all too "instrumental." Going against the grain of emphasizing the hammer's tool-character as indicative of our practical, pre-conceptual

mode of being-in-the-world in the sense of dealing-with-the-world, I suggest interpreting the scenario of a breaking hammer as Heidegger's truncated version of a "vital anecdote."

From this perspective, the breaking hammer stands for an open-ended structure, not just a practical rupture. What is never satisfactorily explained in Heidegger scholarship is how the incident of a breaking hammer is different from any other *accident* that catches someone off guard. The disappointing outcome of most analyses in this regard is something to the effect that tangible surprise, in the form of practical failure, breaks the rhythm of our daily copings and jostles us into considering alternative possibilities.[46] The breaking hammer thus becomes some kind of willy-nilly inspiration to do things differently. What remains unclear is why this is philosophically important. What would be the philosophical cost if hammers did not break from time to time?

In response to this question, I propose to consider Heidegger's hammer example as part of a material semiotics of *Zeug* rather than *Werkzeug*,[47] in which the symbolic structure of *Zeug* becomes *morally* important and not merely epistemologically surprising, with respect to its resources for negotiating the demonic tendencies of symbolic violence and political idolatry. In this regard, we may catch a first glimpse at the structural analogy between the vital anecdote of "Heraclitus at the stove," in the *Humanismusbrief*, as well as Heidegger's exposition of *Zeug*, in *Being and Time*, if we compare the latter to its "Urfassung" in the *Prolegomena*.

Significantly, in this earlier version, Heidegger's illustrations are more clearly stated and more anecdotal, in my technical sense of the term, e.g., when he describes how environment-things (*Umweltdinge*) like a hammer or a stone hatchet (*ein Hammer oder ein Steinbeil*) can become sign-things (*Zeichendinge*). Under the rubric of "historical

discovery" (*historisches Entdecken*) and "historical source" (*historische Quelle*), Heidegger characterizes the encounter of a peasant with a stone hatchet in much more anecdotal detail than he will talk about the breaking hammer in *Being and Time*.[48] What is more, the possible transition from environmental things to sign-things is here presented as a subject matter for "a heremeneutics of the historical disciplines" (290), yet another anonymous gesture at the work of Droysen, who was already passed over in the opening pages of the *Prolegomena*, where Heidegger discarded the entire nineteenth century as historico-methodologically insensitive.[49]

This connection between the hammer as a sign-thing and as an object of hermeneutic inquiry, in the context of the *historical science debate*, will not be stated in *Being and Time*, where most discursive or discipline-related commentary is bleached out. The main difference in terms of symbolic structure between these two featurings of the hammer, then, can be put as follows. In the historico-hermeneutic context, still acknowledged in *Prolegomena*, the hammer (or stone hatchet) is a concrete expression that may or may not "intrude" the world of the peasant. In this case the semiotic directionality is one of *entering*, or breaking in, as we examined in section two in the context of meaning transfer between different possible worlds.

By contrast, in the *Werkzeug* context, predominant in *Being and Time*, the semiotic directionality is one of *exiting*, insofar as the hammer, literally, "breaks out" of the practical fabric in which it was comfortably submerged before. To be sure, something unexpected stands out, in both cases. But the *Werkzeug* scenario puts an one-sided emphasis on the life-world of the hammer-handling subject. A rupture occurs in one's life-world but there is no indication of reciprocal, concrete communication. In the

Prolegomena version, on the other hand, Heidegger speaks explicitly of *Mitteilung* (290), in a way that is generally open to an interpretation according to our earlier analysis of in-forming.

All of these interfaces of *Zeug* (especially in the "breaking hammer" example) with the historical science debate in the second half of the nineteenth century, with the Neogrammarian project of language as concrete communication, and with "vital anecdotes" as a Christological antidote against the demonics of political idolatry are foregone, if we follow the Dilthey-bypass, along with the neo-Kantian bypass that contemporary Heidegger scholars like Kisiel have laid out, in their ontoeroteric fantasy about a hyper-radical hermeneutics that Heidegger single-handedly bestowed on us. In opposition to this trend, we ought to put our faith in the theoretical resources of a material semiotics that explores Heidegger's philosophical contributions on a plane of post-Schellingean thought, where his texts can emerge as both a warning and an inspiration in the quest for new religious meaning and an open commitment to "vital anecdotes."

---

[1] For an instructive overview, see: Peter J. Brenner, "Nachkriegsliteratur," in: *Deutsche Literatur zwischen 1945 und 1995: Eine Sozialgeschichte* (Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Paul Haupt), pp. 33-57.

[2] Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage* (Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1946).

[3] Max Picard, *Hitler in uns selbst* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch, 1946).

[4] Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946).

[5] This discussion regained additional momentum through the "swastika incidents" (*Hakenkreuzschmierereien*) of 1959; see: Clemens Albrecht, "Die Massenmedien und die Frankfurter Schule," in: Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, Friedrich H. Tennbruck (1999), p. 235

[6] For a synopis of this project and its political stakes, see Cassirer's earlier essay in this volume (Part I, chpt. IV.), "The Funktion of Myth in Man's Social Life":

> Man is no longer satisfied with doing certain things – he raises the question of what these things "mean," […].
>
> It is a well-known fact that every expression of an emotion has a soothing effect. A blow with the fist may assuage our wrath; an outburst of tears may relieve us from grief and sorrow. […] In a certain sense this "law of discharge" also holds for all *symbolic* expressions. But here we

meet with an entirely new phenomenon. In our physical reactions a sudden explosion is followed by a state of rest. And once disappeared the emotion has come to its end without leaving any permanent trace. But if we express our emotions by *symbolic* acts the case is quite different. Such acts have, as it were, a double power: the power to bind and unbind. Even here the emotions are turned outward; but instead of being dispersed, they are, on the contrary, concentrated. […] But symbolic expression does not mean extenuation; it means intensification. What we find here is no mere exteriorization but condensation. In language, myth, art, religion our emotions are not simply turned into mere acts; they are turned into "works." These works do not fade away. They are persistent and durable. […]

In mythical thought and imagination we do not meet with *individual* confessions. Myth is an objectification of man's social experience, not of his individual experience.

Myth, and religion in general, have often been declared to be a mere product of fear. But what is most essential in man's religious life is not the *fact* of fear, but the *metamorphosis* of fear. Fear is a universal biological instinct. It can never be completely overcome or suppressed, but it can change its form. Myth is filled with the most violent emotions and the most frightful visions. But in myth man begins to learn a new and strange art: the art of expressing, and that means organizing, this most deeply rooted instincts, his hopes and fears. (46-48)

In Part III, chpt. XVIII., "The Technique of the Modern Political Myths," Cassirer comments specifically on the dangers of political idolatry, which connects his thought to that of Tillich and Picard:

In the first book of his *Novum Organon* Bacon tried to give a systematic survey of these illusions. He described the different kinds of idols, the *idola tribus*, the *idola specus*, *idola fori*, and the *idola theatri*, and he tried to show how to overcome them in order to clear the way that will lead to a true empirical science.

In politics we have not yet found this way. Of all human idols the political idols, the idola fori, are the most dangerous and induring. Since the times of Plato all great thinkers have made the greatest efforts to find a rational theory of politics. The nineteenth century was convinced that it had at least found the right path. In 1830 Auguste Comte published the first volume of his *Cours de philosophie positive*. He began with analyzing the structure of natural science; […] His real aim and highest ambition was to become the founder of a new social science and to introduce into this science the same exact way of reasoning, the same inductive and deductive method as we find in physics or chemistry.

The sudden rise of the political myths in the twentieth century has shown us that these hopes of Comte and of his pupils and adherents were premature. Politics is still far from being a positive science, let alone an exact science. […] In politics we have not yet found firm and reliable ground. Here there seems to be no clearly established cosmic order; we are always threatened with a sudden relapse into the old chaos. (294-295)

[7] "Nichts gibt es, was mehr Schrecken erregen kann, als ein Nazi, der ruhig dasitzt und nichts tut. […] Man erschrickt über den Anblick, über das, was man am ruhenden Nazi sieht: es ist der zementierte Dynamismus, […]

Das gibt es eigentlich nicht: zementierten Dynamismus, und doch ist der ruhende Nazi dies: zementierter Dynamismus. […]

Der unbewegliche Nazi wirkt schreckenerregend durch sein blosses Dasein, wie ein Götze, - er wirkt verzaubernd und verwirrend. Und darum fielen dem Nazismus auch Opfer zu, nicht nur wenn er aktiv war, nicht nur wenn er forderte, sondern auch dann, wenn er stumm da sass. Das hielt man nicht aus, man ergab sich ihm, es gab ja nur ihn, den Götzen.

Es ist aber nicht der Götze, der die Anbetung ewartet, es ist der Götze, der die Anbetenden bereits verschlungen hat und nun sich selber anbetet: Götze und Götzenanbeter zugleich." (27-28)

[8] Paul Tillich, "Das Dämonische: Ein Beitrag zur Sinndeutung der Geschichte," in: Paul Tillich (GW VI, 1963), pp. 42-71.

[9] See, e.g., Picard's (1946) following remarks, in the context of "the bare aspect of the Nazi phenomenon" (*Der blosse Aspekt des Naziphänomens*): "So sieht das Nazitum aus, so ist es, wenn man es nur anschaut, wenn man vergisst, was darüber gesagt und geschrieben worden ist: aus dem Volumen eines ungeheuren

Nichts wird etwas herausgebrüllt, Schreie werden ausgestossen, man weiss nicht, ob von den Befehlenden oder von den Befohlenen, die wegen der Bedrückung schreien; […]

So schreit sich nur das Nichts aus, das selbst weiss, das es eigentlich nicht da ist, und das durch Geschrei sich selbst und anderen seine Existenz zeigen will.

Das ist der phänomenologische Aspekt des Nazismus. So sieht weder ein politisches, noch ein soziologisches oder ein psychologisches Phänomen aus. Diesen Aspekt hat nur ein dämonisches Phänomen" (23-24).

[10] For the instructive expression of Cassirer's (1946) view of Heidegger's philosophical fatalism, see: "The new men were convinced that they fulfilled Spengler's prophecy. They interpreted him in their own sense. If our culture – science, philosophy, poetry, and art – is dead, let us make a fresh start. Let us try our vast possibilities, let us create a new world and become the rulers of this world.

The same trend of thought appears in the work of a modern German philosopher who, at first sight, seems to have very little in common with Spengler and who developed his theories quite independently of him. In 1927 Martin Heidegger published the first volume of his book *Sein und Zeit*. […] He [Heidegger] does not admit that there is something like "eternal" truth, a Platonic "realm of ideas," or a strict logical method of philosophic thought. All this is declared to be elusive. In vain we try to build up a logical philosophy; we can only give an *Existenzialphilosophie*. Such an existential philosophy does not claim to give us an objective and universally valid truth. […] In order to express his thought Heidegger had to coin a new term. He spoke of the *Geworfenheit* of man (the being-thrown). […] To be thrown into the stream of time is a fundamental and inalterable feature of our human situation. We cannot emerge from this stream and we cannot change its course. We have to accept the historical conditions of our existence. We can try to understand and to interpret them; but we cannot change them.

I do not mean to say that these philosophical doctrines had a direct bearing on the development of the political ideas in Germany. Most of these ideas arose from quite different sources. They had a very "realistic" not a "speculative" purport. But the new philosophy did enfeeble and slowly undermine the forces that could have resisted the modern political myths. A philosophy of history that consists in somber predictions of the decline and the inevitable destruction of our civilization and a theory that sees in the Geworfenheit [sic.] of man one of his principal characters have given up all hopes of an active share in the construction and reconstruction of man's cultural life. Such philosophy renounces its own fundamental and ethical ideals. It can be used, then, as a pliable instrument in the hands of the political leaders.

The return to fatalism in our modern world […] (292-293).

[11] Contrasting Heidegger und Jaspers with Kierkegaard, Picard (1946) writes: Weil der Mensch von keiner Kontinuität gehalten wird, nur deshalb kann es ihm vorkommen, dass er ein ins Nichts Geworfener sei, ein vom Nichts ins Nichts Geworfener. Die Philosophie, die den Menschen so sieht, gehört ganz und gar zu dem zusammenhanglosen Menschen von heute. Die philosophische Entsprechung einer solchen Zusammenhanglosigkeit also kann nichts anderes sein als das "Nichts" (Heidegger) oder das "Scheitern" (Jaspers).

[…] Und in diesem Nichts weist ihn die Existenzialphilosophie darauf hin, dass er jetzt "Angst" und "Sorge" habe. […]

Das Nichts Hitlers und das Nichts der Heideggerschen Existenzialphilosophie entsprechen einander ganz und gar. Es ist nicht weit vom Nichts Heideggers zum Nichts Hitlers.

Die Angst und Sorge hat Heidegger von Kierkegaard hergeholt. Bei Kierkegaard aber ist die Angst und Sorge die *Folge* davon, dass die Kontinuität mit Gott vom Menschen aufgehoben ist. Angst und Sorge sind hier das Letzte, das Ende, Zeichen des Todes, es sind dunkle Blumen auf einem Grabe, in dem der Zusammenhang des Menschen mit Gott begraben liegt.

Was bei Kierkegaard Zeichen des Endes der menschlichen Existenz ist, Angst und Sorge, das wird in der Existenzphilosophie der Anfang der menschlichen Existenz und wird ein Beweis für sie. Die Existenzphilosophie gibt für Leben aus, was bei Kierkegaard Tod bedeutete" (170-173).

[12] See: Picard (1946), "*Das Gesicht Hitlers*," pp. 68-75.

[13] For these four waves, which are not identified by number, see: Hugo Ott, *Martin Heidegger: Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1988), pp. 7-8.

[14] Martin Heidegger, "Only a God Can Save Us," in: *The Heidegger Controversy: A Crtical Reader*, ed. R. Wolin (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), pp. 91-116; for the quotation of Heidegger's (in)famous remark, see: pp. 103-104.

[15] As he had so many of the underpinnings of his work, Heidegger had inherited the humanism debate from the pre-WWII writings of Karl Jaspers and Ernst Cassirer. This debate concerned the options for negotiating the tension between human individuals and the social mechanisms of crisis-ridden modern society. One of the most instructive accounts of this cultural context is given by Pierre Bourdieu, *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*, trans. P. Collier (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1991).

Here it is crucial to notice that this debate was inherently linked to the upheavals in the field of historical science, which I addressed in section two of this study, with respect to the Neogrammarians and their neo-Idealist detractors. In this sense, the humanism debate was always already a science debate. Zeroing in on the plane of the second debate, it becomes clear that the controversies over scientific methodology during the second half of the nineteenth century, which threatened to disintegrate the disciplinary landscape of the academic organization of culture (including, above all, the German university system), are part and parcel of the "modern crisis" in human self-understanding, which Heidegger encounters at the beginning of his philosophical career. The classical reference in this regard is Fritz Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarines: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge, Mass.:Harvard University Press, 1969). Cf. also Herbert Schnädelbach, *Philosophy in Germany 1831-1933*, trans. E. Matthews (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

The third plane of discourse laid out by the *Humanismusbrief*, the debate about the role of literature in the reclaiming of cultural territory after the Nazi abuse, gained momentum after Alfred Andersch had delivered his famous essay *Deutsche Literatur in der Entscheidung* (1947) (German literature at the point of decision). This essay was intended as a statement by a publicist (not a literary scholar or critic, as Andersch himself hastens to point out) on the challenges and possible pitfalls of Germany's cultural reconstruction during the immediate postwar years. After deserting the German forces in Italy in 1944, Anders had been a prisoner of war and went through a series of US internation camps, most notably Fort Getty, where he underwent "re-education in a test-tube" (*Umerziehung in der Retorte*), before he was sent back to Europe and released in Darmstadt near the end of 1945. The particular importance of Andersch's aforementioned public(ist) intervention pertains to his affiliation with the so-called Group 47. Comprising a motley crew of literary and culture critics, whose visibility, under the auspices of Hans Werner Richter, dominated the intellectual postwar scene throughout the 1950s.

Finally, associated with the writings of Siegfried Kracauer, Max Kommerell, Walter Benjamin, and Bertold Brecht, the debate about critical aesthetics is geared toward questions concerning new paradigms of artistic expressions. The latter include, e.g., film, so-called epic theater, and "puppet shows for adults" (*Kasperle-Spiele für grosse Leute*)." (Note that the first edition of Max Kommerell's book by the same title appeared posthumously in 1948, thus roughly coinciding with the publication of Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*. The focus of inquiry in this debate is the political import of such aesthetic paradigms, each of which hoped in its own way to provide novel patterns of orientation and political perception or peceptivity for their respective audience.

[16] In the context of "thinking," then, these different courses of (mental) action are spelled out as follows: "Alles liegt einzig daran, dass die Wahrheit des Seins zur Sprache komme und dass das Denken in diese Sprache gelange. Vielleicht verlangt dann die Sprache weit weniger das überstürzte Aussprechen als vielmehr das rechte Schweigen. Doch wer von uns Heutigen möchte sich einbilden, seine Versuche zu denken seien auf dem Pfad des Schweigens heimisch. […]

Auf der vorletzten Seite von "S.u.Z." (S. 437) stehen die Sätze: 'der *Streit* bezüglich der Interpretationen des Seins (das heisst also nicht des Seienden, auch nicht des Seins des Menschen) kann nicht geschlichtet werden, *weil er noch nicht einmal entfacht ist*. Und am Ende lässt er sich nicht 'vom Zaun brechen,' sondern das Entfachen des Streites bedarf schon einer Zurüstung. Hierzu allein ist die vorliegende Untersuchung unterwegs.' Diese Sätze gelten heute noch nach zwei Jahrzehnten. […]

Soll man diesen 'Humanismus,' der gegen allen bisherigen Humanismus spricht, aber gleichwohl sich ganz und gar nicht zum Fürsprecher des Inhumanen macht, noch "Humanismus" nennen? Und das nur,

um vielleicht durch die Teilnahme am Gebrauch des Titels in den herrschenden Strömungen, die im metaphysischen Subjektivismus ersticken und in der Seinsvergessenheit versunken sind, mitzuschwimmen? Oder soll das Denken versuchen, durch einen offenen Widerstand gegen den "Humanismus" einen Anstoss zu wagen, der veranlassen könnte, erst einmal über die Humanitas des homo humanus und ihre Begründung stutzig zu werden?" (344-346).

[17] Tillich (GW VI).

[18] Ibid.: "Die Dialektik des Dämonischen erklärt den schwankenden Sprachgebrauch des Wortes "dämonisch." Immer bleibt die Grundbedeutung erhalten, wenn das Wort noch nicht zum entleerten Schlagwort geworden ist: die Einheit von formschöpferischer und formzerbrechender Kraft. […] Die Tiefe des Dämonischen ist das Dialektische in ihm" (45-46).

[19] "Das Sein selber ist das Verhältnis [note a], insofern Es die Ek-sistenz in ihrem existenzialen, das heisst ekstatischen Wesen an sich hält und zu sich versammelt als die Ortschaft der Wahrheit des Seins inmitten des Seienden. […] Er [der Mensch] meint sogar, dieses sei das Nächste. Doch näher als das Nächste, das Seiende, und zugleich für das gewöhnliche Denken ferner als sein Fernstes ist die Nähe selbst: die Wahrheit des Seins" (332).

[20] The translation by Frank A. Capuzzi and J. Glenn Gray is inaccurate and does not capture the audacity of Heidegger's diction: "*genesen*" means to recover or to recuperate. Hence, even as he rejects this suggestion, Heidegger points to the general possibility that the world could reach a better or "healthier" state through the [effects of] German essence. Also note, that the translators do not indicate Heidegger's cross-reference to his essay "Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit" (1947 [1931/32, 1940]), in: Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, ed. D. F. Krell (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993), pp. 217-265.

[21] Vossler (1904) is less "world-historical" in his analyses than Heidegger, but a sentiment of cultural nationalism may be detected in the following passages, among others: "Gustav Gröber hat in einer sehr beachtenswerten Studie [note 1] darauf hingewiesen, dass alle romanischen Sprachen mehr oder weniger von der "Tendenz" beseelt sind, artikulatorische Hindernisse in den Worten und *zwischen* den Worten hinwegzuräumen, d.h. möglichste Offensilbigkeit herzustellen. Es ist dies im grossen ganzen eine Folge der den romanischen Sprachen eigenen musikalisch-wiegenden Accentuierung, die uns Germanen so fremdartig und reizvoll anmutet. Dem Deutschen kommt alles auf Heraushebung der Wortstämme als der Träger des Gedankens an; seine Gliederung der Rede entwickelt sich mehr nach geistigen als nach akustischen Rücksichten. Daher wir denn vor konsonantischen Komplikationen in keiner Weise zurückschrecken.

[…] Das Deutsche ist sozusagen innerlicher und geistiger, und deshalb in seinen äusseren Formen komplizierter, verschrumpfter und stacheliger. Die romanischen Sprachen sind im ganzen sinnlicher und in den äusseren Formen besser durchgearbeitet und harmonisiert. Hier scheint es, als sei der Geist zur Form verdichtet und versinnlicht, dort als habe die Form sich zum Geiste verflüchtigt. Dort die grossen Philosophen und Ethiker, hier die grossen Künstler.

[…] Sollten diese beiden Erscheinungen nicht in Zusammenhang stehen? Sollte nicht so etwas wie ein germanischer und nordischer Hauch in die lateinische Seele des heutigen Franzosen sich eingeschmeichelt haben? (73-74).

[22] Heidegger (GA 20), p. 343.

[23] For another prominent passage where Heidegger engages the "guardian" motif, see also: p. 345.

[24] For a comprehensive account of that period, see, e.g.: Hermann Glaser, *The Rubble Years: The Cultural Roots of Postwar Germany, 1945-1948* (New York: Paragon House, 1986).

[25] Cf. also: "Für den Menschen aber bleibt die Frage, ob er in das Schickliche seines Wesens findet, das diesem Geschick entspricht; denn diesem gemäss hat er als der Ek-sistierende die Wahrheit des Seins zu hüten. Der Mensch ist der Hirt des Seins" (331).

[26] In his essay "Wohnungen," Karl Christian Führer points to significant discrepancies between cities and rural areas, with respect to the actual numbers of destroyed houses and apartments (Wohnungen). In: *Deutschland unter alliierter Besatzung 1945-1949/55: Ein Handbuch*, ed. W. Benz (Berlin: Akademie, 1999), pp. 206-209.

[27] Cf. also Heidegger's similar remarks on "descent" (*Abstieg*) and "ascent" (*Aufstieg*): "Der Abstieg ist, zumal dort, wo der Mensch sich in die Subjektivität verstiegen hat, schwieriger und gefährlicher als der Aufstieg. Der Abstieg führt in die Armut der Ek-sistenz des homo humanus" (352).

[28] Addressing Jean Beaufret, as the recipient of the *Letter*, Heidegger implies that we may want to drop the term "humanism" from our philosophical vocabulary altogether, since it has lost its meaning: "Sie fragen: *Comment redonner un sens au mot 'Humanisme'?* 'Auf welche Weise lässt sich dem Wort Humanismus ein Sinn zurückgeben?' Ihre Frage setzt nicht nur vorraus, dass Sie das Wort 'Humanismus' festhalten wollen, sondern sie enthält auch das Zugeständnis, dass dieses Wort seinen Sinn verloren hat" (344-345).

[29] See, e.g., the concluding analysis in: Tom Rockmore, *Heidegger and French Philosophy: Humanism, Antihumanism, and Being* (New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 181-189, eps. pp. 184-187.

[30] Surpassing Vossler's (1904) neo-Idealist tendencies toward cultural nationalism as linguisic nationalism, one of Heidegger's starkest and frequently quoted statements on the issue is put forth in the Spiegel-interview, "Only a God Can Save Us":

> H[eidegger]: […] Thinking iself can be transformed only by a thinking which has the same origin and calling.
> S[piegel]: […]
> H: […]
> S: You assign in particular a special task to the Germans?
> H: Yes, in the sense of the dialogue with Hölderlin.
> S: Do you believe that the Germans have a special qualification for this reversal?
> H: I have in mind especially the inner relationship of the German language with the language of the Greeks and with their thought. This has been confirmed for me today again by the French. When they begin to think, they speak German, being sure that they could not make it with their own language.
> S: Are you trying to tell us that this is why you had such a strong influence on the Romance countries, in particular the French?
> H: Because they see that they can no longer get by in the contemporary world with all their great rationality when it comes right down to understanding the world in the origin of its being. One can translate thinking no more satisfactorily than one can translate poetry. At best one can circumscribe it. As soon as one makes a literal translation everything is changed.
> S: A discomforting thought.
> H: We would do well to take this discomfort seriously and on a large scale, and to finally consider the grave consequences of the translation which Greek thought experienced when it was translated into Roman Latin. Indeed this today, even this, blocks the way to an adequate reflection on the fundamental words of Greek thought. (Cited in Wolin [1993], p. 113.)

[31] "Das Einzige, was das Denken, das sich in "S.u.Z." zum erstenmal auszusprechen versucht, erlangen möchte, ist etwas Einfaches. Als dieses bleibt das Sein geheimnisvoll, die schlichte Nähe eines unaufdringlichen Waltens. Diese Nähe west als die Sprache selbst" (333).

[32] "Das εστι γαρ ειναι des Parmenides ist heute noch ungedacht. Daran lässt sich ermessen, wie es mit dem Fortschritt der Philosophie steht. Sie schreitet, wenn sie ihr Wesen achtet, überhaupt nicht fort. Sie tritt auf der Stelle, um stets dasselbe zu denken. Das Fortschreiten, nämlich fort von dieser Stelle, ist ein Irrtum, der dem Denken folgt als der Schatten, den es selbst wirft" (335).

[33] Wolin (1993), p. 113.

[34] Hans Ebeling detects such complete lack of any community-grounding reference point in Being and Time: "Indessen zeigt sich, dass die sog. Formalität der Existenzanalytik neue – und angemasste – nicht bloss formale Präskripte einschliesst, und deren philosophisch wie politisch folgenreichstes ist das fürchterliche Offenlassen aller Optionen, also auch einer solchen die Gemeinschaft nur usurpiert, re vera aber bei der Einzigkeit des zu allem Entschlossenen bleibt und so die Negation der Sozietät nicht erneut aufhebt" (50). In: Hans Ebeling, *Martin Heidegger: Philosophie und Ideologie* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1991). Considering Heidegger's *Letter on Humanism*, we should at least add that whenever Heidegger's adopts the voice of cultural nationalism, he posits a cultural essence as the supposed anchor of community, which is mostly specified as a linguistic one, the national treasure of the German language.

[35] In: Gil Bailie, *Violence Unveiled: Humanity at the Crossroads* (New York: Crossroad, 1995).

[36] S: You assign in particular a special task to the Germans?
H: Yes, in the sense of the dialogue with Hölderlin. (Cited in Wolin [1993], p. 113)

[37] H: […] One can translate thinking no more satisfactorily than one can translate poetry. At best one can circumscribe it. As soon as one makes a literal translation everything is changed. (Ibid.)

[38] Cf. Heidegger's remark on the "inner relationship of the German language with the language of the Greeks and with their thought." (Ibid.)

[39] Milan Kundera, *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* (New York: Perennial Classics, 1999 [1984]): "Kitsch causes two tears to flow in quick succession. The first tear says: How nice to see children running on the grass! The second tear says: How nice to be moved, together with all mankind, by children running on the grass! It is the second tear that makes kitsch kitsch. The brotherhood of man on earth will be possible only on a base of kitsch" (251).

[40] Due to the special emphasis I put on the specific structural features of anecdotes, in the present context of symbolic corruption, Heidegger's term "*Geschichte*" strikes me as a misnomer. Instead, one ought to speak of an anecdote here, for reasons that I will address shortly. Admittedly, in German, the term "Geschichte" (history, story, or tale) is generally vague and can refer to texts presented in different formats. Speaking of a "misnomer," then, does not so much imply negligence on Heidegger's part as it calls for more precision in order to specify the unique workings of anecdotes, according to my present account.

[41] I adopt this translation as part of F. A. Capuzzi's and J. G. Gray's translation of Heidegger's *Letter*, in: David F. Krell (ed.) (1993), p. 256.

[42] No fully accurate translation of the German expressions Heidegger chooses is possible. Translating "*geheuer*" as "familiar" and "[u]n-geheuer" as "unfamiliar" as Capuzzi and Gray do, omits the connotations of "monstrous" that adhere to "Un-geheuer," used as a noun phrase. "*Ungeheuer*" in German means "monster." Yet, there is an assymmetry, here, which Heidegger exploits. If "geheuer" is negated as "nicht geheuer" it means something like "dubious," "not kosher," or "eerie." Yet, if it is negated with the prefix "un-" and thus rendered "ungeheuer" it means "enormous," "vast," or "gigantic." My rendering of "geheuer" as "un-eerie" and "Un-geheuer" as "eerie" preserves at least some of the "monstrous" connotations. The main disadvantage of this translation is that it has to criss-cross the negating prefixes, to approximate the proper meaning.

[43] Note 8: "On this complex device, cf. Thomas de Quincey, "The Last Days of Immanuel Kant, " in David Masson, ed., *Collected Writings*, vol. 4, pp. 340-41 (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890)" (222). Here I omit the *Translator's note*, which provides the text of the passage under consideration, thus relating the "technical" details of Kant's device.

[44] For the problems pertaining to the translation of this term, see: Introduction, note 5, above.

[45] See, e.g.: Polt (1999), pp. 50-54. To be fair, Polt shows himself aware of the potential problem regarding the status of *Zeug* vis-à-vis *Werkzeug*, but does not pause to fully address it: "It is tempting to interpret the *referential* totality purely in terms of utility, and view it as a set of functions of useful things. Heidegger's own examples encourage this interpretation. But this would be too narrow – […] A world is not only an environment, but any context in which entities are available and meaningful to Dasein. Important features of the world for someone may include many *references* that go beyond mere utility – for instance, *references* that are structured around sin, beauty, or sincerity" (52). While Polt lays his finger on an important problem, the last sentence remains inconclusive, even with respect to the general direction, in which we may look for a solution or refinement of Heidegger's account. Cf. also, Hubert L. Dreyfus's influential book *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's* Being and Time*, Division I* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991), pp. 70-87; 99-107. For two passages in which Dreyfus enforces the conception of *Zeug*/*Werkzeug*, which I want to put in question, see: "The switch to deliberation is evoked by any situation in which absorbed coping is no longer possible – any situation that, as Heidegger puts it, requires a "a more precise kind of circumspection, such as 'inspecting,' checking up on what has been attained, [etc.]" (409) [358]. […] Heidegger, however, concentrates on the specific experiences of breakdown, that is, on the experience we have when ongoing coping runs into trouble" (70). Similarly, he states: "Hammers make sense by referring to nails, etc. But how does the activity of hammering make sense? Equipment makes sense only in the context of other equipment; our use of equipment makes sense because our activity has a point. Thus, besides the "in-order-to" that assigns equipment to an equipmental whole, already discussed, the use of equipment exhibits a "where-in" (or a practical context), a "with-which" (or item of equipment), a "towards-which" (or goal), and a "for-the-sake-of-which" (or final point)" (92).

[46] Here we have to admit that such disappointment is, in large part, due to Heidegger's own exposition, in *Being and Time*. One of the passages, in which Heidegger himself suggest this restrictive reading of *Zeug*, is the following: "Die Struktur des Seins von Zuhandenem als Zeug ist durch die Verweisungen bestimmt. Das eigentümliche und selbstverständliche "An-sich" der nächsten "Dinge" begegnet in dem sie gebrauchenden und dabei nicht ausdrücklich beachtenden Besorgen, das auf Unbrauchbares stossen kann. Ein Zeug ist unverwendbar – darin liegt: die konstitutive Verweisung des Um-zu auf ein Dazu ist gestört" (74). The general problem is that Heidegger keeps begging the question whether the character of *Zeug* is prior to any practical agenda (e.g., hammering, whether conscious or not) or whether the "Um-zu" of *Zeug* is somehow prior to any such activity. At least, it is not immediately apparent, which of these alternatives is closer to Heidegger's view, when he writes: "Das Hämmern selbst entdeckt die spezifische "Handlichkeit" des Hammers. Die Seinsart von Zeug, in der es sich von ihm selbst her offenbart, nennen wir die *Zuhandenheit*. Nur weil das Zeug *dieses* "An-sich-sein" hat und nicht lediglich noch vorkommt, ist es handlich im weitesten Sinne und verfügbar" (69). In § 17., finally, things seem to get worse, i.e., opaquely complex, when Heidegger makes the following distinction: "Unter den Zeichen gibt es Anzeichen, Vor- und Rückzeichen, Merkzeichen, Kennzeichen, deren Zeigung jeweils verschieden ist, ganz abgesehen davon, was je als solches Zeichen dient. Von diesen "Zeichen" sind zu scheiden: Spur, Überrest, Denkmal, Dokument, Zeugnis, Symbol, Ausdruck, Erscheinung, Bedeutung. Diese Phänomene lassen sich auf Grund ihres formalen Beziehungscharakters leicht formalisieren: […]" (78).

[47] To this end we will have to critically revisit especially those passages in *Being and Time*, where Heidegger keeps sliding between the terms *Zeug*, *Zuhandenheit*, *Werk*, and *Werkzeug*, all of which he defines in terms of one another without fully clarifying their relations; see esp. p. 69-70.

[48] In the *Prolegomena*, then, Heidegger writes: "Solche eigentümlichen Dinge wie eine historische Quelle sind in ihrer spezifischen Struktur nicht selbst verständlich und einfach zu sehen. Das Steinbeil ist in diesem Fall noch als Vorhandenes entdeckt, während es zuvor, vor seiner Entdeckung, für einen Bauern vielleicht nur als vorkommender Stein zugänglich war, der seinem Wagen und Fuss im Wege liegt, woran der Pflug schartig wird" (289).

[49] See: *Prolegomena*, pp. 14-15.

Bibliography

A. Heidegger in German
B. Heidegger in English
C. Other Works Cited

Volumes of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, or collected edition (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976 –). Throughout this study, these are designated by "GA" and the volume number.

A. Heidegger in German

GA 1: *Frühe Schriften*, 1978 [Written 1910-1916].

GA 2: *Sein und Zeit*, 1977 [1927].

GA 3: *Kant und das Problem der* Metaphysik, 1991 [1929].

GA 9: *Wegmarken*. 1978 [includes writings from 1919/21-1961].

GA 20: *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs*, 1979 [1925].

GA 24: *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 1975 [1927].

GA 26: *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz*, 1978 [1928].

Heidegger, Martin. *Die Lehre vom Urteil im Psychologismus: Ein kritisch-positiver Beitrag zur Logik*. Dissertation, Freiburg i. Br., 1913 (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1914); reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 1). 59-188.

---. *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus*. Habilitationsschrift, Freiburg i. Br., 1915. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1916); reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 1). 189-411.

---. *Der Begriff der Zeit: Vortrag vor der Marburger Theologenschaft*, Juli 1924. Ed. H. Tietjen. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989.

---. "Vom Wesen der Wahrheit." Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klosterman, 1943 [public lecture 1930]. Reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 9). 177-202.

---. *Brief über den Humanismus*. Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1949 [written 1946]; reprinted in: Martin Heidegger (GA 9). 313-364.

---. *Gelassenheit.* Pfullingen: Neske, 1959.

B. Heidegger in English

The Basic Problems of Phenomenology. Trans. A. Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

Basic Writings. Ed. D. F. Krell. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.

Being and Time. Trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Being and Time. Trans. J. Stambaugh. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Discourse on Thinking. Trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic. Trans. M. Heim. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

"Only a God Can Save Us." *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*. Ed. R. Wolin. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993. 91-116.

On the Way to Language. Trans. P.D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

The Concept of Time. Trans. W. McNeill. Oxford/Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992.

C. Other Works Cited

Albrecht, Clemens. "Vom Konsensus der 50er zur Lagerbildung der 60er Jahre: Horkheimers Institutspolitik." In: Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, and Friedrich H. Tennbruck. *Die intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1999. 132-68.

Albrecht, Clemens. "Die Massenmedien und die Frankfurter Schule." In: Clemens Albrecht, Günter C. Behrmann, Michael Bock, Harald Homann, and Friedrich H. Tennbruck. *Die intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1999. 203-246.

Amsterdamska, Olga. *Schools of Thought: The Development of Linguistics from Bopp to Saussure.* Dordrecht, Boston: D. Reidel, 1987.

Arens, Hans. *Sprachwissenschaft: Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1974.

Arens, Katherine. "*Geister der Zeit*: The Allies' Enlightenment and German Literary History." *JEGP*, 102. 3 (July 2003): 336-61.

---. "The Linguistics of French Feminism: *Sémanalyse* as Critical Discourse Analysis." *Intertexts* 2.2 (Fall 1998): 171-184.

---. "On Rereading Hermann Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*." *Multiple Perspectives on the Historical Dimensions of Language*. Ed. K.R. Jankowsky. Münster: Nodus, 1996. 105-114.

---. *Structures of Knowing: Psychologies of the Nineteenth Century*. Boston: Reidel, 1989.

---. Funtionalism and Fin de siècle: Fritz Mauthner's Critique of Language. New York /Berne/Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1984.

Bailie, Gil. *Violence Unveiled: Humanity at the Crossroads*. New York: Crossroad, 1995.

Best, Steven, and Douglas Kellner. *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1991.

Blackmore, John T. *Ernst Mach: His Work, Life, and Influence.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Bleicher, Josef. *Contemporary Hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as Method, Philosophy, and Critique*. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

Bloch, Ernst. *Das Materialismusproblem: Seine Geschichte und Substanz.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1972. [written 1936-37; revised and expanded 1969-71].

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*. Trans. P. Collier. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Brenner, Peter J. "Nachkriegsliteratur." *Deutsche Literatur zwischen 1945 und 1995: Eine Sozialgeschichte*. Ed. H.A. Glaser. Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Paul Haupt, 1997, 33-57.

Buchheim, Thomas. "Introduction" (*Einleitung*). F.W.J. Schelling, *Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegenstände*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1997. IX-LV.

Caputo, John D. *Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction, and the Hermeneutic Project*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

---. *The Mystical Element in Heidegger's Thought.* New York: Fordham University Press, 1986.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Myth of the State.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946.

---. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Trans. R. Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-57 [orig. 1923-1929], 3 vols; vol. 1, *Language*; vol. 2, *Mythical Thought*; vol. 3, *The Phenomenology of Knowledge*. For the fourth volume, see: Cassirer, Ernst. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Trans. J.M. Krois. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996, vol. 4, *The Metaphysics of Symbolic Forms*.

---. *The Logic of the Cultural Sciences: Five Studies*. Trans. S.G. Lofts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000 [German orig., 1942].

Cassirer, Toni. *Mein Leben mit Ernst Cassirer*. Hamburg: Meiner, 2003.

Danz, Christian. "Christologie als Theorie endlicher Freiheit. Zur Rationalitätsgestalt und zum systematischen Ort von Schellings Theorie der Christologie." *Schelling: Zwischen Fichte und Hegel / Between Fichte and Hegel*. Ed. Christoph Asmuth, Alfred Denker, and Michael Vater. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: B.R. Grüner, 2000. 265-286.

Danz, Christian. "Die Philosopie der Offenbarung." *F.W.J. Schelling*. Ed. H.J. Sandkühler. Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 1998. 169-189.

Deleuze Gilles and Guattari, Félix. *What Is Philosophy?* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

---. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

---. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Delp, Alfed. *Tragische Existenz: Zur Philosophie Martin Heideggers.* Freiburg: Herder, 1935.

Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Trans. Donald A. Cress. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 1993.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Gesammelte Schriften*, XI. Bd. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1960.

Ebeling, Hans. *Martin Heidegger:Philosophie und Ideologie.* Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1991.

Farías, Victor. *Heidegger and Nazism*. Ed. J. Margolis and T. Rockmore. Trans. P. Burrell and G. Ricci. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989 [German edition 1989; French/Spanish original 1987].

Friedman, Michael. *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, Heidegger*. Chicago: Open Court, 2000.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Trans. J. Weinsheimer and D.G. Marshall. 2nd revised edition. New York: Continuum, 1989.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Philosophical Apprenticeships*. Trans. Robert R. Sullivan. Cambridge, M.: MIT Press, 1985.

Guignon, Charles, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Hesse, Hermann. *Das Glasperlenspiel*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972.

Husserl, Edmund. *Cartesianische Meditationen.* Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1977.

---. *Logische Untersuchungen, Bd. 2 Teil 1: Untersuchungen zur Phenomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntniss*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1993 [orig. 1900-01].

---. *Logical Investigations*. Trans. John Findlay. London: Routledge and Kegen Paul, 1970.

---. *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester1925*. Ed. W. Biemel. Husserliana, Vol. IX. Den Haag: Marinus Nijhoff, 1962.

---. *Phenomenological Psychology: Lectures, Summer Semester, 1925.* Trans. J. Scanlon. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.

Jankowsky, Kurt R. *The Neogrammarians: A Re-Evaluation of Their Place in the Development of Linguistic Science*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

Jaspers, Karl. *Die Schuldfrage.* Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1946.

Kisiel, Theodore. *Heidegger's Way of Thought: Critical and Interpretative Signposts*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

---. "Das Versagen von *Sein und Zeit*." *Martin Heidegger, Sein und Zeit*. Ed. T. Rentsch. Berlin: Akademie, 2001. 253-279.

---. *The Genesis of Heidegger's* <u>*Being and Time*</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Krois, John M. *Cassirer: Symbolic Forms and History.* New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1987.

Kundera, Milan. *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. New York: Perennial Classics, 1999 [1984].

Lafont, Cristina. *The Linguistic Turn in Hermeneutic Philosophy*. Trans. J. Medina. Cambridge, M.: The MIT Press, 1999.

Lipps, Theodor. *Grundzüge der Logik*. Hamburg: Voss, 1893.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. *History of Linguistics Vol. IV: Nineteenth-Century Linguistics*. New York: Longman, 1998.

Mueller-Vollmer, Kurt. Ed. *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German Tradition from the Enlightenment to the Present*. New York: Continuum, 1985.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Trans. W. Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Ott, Hugo. *Martin Heidegger: Unterwegs zu seiner Biographie*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1988.

---. *Martin Heidegger: A Political Life*. Trans. A. Blunden. London: Harper Collins, 1993. [orig. 1988].

Paetzold, Heinz. *Ernst Cassirer – Von Marburg nach New York: Eine philosophische Biographie*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1995.

Paul, Hermann. *Prinzipien der Sprachwissenschaft*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1909 [1880].

Petzet, Heinrich Wiegand. *Auf einen Stern zugehen: Begegnungen und Gespräche mit Martin Heidegger 1929 bis 1976.* Frankfurt am Main: Societäts-Verlag, 1983.

---. *Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger, 1929-1976*. Trans. P. Emad and K. Maly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Picard, Max. *Hitler in uns selbst*. Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch, 1946.

Pöggeler, Otto. Martin. *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking*. Trans. D. Magurshak and S. Barber. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1987. [orig. 1963].

---. *Heidegger und die hermeneutische Philosophie*. Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1983.

---. *The Paths of Heidegger's Life and Thought*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1997. [orig. 1992].

Polt, Richard. *Heidegger: An Introduction*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Ringer, Fritz. *The Decline of the German Mandarines: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Rockmore, Tom. *Heidegger and French Philosophy: Humanism, Antihumanism, and Being*. New York: Routeledge, 1995.

Safranski, Rüdiger. *Ein Meister aus Deutschland: Heidegger und seine Zeit*. München: Carl Hanser, 1994.

Schnädelbach, Herbert. *Philosophy in Germany 1831-1933*. Trans. E. Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Schelling, F.W.J. *Philosophie der Offenbarung 1841/42* [sog. Paulus-Nachschrift]. Ed. M. Frank. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977.

---. *Urfassung der Philosophie der Offenbarung / Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling*. Ed. W.E. Ehrhardt. 2 Teilbde. Hamburg: Meiner, 1992.

Schneeberger, Guido. *Nachlese zu Heidegger: Dokumente zu seinem Leben und Denken.* Bern: Suhr, 1962.

Stone, Ronald. *Paul Tillich's Radical Social Thought*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1980.

Steinthal, Heymann. *Philologie, Geschichte und Psychologie in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler, 1864.

Tillich, Paul. "Schelling und die Anfänge des existentialistischen Protestes." *Gesammelte Werke*, Band IV. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1961. 133-144.

---. "Auf der Grenze." *Gesammelte Werke*. Bd. XII. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1971.

---. "Das Dämonische. Ein Beitrag zur Sinndeutung der Geschichte." *Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. VI. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1963: 42-71.

---. *Das Dämonische: Ein Beitrag zur Sinndeutung der Geschichte.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1926.

Vossler, Karl. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprachphilosophie*. München: Hueber, 1923.

---. *Positivismus und Idealismus in der Sprachwissenschaft. Eine sprach-philosophische Untersuchung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1904.

---. *The Spirit of Language in Civilization*. Trans. Oscar Oeser. London: Kegan Paul; Trench: Trubner, 1932.

Weidler, Markus. "Undoing the *Dialectic*'s Philosophical Hypocrisy: Toward a New Materialist Semiotics." *Monatshefte*, 96. 3 (Fall 2004): 388-408.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus logico-philosophicus: Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1960.

---. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Trans. D.F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness. London/New York: Routledge, 1961/1974.

Wüstehube, Axel. *Das Denken aus dem Grund: Die Bedeutung der Spätphilosophie Schellings für die Ontologie Ernst Blochs*. Würzburg: Könighausen & Neumann, 1989.

VITA

Markus Mikula Weidler was born in Berlin, Germany on April 19, 1974, the son of Karin Weidler and Armin Weidler. After completing his work at the *Evangelisches Gymnasium zum Grauen Kloster* (German private high school), Berlin, Germany, in 1993, he did one year of community service for conscientious objectors. In the fall of 1994, he entered the University of Konstanz (Germany). As a double-major, he passed his intermediate examination (*Zwischenprüfung*) in Philosophy and Germanic Studies in 1996. During the following year, he was an international exchange student at the University of Texas at Austin, before he entered the graduate program of this university in the spring of 1998. He received the degree of Master of Arts from the University of Texas at Austin in May 2000. His publications include: "Toward a New Materialist Semiotics: Undoing the *Dialectic*'s Philosophical Hypocrisy," *Monatshefte*, 96, No. 3 (Fall 2004): 388-408; and: *From* <u>*I and Thou*</u> by Martin Buber, trans. M. Weidler and K. Arens, in: Existentialism, ed. Robert C. Solomon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Permanent Address: Sulzaer Str. 2, 14199 Berlin, Germany

This dissertation was typed by the author.