

# A Heideggerian Deconstruction of Understanding

PHAVISMINDA Journal  
Volume 8 (May 2009): 71-88.

Eddie Babor, PhD  
Holy Name University, Tagbilaran City, Bohol

## INTRODUCTION

Beyond any cloud of doubt, Heidegger is one of the pioneering thinkers in the science of deconstruction. Indeed, he has succeeded in sprinkling a different scent and aroma of giving "meaning" of reality.<sup>1</sup>

A good example of Heidegger's deconstructive efforts is his analysis of understanding and potentiality. Usually, understanding is understood in a subject-object paradigm where the knower comes to terms with the essence and accidents of a particular object. The object in-turn becomes a poor victim of human knowledge or understanding. It is, so to say, robbed of its "privacy" to retain and sustain its being what it is without being disposed to the danger of being abstracted of its essence in order to become a particle of knowledge and be stocked in the human mind. In the case of potentiality, Aristotle,<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, and the Scholastics, hasten in telling their audience that potency is derived from the verb 'posse' whose meaning is "to be able" or "to have power."<sup>3</sup> But Heidegger refuses to go with the path carved out by the Scholastic philosophers. He constructs his different and unique way of looking at reality.

To Heidegger, "understanding is neither a 'mental state' nor a 'possibility' to be seen in terms of 'actual possibilities;' rather, it is the ground for the 'possibility' of possibilities."<sup>4</sup> Understanding, then, is construed by Heidegger as that which is "expressive of [human] *Dasein's* active comportment towards possibilities or projects. Heidegger says that [human] *Dasein's* understanding is altogether permeated with possibilities which means that [human] *Dasein* is always confronted with the 'possible.'"<sup>5</sup> In *Being and Time*, Heidegger writes: "Understanding is the existential Being of *Dasein's* own potentiality-for-Being; and it is so in such a way that this Being discloses in itself what its Being is capable of."<sup>6</sup>

There are two standpoints that he is trying to draw in the foregoing quotation: (1) Understanding from the standpoint of disclosure; and (2) Understanding from the standpoint of potentiality-for-Being.

From the standpoint of disclosure, Heidegger explains that “understanding always pertains to the whole basic state of Being-in-the-world.”<sup>7</sup> Here, the authentic human *Dasein* realizes that he is a Being-in-the-world. Such realization is bloated by a deeper cognizance that it is in the world where he could glean at the depth of the ambiance of his possibilities. As a Being-in-the-world, the authentic human *Dasein* does not engage in a romance with the beauty of the world; the human *Dasein*, rather, positions himself to reach out to the wide array of the possibilities available to him. Here, Heidegger notes that in understanding, the human *Dasein* normally takes the world as the locus of service and welfare. The human *Dasein* takes the world for its own sake. Says Heidegger:

*Dasein* is its “there”, is equivalent to saying that the world is ‘there’; its Being-there, is Being-in. And the latter is likewise ‘there’, as that for the sake of which *Dasein* is. In the “for-the-sake-of-which”, existing Being-in-the-world is disclosed as such, and this disclosedness we have called “understanding”.<sup>8</sup>

In the context of understanding as disclosure, the human *Dasein* realizes that it is the “world” that discloses itself before him. And that its disclosure enables him to affirm that he is a being who is bundled with possibilities. The “world,” thus, is significant to the human *Dasein* as it discloses itself. Heidegger posits his contention, thus:

The disclosedness of understanding, as the disclosedness of the “for-the-sake-of-which” and of significance equiprimordially, pertains to the entirety of Being-in-the-world. Significance is that on the basis of which the world is disclosed as such. To say that the “for-the-sake-of-which” and significance are both disclosed in *Dasein*, means that *Dasein* is that entity which, as Being-in-the-world, is an issue for itself.<sup>9</sup>

From the standpoint of potentiality-for-Being, Heidegger explains that:

Understanding is the Being of such potentiality-for-Being, which is never something still outstanding as not yet present-at-hand, but which, as something which is essentially never present-at-hand, ‘is’ with the Being of *Dasein*, in the sense of existence. *Dasein* is such that in every case it has understood... that it is to be thus or thus. As such understanding it ‘knows’ what it is capable of – that is, *what* its potentiality-for-Being is capable of.<sup>10</sup>

In Heideggerian thought, the human *Dasein* is in every case what he can be and in the way in which he is always his possibilities. An authentic human



*Dasein* understands himself as a possibility – a privilege which the entities (*vorhanden* or present-at-hand and *zuhanden* or ready-to-hand) he encounters in the world do not possess.

Inasmuch as understanding is rooted in concern, it follows that the relatedness of human *Dasein* to entities affects his possibilities because things or entities in the “world” have a part in the realization of the human *Dasein*’s possibilities. Concern, then, is the foundation of understanding.<sup>11</sup> Hence, Heidegger stresses that:

The Being-possible which is essential for *Dasein*, pertains to the ways of its solicitude for Others and of its concern with the ‘world’, as we have characterized them; and in all these, and always, it pertains to *Dasein*’s potentiality-for-Being towards itself, for the sake of itself.<sup>12</sup>

Hence, the authentic human *Dasein* considers understanding as source of root of his ability-to-be. On the contrary, the inauthentic one misses the point of understanding. He is “gone astray” from the core of his self. In a word, he is not dead serious of his existential intrinsic asset of knowing who he is in terms of his possibilities. But this can be cured in the human *Dasein*’s resolve to find itself again in the province of his possibilities. Says Heidegger:

And only *because* *Dasein*, in understanding, is its “there”, *can* it go astray and fail to recognize itself. And in so far as understanding is *accompanied* by state-of-mind and as such is existentially surrendered to thrownness, *Dasein* has in every case already gone astray and failed to recognize itself. In its potentiality-for-Being it is therefore delivered over to the possibility of first finding itself again in its possibilities.<sup>13</sup>

### 1. Projection

While understanding means the making of *Dasein* “to be able to be,” or as *Dasein*’s “potentiality-for-Being,” projection means *Dasein*’s “throwing-forward” to the “world.”<sup>14</sup> Projection is a function of understanding. This is the reason why understanding is a disclosure of possibilities of human *Dasein*. Heidegger posits this query: “Why does the understanding – whatever may be the essential dimension of that can be disclosed in it – always press forward into possibilities?”<sup>15</sup> For this, Heidegger opines: “It is because the understanding has in itself the existential structure which we call projection.”<sup>16</sup>

Projection, as cited above, has for its basic meaning as “throwing” something “off” or “throwing” something “away.”<sup>17</sup> In ordinary German usage, and often in the way Heidegger uses it, projection means “designing” or “sketching some project” which is to be carried through and through.<sup>18</sup> In *Being and Time*, Heidegger argues:

The character of understanding as projection is constitutive of Being-in-the-world with regard to the disclosedness of its existentially constitutive state-of-Being. . . . Projecting has nothing to do with comporting oneself towards a plan that has been thought out. . . . Dasein is already projected itself, as long as it is, it is projecting.<sup>19</sup>

In sum, in Heidegger's analysis of understanding he sketches some important remarks: (1) Human *Dasein* projects himself into his possibilities; (2) The human *Dasein* projects his possibilities to things which he comes across.<sup>20</sup> In other words, "the 'world of things' and the 'world of Human *Dasein*' meet by way of serviceability and usability...."<sup>21</sup> Hence, the human *Dasein* in this regard can express his authentic existence by giving meaning to things he encounters.

There is really no hard and fast rule when it comes to the human *Dasein*'s actualization of his possibilities, specifically in the context of understanding and projection. We cannot afford to charge Heidegger with espousing and glowering at us with "wait-till-you-get-there" kind of attitude. To finish off our business in understanding projection, Heidegger eagerly delivers some heavy dosages of not just a shard but a considerable quantum of his thought. To Heidegger, in projection the authentic human *Dasein* realizes that he is not a finished product. The human *Dasein* is engrossed with a sublime realization that it is not enough that he is a human being.<sup>22</sup>

Because of the kind of Being which is constituted by the *existential* of projection, Dasein is constantly 'more' than it factually is, ... But Dasein is never more than it factually is, for to its facticity its potentiality-for-Being belongs essentially.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Interpretation

Interpretation is part and parcel of the whole web of wisdom knitted by Heidegger in his analysis of *Dasein*'s Being-in-the-world. It is an indispensable segment of the nexus of Heidegger's thought whose function is as intricate as the nature of human *Dasein*. As has been elaborated, the human *Dasein*, in his efforts to understand the world, projects his possibilities. Heidegger explains that: "This Being-towards-possibilities which understands is itself a potentiality-for-Being..."<sup>24</sup> To Heidegger, human *Dasein*'s act of projecting its possibilities through understanding has its own possibility, i.e., that of developing itself.<sup>25</sup> It is here where Heidegger introduces the import of interpretation. Writes Heidegger:

This development of the understanding we call "interpretation." In it, the understanding appropriates understanding that which is understood by it. In

The character of understanding as projection is constitutive of Being-in-the-world with regard to the disclosedness of its existentially constitutive state-of-Being. . . . Projecting has nothing to do with comporting oneself towards a plan that has been thought out. . . . Dasein is already projected itself, as long as it is, it is projecting.<sup>19</sup>

In sum, in Heidegger's analysis of understanding he sketches some important remarks: (1) Human *Dasein* projects himself into his possibilities; (2) The human *Dasein* projects his possibilities to things which he comes across.<sup>20</sup> In other words, "the 'world of things' and the 'world of Human *Dasein*' meet by way of serviceability and usability...."<sup>21</sup> Hence, the human *Dasein* in this regard can express his authentic existence by giving meaning to things he encounters.

There is really no hard and fast rule when it comes to the human *Dasein*'s actualization of his possibilities, specifically in the context of understanding and projection. We cannot afford to charge Heidegger with espousing and glowering at us with "wait-till-you-get-there" kind of attitude. To finish off our business in understanding projection, Heidegger eagerly delivers some heavy dosages of not just a shard but a considerable quantum of his thought. To Heidegger, in projection the authentic human *Dasein* realizes that he is not a finished product. The human *Dasein* is engrossed with a sublime realization that it is not enough that he is a human being.<sup>22</sup>

Because of the kind of Being which is constituted by the *existentiale* of projection, Dasein is constantly 'more' than it factually is, ... But Dasein is never more than it factually is, for to its facticity its potentiality-for-Being belongs essentially.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Interpretation

Interpretation is part and parcel of the whole web of wisdom knitted by Heidegger in his analysis of *Dasein*'s Being-in-the-world. It is an indispensable segment of the nexus of Heidegger's thought whose function is as intricate as the nature of human *Dasein*. As has been elaborated, the human *Dasein*, in his efforts to understand the world, projects his possibilities. Heidegger explains that: "This Being-towards-possibilities which understands is itself a potentiality-for-Being..."<sup>24</sup> To Heidegger, human *Dasein*'s act of projecting its possibilities through understanding has its own possibility, i.e., that of developing itself.<sup>25</sup> It is here where Heidegger introduces the import of interpretation. Writes Heidegger:

This development of the understanding we call "interpretation." In it, the understanding appropriates understanding that which is understood by it. In

interpretation, understanding does not become something different. It becomes itself.<sup>26</sup>

According to Heidegger, interpretation necessitates an advertent study of its correlative concepts, namely: (1) As-Structure; (2) Fore-Structure which entails a discussion of "fore-having;" "fore-sight;" fore-conception; and meaning.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger explicates that interpretation is "the working out of possibilities projected in understanding."<sup>27</sup> This means that projection is an end in itself. The human *Dasein* has to "work out" for the realization of his possibilities. It is the authentic human *Dasein* that strives hard towards the actualization of his possibilities. In this regard, interpretation is engaged in an active interplay both with understanding and projection. As clarified by Heidegger, understanding operates or functions through projection. It is the function in turn of interpretation to "work out," or to make explicit, the possibilities of human *Dasein* that projection projects or reveals to the human *Dasein*.

One of the points we underscored in our discussion of understanding is that the "world" appears and discloses itself to human *Dasein* as ready-to-hand. In Heidegger's own words: "In terms of the significance which is disclosed in understanding the world, concerned Being—alongside the ready-to-hand gives itself to understand whatever involvement that which is encountered can have."<sup>28</sup> It is, therefore, the "world" that the human *Dasein* has to understand because it is the locus of the projection of his enormous possibilities. So, if it is the "world" that the human *Dasein* has to understand what is it that human *Dasein* must interpret? Heidegger's answer is categorical, that is, the world. He maintains: "the 'world' which has already been understood comes to be interpreted. The ready-to-hand comes explicitly into the sight which understands."<sup>29</sup>

Now, it is proper to delve into a discussion on "as-structure," "fore-structure," and "meaning." These three are, according to Heidegger, the indispensable aspects of interpretation.

### 2.1 As-Structure

According to Heidegger, the human *Dasein*'s working out of his possibilities which are projected in understanding—which he calls interpretation—is better appreciated when it is pursued in the ambit of "as-structure," "fore-structure," and "meaning." In *Being and Time*, Heidegger explains that as-structure pertains to human *Dasein*'s interpretation of entities in the world relative to their purpose or utility. The human *Dasein* knows that entities lie in the world. "The ready-to-hand comes explicitly into the sight which understands."<sup>30</sup> It is, then, human *Dasein*'s as-structure<sup>31</sup> to appropriate

their service, purpose, and use in relation to the realization of his possibilities. Here, Heidegger advises the human *Dasein*, however, to really consider objects as objects or something as something. He writes: "That which is understood gets articulated when the entity to be understood is brought close interpretatively by taking as our clue the 'something as something.'"<sup>32</sup>

In view of the fact that entities are understood by human *Dasein* as such, the human *Dasein* takes the "world" environmentally<sup>33</sup> as ready-to-hand. The "world" is 'there' 'in-order-to' make man avail of the fulfillment of his possibilities. In interpretation then, the human *Dasein* makes explicit the 'thereness' of the world. The human *Dasein* takes the world's objects as integral part of the accomplishment of his project – his possibilities. Says Heidegger:

... we take apart in its "in-order-to" that which is... ready-to-hand, and we concern ourselves with it in accordance with what becomes visible through this process. That which has been circumspectively taken apart with regard to its "in-order-to", and taken apart as such - that which is *explicitly* understood—has the structure of *something as something*.<sup>34</sup>

## 2.2 Fore-Structure

Heidegger speaks of "fore-structure of understanding" and "as-structure of interpretation."<sup>35</sup> Now, since interpretation is embedded in understanding we can as well pursue Heidegger's explanation of the meaning of fore-structure in the context of interpretation. This position is affirmed by Heidegger's statement that "whenever something is interpreted as something, the interpretation will be founded essentially upon fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception."<sup>36</sup> This means that the aforementioned triple points, viz.: fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception are considered by Heidegger as foundations of interpretation in the context of the human *Dasein's* interpretation of the world in the context of as-structure, i.e., the human *Dasein* interprets something as something. With a view to lump these three points, we can also say that the human *Dasein's* interpretation of the "world" as ready-to-hand is firmly anchored on fore-structure. Unfortunately, Heidegger gives only a terse explanation of his views on the aspects of fore-structure, which can be understood as human *Dasein's* relatedness to the world as ready-to-hand.

### 2.2.1 Fore-having

According to Heidegger, in the interpretation of the world, the human *Dasein* is loaded with a postulate of his prior awareness (fore-having) relative



to the function and purpose of the entities in the world in order that as-structure becomes clear and explicit. Writes Heidegger:

The ready-to-hand is always understood in terms of a totality of involvement. This totality need not be grasped explicitly... this is the very mode in which it is the essential foundation for everyday circumspective interpretation. In every case, this interpretation is grounded in something we have in advance – in a fore-having.<sup>37</sup>

Fore-having enables the human *Dasein* to establish order and propriety of the entities in the world. The human *Dasein* has inherent knowledge and awareness— explained by Heidegger as a priori in the existential structure of *Dasein* – of an entity's functions or purposes for him as a Being-in-the-world.

### 2.2.2 Fore-sight

Heidegger remarks: "In every case, interpretation is grounded in something we see in advance – in a fore-sight."<sup>38</sup> Before we proceed to clarify the meaning of fore-sight, it must be understood first how Heidegger analyzes sight or the act of seeing. Heidegger asserts: "We must, to be sure, guard against a misunderstanding of the expression 'sight.' It corresponds to the 'clearedness'... which we took as characterizing the disclosedness of the 'there.'"<sup>39</sup> Heidegger explains what he means by seeing:

'Seeing' does not mean just perceiving with the bodily eyes, but neither does it mean pure non-sensory awareness of something present-at-hand in its presence-at-hand. In giving an existential signification to "sight", we have merely drawn upon the peculiar feature of seeing, that it lets entities which are accessible to it to be encountered unconcealedly in themselves.<sup>40</sup>

In the above quotation, Heidegger elucidates fore-sight. To Heidegger, fore-sight is the inseparable half of fore-having. Both fore-having and fore-sight precede the human *Dasein*'s concentration and focus regarding its as-structure. Heidegger maintains: "Anything understood which is held in our fore-having and towards which we set our sights 'foresightedly' becomes conceptualizable through the interpretation."<sup>41</sup> Further Heidegger remarks: "This fore-sight 'takes the first cut' out of what has been taken into our fore-having, and it does so with a view to a definite way in which this can be interpreted."<sup>42</sup>

As the human *Dasein* has prior awareness or prior knowledge (fore-having) of the function, purpose, and service of the entities in the world, the human *Dasein*, likewise, "sees in advance" (fore-sight) something relative to the same. In this vein, both fore-having and fore-sight are avenues through which the existential possibilities of *Dasein*, to be creative and productive, can

find satisfaction. Heidegger opines that the “world” is “there” “in-order-to” make the human *Dasein* realize his potentialities. In fact, Heidegger contends: “The ready-to-hand comes explicitly into the sight which understands. All preparing, putting to rights, repairing, improving, rounding-out...”<sup>43</sup> are gestures of human *Dasein* out of which fore-having and fore-sight find their respective places and roles. How can the human *Dasein* plunge into such activities as preparing, putting to rights, repairing, improving, rounding-out and the like if the human *Dasein* does not have intrinsic possession of fore-having and fore-sight? Indeed, both fore-having and fore-sight explain the “existence” of civilization, culture, or progress and development in the context of advancing human knowledge. Had it not have been the case that the human *Dasein* was never existentially equipped with the structures of fore-having and fore-sight, humanity would have always been as primitive and as poor as it was. Fore-having and fore-sight are ontologically necessary for the progress of human civilization and culture.

Nature per se is not intelligent enough to provide all the overlapping, intricate, and so variedly complicated needs of human *Dasein*. As a result, what nature cannot provide, the human *Dasein* provides for himself through the aid of fore-having and fore-sight. Thus, invention owes its “existence” to human *Dasein*’s fore-having and fore-sight.

### 2.2.3 Fore-conception

As the third foundation of interpretation, fore-conception is taken by Heidegger as “something we grasp in advance.”<sup>44</sup> Like fore-having and fore-sight, fore-conception is *a priori* in the structure of the existential analytic of human *Dasein*. “Fore-conception functions in terms of a conception [or an interpretation] by which the as-structure will be made explicit.”<sup>45</sup>

Finally, Heidegger lumps all these three-fold foundations of interpretation as he notes: “Whenever something is interpreted as something, the interpretation will be founded essentially upon fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception.”<sup>46</sup>

In our discussion of interpretation, we see the tacit depth and scope underneath Heidegger’s critical and radical analysis of human existence. It is submitted as a postulate, however, that the impetus for such analysis of human existence is his undying love of Being. He designs the existential analytic of human *Dasein* to clear the path of human *Dasein* as he pursues the unconcealment Being. Part of this task of “clearing the way” for Being is human *Dasein*’s authentic interpretation of the world. And undeniably, this authentic interpretation includes the authentic inculcation and nourishment of human *Dasein*’s fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception. Needless to say, one of the apexes of the development of authentic interpretation is invention.





In Heideggerian parlance, invention means transformation of present-at-hand entities to become ready-to-hand entities.<sup>47</sup> The eventual founding or discovery and advancement of science and technology all draw their resources from fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception. Expressed differently, science and technology emanate from authentic human *Dasein's* understanding, projection, and interpretation.

Thus, even in scientific research, which is a *conditio sine qua non* in discovery, Heidegger sees the glaring presence of fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception (as a whole, interpretation) especially when a sort of philosophical attitude is given its way relative to an ontological interpretation of discovery. This indispensable presence of interpretation in any discovery is apparent in such different fields of learning as physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, zoology, industry, agriculture, among others. This presence is emphasized by Heidegger in the context of philosophical attitude on the part of the physicists, chemists, biologists, physicians, zoologists, industrialists, agriculturists, in their respective discoveries. In Richardson's observation, Heidegger is driving home the point that without interpretation all these sciences can never have a rightful and an authoritative claim in their discoveries since what they embrace as discoveries are dependent on their attitudes that should always be philosophical.<sup>48</sup>

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing presentation, it can be argued that this philosophical attitude is ever present in Fleming when he discovered penicillin; in Priestly when he discovered oxygen; in Roentgen when he discovered X-ray; in Finlay and company when they discovered terramycin; in Lippershey when he discovered television; in Bundy when he discovered time recorder or Bundy clock; in Mitterhoffer when he discovered the typewriter; in Taylor and Young when they discovered radar; in Niepse, Sr. when he discovered photography; in Laennec when he discovered the stethoscope; in Goodyear when he discovered rubber; in Edison when he discovered the movie machine; in Nobel when he discovered dynamite; in Aspdin when he discovered cement; in Pascal when he discovered the adding machine; and in Bushnell when he discovered the submarine.<sup>49</sup>

What all these scientists discovered are nothing other than beings, the entities in the world, the "something as something" in the world; in a word, the as-structure of human existence.

Earlier, we cited Jacques Derrida's contention about the meaning of meaning, which is traceable to its root that signifies 'opinion' or 'intention.' Also, in Aristotelian, or classical, or traditional logic, we are told that all words are terms, but not all terms are words. Those words which are called

syncategorematic (or co-significant words), e.g. "at," "on," "in," "the," "a," and the like, are, indeed, words but they do not have the privilege to be called terms. On the contrary, those words that are intrinsically pregnant with meaning - or those that truly signify or represent reality - are called categorematic, e.g. house, rock, pen, apple, car, among others.<sup>50</sup> In this regard, meaning is had only in the context of categorematic terms.

On the part of Heidegger, the meaning of meaning is never anchored on the purview of 'opinion,' or 'intention,' or categorematic words. To Heidegger: "When entities within-the-world are discovered along with the Being of *Dasein* - that is, when they have come to be understood - we say that they have meaning."<sup>51</sup> In his analysis, when understanding comes to the fore, what is being understood by human *Dasein* is not the meaning of its object but the "object" of understanding itself, i.e. Being. Heidegger asserts: "But that which is understood, taken strictly, is not the meaning but the entity, or alternatively, Being."<sup>52</sup>

Along with his conviction that only the human *Dasein* exists and none other goes his firm contention that meaning matters only to human *Dasein*. There is no other grade of being which is, or who is, capable of and is conscious of meaning. Writes Heidegger: "*Dasein* only 'has' meaning, so far as the disclosedness of Being-in-the-world can be 'filled in' by the entities discovered in the disclosedness. Hence, only *Dasein* can be meaningful."<sup>53</sup>

Also, Heidegger clarifies that the concept of meaning is ontologico-existential. This means that outside the realm of human *Dasein*, meaning is debunked. Thus, to Heidegger: "This interpretation of the concept of 'meaning' is one which is ontologico-existential in principle.... all entities whose kind of Being is of a character other than *Dasein's* must be conceived as unmeaning."<sup>54</sup> However, meaning is not an isolated issue of understanding. Rather, it is glued in projection and interpretation, with its inseparable foundations, viz., fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception. This is the reason why Heidegger writes: "Meaning is the 'upon-which' of a projection in terms of which something becomes intelligible as something. It gets its structure from a fore-having, fore-sight, and a fore-conception."<sup>55</sup>

Φ

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Books

- Labor, Eddie. *The Human Person: Not Real, But Existing*. Manila: C & E Publishing, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ethics: The Philosophical Discipline of Action*. Manila: Rex Book Store, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Logic: The Philosophical Discipline of Correct Thinking*. (Manila: C & E Publishing, 2003.
- Collins, James. *The Existentialists*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1952.
- Gelven, Michael. *A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time*. New York: Harper Torch books, 1970.
- Guignon, Charles, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Harold Bloom, Jacques Derrida, and J. Hillis Miller. *Deconstruction and Criticism*. New York: Seabury Press, 1979.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Trans. by Joan Stambaugh. London: Harper and Row Publishing, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Being and Time*. Trans. by John Macquarie and E. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Contributions to Philosophy*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Discourse on Thinking*. Trans. by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Existence and Being*. Trans. and ed. By Werner Brook. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Identity and Difference*. Trans. By Joan Stambaugh. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Translated by Richard Taft. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter on Humanism," in Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, 2nd ed. San Francisco, California: Harper & Row, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Letter on Humanism." Trans. by Edgar Lohner in *The 20th Century Philosophy*. Vol.3, (eds) William Banett, and H.D. Aiken. New York: Random House, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Question Concerning Technology," in Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*. David Farrell Krell, ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Question Concerning Technology," in Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*. David Farrell Krell, ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What is the Metaphysics?" in Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*. David Farrell and Krell, ed. USA: Harper Collins Publisher, 1993.
- Poggeler, Otto. *Heidegger's Path of Thinking*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1995.
- Rintelen, von J. *Beyond Existentialism*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1961.
- Taminiaux, Jacques. "Philosophy of Existence I: Heidegger," in *Twentieth-Century Continental Philosophy*. Richard Kearney, ed. New York: T.J. Press, Padstow, Cornwall, 1969.
- Vycinas, Vincent. *Earth and Gods: Introduction to the Philosophy of Heidegger*. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
- Zimmerman, Michael. "Heidegger, Buddhism, and Deep Ecology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*. Charles Guignon, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eclipse of the Self*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1981.

## Articles

- Barbor, Eddie. "Christian Philosophy and the Challenge of Postmodernity." *PHAVISMINDA Journal* 6 (May 2007):15-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "An Essay on the Fate of Metaphysics." *Holy Name University (DWCT) Graduate School Journal* 10, No. 2, (March 1999): 40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Heidegger's Concept of Authentic Existence as a Being-in-the-World in the Context of Fear, Dread, and Concern." *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy* 36, No. 2: 182-199.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Nietzsche's Concept of Religious." *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy* 34, No. 2: 169-181
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Nietzsche's Zarathustra According to Martin Heidegger." *Holy Name University Graduate School Journal* 14, No. 1, (October 2003): 12-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Heidegger in His Discourse on Thinking." *Holy Name University Graduate School Journal* 13, No.1 (March 2002): 29-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Science of Being: Heidegger and Kant." *Holy Name University (DWCT) Graduate School Journal* 12, No.2B (October 2001): 17-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Reflection and a Critical Survey on the Meaning of Human Nature: From Thales to the Stoics." *Philippine Journal of Arts and Sciences* 1 (1997): 68-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Kong Zi's Concept of Virtues: A Hermeneutical Approach." *UNITAS* 76, No.4, (December 2003): 459-490.
- Platt, David. "The Seashore as Dwelling in the Fourfold: An Ontic Explanation of Heidegger." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 25, No. 2 (June 1985).
- Richardson, William. "Heidegger's Critique of Science." *New Scholasticism* 42 (Autumn 1985): 511-535.

---

## Electronic Sources

Capelle, Philippe. "The Concept of Transcendence in Heidegger." Available from <file:///c:/amydocuments/conceptoftranscendencehtml>.

Carr, Thomas. "Only God can Save Us." Available from <http://www.firtadings.com/issues/ft981/carr.t/html>.

Carry Deverell, "Martin Heidegger: A Theology Yet to Come." Available from <http://deverell.net/heidegger.html>.

Cavalier, Robert. "Lectures on Heidegger's Being and Time." Available from <http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part1/sect3/texts/Bourke.html>

Heidegger, Martin. *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*. Translated by Michael Heim. Available from <http://books.google.com.ph/books?id=NpLPePqZYwEC#dq=the+metaphysical+foundation+logic+bym>. 13 March 2008.

Soressi, Beminiano. "Heidegger on Poetry and Technology: Toward a New Dispute over Ancient and Modern Gods," in [www.whpp.org/whpq/200212/whpq2000212-004-1.html](http://www.whpp.org/whpq/200212/whpq2000212-004-1.html).

Weatherson, Martin. "Categories and Temporality: Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant." Available from <http://www.esu.edu/phil/mwthesis/ct.int.html>.

<sup>1</sup> "The word meaning goes back to a root that signifies 'opinion,' or 'intention,' and is closely related to the word moaning." See Harold Bloom, Jacques Derrida, and J. Hillis Miller, *Deconstruction and Criticism* (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 1.

<sup>2</sup> "To Heidegger, the Scholastic philosophers – most of who are Fathers of the Catholic Church – take Aristotle as a disguised Catholic cleric. Even Plato's thoughts on Ideas are taken as tailor – made by the Scholastic philosophers in their attempt to explain the meaning of world-view." See Eddie R. Babor, "An Essay on the Fate of Metaphysics," *Holy Name University (DWCT) Graduate School Journal*, 10, no. 2, (March 1999): 40.

<sup>3</sup> R.F. Phillips, *Modern Thomistic Philosophy* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950), 180.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Cavalier, "Lectures on Heidegger's Being and Time," in <http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part1/sect3/texts/Bourke.html>

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 184.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 183-184.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>11</sup> As explained earlier, concern in Heidegger's analysis does not pertain to the model of subject-object relationship of human *Dasein* and entities, therefore, we do not ascribe to the idea that in the disclosure of the human *Dasein's* possibilities in the world, the world becomes an object of such actualization, nor do we submit here to the Scholastic theory of truth as coherence, i.e., conformity between judgment and reality. For further readings, see V. Vycinas, *Earth and Gods: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Martin Heidegger* (Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969), 33.

<sup>12</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 183.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>14</sup> Michael Gelven, *A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (New York: Harper Torch Books, 1970), 86-87.

<sup>15</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 184.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 184-185.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 185.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 185 and n.1.

<sup>19</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 185.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 183.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>22</sup> For further readings, see Eddie R. Babor, *The Human Person: Not Real, But Existing*, 5ff.

<sup>23</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 185.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>25</sup> See Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>31</sup> See, Ibid., 190.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> See Ibid., 189.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> See Ibid., 192.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 191.



<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 191.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Gelven, *A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time*, 97.

<sup>46</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 97.

<sup>47</sup> Entities, seen from their aspect of use, are called 'ready-to-hand or *zuhanden*, while entities which become disengaged from our use with them are called 'present-at-hand' or *vorhanden*. For further readings see Robert Cavalier, "Lectures on Heidegger's Being and Time," in <http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part1/sect3/texts/Bourke.html>.

<sup>48</sup> See William Richardson, "Heidegger's Critique of Science." *New Scholasticism* 42 (Autumn 1985): 518.

<sup>49</sup> For further readings, see Eddie R. Babor, "An Essay on the Fate of Metaphysics," *Holy Name University (DWCT) Graduate School Journal* 10, No. 2, (March 1999): 44-45.

<sup>50</sup> See Eddie R. Babor, *Logic: The Philosophical Discipline of Correct Thinking* (Manila: C & E Publishing, 2005), 25.

<sup>51</sup> Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 192.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 192-193.

<sup>53</sup> *ibid.*, 193.

<sup>54</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *ibid.*