

4-7-2016

## The Statue that Houses the Temple: A Phenomenological Investigation of Western Embodiment Towards the Making of Heidegger's Missing Connection with the Greeks

Michael Arvanitopoulos  
*University of South Florida, stookerman@aol.com*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

---

### Scholar Commons Citation

Arvanitopoulos, Michael, "The Statue that Houses the Temple: A Phenomenological Investigation of Western Embodiment Towards the Making of Heidegger's Missing Connection with the Greeks" (2016). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.  
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/6170>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usf.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usf.edu).

The Statue that Houses the Temple:  
A Phenomenological Investigation of Western Embodiment  
Towards the Making of Heidegger's Missing Connection with the Greeks

by

Michael Arvanitopoulos

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Department of Philosophy  
College of Arts and Sciences  
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Joanne B. Waugh, Ph.D.  
Co-Major Professor: Charles B. Guignon, Ph.D.  
Alexander T. Levine, Ph.D.  
Mor Segev, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:  
April 1, 2016

Keywords: Phenomenology, Existentialism, Embodiment, Greece, Sculpture

Copyright © 2016, Michael Arvanitopoulos

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures .....	ii
List of Tables .....	iii
Abstract .....	iv
Chapter One: Looking for Heidegger’s Theory of Embodiment .....	1
1.1 Why Looking in “Origin” .....	1
1.2 Why Looking in Art .....	11
1.3 Why Looking in the Statue .....	24
Chapter Two: The Embodiment of Horizontal Temporality .....	37
2.1 Figure as the Structure in Whose Shape Time Composes Itself .....	37
2.2 The Muscle As Cultural Predilection .....	40
2.3 Time as Muscular Motility for the Movement of the Understanding .....	46
2.4 <i>Zeus</i> and the Foregrounding of Consciousness .....	55
Chapter Three: Dasein’s World Emptying and World Gathering .....	71
3.1 The Embodiment of Primordial Angst: The Gaze .....	71
3.2 Time Gathering <i>Laokoön’s</i> Knee .....	84
Chapter Four: The Embodiment of Care I .....	109
4.1 The Problem of the “Anthropopithique” .....	109
4.2 Agalmatophilia .....	114
4.3 The Embodiment of Understanding .....	124
Chapter Five: The Embodiment of Care II .....	148
5.1 The Embodiment of Attunement .....	148
5.2 The Embodiment of Entanglement .....	163
Chapter Six: The Embodiment of Care III .....	180
6.1 The Embodiment of Discourse .....	180
Chapter Seven: Conclusion .....	199
7.1 The Embodiment of Primitive Dasein as Art: A Glimpse of the Invisible .....	199
7.2 <i>Laokoön’s</i> Body as the Origin of All Subjectivity .....	211
References .....	214

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Vesalius, <i>Fabrica</i> , 1543 AD, Mütter Museum, Philadelphia College of Physicians .....	42
Figure 2.	Hua Shou, Shisijing Fahui, <i>Acupuncture Man</i> , 1341, National Museum of China.....	43
Figure 3.	<i>Zeus of Artemision</i> , c 480 BC, National Archaeological Museum, Greece .....	57
Figure 4.	<i>Laokoön Group</i> , c 150 BC, Museo Pio-Clementino, Vatican.....	58
Figure 5.	<i>Berekhat Ram Statuette</i> , c 800.000-233.000 BC, Israel National Museum, Jerusalem .....	61
Figure 6.	<i>Ptoan Kouros</i> , c 525 BC, National Archaeological Museum, Greece .....	69
Figure 7.	<i>Kritios Boy</i> , c 485 BC, Acropolis Museum, Greece.....	74
Figure 8.	<i>Blond Boy</i> , c 485 BC, Acropolis Museum, Greece .....	75
Figure 9.	<i>New York Kouros</i> , c 580 BC, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York .....	86
Figure 10.	<i>Ramping Horseman</i> , second quarter of sixth century BC, Louvre Museum, France .....	173
Figure 11.	<i>Calf Bearer</i> , second quarter of sixth century BC, Acropolis Museum, Greece .....	174
Figure 12.	<i>Gigantomachy</i> , last quarter of sixth century BC, Pergamon Museum, Berlin .....	194



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Schema .....	200
----------	--------------	-----

## ABSTRACT

Much of the criticism Heidegger has drawn from realism, from postmodernism and even existentialism, as well from the anti-Nazi protests on his philosophy, could be diluted if a defaulted connection was made between Heidegger's metaphysics and the Greeks. *Being and Time* drafted the blueprint of the origin of predication and world-disclosure from the primordial intuition of the limitations of action in the face of human finitude. This existential reprioritization forced a radical reversal of primacy from nature to culture, having assumed the absolute objectivity of some original world determinacy, the phenomenological structure of which, nevertheless, was never produced in Heidegger's seminal work or thereafter.

Existentialism has thus been downplayed as a counterintuitive, fanciful hypothesis, and will remain so for as long as horizontal temporality has not made itself available to itself as a negated object of perception in the horizon of disclosure. The *objectified* subjectivity of Dasein's cultural bias should be demonstrable, if there is indeed a determinant even firmer and "causally prior" to the object of perception in reified nature. And the theory of freedom that is existentialism will remain a "theory" with a private definition of the term, if *both* the phenomenological structures of the "objectification" of subjectivity have not *appeared*: first as the objectivity of freedom that is absolute and universal, but no less than as the *object* that frees made up from nothing other than the absolute and universal objectivity of freedom.

Heidegger must have felt this most pressing shortcoming in his metaphysics, because in a later monumental work, *The Origin of the Work of Art*, he avowed of such an object that is both the programmatic manifesto of freedom, and frees, pointing to the Greek Doric temple. He must

have realized that the highest objectification of Dasein's volatile subjectivity was somehow of "Greek" origin, and as I will argue, in this assumption alone he was right. But his proof was premised therein in an incomplete, trivial and self-contradictory way that left exposed to counter-entrenchment his arguments over both the attribution of the origin of reality, and consequently also its subjective constitution. From this point on, existentialism has remained doggedly problematic, if not inconsequential, in being unconnected to its bloodline, that is, phenomenology, and inasmuch as Heidegger's incomplete metaphysics has remained unconnected to his miscued art theory.

My hermeneutic method seeks this elusive, twofold objectification of subjectivity, in order to justify existentialism by simultaneously making the missing connections between Heidegger and the Greeks, and between *Being and Time* and *The Origin of the Work of Art*. The connections I am suggesting are both necessary and possible, provided that Heidegger's theory of art is modified to grant monumental statuary its due hermeneutic primacy.

Heidegger attributed the disclosure of world in truth-as-untruth to poetry and architecture, while Gadamer, who advanced Heidegger's phenomenology to the currently predominant hermeneutic theory, also gave primacy to poetry and architecture. Their mistake is critical, because, as I will argue, Greek statuary is the patent twofold objectification of Dasein's existential analytic, it is the convergence point of evidence to infer Heidegger's missing theory of embodiment, and it is the ultimate origin of Western metaphysics.

Current theories of embodiment, including Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological case from where a missing dialogue has been attempted to derive Heidegger's theory of embodiment, typically confine themselves to Dasein's ontological and ontic corporeality. I suggest that such theories should have addressed the necessity of the structures of Reason to incarnate themselves

as the *fundamental* ontological prescriptions of perception. To address the necessity of this incarnation in monumental art as a primordial world disclosure, is to explore in this work a previously untapped tripartite hermeneutic conjecture, where theory of art and theory of embodiment are already theories of perception.

My hermeneutic hypothesis adheres to, corroborates and advances basic phenomenological principles, to show how Dasein's embodied structures in the exclusivity of Greek statuary have so far been misunderstood, decontextualized, and begged the question, accordingly as a "mystery" (Hegel), as "godly" (von Humboldt), as a "misunderstanding" (Buschor), or as "Greek naturalism" (art historians).

Special attention will be paid to works such as the *Laokoön Group*, the *Ptoan Apollo*, the *Blond Youth*, the *Zeus of Artemision* and the *Gigantomachy*. I argue that these cultural fossils provide the most reliable grounds for a thorough commentary to Heidegger's implied theory of embodiment, because they manifest as the art which relates most intimately to the instrumental modality through which the being-towards-death makes itself phenomenologically available to itself as the negation of the negation to live. Additionally, and in a postmodern world of academic wars that have claimed every aspect of Greek culture as stolen from other great civilizations, such solely uncontested cultural fossils are arguably the unsolicited proof classicists have been unable to produce regarding the exclusively Greek origin of Western metaphysics.

The most consequential thrust of this work seeks to revitalize Heidegger's claim regarding the origin and the chronology of world against competing alternatives such as Christian metaphysics, science's Big Bang Theory, or the emasculated feminist case regarding the metaphysical primacy of the womb. The ultimate contribution this work aspires to, is the empowering of a presently stalled paradigm shift from the scientific to an existential-

phenomenological world view. This shift would be akin to the one which procured with the advent of the Enlightenment between science and religion - a clash still raging in education – where further progress now demands that humanity leaves behind the disguised alienation which Heidegger himself coined as “the dictatorship of science.”

## CHAPTER ONE

### LOOKING FOR HEIDEGGER'S THEORY OF EMBODIMENT

#### 1.1 *Why Looking In "Origin"*

Perhaps paradoxically, Heidegger's metaphysics, that is, his fundamental ontology, is not grounded in the 1927 seminal work of *Being and Time*, as it may be expected, but in his 1935 essay *The Origin of the Work of Art*. *Being and Time* may explicate the transcendental world-determinations of angst, temporality, and care, which disclose reality by allowing beings to become phenomenologically available in their being for the being-towards-death, but according to Heidegger in *Origin* these determinations are themselves subject to whether or not they may first manifest as art. It is in the artwork, or, as we will see, rather *as* the artwork, where these metaphysical inscriptions first manifest as the possibility of world. "Towering up within itself, the work opens up a *world* and keeps it abidingly in force", we read in *Origin*. (*Origin* 169) Before Heidegger, art was about the beautiful; with *Origin*, this changed dramatically: "Till now art was about the beautiful and beauty, not about truth." (*Origin* 162) The things of the world, including the artwork itself, can appear only "after" some sort of art has determined, not in a causal relation, how the objects of perception appear: "Nothing can be discovered about the thingly aspect of the work so long as the pure self-subsistence of the work has not distinctly displayed itself." (*Origin* 165) In this chapter I will first argue that Heidegger is mistaken to regard *architecture* as the foundational art form. In the following evocative passage from *Origin* it is clear how it is not the work - here the Greek temple - which is contained within a world of an otherwise unaccountable

origin, but a world that begins to unfold as an expandable morphogenetic field of perception at the periphery of such monumental art:

Standing there, the building rests on the rocky ground. This resting of the work draws up out of the rock the obscurity of that rock's bulky yet spontaneous support. Standing there, the building holds its ground against the storm raging above it and so first makes the storm itself manifest in its violence. The luster and gleam of the stone, though itself apparently glowing only by the grace of the sun, first brings to radiance the light of the day, the breath of the sky, the darkness of the night. The temple's firm towering makes visible the invisible space of air. The steadfastness of the work contrasts with the surge of the surf, and its own repose brings out the raging of the sea. Tree and grass, eagle and bull, snake and cricket first enter into their distinctive shapes and thus come to appear as what they are. The Greeks early called this emerging and rising in itself and in all things *physis*. It illuminates also that on which and in which man bases his dwelling. We call this ground the earth. (*Origin* 167-168)

For Heidegger art is the furthestmost regress we may reach in our quest for the source of truth and reality. Whereas the world's determinations and their disclosures, including the artist and his work, are founded, grounded, and bestowed in art, art itself as truth is not brought about by anything else or prior to it; art as truth comes out of a particular sense of nothing. So we read in *Origin*: "Does truth, then arise out of nothing? It does indeed if by *nothing* we mean the sheer 'not' of beings, and if we here think of the being as something at hand in the ordinary way, which thereafter comes to light and is challenged by the existence of the work as only presumptively a true being." (*Origin* 196)

The world disclosed and thus mounting at the foothold of the artwork, is a self-contained and self-maintained morphogenetic field of perception with a certain entelechy. So we read in *Origin*: "A genuine beginning, as a leap, is always a head start, in which everything to come is already leaped over, even if as something still veiled. The beginning already contains the end latent within itself." (*Origin* 201) When Heidegger describes works that bear the monumentality of

opening up such a self-contained and self-maintained world, it is usually implicit but it is made explicit that he means *just that one particular world* of Dasein which has disclosed itself and came to us as its ontological preservers to be casually known as “Greek”. “Always when beings as a whole, as beings themselves, demand a grounding in openness, art attains to its historical essence as foundation. This foundation happened in the West for the first time in Greece. What was in the future to be called Being was set into work, setting the standard.” (*Origin* 201)

To recapitulate, the grounding of Dasein’s fundamental ontology is rather oddly explicated in *Origin, post-scriptum* to *Being and Time*. This is so for several reasons: (a) the primordial inscriptions of reality are themselves subject to whether they may or may not first manifest in art or as art; (b) the things of the world, including an epiphenomenal understanding of the artwork itself, can appear only “after” art has determined how they appear; (c) the being of a world and its preservers can only begin to precipitate at the periphery of monumental art as a morphogenetic field of perception; (d) art as truth itself comes out of nothing. In *Being and Time*, “art” is only mentioned in two very brief instances, with a few more fleeting and inconsequential mentions of “poetry” and “literature”. Dasein's fundamental ontology and Heidegger’s metaphysics begin in *Origin*.

Nevertheless, scholarship typically looks for Dasein’s fundamental ontology in Heidegger’s seminal volume of *Being and Time*. The miscue may be due to the fact that the competent art form to incorporate the above mentioned primordial inscriptions of reality had yet to be correctly identified, especially in Heidegger’s misguiding us to poetry and architecture. Poetry and architecture, which Heidegger and Gadamer thought of as the art forms upon or through which a world first discloses itself, are relatively unfit to harbor the world’s equiprimordial determinations of temporality, angst, and care, because unlike the human body’s



ideation in art, the temple and the poem are not objects wedged in between mind and world.

What makes the rendition of the human figure in monumental sculpture uniquely qualified for this task, is that the human body is the only world object wedged as an organic frontier in between mind and world, whereupon, it will be shown, world projects, Dasein's or otherwise, are themselves projected.

Since the world-disclosive structures of primitive Dasein could not be found in the favored poetry and architecture (at last Heidegger did not even attempt to point out these structures therein), the otherwise Heideggerian claim in *Origin* that *it is rather art that creates the artist as well as the work and the work's preservers*, remained trivial and inconsequential at best. For some, it was Heidegger just "being poetic". Heidegger only obliquely if at all suggests the obligatory conjecture following from his refutation of substance ontology in *Being and Time* and his elucidation of the origin of world in *Origin*, namely that besides the artist art must also create its preservers together with their morphogenetic field of perception as "world". For if the perceptual culture of Dasein does not simply parachute into a world of otherwise unaccountable origin, and if the eidetic suchness of the "artist" cannot be seen apart from the eidetic suchness of the non-artist preservers of the work and their morphogenetic fields of perception, then we must start taking seriously the possibility that some kind of art may not only be the origin of artist, work, and the work's preservers, but through and through the origin of world. The only alternative would be the absurdity that *all* preservers are actually active artists of the caliber that chiseled the *Laokoön Group* or other comparable arche-techne that discloses the existential structures of primitive Dasein. The non-literal reading of *Origin* implies the acceptance of this absurdity, for if art does not actually discloses world, as the non-literal reading suggests, and art has only created the artist and the work but nothing else, *then how is it possible that there are*

*mere preservers besides the artist who have not chiseled such works, but, nevertheless, whose own world-perception, as well as how these preservers are themselves perceived, are all absolutely determined by the structures disclosed as the artwork?*

To avoid this absurdity and turn a hitherto slack conjecture between Heidegger's metaphysics and his aesthetics into a rigorous understanding of the origins and the constitution of reality, we must bring and keep in full sight both the refutation of substance ontology in the early Heidegger and a *literal* reading of the radical claims in *Origin*, which is considered as part of his middle work. The implications of this conjecture not only are neglected by Heidegger himself, but they have been subverted by the mysticism of his late philosophy. Self-justified by this subversion of the early by the late Heidegger, where it has been noted that capital concepts such that of care are radically discrepant in between the two periods, and where a relapse to substance ontology is implied by Heidegger's concession that Greek art - in general - learned from Egypt,<sup>1</sup> scholarship has remained blind to the obligatory and discriminatory conjecture that we are making here. Some Heideggerian scholars think we can afford to shrug off the literal reading of *Origin*.

Amongst these scholars is Julian Young, who in his 2001 book *Heidegger's Philosophy of Art* proposes that the literal reading of *Origin* is a misunderstanding. Young tags any world-deriving readings such as ours as "Protean", and figures that in critical passages of *Origin* such as those about the unconcealment of world at the periphery of the Greek temple where art as truth is setting itself to work, and where nature as *physis* emerges for the first time as that which it is, Heidegger did not mean that literally; he was merely being "poetic".<sup>2</sup>

Young finds two reasons why the Protean understanding of monumental art is wrong. In the first he sees that "whether or not *some* artwork may have created the Greek world, it is

extremely difficult to see how it could have been *the temple*.”<sup>3</sup> Though he is right – indeed, as we will see, the temple cannot house the statue, the reverse is true - here Young is himself twice wrong: once because our linking of *Being and Time* with *Origin* will show that the world ensuing is not merely “the *Greek* world”, but *our* world, since the post-archaic Greek world must be seen as the origin of Western metaphysics; then wrong again because, while the structures of primitive Dasein do not manifest as architecture, this does not preclude their manifestation in some other, more competent art, - in our case to be made, in monumental statuary.

Young’s second reason to dismiss the Protean reading of *Origin* is that it is supposedly “inconsistent with fundamental positions Heidegger had already worked out in *Being and Time*.”<sup>4</sup> But, as I am to demonstrate in what follows, quite the contrary is the case. Not only our reading of *Origin* is thoroughly consistent with Dasein’s fundamental ontology as this ontology is explicated in *Being and Time*, but *Being and Time* can be explained and defended only through Heidegger’s radical hypotheses in *Origin*, albeit only by means of our corroboration of these hypotheses up against the correct type of art.

Young dismisses the disclosure by art of the possibility of a world from without, as he misconstrues a “fundamental position” from the writings of early Heidegger (*Being and Time* and *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*) in order to establish the inauthentic world of the they as a background world constituency which is already there for the work to arrive into. Heidegger may have said that the self arrives to the they, but never said that so does art. In *Being and Time* the origin of the they from the self is as often repeated as it is clear: “the inauthentic they-self is an *existentiell* modification of the authentic self.” (BT 268, 318) Nonetheless, with this false precedence made by Young, “... the role of the artwork is not to create but rather to ‘make

expressly visible', to 'thematize' a world which *is already in existence*.”<sup>5</sup> But then, one ought to ask Young, whence the background world of the they?

Young addresses this question by kicking it further down the road. He cites Heidegger's obtrusive idea that language (the art of poetry) creates the background world of the they,<sup>6</sup> an explanation as liable to Young's first objection against the Protean reading - that it is extremely difficult to see how in this case the art of poetry may have created the world - as is the art of architecture. Young does not show how poetry discloses the world-prescriptive structures of primitive Dasein including the background constituency of world as the they, and neither does Heidegger.

Young is supposedly “phenomenologically speaking”,<sup>7</sup> and yet his non-literalist reading dodges the core phenomenological argument in *Being and Time* and arguably Heidegger's most important contribution to philosophy, namely the refutation of substance ontology. To grant the they preexistent status to what art may disclose, is to acknowledge merely the world-*descriptive* function of non-monumental art, to remain blind to the world-*disclosive* role of *arche-techne*, and thus to ultimately revert to substance ontology. It is only in the absence of the phenomenological distinctions we are going to make in the next chapter between monumental and non-monumental, world-prescriptive and world-descriptive art, that Young can beg the question in saying that “Great art ... brings world out of background inconspicuousness.”<sup>8</sup> But, again, whence this “background”, and whence its “inconspicuousness”?

Young's dependence on late Heideggerian concepts of a Dionysian, chaotic “It” that “gives world to us” underscored by Cézanne,<sup>9</sup> reintroduces an unaccountable origin of a perceptual thing-in-itself and is thus a relapse to the understanding of space and time in Kant's *Transcendental Aesthetic*, which *Being and Time* has decisively left behind. Whether a Kantian

*ding-am-sich*, an Einsteinian Big Bang, a Freudian *Id*, or the feminist's primordial womb, the substrative world into which Dasein is seen to parachute is as alien to what is premised in the phenomenology of *Being and Time* as it is flying in the face of the literal interpretation of *Origin* and the vindication of this interpretation by Greek art.

Our literal reading of *Origin* is thoroughly consistent with *Being and Time* - indeed the two works cannot stand apart from each other - inasmuch as Greek statuary discloses the they-self, both authenticity and inauthenticity, so that there is nothing left of "world" to be claimed by substance ontology and the discretionary systems of elucidation that explicitly or tacitly assume it. Our analysis of Greek statuary in the next chapter will bring forth the origin of the they-self in multiple ways, that is, in all the embodied structures of primitive Dasein's temporal and spatial determinations. What remains unaccounted for in Young's non-literal understanding of *Origin*, namely the world's background constituency into which both art and artist supposedly parachute into, emerges and is validated in the newfangled consistency between *Being and Time* and *Origin*. The they part of the they-self appears in the *mitda-sein* not only as Dasein that *has-been*-there in the anthropological history of selves bygone, but more so, it appears as the sedimented determining manifold *perceptions* of those selves bygone: cumulatively speaking, it appears as a reified "nature". The Western world's infatuation with the *ideality* of Dasein's embodiment in Greek art owes to our preserving and in coming to terms with this ideality in the disclosure of the they, as the ideal body of the individual tacitly reveals the possibilities of the they reenacted in the self, and of the self abeyant in the they. Ultimately, our explanation of the "beautiful" in the next chapter will be simpler, more intimate, more intelligible, and hence more convincing than Young's bleary idea that "The beautiful is, after all, what according to 'aesthetics', we respond to when we abstract from the instrumental categories of normal experience."<sup>10</sup>

Our regress to *Origin* as an uncanny text which is *post scriptum* but essentially precedent and anticipating *Being and Time*, justifying Heidegger's fundamental ontology by providing this fundamental ontology's metaphysical grounds, has many advantages. One of them is that it begins to dissolve the accusations (Victor Farias, Hugo Ott, Emmanuel Faye) that Heidegger's is a Nazi "philosophy". Examining a 1934 lecture, Faye uncritically connects Dasein's "earth" to Hölderlin's "secret Germany"; and in Heidegger's essay *The Fundamental Question of Philosophy*, he understands that, "[f]rom the outset philosophy's function is to address, in a privileged, or even an exclusive way, the German people alone. All others but this originally German man are excluded from the we."<sup>11</sup> Heidegger may have expediently used and abused his own philosophy in his own given sociopolitical situation. But at this point, and beginning in *Origin* as the foundation of his metaphysics, it is clear that Heidegger makes sense precisely because he does not refer to the German land, or the German people, and because he does not even address the Greek people or the Greek land in a privileged way. As we saw earlier, where Heidegger qualifies what is "Greek", designation, signification, and thematization begins only "after" the artwork has eidetically designated itself so that the phenomenological availability of the land, together with its preservers, begins to engender itself from the foothold that the world launches at the artwork's metaphysical foundations. Dasein's land is not necessarily "Germany"; it is all the earth as the countries and the nations, the planet, and all the universe designated in its suchness; the reason is that, as we read in *Origin*: "[t]hat into which the work sets itself back and which it causes to come forth in this setting back of itself we call the earth. Earth is that which comes forth and shelters." (*Origin* 171) Dasein's truth-as-untruth initially has nothing particularly "German" or "Greek" about it, but pertains only to the destiny of the being-towards-death as a historical people out to resolve their situated being. Because the preservers preserve this truth-as-

untruth founded, grounded, and bestowed by the work, this destiny and this situation cannot be reduced exclusively to the private experience of *Das Deutsche Volk*; the destiny and the situation is that of the *hoi polloi*, which is a *cultural*, that is, essentially perceptual, and not national, nor racial entity. The “Greeks” is not a racial or national designation: “Preserving the work does not reduce people to their private experiences, but brings them into affiliation with the truth happening in the work”, we read in *Origin*. (*Origin* 193) *The Origin of the Work of Art* precludes such abusive misinterpretations of the existential analytics of Dasein, and thus this text has the potential to simultaneously begin to defend both Greek culture *and* Heidegger’s philosophy. The potentiality of this text - if we modify it beyond Heidegger’s shortcomings - lies in that it explains *cultural* values as perceptual determinations disclosed in monumental art, or rather *as* monumental art, so that arguments about metaphysics propounded on the anchored relationship between a given culture and its artistic fountainhead are relatively incontestable.

Fundamental ontology in *Being and Time* may be recovering the authentic temporal horizon of disclosure as the recovery of the question of being, but it is *Origin* which rattles the foundations of substance ontology. As we will see in later chapters, it is in or rather as art that the equiprimordial conditions of substance disclosure, namely angst, temporality, and care, are themselves originally disclosed. If the - otherwise granted - primacy of art over philosophy in the explication of perceptual determinations has not been clear, this is due to the forms of art which Heidegger and Gadamer pointed to, and which are incompetent to embody the equiprimordialities of angst, temporality, and care. Dasein does not disclose itself into its Being as a temple or as a poem, but in that actually elusive, mystical object that we casually refer to as a “body”. It is only from the explication of art as the objectified origin of truth in *Origin*, not from the existential metaphysics of *Being and Time*, that it can be shown why the origins of

Western metaphysics can be traced only through a comparative hermeneutics in competent world art. Once we have pointed out the objective indispensability of *Origin* in inferring Heidegger's implicit theory of embodiment, we can next see with *Origin* why such a theory can be inferred from what Heidegger claimed about art.

## **1.2 Why Looking In Art**

One of the collateral consequences forced in by *Origin*, is the refutation of both the materialist and the idealist understandings of science. Heidegger's claim that the original disclosure of natural laws takes place as a singular event in art, precludes science's "discovering" truths about the world that preexist art and science, awaiting to be understood by the sorts of Newton, Einstein and Heisenberg. Gravity, relativity, and indeterminacy must be world determinations originally disclosed as such by the instigation of some embodied art-world. Heidegger posts several abstract arguments towards this end, but it is only in the case that will be made here about the hermeneutic primacy of monumental statuary art, that his proofs begin to seem plausible. Heidegger starts out with the most generic argument, the reassignment of the opening of perceptual possibilities: "Art is the origin of the artwork *and* of the artist; ... On the usual view, the work arises out of and by means of the activity of the artist. But by what and whence is the artist what he is?" (*Origin* 182, 143) Perceptual possibilities emerge for both the artist and the preservers of the work as a social enframing: "Createdness of the work means truth's being fixed in place in the figure. Figure is the structure in whose shape the rift composes itself." (*Origin* 189) And again: "The establishing of truth in the work is the bringing forth of a being such as never was before and will never come to be again." (*Origin* 187) If Heidegger is correct here, and we will demonstrate that he is, the scientist arrives to investigate a world the possibility of which has already been opened to her by some competent form of art. So we read in *Origin*:



Truth happens only by establishing itself in the strife and the free space opened up by truth itself. But truth does not exist in itself beforehand, somewhere among the stars, only subsequently to descend elsewhere among beings. This is impossible for the reason alone that it is after all only the openness of beings that first affords the possibility of a somewhere and of sites filled by present beings. ... By contrast, science is not an original happening of truth, but always the cultivation of a domain of truth already opened, specifically by apprehending and confirming that which shows itself to be possibly and necessarily correct within that field. (*Origin* 186, 187)

As if the claim that it is art which creates the artist was not bizarre enough, what makes it even more difficult a hypothesis to test, is that Heidegger did not distinguish between monumental and non-monumental art, nor did he venture beyond generic statements to say which poetry and which architecture founds, grounds, and bestows the existential analytic of Dasein. If Dasein is a perceptual *culture of morphogenesis* and not the Germanic race or the Greeks, and if there can be more than one variant perceptual cultures ranging from the animal to what is “human”, Heidegger’s references to the Greek temple, to Van Gogh’s painting, and of Hölderlin’s verse, leave out legitimate candidates from both inside and outside the perceptual biases of Western civilization.

There is one suggestion though, in *Being and Time*, from where we can infer that the monumentality of the work can be decided by whether the work is *made of* a certain authentic historicity, so that it opens up a historiographical horizon for other, non-monumental, or historically authentic (as opposed to authentically historic) works to be visible as such, since even the possibility of authentic historicity would have no other venue to initially disclose itself but in a definitive work of art. An awe-inspiring Egyptian statue may be historically authentic, but it cannot be more authentically historic than a Greek work, as the Afrocentrist or the alternative cultural vindicationist wants it in the recent raging cultural wars. Here Heidegger

agrees with Nietzsche: “Beings do not become ‘more historical’ as we go on to a past ever farther away, so that what is most ancient would be the most authentically historical.” (BT 382)

For us to be able to tell the difference between the *authentically historic* artwork (the work through which any other and all works of art are visible as such) and the *historically authentic* artwork (the work which is visible in its suchness through the perceptual determinations disclosed by an authentically historic work), we would need to let the work talk to us, instead of us talking to it. Harkening to the work is the non-factual reading of art. We are talking to the work when we assign to it its creator, its style and influences, the tools used to make it, the chronological time and the place and the material from which it was made. And we let the work talk, when, in order to decide its monumental quality, we intuit the ideational structures of its constitution, the programmatic inscriptions which may appear as casual forms integrating the content, so that reason, or unreason, or whatever other programmatic inscriptions we may meet with in the work, is disguised as Nature. That such a hearkening could attend to *fundamentally* variant world programmes, can be easily demonstrated, even if we stayed within “Greek” art and compared the vocations of two monumental works, say an Ionian to a Doric temple, the Homeric epos to Sophoclean tragedy, or more manifestly so, the statuary sculpture of an Archaic *kouros* compared to works such as the *Zeus of Artemision*.

Scholars who agree with Heidegger that fundamental ontology must start from Dasein’s factual concerns would, nevertheless tell Heidegger’s critics that Dasein should not be understood in terms of everyday human existence. From this discrepancy, evidence from Classical Greek statuary obliges me to suggest that the search for first principles in fundamental ontology can be investigated only from a non-factual reading of art. If scholars have failed to infer a rigorous theory of embodiment out of Heidegger’s metaphysics, it is because of three

preoccupations. Firstly, because they are bound to the fundamental ontology in *Being and Time*, looking only there for the transcendental structures that allow beings to emerge-into-presence in their being in everyday practices and prior to any theoretical assumptions. Secondly, in *Being and Time* scholarship has no access to Dasein's *embodied* ideational structures of meaning, so that they end up assuming that access to the question of being begins with the hermeneutics of ontic Dasein. The assumption is that any philosophy arises from the ontic realm of finitude, of historicity, and engenderment, and it always returns to this ontic realm in order to conform with reality. Thirdly, even those daring scholars who have ventured into *Origin* for clues, are therein tripped up by Heidegger's mistake to promote poetry as capable of embodying the founding, grounding, and bestowing of Dasein's existential analytic. One must already possess the defensive conceptual armature when entering the bewildering landscape of *Origin*, and be ready to dispute Heidegger's conviction there that it is language that first brings man about into existence by naming things for the first time and by first bringing beings to word and into appearance.

None has figured how a major obstacle to infer Heidegger's rigorous theory of embodiment can be overcome by a non-factual reading of art. Scholars typically point to the interrelated constraints which prevent Dasein from making visible to itself the absolute productivity of its own existential determinations, the limitations posed by the twofold restriction of the "hermeneutic circle." The circularity of existence preordains that interpretation of reality always commences from the throwness of sociohistorical prejudice and from interrupted, corrupted, finite understanding, so that there is never an exhaustive description of what it is to be "human". Disquiet over this matter was even appeased, since Sartre made the existential case to actually understand this quandary as an advantage, an open horizon that puts an end to

correspondence theories of reality, from Plato to early Wittgenstein. On their account, Gadamer and Heidegger did much to show how the hermeneutic situation precludes that there can be an objective ground from which the essential structures of understanding become transparent. (*BT* 363, 195, 275).

Be that as it may, and while the hermeneutic circle is understood rather as a procreative, onto-poetic episode promulgating Heidegger's "worlding world", it remains to be reckoned with that the hermeneutic rapture is simultaneously *degenerative*, in ever distancing Dasein from digressing to the singularity event of its own original world disclosure. The hermeneutic circle more or less builds up a "past" essentially different from that which was originally "there", rendering that original "there" into a mere ontic prejudice that must be reified ever-again. This generative-degenerative buildup occurs in the process which Gadamer coins as "reconstruction" and "restoration".<sup>12</sup> Both Gadamer and Heidegger consider the world-generative aspect of the hermeneutic event more important and valuable than its degenerative aspect, and for the world's ec-static justification, rightly so. But the third, degenerative function of the hermeneutic circle has remained relatively unrecognized, perhaps at its most important implication, namely in that *it sustains the asymmetry between the ontological and the ontic interpretations of history*.

When Heidegger writes that it is rather the art that creates the artist, he is either misunderstood to have meant that the work more or less merely reorganizes the emotional constitution of the artist, or *at most* that the experiencing of the work-making somewhat affects the artist's perceptual biases. If neither, then Heidegger remains incomprehensible to the mainstream art historian, who understands that art comes into a world already in existence and in full force, and definitely not that a world, including the artist, his teachers, his tools, the work itself, etc., literally comes forth *because* (although not causally), and thus out of, that art. This

understanding is clear, though implicit in one of the most prominent figures in the field, Sir John Boardman's ontic assessment of the origin of Greek art. In his 1978 and 1985 handbooks *Greek Sculpture – The Archaic Period*, and *Greek Sculpture – The Classical Period*, the acclaimed Oxford professor assumes a preexisting historical world-background which for Heidegger could have only been established *because of, and thus “after”* the given art. But not so for Boardman:

The physical turmoil of Greek history in the early decades of the fifth century was answered in Greek art by what appears to be a sure and steady progress, and the gradual changes in style encouraged effortlessly, it seems, a revolution in the sculptor's approach to his craft. This marks a turning point in Western art. ... The Attic temple programme was inspired by the historical fact of the city's recent leadership and military successes against Persia.<sup>13</sup>

Boardman understands the *greatness* of Greek art as a *realistic* representation, a mere side effect triggered by the specific historical situation into which the Greeks found themselves facing the invading Persian armies. Historical events come first and art follows. Some half a century after *Being and Time* and *Origin*, Boardman's publications, which gave the canon to generations of art historians, remained factual readings of art, oblivious of Heidegger's radical hypothesis: to wit, that the foundation concepts which Boardman deploys and integrates in the above excerpt, concepts such as “historicity”, “facticity”, “physicality”, “situatedness”, “specificity”, “change” and “progress”, are cognitive and perceptual possibilities prescribed in the temporal horizon of understanding disclosed by Greek art.

The unrecognized implication of the hermeneutic circle's degenerative function – Boardman's unsuspected predicament - distances us from the original event and reconciles us to an otherwise inscrutable “past” which actually was never “there”. It also forces the artistically-instigated historical consciousness into spinning out a foregrounding that has unfolded incrementally and cumulatively as a past factual threshold at the disclosive horizon of the

artwork. It is this perceptually malleable foregrounding that maintains the asymmetry between the ontological and the ontic interpretations of history, so that the world may continue to “ex-ist” in maintaining *an ecstatic* horizon of disclosure. Boardman, Osborne, Toynbee and all our best scholarship of ontic science of Western history, never get a glimpse of the fact that the hermeneutic event shyly integrates its own fundamental ontological, prescriptive determination, and presents it to its own historical consciousness as a mere aftermath.

Besides the maintenance of the asymmetry between the ontological and the ontic interpretations of history, the hitherto unaccounted degenerative effects of the hermeneutic event blanket and hush the maintenance of an additional asymmetry, now between artistically-instigated fundamental ontologies which disclose to their preservers otherwise incommensurable worlds. The blanket is lifted only when Dasein is freed from the constraints of science, here historiography, to reflect on and compare its own embodied world determinations with samples of alternative cultures’ monumental art. The degenerative aspect of the hermeneutic event – “degenerative” in that it ultimately encumbers us from recovering the question of Being - has guaranteed that, no matter how striking, as much unnoticed must remain the asymmetry between, say, the classical Greek statuary work of *Zeus of Artemision* with the competent embodied determinations of Egyptian or Taoist art. We do not even have to venture that far out of the “Greek” world to see that Dasein’s all-inclusive historical enframing is obliged to reach out and make its own any perceptual intimations that may otherwise be alien to its own. The reconstructive and restorative integration of the Homeric archaism into Dasein’s historical bloodline is just one such paradigmatic case in point, even if our fundamental ontological analysis remained within things “Greek”. Informed by our case made regarding the hermeneutic primacy of statuary art, Gadamer would point out that Boardman’s naive understanding of art is

possible only from an hermeneutic standpoint that has lost sight of its own productive prejudices, a consciousness that cannot do otherwise but to: “immediately ... recombine with what it has foregrounded itself from in order to become one with itself again in the unity of the historical horizon that it thus acquires.”<sup>14</sup>

Boardman’s inference of the innerworldly historical determinations which supposedly instigate art, so that art may intuitively appear as a mere effect of a pre-established material world, requires the cumulative transhistorical effect of this ontic foregrounding, of which Boardman’s account is only a latecomer. Nonetheless – and, theoretically speaking – as soon as we have justified and acknowledged the ontological primacy of the work with a non factual reading of art, an exhaustive sequencing of the primordially accrued ontic foregroundings would suffice to take us upstream to the fountainhead of Dasein’s absolute productivity of historical determinations. This retrogressive expedition would exhaust itself to no “earlier” than the metaphysical first principles which have founded, grounded, and bestowed by the work. The viability of this exhaustive phenomenological sequencing, though practically an impossible project, would in theory reset straight the paleo-ontological deficit between fundamental ontological and ontic temporality, and this is a better, more intimate problem to solve than the alienating project to infer the origin of the world in the empiricist, scientific assumptions of substance ontology.

The elusive “Archimedean foundation” is fully disclosed as art, but only if we let the work speak to us instead of imposing facts to its constitution. It is art, authentically historic, monumental tragic art, that is, which reveals the exhaustive description of what it means to be human. What follows here will attempt to show that it is in the statue alone, where the objective ground from which the essential structures of understanding become transparent. The subjective

prejudice of thrownness and of finitude is itself objectified, if we can determine that the tragic meaning of what it is to be human is an *a priori* condition for the horizon of world disclosure. The tragic truth is a “foundation”, inasmuch as that this truth is the condition of world disclosure. The tragic truth is a “foundation”, inasmuch as that this truth is the condition of world disclosure for the being-towards-death; this tragic truth is “objective”, inasmuch as it prescribes that the hermeneutic circle must remain a subjective situatedness; and this tragic truth is an “exhaustive description”, inasmuch as, as Heidegger anticipated, the entelechy of Dasein’s world programme is a “beginning [that] already contains the end latent within itself.”

Launching an investigation only from Dasein’s factual concerns allows the Hermeneutic Circle to interfere and determine that any research for cultural origins is ill fated, because the futurally concerned civilization evolves by carrying with it and transfiguring its own past instances of situation and finitude into its ever new apprehensions of reality. For Heidegger and Gadamer the hermeneutic circle ultimately is not an impediment but a constructive ontological event: through it truth and reality is spawned, albeit this truth and reality buries the essential structures of the understanding as a “merely” hermeneutic event, a mere performance.

This principle must be constantly upheld against all of Heidegger’s critics: that Heidegger is an *a priori* anthropologist who distinguishes between three overlapping layers of epistemological inquiry: the ontic, the ontological, and the fundamental ontological. Fundamental ontology alone is in the last analysis what we call “phenomenology”, i.e., the principled science of investigating how and why, in the first place, the being of beings is interconnected and contextualized to become eidetically available for the being-towards-death. The ontic and the ontological inquiries are subsumed to fundamental ontology, because, as we



read in *Being and Time*, "... the necessity arose for a fundamental ontology which would have as its theme that being which is ontologically and ontically distinctive, namely Da-sein." (BT 37)

If the fundamental ontology of Dasein can unearth its Archimedean moment, the origin of our quest for origins must evince as some sort of a cultural, primordial fossil which is not contained by, but rather contains the prescriptions of the thetic, eidetic, and finite, *existentiell* consciousness, so that the overlapping hermeneutic circles of thrownness and finitude leave it unaffected. Such cast prejudices of a blind adherence to a world, primordial fossils which remain stubbornly unfeigned to the transformation of the past into ever new and familiar apprehensions of reality, we casually think of as the art of strange worlds bygone.

Heidegger ponders how things from antiquity can still appear objectively present as innerworldly things in today's world. But by talking of "things historical", it is likely that he means the historically authentic works, and not the authentically historic. This is suggested in the following passage from *Being and Time*:

How are these ... things historical when they are, after all, *not yet past*? ... Or do these 'things' 'in themselves' yet have 'something past' about them although they are still objectively present today? ... What *were* the 'things' that they no longer are today? ... What is 'past'? Nothing other than the world within which they were encountered as things at hand belonging to a context of useful things and used by heedful Da-sein existing-in-the-world. That *world* is no longer. But what was previously innerworldly in that world is still objectively present. (BT 380)

Not all ancient works of art are made of the hermeneutic prescriptions of thetic and finite consciousness, even if they themselves are monumental works by means of their having founded, grounded, and bestowed discernible, alternative perceptual world programmes. The historically authentic work is the work which surrenders its monumentality to the hermeneutic circle. It is Heidegger's "innerworldly thing", the Archaic *kouros*, the *Iliad*, the laughing Buddha statue, the

*Upanishads*, part of an ever modifiable and adjustable, hermeneutically liable “past”, determined so through our futurally concerned quest for origins. Such a work, because of its “innerworldliness”, is *contained* and thus corruptible to hermeneutical modifications by thethetic, eidetic, and finite historical consciousness.

Contrarily, the authentically historic work *contains* the hermeneutic prescriptions, being the origin of the possibility of interpreting any past out of any future. No matter how situated in thrownness and finitude is their interpretation, these works are not liable to hermeneutic modification, because if they were to be modified, the modifying powers of the understanding that attempt the modification, i.e., the powers which preserve the work for its preservers in the first place, would have to turn against and modify themselves out of their own modifying powers, and thus render themselves impotent to render the modification.

We know that we have arrived at the fountainhead of Western metaphysics through the competent, non-factual end of the inscriptive evidence of Dasein’s fundamental ontology, when in the authentically historic work that we examine, we meet with no other than the hermeneutic prescriptions that enable our examination. The primordiality of the authentically historic artwork has established itself as the fundamental ontological terminal past, as opposed to the ontic terminal past which empirical science identifies as a “Big Bang” of ultimately an unaccountable origin. But this fundamental ontological arrival is an arrival to an objective and potent ever-present that resists the corrupting subjectivity of the hermeneutic circle. For, no matter how subjective, that is, no matter how provincially thrown and incomplete the interpretation of this artwork may be, it would still be a tautology to Dasein’s consummate world project, since, just like Dasein’s indeterminacy, the interpretation is itself a “beginning [that] already contains the end [of thrownness and incompleteness] latent within itself.”

In monumental works such as the statue *Zeus of Artemision*, or Aeschylus' tragedy *Persians*, Dasein's primordial world disclosure encounters as clearly as spectacularly the resistance of the Other as such, while it reaches out to the Other to eliminate it as such and make it its own. This is the *artwork*-originating modality through which, as Heidegger argued, Dasein's historical concerns engender and install for itself a certain path out of a threatening future. The art whose ontological, aesthetic, and moral values are not tautological to the movement of the understanding of the inquiring agency, is thus encountered as the Other which Dasein must reach out and make its own in collective memory (*koinomnemosyne*). Dasein's biblio-*thetic* regiment is obliged to classify and shelf that art (African masks and surrealist paintings are prime examples), either as the exciting art of a queer and alien world, or at least as less intimate instantiations of its own aesthetic evolution. The annexing of alien world-disclosive art by Dasein's historicity is executed as if by default, because nothing can be disclosed in history apart from Dasein's world: "Da-sein is primordially historical, what historiographical thematization presents as the possible object of its investigation must have the kind of being of Da-sein that has-been-there." (BT 394)

Unlike the historically authentic work, the authentically historic work, though it may casually and inconspicuously appear in the museum standing amongst other works and innerworldly beings, is nevertheless the only unconditional constancy amidst the multitude of innerworldly forms of contingency, uncertainty and ambiguity. In this sense the authentically historic work is not of this world, - *the world is of this work*. The hermeneutic competence of statuary art alone, shows that what makes it necessary for the authentically historic work to casually appear amongst innerworldly beings, is the necessity that the metaphysical ordinance which appears as "the work" must engage itself *as the world's implementing instrumentality*. The

world-instigating constancy has to appear in the ideational form of the human body, because only this intermediary comportment between mind and world that speaks of itself while speaking from inside that world can connect noumenal Reason with phenomenal Nature, by means of its own embodied involvement in existential anxiety.

Heidegger's incomprehensible claim that art creates the artist and her world, begins to be vindicated only after we have made the distinctions between the monumental and the non-monumental, the authentically historic and the historically authentic art. The distinction will direct us to interpret the most competent works, since we already saw that, even if we remained limited within "Greek culture", we met with art that founds, grounds, and bestows incommensurable worlds. These initial distinctions already suggest that in our arriving before some art rather than another, our presented consciousness may realize that it is standing before the ideational embodiment of its own world programme, this encounter affirming that a world, at least this world, is indeed founded, grounded, and bestowed in art as Heidegger radically proposed.

We conclude this section by having assessed why Heidegger's theory of art should be the commencing text for an investigation which seeks to infer the implicit theory of embodiment out of Heidegger's fundamental ontology, instead of starting from Dasein's factual concerns. The artwork begins revealing its essence as the metaphysical decree of world interpretation, when its phenomenological structures are allowed to talk louder than our own imposition on it of the work's factual presence.

### 1.3 *Why Looking in the Statue*

It seems a paradox, that an elusive theory of *embodiment* sought after a metaphysics that anticipates a world first disclosed *in art*, would not have considered the human body rendered in statuary.

Heidegger addressed the phenomenological structures of the human body only as an *existentiell* comportment. The body in itself is not worth much attention for Heidegger, since it is thrown in Dasein's spatiotemporality that is already there, prior to the body's capacities for sensation. Empiricism saw the body as the converging receptor of primary and secondary sensations, but for Heidegger the body is hermeneutically inconsequential because it is not the origin of perception. Scholarship has followed in this misleading path, having conceded to Heidegger's conviction that the body may give us access to beings but it does not constitute a disclosive horizon that bestows meaning to beings, and that our body makes sense to us only on the basis of an already opened horizon.

This particular conjecture does not take into account the larger picture in Heideggerian metaphysics, where Dasein's disclosive horizon in question must have itself become phenomenologically available as some form of art, that horizon being the transcendental law with which the human body must intimately and consummately identify. The natural world as an incomplete state of affairs can be interfaced with only by that transcendental law which embodies itself as the instrumentality of incompleteness towards the implementation of Dasein's teleological world programme. By "world programme", we understand the programmatic projection which Heidegger meant in writing that "understanding in itself has the existential structure which we call project." (BT 145) As it turns out, and as I will argue in my analysis of Greek statuary in following chapters, the physical human body *does* constitute some sort of

Dasein's transcendental disclosive horizon, for otherwise our bodies would not make sense *to us as us as finite beings*, if these bodies were not the instruments through which Dasein's world programme is implemented.

The anticipation of what the human body ought to look like according to some tacit law disclosed in art, also explains our sheer horror and alienation when the human body is opened up in accident, dismembered in war, or anatomized by science, or when we are confronted by otherwise natural deformities of the human body, obesity the simplest one, or the more severe ones usually found in third world countries with poor water conditions; the parasite mycosis disease reconfigures the human extremities into shapes that resemble broccoli florets, which we find an utterly uncanny sight.

Accordingly, Heidegger makes a grave hermeneutic mistake, a mistake which exposes his philosophy to criticism from all quarters, when he attributes to the temple the original disclosure of how the human body ought to look like. He does this when he writes in *Origin* that, “[t]he temple, in its standing there, first gives to things their look and to men their outlook on themselves.” (*Origin* 168)

We read previously that Heidegger thinks the human body makes sense to us because it is equal to all other innerworldly beings within Dasein's disclosive horizon; but actually the human body would not make sense to us - it would indeed appear a horrid sight - if within this horizon it stood equal to other innerworldly beings such as broccoli. Our body makes sense *to us as us* only in its somehow resembling the transcendental law of disclosure; to be more specific, when the body is assembled by the phenomenological structures of the equiprimordialities of angst, temporality, and care. Although it has not been noticed by neither art theorists nor phenomenologists, in this embodied equiprimordial gathering *the body resembles that one*

*unique world object wedged in between mind and world.* Because the human body is the only configured phenomenological objectification wedged exactly at, and entirely occupying, Dasein's critical interface between mind and world, the body is more of a being than any other beings, the body thus constituting the only exception in Heidegger's understanding that "[t]he being of beings 'is' itself not a being." (BT 6) If a given possibility of perception is enacted and engendered by Reason, and if the phenomenological structures of the body as art are found to be identical with the structures of Reason, then the body *is* the origin as the provenance of perception, though not quite how the empiricists thought of it.

Were we able to demonstrate that some rendition of the human body in statuary art *is consummately* made of those transcendental equiprimordialities, we would have shown that the human body – that particular rendition of the human body – *is* the disclosive horizon of Dasein. From this proof we can further derive Heidegger's implicit theory of embodiment that connects his philosophy with Greek tragic art, and thus to ultimately answer his critics and the question regarding the cultural origin of Western metaphysics.

Heidegger's failure to identify the human body as a *fundamental ontological* intimation and consummation of Dasein's metaphysical grounds, may be attributed to two preoccupations. The first one can be seen as an uncritical conformity to the German romantic tradition which saw art as the representation of beauty instead of as the disclosure of truth, stemming all the way back to Winckelmann. The understanding of statuary art as representation is consistent in Winckelmann's analysis, and Paragraph 29 of Section One of his pioneering *History of Ancient Art*, set out the tone by reckoning that architecture must be more "ideal" than sculpture, because statuary is a "mere imitation" of the human body; on the other hand, architecture does not imitate

anything actual, but “was obliged to discover its own rules by repeated trials, and establish them by general approval.”

The second preoccupation may be Heidegger’s regard of the body as yet another *re-*presentation amongst innerworldly beings. Kevin Aho, who attempted an ontic and ontological inference of Heidegger’s theory of embodiment, rightly observes that Heidegger’s “... early project is still to identify the metaphysical ground that gives meaning to beings. The result is a tendency to re-present what is ontological - namely, the meaning of being - in terms of an object, reifying the happening or event of being as a being, as something ontic ...”<sup>15</sup> In *Origin*, however, Heidegger momentarily implies that the statue, as well as the temple, are not representations.

The temple, in its standing there, first gives to things their look and to men their outlook on themselves. This view remains open as long as the work is a work, as long as the god has not fled from it. It is the same with the sculpture of the god ... It is not a portrait whose purpose is to make it easier to realize how the god looks rather, it is a work that lets the god himself be present and thus *is* the god himself. (*Origin* 168)

In *Origin*, the essence of the statue appears only within a world already disclosed by architecture. But, as we premised earlier and will comprehensively argue in the next chapter, architecture is not the *arche-techné*. Heidegger’s fundamental ontology could not have been more wrong in premising that the world as an eidetic morphogenetic expansion begins to unfold for “the first time” at the perimeter of the temple. The following passage is as unequivocal as it is erroneous on multiple accounts (my italics):

A building, a Greek temple, portrays nothing. It simply stands there in the middle of the rock-cleft valley. The building encloses the figure of the god, and in this concealment lets it stand out into the holy precinct through the open portico. *By means of the temple, the god is present in the temple.* This presence of the god is in itself the extension and delimitation of the precinct as a holy precinct. *It is the temple-work that first fits together and at the same time gathers around*



*itself the unity of those paths and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire the shape of destiny for human being. The all-governing expanse of this open relational context is the world of this historical people. Only from and in this expanse does the nation first return to itself for the fulfilment of its vocation. ... 'the temple-work, in setting up a world ... causes it to come forth for the very first time.'* (Origin 167, 171)

In fact it is the other way around. Again: if we can read beyond the work's factual presence and demonstrate that some monumental disclosure of the human figure in sculptic art is *essentially made of* the transcendental equiprimordialities of angst, temporality, and care, that is to say, if some statuary art is found to intimately and consummately manifest Dasein's existential analytic, thus idealizing the human body as the only innerworldly object wedged in between mind and world being their connective interface, then we would have shown that *it is rather the statue that houses the temple*. Heidegger asks: "With what essence of what thing would a Greek temple agree?" (Origin 162) The answer he expects is that "it agrees with nothing". We answer: the Greek temple agrees with the essence of the statue presented *as* the statue, because the phenomenological structures of the temple as such are perceptually affordable only by the perceptual possibilities disclosed by the statue. Conversely, just because the said transcendental equiprimordialities evidently *are not* present in the temple, or rather *as* the temple, then the statue would not be disclosed, or at least would not be disclosed as such, if, as Heidegger thought, it was the temple that is setting up a world.

The presence or absence of the transcendental equiprimordialities of world disclosure in the work, or rather *as* the work, is our only way of validating both the work as the possible origin of a preservable collective consciousness, one possible version of which Heidegger describes as "Dasein", but also for qualifying statements about the identifying of the work's preservers to the work. Were we to mistakenly use the temple as the origin of the ontological, aesthetic, and moral

constitution of the people, the temple being an art form where the perceptual inscriptions are arguably absent, we would have lost sight of the grounds from which to infer the people's world programme. To art historians the structures of Reason may have been regnant on a Doric temple, but the equiprimordial conditions of angst, temporality, and of care, which precede thought (the case Heidegger made against Descartes), and which though themselves not innerworldly beings nevertheless *do* summon and gather the structures of Reason in the ideal human body, are not even implicitly present in the temple's rhythm.

With such a loss of sight, fundamental ontology can be easily warped and slanted according to the whim of circumstantial political motive to alternative world programmes - now actually mere *existentiell* policies - that may be ignorant to the "human condition". In pointing to the (relatively speaking) hermeneutically vacant temple as the origin of the people, the Freiburg professor in 1935 exposed himself to accusations that his "philosophy" is actually Nazi propaganda in disguise. Faye could not help but make it a point that Heidegger was "referring to the temple as an 'enrooted and outspreading middle, in which and on the basis of which a people founds its historical sojourn'." This at the time when Hitler was speaking to the NSDAP at the *Zeppelinfeld* in Nuremberg, amidst a sea of swastikas, around the *Zeppelintribune*, a large structure of colonnades and basins intended to recreate the Greek atmosphere of the Pergamon Altar. Faye is justified in seeing Heidegger the Nazi, "[t]o speak two months later [than Hitler's speech], in his lecture, of the 'temple' in which the people 'comes to itself' (which is not a Greek but a Nazi conception) and of the 'clearing' ... such was the way chosen by Heidegger to celebrate the congress ..." <sup>16</sup>

Gadamer fostered Heidegger's arguments on the primacy of architecture, but fell even further afield. In his connecting Heidegger with the hermeneutic tradition from Schleiermacher,

to Husserl, Ranke, Droysen, and Dilthey, Gadamer advanced and established the currently predominant hermeneutical theory. In this theory the hermeneutic primacy of monumental statuary is given a mere decorative role. Gadamer sees that the most plastic of the art forms is architecture, because of its creating and bestowing original space to the other arts. The following passage, underscoring Gadamer's implicit adherence to substance ontology by his understanding statuary art as a mere representation, is from his *Truth and Method*.

Architecture gives shape to space. Space is what surrounds everything that exists in space. That is why architecture embraces all the other forms of representation: all works of plastic art, all ornament. ... By embracing all the arts, it asserts its own perspective everywhere. That perspective is *decoration*. ... Even the free-standing statue on a pedestal is not really removed from the decorative context, but serves to heighten representationally a context of life with which it is decoratively consonant. ... Hence, given its comprehensiveness in relation to all the arts, architecture involves a twofold mediation. As the art which creates space, it both shapes it and leaves it free. It not only embraces all decorative shaping of space, including ornament, but is itself decorative in nature. ... [I]t is clear that architecture explodes that prejudice of the aesthetic consciousness according to which the actual work of art is what is outside all space and time, the object of an aesthetic experience.<sup>17</sup>

Gadamer is correct to point out architecture's role in ruining the understanding of art as spatiotemporal transcendence. With the foundation of a certain rhythm, a given architectonic of meaning frozen in stone *may* suggest the "aesthetic" which, as such, grounds consciousness in situational spatiotemporality. Nevertheless, Gadamer will be first proven wrong, just in case we demonstrate that statuary does transcend spatiotemporality if it is made out of the equiprimordial horizontal temporality and care as the conditions respectively for the possibility of vulgar time and *the res extensa*. But even before this demonstration, Gadamer gives space an indefensible primordial status. On a first account, this primordial status is indefensible because it is not giving us a good reason to dismiss Heidegger's conviction that, "[t]he *temporality* of factual being-in-

the-world is what primordially makes the disclosure of space possible [my italics].” (BT 417)

Architecture may generate and bestow *space*, indeed, it does manifest *as* space, but itself belongs to the precedent horizon of *temporal* disclosure, which evidently does not present itself *as* architecture. The temple is space, and does create space for the statue to appear within; but the temple must first appear itself within the world disclosure of the primordial temporal horizon, which, as I will argue in the next chapter, consummately manifests *as* the statue. If the temple is frozen primordial spatiality, the statue is frozen primordial temporality. The *existentiell* proposition that before the statue can appear in the temple, the temple must first itself be erected within the Heideggerian earth’s spatial expansion, is ontologically counterintuitive, because the perceptual horizon which opens up the possibility for the earth upon which the temple is erected, is itself temporally pressurized, and as such, of a higher primordially and is first disclosed as the statue. If the temple’s opening up of space was the original disclosure of the “there”, as the Da of Dasein, then the temporal horizon of disclosure would have had to walk in, in that opened space, by means of the temple’s preserver constituting the part of Dasein that is *sein*, a false assumption that would revert us to Kant’s *Transcendental Aesthetic*, where space and time belongs to a *priori* cognition. But for Heidegger space and time are not receptacles of beings, nor do they belong to the “I”; they belong to Dasein, and are first disclosed to the preservers of some art form *as* an art form. That art form is not the temple, because the temple appears not as time, but as space.

As the next chapters will explore in detail, both primordial temporality *and* the possibility of regional expansion being grounded in temporality first appear as embodied formal provenance in what we otherwise casually understand as the “statue”. The statue’s agalmatic quality, from the Greek noun *agalma* dubbing for both “statue” and “fascination”, earns its monumentality in

fascinating us by means of its inconspicuously giving flesh to nothing more or less than our own fundamental ontological world project. As an ideation, it is the statue rather than the temple which is the most immanent art form to appear the closest to the instrumentality which implements Dasein's world project. The temple is not instrumental to that project, first because *Das Man* does not appear and act in the world embodied as a temple - for the same reason that it does not appear as a poem - but also because in its objective imposition the temple just *is*, it is homeostatic and devoid of kinaesthesia; it does not *ek-sist*, i.e., does not "stand-out-of-itself", and thus cannot project the situated subjective fitness needed to interface itself with a world which is only because it is yet to be. To originally and manifestly unleash Dasein's world project into a world, the competent art form must embody a kinaesthetic *contingency*, since, as Heidegger notes: "[b]ecause of the kind of being which is constituted by the existential of projecting, Da-sein is constantly 'more' than it actually is." (BT 145) The Doric colonnade may have institutionalized in spatial monumentality the objective structures of Reason, as art historians will reckon, but in its lithic articulation the temple is static; it lacks the regional situatedness and does not incarnate the temporal existential pressure to instigate the kinaesthetic expansion for the ever more disclosure of eidetic spatiality. The temple posits itself as it is, and in this positing context it may found, ground, and bestow thetic spatiality, but "*thesis*" in Greek means more than to be positioned; as we will further see in detail, it means to be *situated*. Heidegger anticipates such subtle loss in the translation of the word "*thesis*", both when he writes that "the rootlessness of Western thought begins with the translation of Greek words by Roman", but also when he acknowledges the kinaesthetic disposition of the situated being, in pointing out that "'thesis' means setting up in the unconcealed." (*Origin* 149, 186) Gadamer thinks that architecture is the most "plastic" art form. But "*plathein*", "to give shape", to "morph", is a

kinaesthesia, the creative force which makes itself manifest in the work. If Heidegger's fundamental ontology can embody itself in the world of experience, this creative force is enacted by the existential pressure of the *understanding* of finitude, and from that initial pressure, then through the regional expansion that seeks to thematize and sort out every contingent motive.

For the above reasons, it should begin now to become obvious what a monumental hermeneutical mistake it is to demote statuary art to a mere decorative role, and divert our attention to architecture and language. Charles Waldstein does not go as far as to connect classical Greek statuary with Dasein's existential analytic, but he already understands the unparalleled heuristic value of ancient statues, as being "things in themselves". In his *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*, he knows the difference between "[a]n inaccurate passage from any miserable scholiast of the 12th century who happened to write Greek, [having] more convincing power over the word-enslaved minds of many modern scholars than the life-long careful comparative study of form in the things-themselves."<sup>18</sup>

Gadamer follows Heidegger's understanding of the hermeneutic circle as an ontological event, but plays upon Heidegger's half-heartedly entertaining the idea that language holds a privileged hermeneutic position in the domain of the arts. Twice in *Origin* Heidegger clearly voices this position; first by writing that "... the linguistic work, poetry in the narrower sense, has a privileged position in the domain of the arts. ... Language, by naming beings for the first time, first brings beings to word and to appearance. Only this naming nominates beings to their Being *from out of their* Being"; and then again: "... since language is the happening in which beings first disclose themselves to man each time as beings, poesy - or poetry in the narrower sense - is the most original form of poetry in the essential sense." (*Origin* 189, 199) But Heidegger is also

admitting that it is arbitrary to trace back all the other forms of art, sculpture included, to poetry.

(*Origin* 198, 199)

Gadamer, however, thinks that the original ontological event describes itself phenomenologically even in everyday, relatively non-poetic, that is, non-creative but rather descriptive language: “The articulation of the logos brings the structure of being into language”, he writes. “Human thought regards the infinity of this presence as its fulfilled potential, its divinity. ... in language the order and structure of our experience itself is originally formed and constantly changed.”<sup>19</sup>

The expectation that language originally discloses and archaeologically preserves in everyday discourse a world’s primordial grounds of objectification, on first account does allow for both fundamental ontological and factual investigations of the sedimented linguistic evidence. In the cases we undertake, the fundamental ontology of a world programme *may* be derived from that world’s monumental linguistic narrative, and Eric Havelock, E.R. Dodds, and Bruno Snell do exactly that when they draw the blueprint of the fundamental ontology of Archaic Greek culture, detecting in the Homeric verse a sense of primordial spatiotemporality which we find to be alien to Dasein’s. But in our context of seeking the embodied existential analytic of Dasein, the archaeological analysis of linguistic sedimentation ultimately proves to be insufficient and unreliable.

Insufficient, because, at least in the case of Dasein’s perceptual project from within which we can have a say, it is not as a poem that “*sein*” is thrown into the “*Da*”. Phenomenologically speaking, the being of beings manifests in embodying itself as *Das Man*, that is, an instrumentality which *acts* upon its own existential predicament, not when it merely *talks* about it as Gadamer’s “divinity of Logos” and as a “fulfilled potentiality”; Dasein is

thrown, and thus it is not an immortal divinity. Heidegger understands that Dasein has a world only because that world resists Dasein's will to live: "Only because things offering resistance are disclosed on the basis of the ecstatic temporality of taking care ..." (BT 356) Were it for Dasein to be a noumenal ecstasis alone, Gadamer's divine Logos reaching out to thematize every motive, this noumenal being-there-ness would not suffice to produce a world; Dasein would not have a world if it did not actually have some-*thing* to throw against that world as its own reified thing. That some-*thing*, is on every single first account no other than Dasein's "human" body, be it the arm that extends the bow to sling an arrow, the mouth that screams behind a megaphone to a street protest against injustice, or the foot which accelerates an automobile.

Suppose we were to rely on language, or worse on language alone; what sort of an archaeologically preserved text would we choose to bear the original disclosure of Dasein's fundamental ontology? And what text would it be, that would make no less than the elusive connection between Heidegger's conception of Dasein and Heidegger's challenged preoccupation with the Greeks? The rational Platonic dialogue, or maybe more so the Greek tragedy, should be such monumental texts upon which to investigate the fundamental ontology of Dasein's existential predicament. But unlike in the case of statuary art, the origin of such texts is itself disputable and disputed by cultural vindicationism premised on seniority. The ultimate effect of this disputation is that the hermeneutic potentiality of such texts is diluted. These texts are then at best forced to partake on equal membership in a pool of perceptual cultures that are actually alien to Dasein's fundamental ontology. The Archaic Greek was just one of many such visible alien perceptual cultures, which are supposed to have evolved within the world model of substance ontology.



Contrarily, statuary art allows a thorough fundamental ontological analysis, because the qualified statue arguably incarnates the structures of Reason as the instrument of the world-disclosing equiprimordialities of angst, temporality, and care. Statuary art is not subject to surreptitious cultural modification, if the statue remains physically and essentially intact to reach any subsequent interpreter. And neither has the hermeneutically competent statue ever been disputed - it would be laughable - since, as we already mentioned, a strange silence has prevailed regarding post-Archaic Greek statuary, amongst all those who have otherwise claimed every single Greek cultural aspect as either stolen or appropriated from more senior civilizations.

### ***Endnotes***

1. Julian Young, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Art*, p. 97.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-36.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
11. Emmanuel Faye, *Heidegger - The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy*, pp. 103, 91.
12. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 167.
13. John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture - The Classical Period*, pp. 20, 168.
14. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 306.
15. Kevin Aho, *The Missing Flesh: On Heidegger's Neglect of the Body*, chapter 4, V.
16. Emmanuel Faye, *Heidegger - The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy*, pp. 238, 239.
17. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, pp. 157, 158.
18. Charles Waldstein, *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*, p. 30.
19. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 457.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE EMBODIMENT OF HORIZONTAL TEMPORALITY

#### *2.1 Figure as the Structure in Whose Shape Time Composes Itself*

Heidegger does not provide the necessary analysis of how angst, temporality, and care, that is, primitive Dasein, originally manifest as art within the world to which these determining equiprimordialities are said to be giving shape. Was he to provide this analysis, in order to allow an interface between these equiprimordialities being a transcendental law of disclosure on the one hand, and on the other the phenomenological structures which appear in the disclosed horizon for the being-towards-death, Heidegger would have to somehow trace the transcendental law manifesting *as* poetry and/or *as* architecture.

The closest Heidegger ever comes to yielding something about this necessity, are the ideas in *Origin* that the artwork instigates a rift for truth as strife that sets itself to work, and that the artwork as a structure is composed by this rift. This, we may surmise from the following two passages: “In setting up a world and setting forth the earth, the work is an instigating of this strife”; and “[c]reatedness of the work means truth’s being fixed in place in the figure. Figure is the structure in whose shape the rift composes itself. This composed rift is the fugue of truth’s shining.” (*Origin* 175, 189)

But is this “rift” the transcendental law of disclosure, which, nonetheless, as we premised in section 1.7., must embody itself as the interfacing instrumentality to *prescribe* the world’s incompleteness? It is not. Conceptually, the rift may, indeed, be the patent manifestation of the

world's incompleteness and the world's contingency; but the rift is itself an already conditioned ontological event (*Ereignis*), since we know from *Being and Time* that the condition of the possibility of innerworldly beings is not the rift, but something even more primordial: it is time as the intuition of finitude. (BT 419) The origin of *any* meaningful possibility, writes Heidegger, thus including the possibility of the rift as such, is time. (BT 325) Thus horizontal temporality, as the origin of all origins, ought to be embodied in the most monumental form of art, or rather *as* that art, "earlier" than any other noumenal or phenomenal phenomenological structure. For the being-towards-death the strife in which innerworldly beings are disclosed, and hence the rift within which this strife is objectified, is possible only in the lapse of irretrievable time.

Heidegger refers to Van Gogh's painting of the peasant's shoes as a work instigating the rift. In my understanding, this painting discloses the strife between world and earth, where the "world" is the existential necessity of the being-towards-death to toil in the face of *ananke*, while the "earth" is the peasant's toiling fields out of which *ananke* is transiently appeased. It is the strife in the rift opened by this opposition, which discloses, that is, configures as a regional *res extensa*, the given shape of the painted peasant's shoes. As Heidegger sees it, the figure of the shoes is "the structure in whose shape the rift composes itself". The disclosed shape of the shoes may intimate the rift which has opened in human experience to give the shoes their form, but the shoes' form, their "figure", says nothing about the even more primordial and binding truth which has made possible any and every rift, the "whence" of the strife, that is, the truth of the being who in its own being invents and uses the shoes as such because its own being has become an issue. This painting is "art" because its creativity describes a possibility of experience within a given perceptual field by composing otherwise disparate parts of world and earth into a meaningful unity. But this art is not monumental, inasmuch as it merely *describes*, that is, it does

not *prescribe* the domain. As Heidegger wants it, the art which would prescribe the domain should be an art that manifests itself as the disclosure of the temporal horizon within which innerworldly things such as peasants' shoes and the *Peasant's Shoes* may appear in their suchness.

But if *primordial horizontal temporality* conditions the possibility of experiencing the rift as strife in art, how would it be possible for the work to be structured *as primordial horizontal temporality*? How can the *subjectivity* of time - death pertains only to the "I" or to a sum of "I"s as the "they" - objectify itself as the world-disclosive idealization we understand to be the "artwork"? "The they never dies because it is *unable* to die ... death is always my own ...", notes Heidegger. (BT 425) If a world is first disclosed in art, and if time is the origin of predication for the being-towards-death, then *art in its most monumental manifestation ought to appear as raw temporality*. To rectify Heidegger on his own terms, we now have to say that: figure must be the structure in whose shape *time* composes itself.

In chapter 1 we suggested why finite time, being the prescriptive transcendental law and ultimate origin of predication, cannot manifest as poetry and as architecture. We argued despite of Heidegger and Gadamer, that time as the transcendental decree must instead appear – and be misunderstood as an idealization - in statuary art. In understanding the Greek body as the instrumental negation of the negation to live, we do not necessarily imply a dependency on the conclusions of Hegelian dialectics, but at this point only give Heidegger's "being-towards-death" the body that such a being can *live* by, and in this living to free itself by negating death. The double negation involved appears uniquely in Greek statuary as a muscular narrative, where the "muscle" is essentially intelligible as the phenomenological structure of affirmative instrumentality towards action; it is this double negation that we positively understand as our fit

“body”. In more tangible and visible terms, the embodiment of the double negation is patently noticeable in the comparison between Archaic and Classical Greek statuary, where the Archaic body lacks all the kinaesthesia and the intelligibility that makes us identify rather with the latter kind of idealized embodiment and makes our art historians say that it is only the Greek masters of the Classical era who “finally understood the human body.”

This chapter will demonstrate that the “muscle” as an ideation is fundamental ontology’s ultimate subject of inquiry. What ontic science casually understands as the “muscle”, “is”, preontologically speaking, primordial temporality having embodied itself ideally so that it can act upon its own world programme. But before we begin letting the statue talk to us, instead of our imposing on it our factual concerns, let us first be familiarized with what we are up against in our radical interpretation, by laying down an account of some narratives that are dependent on substance ontology, in which the muscle has either been misunderstood or triggered dumbfounding questions.

## ***2.2 The Muscle As Cultural Predilection***

The muscle does not attain a monumental phenomenological structure “earlier” than the Severe Style in Greek art, evinced by the *Zeus of Artemision*, even in world perspective. The “gadget” slowly begins to burgeon in Greek medical discourse only after it has been introduced in Greek art. For, while in Galen’s works of the mid second century A.D. the word *mys* (for “muscle”) shows up 460 times, and in Hippocratic attributions established between 450 and 350 B.C.E. it appears 14 times, in the Homeric saga it is totally absent.

In world perspective, the record from a rare fleeting moment of a first, unadulterated encounter between two variant art-worlds, proves even more incredible. In his book *The*

*Expressiveness of the Body – and the divergence of Greek and Chinese medicine*, Shigehisa Kuriyama reports that when in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Europeans began to study Chinese medical teachings, the descriptions of the body they encountered struck them as “phantastical” and “absurd”, “like tales of an imaginary land.” “[A]ccounts of the body in diverse medical traditions”, writes Kuriyama, “appear to describe mutually alien, almost unrelated worlds ... Chinese doctors lacked even a specific word for ‘muscle’. Muscularity was a peculiarly Western preoccupation.”<sup>20</sup>

Kuriyama traces the divergence of the “alien worlds” already well-developed at around 25-220 C.E.; in China by the end of the Later Han dynasty and in Greece beginning sparingly with the Hippocratic opus, clearly with the Hellenistic doctor Galen of Pergamon, and entirely embracing early renaissance Europe at the time of the anatomist Vesalius. Kuriyama offers a rare glimpse to incredulity once we momentarily escape the shifty spell of realism regarding the origin of the muscle:

Comparing the musculature portrayed in Vesalius’ anatomy [Figure 1] and the total absence of muscles in the acupuncture man [Figure 2], we see almost irresistibly a puzzle about blindness, about how observant Chinese doctors overlooked, strangely, one of the most prominent features of the human body. Yet historically, the vision of muscularity was in fact the exception. Interest in individual muscles and indeed the very notion of muscles – as distinct from flesh, tendons, and sinews – developed uniquely in medical traditions rooted in ancient Greece. Elsewhere, as in China, ‘ignorance’ of musculature was the rule. ... When dissectors inspected the body in ancient China they didn’t see the nerves and muscles that Greek anatomists found so arresting.<sup>21</sup>



Figure 1: Vesalius, *Fabrica*, 1543 AD



Figure 2: Hua Shou, Shisijing Fahui, *Acupuncture Man*, China, 1341 AD

The disquieting view into this alien intercultural encounter leads Kuriyama into asking pre-scientific, phenomenological questions, free from our own cultural biases and the debilitating spell of substance ontology. Only such a rare epistemological environment can elucidate the disclosive horizon event and the prescriptive origin of the essence in question. And although



Kuriyama still sees art as a representation, this does not stop him short from asking spectacularly unassuming questions that force the rather odd convergence of theory of art, theory of embodiment, and theory of perception that we ourselves have attempted here:

Greek artists represented figures with bulging ripples well before these ripples would have been identified as muscles, and they represented ripples even where, anatomically, no muscles exist. Yet if not as muscles, how did sculptors conceive these bulges they emphasized so? What did these ripples originally signify? And what change in consciousness transformed them into muscles?<sup>22</sup>

Kuriyama remains dumbfounded by the questions which his research orientation cannot confront, lacking the conceptual tooling that we get mainly from Heidegger's fundamental ontology and from Gadamer's hermeneutics; and yet even the formulation of such unassuming questions alone is a vast progress, a solid launching pad for our own investigation. Kuriyama's report is indispensable in that it casts doubt from inductive, *empirical* observation, from "phenomena that show up in everyday practices, prior to theoretical assumptions", as Heidegger wants, a doubt to the idea that the muscle is a universal essence, much less that the muscle is a gadget invented by mollusks at the bottom of the oceans half a billion years ago. In conjunction with Heidegger's claim that science commits to the mere expediting of perceptual world projects first disclosed in art, Kuriyama's intercultural report suggests that Dawkins' narrative is epiphenomenal to the muscle as a phenomenological structure first disclosed in art. That is, provided our pending demonstration that "muscle consciousness" partakes an embodied metaphysical law, a fundamental ontological horizon of disclosure which makes Dawkins' scientific narrative possible in the first place.

For phenomenology there is no world aside from a *culturally*-derived perceptual construct, before any scientific investigation is possible the being-towards-death must find itself

embodied into a world of its own making, no less than by a modality through which the being-towards-death must find *itself* in that which it investigates. It is this metaphysical mandate for natural conviviality that sends the theoretical biologist to the bottom of the oceans, because as it is the case that Dasein must belong to its world, so it is that the world must belong to Dasein, hence that the “gadget” must be found both in Dasein’s embodiment (as pectoral, abdominal, etc. muscle), *and* in Dasein’s disclosed world (here starting out from the mollusk). Though this cannot be pursued here, one must return to this point by the need to make the connection which Heidegger’s critics saw missing between the subjectivity of the temporally-determined being, and its objective world.

In the previous section we paraphrased Heidegger, to postulate that, as far as monumental and authentically historic art goes, the figure must be the structure in whose shape, not the rift, but *time* composes itself. With this postulation, and with all that we have thus far premised from Heidegger’s reexamined fundamental ontology, we will next set out to answer Kuriyama’s three pre-scientific aporias in the following order: (a) “what did the ripples originally signify?”; (b) “how did the sculptors conceive the bulges?”; and (c) “what change of consciousness transformed them into ‘muscles’?” To the first, our answer will be that the original signification of the “ripples” partakes the primordial embodiment of Dasein as art, and as the disclosive horizon of primordial temporality. To the second, we answer that it is actually the “bulges” that conceived the “sculptors” as such, and not the other way around. And to the third, that the change of consciousness which transformed the “ripples” into “muscles”, has been the entire project of Western science, currently advanced in Richard Dawkins’ theoretical biology. But let us take upon one question at a time.

### ***2.3 Time as Muscular Motility for the Movement of the Understanding***

The pre-muscular ripples signified the embodiment of the origin of signification. The ripples are an “origin”, as Heidegger saw it, of “that from which and by which something is what it is.” (*Origin* 143) The “ripple” is the original, pre-scientific structure of this origin, and, precisely as Heidegger predicted, and Kuriyama verifies extemporaneously, it appears first in art, as “ripple” before it appears in science as “muscle”. This “origin” is not a foundation, as in substance ontology, but an horizon as a whereupon of the disclosure of being. This origin first appears in art as “ripple” before it appears in science as “muscle”, because as we premised earlier, Dasein must embody and appear to itself in its nascent form as an instrument of its own world programme, within a world of its own making and prior to any scientific investigation of itself. The primordial signification of the signifier essence is possible only because this primordial signification is necessary for the disclosure of any other subsequent innerworldly beings into that endocrinological morphogenetic field of perception we casually call “culture”.

Time composes itself as a ripple in the figure, so that the figure, i.e., Dasein’s idealized embodiment, can comport itself ideally into its own world by becoming the most intimate instrument of resistance against the such and such of the world which ultimately resists Dasein’s will to live. This congenial approximation between (“Western”) mind and (“Western”) world derives the unparalleled “naturalism” which art historians find in Greek Classical statuary. To negate the negation to live, is for the being-towards-death to resist this negation piecemeal through labor and toil. As some neuroscientist put it, in this task the muscle is indispensable, “whether in whispering a syllable, or falling a forest.” The “ripple” becomes “muscle” first in view of this expenditure in labor and toil, and then as the object of the scientific inquiry which

sets out to qualify the conviviality of the human with the natural world and to quantify the “gadget” in order to increase human efficiency against a threatening nature.

At the origin of all quests for origins the “content” is raw, primordial temporality, and “form” is the structure of the figure which integrates within itself the raw temporality until Dasein embodies itself so that Reason may appear as Nature. As we will see in next chapters, the embodiment of temporality in Greek art is just one and the most primordial of the “contents”, or metaphysical mandates, through which the embodiment of Reason appears as Nature in Greek statuary art in order to prescribe and act upon a particular field of perceptual possibilities.

Winckelmann, who may be responsible for Heidegger’s erroneous conviction that architecture is Dasein’s original world disclosure, nevertheless did see the *transcendental* rootstock of resistance having taken the natural form of the muscle in the statue, although he may have understood it as a form of preternaturalness. In his analysis of the *Laokoön Group*, Winckelmann reckoned with both the consummate relation between the muscle and resistance, as well as with the unearthly origin of the muscle narrative. This reckoning is evident in the following passage from his *History of Ancient Art* (my italics):

The serrated muscles on the sides, as well as others, are *more* prominent, active, and contractile *than is natural*. ... The action of these muscles in the *Laokoön* is *carried beyond truth into the limits of possibility*; they lie like hills which are drawing themselves together, for the purpose of expressing the extremest exertion in anguish and *resistance*. ... *Laokoön* is an image of the most intense suffering. *It manifests itself in these muscles* ... every part of the body seems as if straining with agony.<sup>23</sup>

Yet the consummate identity between primordial temporality and the muscle seems to elude Heidegger. In *Being and Time* the only structural disclosure of primordial temporality

comes in the concept of the temporalization of temporality, where “[t]emporality reveals itself as the historicity of Da-sein.” (BT 322) The asymptotic inference follows from the fact that for Heidegger time is the horizon of any meaning, and as such it precedes and does not concur with bodily comportments.

The closest that *Being and Time* ever comes to see the muscle as embodied primordial, horizontal temporality, is when Heidegger refers to Hegel’s vulgar understanding of time, whereupon it is said that “this negation of negation as punctuality is time.” (BT 430, 431) The connection is missed again at this point - earlier we saw why factual body structures like the muscle are expected to be understood only untheoretically, in everyday practices - now because of Heidegger’s underplaying the concept of resistance. Resistance is the concept that suggests the hidden affinity between time and the muscle.

Heidegger grapples with this key concept in *Being and Time* initially to refute Descartes’ substance ontology, in terms of the resistance of the *res extensa*. But then he argues that innerworldly things are not disclosed in their resistance to reveal themselves, but resist only after they have already been fully disclosed in attunement. This is because: “[w]e encounter resistance in not-getting-through, as an obstacle to wanting-to-get-through. But with this willing, something must already have been disclosed, something which drive and will are *out to get*.” (BT 210) And also because:

[B]eing affected by the unserviceable, resistant, and threatening character of things at hand is ontologically possible only because being-in as such is existentially determined beforehand in such a way that what it encounters in the world can *matter* to it in this way. This mattering to it is grounded in attunement, and as attunement it has disclosed the world, for example, as something by which it can be threatened. (BT 137)

It is shown here that for the object to resist, something that matters must already have been disclosed about the object; but at best it is not clear here whether that disclosure is granted by default or whether it must be won through a more primitive encountering, where resistance must be involved by necessity for the possibility of attunement in the first place. At another point Heidegger also implicitly admits a pre-formative mode of struggle against the world's resistance to reveal itself, when he points to the privative function of the Greek word *a-leitheia*. "Truth (discoveredness) must always be wrested from beings. Beings are torn from concealment. The actual factual discoveredness is, so to speak, always a kind of robbery." (BT 223) In view of the need to further demonstrate the identity between time and the muscle, we can show without contradicting, but rather complimenting what is argued in *Being and Time*, that Dasein does meet with a resisting object in the process of attunement and prior to the object's being an obstacle or being hard to acquire; we will clarify that objects are disclosed in their resistance, or rather *because* of their resistance.

What decides primordially that innerworldly beings must resist even prior to their possibility of becoming obstacles or being willed as proprietary objects, is Dasein's *situational* manifestation. The origin of *predication* is precisely Dasein's *predicament* of having to determine an object which resists this determination. Ultimately this predicament is grounded on primordial temporality, since Dasein does not have "all the time in the world" to determine the object; Dasein is always rushing towards death. This hermeneutic predicament distresses pre-phenomenal Dasein and pre-pressurizes its existence, thus *objectifying* Dasein as a threatened being, prior to the object's obstructionary or proprietary resistance. It is this, more primitive predicament, this *manifestation-of-being-in-a-situation*, which dialectically discloses the object

in attunement in the first place, only because initially there is some-*thing* to be attuned to the object of perception.

Heidegger explicates the intricate phenomenological undertaking of Dasein's determining the thing at hand, through the concepts of attunement and of anticipatory resoluteness. These concepts are expansive enough for the analysis of the hermeneutical event in terms of other, subservient concepts (mood, fear, curiosity, meaning, ambiguity, thematization, understanding, etc.), but they are too broad to net the simpler idea which otherwise permeates *Being and Time*, namely that for Dasein signification comes out of situation. But then it is even more unfavorable to our case that in Heideggerian discourse these two latter concepts of signification and situation are themselves rendered impotent to reveal the kinship between time and the muscle through the intermediary concept of resistance. This is for two reasons: first because Heidegger discusses signification only as a linguistic rather than a fundamental ontological event, justifiably so only if we remain within Heidegger's error that Dasein's world project is first disclosed in poetry. But if the situation which signifies the suchness of the object manifests not in poetry but in statuary art, as we have suggested, then any artistic monumentality that may have been signified out of a situation in poetry, or rather, *as* poetry, is already a distant and dimmed if not distorted echo of the original, embodied fundamental ontological event. The closest that Heidegger ever comes to seeing the dependence between signification and resistance in terms of time in Dasein's comportment as a temporal being, is when he realizes that "[t]he 'origination' of 'significance' can be clarified ... only in terms of the *temporality* of discourse ... [my italics]" (BT 350) Second, now also the concept of situation has been debilitated, because Heidegger has veered off from the Greek, to the Latin linguistic rendition of the concept, where, as it often happens in between these two languages, something important is lost in the translation. In explicating the

existentiality of the “being-there-ness”, Heidegger is prone to treat more of the spatial rather than the existential determination of Dasein, forced as he is to derive the concept of “situation” from the Latin *in situ*. The distracting bias of understanding *Da-sein*’s “situation” as being in the *there*, rather than being in the *is*, is clear in the following passage (my italics): “Situation is *the there* disclosed in resoluteness-as which the existing being *is there*. ... Resoluteness brings the being *of the there* to the existence of its situation.” (BT 300) The issue may seem trivial or overemphasized, until we see what is lost in our visiting the corresponding Greek word for “situation”, which is *katastasis*. The Greeks may use *thesis* for (viewed) spatial determination, for position, but may use *katastasis* to denote situation not as a spatial, but as that categorical dwelling of being, opposite to idleness, in which new possibilities of disclosure have become imminent by means of an onrush of existential resistance towards the inevitability of decidedness. This dwelling is dialectical and categorical – the “*kata*” in “*katastasis*” - because in *katastatic* situation the forms of resistance have themselves on both sides of the hermeneutic event become eidetic, that is, accountable for under the categories of the understanding, so that the embodied will and what resists it are now already reified or things-at-hand. And this dwelling is also a “*stasis*”, because this dwelling is *a standup*, a lingering in what Heidegger coined as *anticipatory* resoluteness. Dasein’s mode of attunement is world-constitutive when it becomes *katastatic*, i.e., situated in the *is* and not in the *there*, the latter of which Heidegger would see as a “standing reserve”. Of course the concept of *katastasis* is otherwise comprehensively expressed by the rest of Heidegger’s fundamental ontology in art, as a happening of truth in strife. World disclosure obtains only “when” Dasein is *katastatically* situated: “Beings are discovered only *when Da-sein is*, and only *as long as Da-sein is* are they disclosed.” (BT 227)



The point here is that our access to the hidden identity between time and the muscle is hinged on our demonstration that resistance is met with in both the phenomenal *as well as* the noumenal realms. In true phenomenological terms, we need to demonstrate that the thing at hand resists no less *its hermeneutic determination* than its material overcoming and acquisition, so from this unexplored equilibrium the possibility may yield that *that* which resists Dasein's loss of world on either realm, is actually one and the same efficacy.

Heidegger goes as far as to tell us how the "subject" as an existential center of cognition must have already identified itself for itself when it reaches out to the world to acquire only what matters. But since: (a) "the primordial ontological ground of the existentiality of Da-sein ... is *temporality*" (BT 235), (b) "time as within-time-ness arises from an essential kind of temporalization of primordial temporality", (BT 333) and (c) "temporality first [shows] itself in anticipatory resoluteness", (BT 332) *there must also "be" a pre-objectified immanent dwelling of katastatic situation where in the lapse of this primordial temporality Dasein projects itself now as an effective, that is, "muscular" motility in the, and for the, movement of the understanding, in order to dialectically resist a pre-objectified world that resists its disclosure.* To simply put the corresponding identity between the ontological and the fundamental ontological levels of investigation, where the biologist discovers the mollusk inventing the primitive muscle, Dasein discloses itself as a primordial "gadget" for the phenomenologist.

In this *pre-existential* encountering of *itself* the resisting primordiality of Dasein "is" nothing yet but raw, "time-calculative" temporality, (BT 235) because it has nothing else to identify itself with. It has at this point no signified "there" *in situ*, other than its futural concerns, no reified structure to dwell into or grasp itself from, other than the precious irretrievable ticking

away that resists Dasein's factual potentiality-of-being. In this, as critical as unbearable an immanent motility, "[t]emporality 'is' not a *being* at all." (BT 328)

What is already disclosed in attunement is not yet the object, but so far only the resoluteness to reach out and determine *this* rather than *that* object for the attuned, thrown being-towards-death. What is initially willed is not the acquisition or avoidance of the yet-to-be-determined object, but at this "earlier", constitutive phase of Dasein, *the determination alone* of whether the object in question fits what is anticipated by Dasein's existential pressures and the perceptual history with which Dasein arrives at the hermeneutic event. The disclosure of the object in its importance ensues infinitesimally piecemeal in the punctuality of lapsing time, so that there is still disclosive resistance even with the object having already been somehow willed. At the early phases of the hermeneutic event the object is only partially and thus inconclusively determined, otherwise the object's properties would have been determined once and for all, thus depressurizing and shutting down the otherwise constantly stressed temporal horizon of disclosure. Appropriately: "Beings are not completely concealed, but precisely discovered, and at the same time distorted. They show themselves, but in the mode of illusion. Similarly, what was previously discovered sinks back again into disguise and concealment." (BT 222) At the outset of the hermeneutic encounter between the potentially willing and the potentially willed, only a diminutive and inconclusive portion may appear out of what the potentially willed object may actually turn out to be, if Dasein's existential needs sustain the pressure for further disclosure. Phenomenologically speaking, different situational orientations, or modes of attunement of the perceiving "I", may disclose variant and often mutually exclusive properties of the object. Hence the being of the object is disclosed only after the "I" of perception is situated, as a follow up of this or that mode of attunement, so that the object may matter in this or in that way. What matters

initially, is the ongoing need for at least a partially conclusive appearance upon which the decision can be made on whether the object of perception is actually willed as acquisition or avoidance, whether and how the object matters. In other words, what “drive and will” is initially projected, is not “to get” or to “avoid” the object, but first of all to determine it. The willed-for-definition object remains unserviceable, that is to say, partially or entirely unsignified, for as long as the willing “I” of perception is not situated, or as Heidegger would say, “attuned”. The object discloses itself as an itinerant contingency, and only for as long as it becomes and remains relevant to Dasein’s existential needs. Finally, for the object - any object and the world in its entirety - to have become relevant, is in the very last analysis to have at least implicitly or indirectly either resisted or supported Dasein’s will to live. “Da-sein awaits its potentiality-of-being-in-the-world in such a way that it reckons *with* and *on* whatever is in eminent *relevance* for the sake of its potentiality of being.” (BT 412)

What makes a thing resist its phenomenological disclosure and subsequently its proprietary availability for any given attuned will to live, may be the object’s unknown origin, its prejudiced utilitarian orientation, or its already competing belonging to alternative interpretations. The pre-scientific revision of the “ripple” into “muscle” that we already discussed resembles *the primordial* such ontological symptom. This is a history of phenomenological structures resisting Dasein *not merely in their physical acquisition, but also in their perceptual determination in the movement of the understanding.*

The movement to first behold the object in determination through attunement, then either physically avoid it or acquire it, is exteroceptive and ecstatic both as an hermeneutic bias and only afterwards as a physical action of evasion or appropriation. Heidegger does not make this important distinction, but it is by this, *primordial* temporal ecstasis, *that the chronological age of*

*the world ever increases*, not only by the archaeological and cosmological discovery of the world's reified past, since this latter thrust accumulates only the determined results of the investigation. Although only the compiled durations of the hermeneutical events that result into reification and therefore spatial manifestation are visible and measurable in Dasein's *ontological* datability, while the intermediary critical and unbearable ticking of the attuning Dasein remains unmeasured, *the existential* age of the world increases asymmetrically also and mainly by the horizontal compilation, the accruing duration of hermeneutic resistance and the movements of the object's evasion and appropriation. The *movement* of the understanding to determine the object of perception is enacted by default on the whereupon *of the lapse* of irretrievable time for the being for which its own being has become an issue, while the *motility* in the physical world to obtain or avoid the object that may palliate the existential issue is possible only circumstantially and by means of Dawkins' "gadget". Dasein's grounding in futural temporality preordains that Dasein is threatened through a life-negating present descending from a life-negating future, since for Heidegger "[r]eality is resistance" (BT 209) and "the present arises from the future". (BT 427) Accordingly, Dasein's embodiment is muscular because the metaphysical disclosure of temporality as a resistance to Dasein's existence must itself be resisted in nature.

## **2.4 "Zeus" and the Foregrounding of Consciousness**

So far we have responded to Kuriyama's first of three questions: the "ripples" originally signified the embodiment of Dasein as primordial temporality. But without the missing connection that we are making here between Heidegger's fundamental ontology and Greek art, Kuriyama's answers, when venturing to explain what he saw as an "enigma", take the form of generalities such that, these observations: "... construe the origins of muscle-consciousness in terms of a shift from a teleology of cosmic motion to the spontaneous movements of autonomous

agents.”<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, even from the perspective of the historian circumscribed by his ontic project, Kuriyama does make an implicit connection between the muscle and the embodiment of the being-towards-death, a connection entirely missed by Heidegger, by phenomenology, and by the aforementioned circulating ontic theories of embodiment. On the background of our own phenomenological analysis of the hidden identity between the muscle and the grounding of Dasein as a finite being, Kuriyama’s factual concerns make perfect sense:

[T]he rise of the preoccupation with muscles, I suggest, is inextricably intertwined with the emergence of a particular conception of personhood. Specifically, in tracing the crystallization of the concept of the muscle, we are also, and not coincidentally, tracing the crystallization of the sense of an autonomous will. Interest in the muscularity of the body was inseparable from a preoccupation with the agency of the self. ... The obsession with muscles reflected the birth of a new experience of embodied life and an altered perception of persons.<sup>25</sup>

Of course Kuriyama is not the first to have seen an “illusion”, a “puzzle”, and an “enigma [in] the European muscular body.”<sup>26</sup> In his *Introductory Lectures on Aesthetics*, Hegel had resorted to mysticism in order to explain the Greek body, meanwhile having elevated the Greek above all world art, because of its “spiritual secret accord.”<sup>27</sup>

What is so “godlike” about Greek classical statuary, however, what we find so “beautiful” about it, is no more than our recognition upon it, as preservers, of our own existential world-project. What distinguishes Greek art from any other comparable idealizations, is that, because of its being the embodiment of *primordial* temporality, this idealized embodiment alone appears *as* time, instead of *in* time. Upon our letting the work speak to us instead of us imposing to it the factual concerns of the museum, the primordial signifier signifies itself as muscular narrative, as Dasein’s resistance to what resists its will to live, and the monumental truth of Dasein’s existence as a finite being sets itself to work.

In the world's history of art, the insurrectionary embodiment of temporality first registers with *Zeus of Artemision*, [Figure 3] and climaxes with the *Laokoön Group* [Figure 4] some three centuries later in Dasein's independent datability. The relational structuring of *existentiell* temporality, what Heidegger calls "datability", which lapses in between these two subjects of investigation for fundamental ontology, belongs only to Dasein's foregrounding as the means through which the being-towards-death reaches out in care to connect in a cogent and meaningful whole a world which otherwise would not be its own.



Figure 3: *Zeus of Artemision*, Greece, circa 480 BC



Figure 4: *The Laokoön Group*, Greece, circa 150 BC

As an embodied world-disclosure, the art of *Zeus* prescribed the hermeneutic visibility of the muscle in its eidetic suchness; it enacted the understanding that the “ripple” in art would be seen as “muscle” in medicine when the scientific project took over the disclosure by art. In this prescription Dasein reckons with the muscle’s archetypal forms, foregrounding them as the “before” of Dasein’s inaugural objectification in vulgar chronology. Whereas an alternative art-world disclosure, say the Buddhist embodiment of the Chinese morphogenetic field of perception, may have not afforded the visibility of the muscle whatsoever, Dasein’s factual project not only finds the muscle to be part of its own embodiment, but is out to connect its body with the world by finding the muscle also in both other world art and in the world of nature. This ecstatic reckoning, out of the concern of being for its own being, is possible through the temporalization of primordial temporality, “‘in which’ objectively present things come into being and pass away”. (BT 333) The first objectification of “things-muscle” that comes into being in the temporalization of primordial temporality, is Dawkins’ mollusk. This is the primordial connection of muscular, that is, of the primordially temporal Dasein, with the natural world, the “Big Bang” of the world’s fundamental ontology in phenomenological terms; it is also the theoretical leadoff of the missing connection between Dasein and the natural world which Heidegger’s critics have demanded. Through this ecstatic reckoning Dasein connects primordially with the conglomerate of living agency in the motility of the ascendance of life from the bottom of the oceans, where Reason comes to appear as Nature.

Accordingly, now towards an unbreakable and inexhaustive continuum from nature to culture, Dasein must also connect itself with the dawn of its own embodied objectification, by unearthing “things-muscle” as ideational representations in the primordial consciousness of Dasein’s physical self. Dasein connects itself with nature by understanding its own derivation



from nature *in* time, although it maintains the separation between the signifier (humanity as a historical being) and the signified (nature), because: “history signifies ... the transformations and destinies of humankind, human institutions and their ‘cultures’, in contradistinction to nature that similarly moves ‘in time.’” (BT 379) As a historical being, Dasein simultaneously stretches along towards its end and towards its beginning. The ecstatic retrieval of Dasein’s past as a having-been-there, has currently taken the connection of Dasein with the dawn of the consciousness of its physical self as far back as the Lower Paleolithic Era in the Middle East, to the first known artistic rendition of the human body, dated circa 233,000-800,000 years “ago”. The *Berekhat Ram Statuette* [Figure 5] is described as the carving on volcanic tuff of the natural resemblance of a protohominid female figurine.<sup>28</sup> Muscular definition is yet too much to ask for from this earthly mass, marginally cognizable as it is of human origin and representation.

But then the archaeologist will ask: if *Zeus* came first so that through *Zeus*’ art-world disclosure the appearance of the *Statuette* as such may have become possible, how is it possible for the protohominid who carved the *Statuette* to have already lived so long *before* the Greeks, so that some Greek may have eventually descended from the protohominid to carve *Zeus*? This paradox owes to the degenerative function of the hermeneutic circle which sustains the asymmetry between the ontological and the ontic interpretations of history, a function we introduced in section 1.2. The upset priority is viewed as a paradox only from an hermeneutic standpoint which has lost sight of its own productive prejudices, or, as we already have had Gadamer put it: “from a consciousness that cannot do otherwise but to immediately recombine with what it has foregrounded itself from in order to become one with itself again in the unity of



Figure 5: *Berekhat Ram Statuette*, Israel, circa 800.000-233.000 BC

possible ontological interpretation of Dasein behind the ontic:

*The being that we ourselves always are is ontologically farthest from us.* The reason for this lies in care itself. Entangled being-together-with-the-‘world’ initially taken care of, guided the everyday interpretation of Da-sein, and covered over ontically the authentic being of Da-sein, thus denying the appropriate basis for an ontology oriented toward this being. (BT 311)

Heidegger also anticipates our own radical agenda here to make the defaulted connection between his metaphysics and the Greeks, by violating the ordinary and mundane order of history:

[T]he *kind* of being of Da-sein *requires* of an ontological interpretation that has set as its goal the primordially of the phenomenal demonstration *that it be in charge of the being of this being in spite of this being’s own tendency to cover things over*. Thus the existential analytic constantly has the character of *doing violence* ... Every ontologically explicit question about the being of Da-sein has already had the way prepared for it by the kind of being of Da-sein. (BT 312)

The paradox would begin to dissolve once we realized that in our immediate, *existentiell*, factual and unreflective understanding of time, we arrange the signified historical events as it were by default into a rigid linear succession from past, to present, to future. Be that as it may, it is a critical point of understanding Heidegger’s fundamental ontology to take account of the contingency of the historical event-signification as a merely *quasi*-established temporalization in Dasein’s *each and every* ecstatic hermeneutic episode. Heidegger shows that Dasein breaks off with tradition at each and every instantiation of the hermeneutic event in the temporalization of temporality, since this event is always no less than a *rapture*: “Temporality temporalizes itself in the ecstatic-horizontal unity of its raptures.” (BT 397) For Heidegger the compiling mutations of the temporalized historical event remain subject to constant and infinite possibilities of reinterpretation and recombination *from their foundations*, and even within the same individual’s

consciousness, far more so in Dasein's sedimented sum of the they. In Heidegger's condensed wording:

[T]emporality temporalizes itself in every ecstasy ... Temporalizing does not mean a 'succession' of the ecstasies. The future is *not later* than the having-been, and the having-been is *not earlier* than the present. Temporality temporalizes itself as a future that makes present, in the process of having-been. (BT 350)

Heidegger's at this point obscure concept of the temporalization of temporality, explains our difficulty to accept the otherwise rigorous and cohesive evidence presented so far here, suggesting that the world disclosed by *Zeus* is a world of a higher constitutive primordiality than the historiographical world foregrounded by the hermeneutic possibilities disclosed by *Zeus*, and an art-world to which the protohominid and the *Statuette* as such belong. The causal precedence of the art which disclosed the Greek sculptor of the statue of *Zeus* over the art which implies the "prior" existence of the protohominid sculptor of the *Statuette* is not anymore incomprehensible, once we reckon with the mind-bending hermeneutic necessity that the history of the world is reenacted *afresh, in every* ecstatic world interpretation, so that the compiled idiosyncratic recombination in the practically infinite ecstatic foregroundings of some 250 generations of humanity that distance us from the ontic datability of the Greeks and *Zeus*, *ought* to have actually put the cart before the horse so that the *Statuette* comes before *Zeus*.

The complete restoration of the true priority of the fundamental ontological to the ontic origin of the world would require no less than the production of the equivalent of a genomic algorithm of Dasein's entire perceptual history. In it, the reversal of the they's *compiled* hermeneutic effects would be retrieved from each and every of the practically infinite ecstatic temporalizations of temporality in Dasein's total historical consciousness, as this consciousness' absolute productivity. For Heidegger historiographical disclosure and the selection of what may

become a subject of history temporalizes itself out of Dasein's futural concerns, so that the past is not a fixed bestowal, but constantly *selected*, that is, prioritized, according to those concerns, and thus idiosyncratically expansive under the threefold limitations of the hermeneutic circle and out of Dasein's futural concerns. To trace back, as it were in a reverse engineering, the very first Heideggerian "preserver" of the perceptual prescriptions disclosed by Greek art, and this preserver's nascent foregrounding of an expansive factual past established as if immediately anteceding the enactment of the perceptual prescription, – this is what the archaeologist would ultimately demand.

Ultimately Heidegger does not address this most pressing issue of his *systematic* metaphysics regarding the origins of the world as an idiosyncratic perceptual construct, although in *Origin* he is clear both that a world is first disclosed by a work, and that the preservers of the work can come only "after" the work has disclosed the world within which the preservers preserve. This is made explicit in many contexts, amongst them in that: "... the temple-work, in setting up a world ... causes it to come forth for the very first time ..." (*Origin* 171); and in that the work anticipates preservers: "waiting for them ... to enter its truth." (*Origin* 192)

As a pressing issue, the question of provenance perhaps emerges only in the context of Heidegger's neglected theory of embodiment, having become important in the fundamental ontological connections between *Being and Time* and *Origin* that only *we* have made here. These connections from Heidegger's seminal works suggest that for the Heideggerian metaphysics the terminal origin of the they is not the sum of individuals, but art, while what we already have and will further argue here, suggest that the origin of the they is Greek statuary.

And yet here once again Heidegger's metaphysics is corroborated by Greek art: *Zeus'* and *Laokoön's* bodies may appear as the bodies of an individual man, but what this art's ideality

actually discloses is the prescriptive embodiment of the they, for the simple fact that *Zeus*' muscular and proportional embodiment (and as we will later see, also *Laokoön*'s) is too ideal to be the representation of just any individual man. This *ideal individuality* has puzzled art historians throughout the history of the discipline.

Art historians typically reckon with the unaccountable ideality of the body in Greek art in various ways, all of which are blinded in their factual understanding of statuary art as a representation. Winckelmann explained away the ideality as a selective aggregate of real elements elevated beyond its parts: "[t]he shape of beauty is either *individual*, that is confined to an imitation of one individual, or it is a selection of beautiful parts from many individuals, and their union into one, which we call *ideal*, yet with the remark that a thing may be ideal without being beautiful."<sup>29</sup> Lessing, mistakenly attributed the ideality of the *Laokoön* on the sculptor's influence by *Virgil's account* of the Homeric myth, where the Trojan priest and his two sons were attacked by poisonous serpents sent by Apollo as a punishment to the priest's protesting the admittance into Troy of the wooden horse of Ulysses. This account, as it turned out, was itself actually written a generation *after* the work was rendered. As it is the case with the understanding of many art historians who followed the trailblazing German romantics, for them the artwork's function is not prescriptive, but descriptive. For Lessing sculpture is the copying of nature, and *Laokoön*'s ideality, it's "highest beauty", supposedly owes to an adoption, from the artist's having:

[A]imed at the highest beauty compatible with the adopted circumstance of bodily pain. The latter, in all its disfiguring violence, could not be combined with the former; therefore he must reduce it; he must soften shrieks into sighs, not because a shriek would have betrayed an ignoble soul, but because it would have produced a hideous contortion of the countenance.<sup>30</sup>

Palpable evidence for the deceptive ontic prioritization of Dasein's foregrounding, is that the prejudice which signified *Zeus* could not have been prescribed by the *Statuette*, for one thing because the latter world-disclosive art is evidently *not* the embodiment as art of the prescriptive horizon that can disclose innerworldly beings in their definite, resolute *suchness*. The *Statuette* is evidently *not* the embodiment of primordial temporality, *Zeus* is, and Heidegger showed that historicity and thematization are ultimately grounded on primordial temporality through the intermediary determinations of relevancy and care, which, as we shall see further, are also embodied as *Zeus*: "If letting things be relevant constitutes the existential structure of taking care, and if the latter as being together with ... belongs to the essential constitution of care, and if care in its turn is grounded in temporality, then the existential condition of the possibility of letting something be relevant must be sought in a mode of the temporalizing of temporality."

(BT 353)

This artwork's world-disclosure is evidently not horizontally temporal, perhaps for similar reasons that the world-disclosure of the "Greek" Archaic *kouros* statue is also not horizontally temporal. The *Statuette* is intelligible and signifiable as such in historical consciousness only from Dasein's futural concerns, that is, from the disclosive horizon of primordial temporality embodied as art in *Zeus*. As we saw earlier, for Heidegger "... even historiographical disclosure temporalizes itself out of the future." Because of Gadamer's spontaneously foregrounding consciousness, historiographical objects such as the *Statuette* are understood in their specificity and historicity and owe their hermeneutic constitution to Dasein's *temporal* grounding, although they *in themselves* – together with the indeterminable perceptual field they prescribe if qualifying as world-disclosive art – may not "have-been-there". Heidegger invites confusion not providing for the radical exclusion of alien art-worlds such as the *Statuette*

and the Greek archaic *kouros* statues, when he writes that: “Remains, monuments, and records that are still objectively present are possible ‘material’ for the concrete disclosure of *Da-Sein* that has been-there [my italics].” (BT 394) On the other hand Heidegger also indicates a need for foregrounding when he allows a distinguishing between a culture of “our own”, of “foreign cultures”, and of the need for a “synthesis”, in writing that: “With special regard to the interpretation of *Da-sein*, the opinion may now arise that understanding the most foreign cultures and ‘synthesizing’ them with our own may lead to the thorough and first genuine enlightenment of *Da-sein* about self.” (BT 178)

Despite our unfolding case here, the *kouros* typology has been routinely seen by classicists a direct progenitor of *Zeus*’ introduction of the Severe style, with some very important intermediary renditions which we will briefly examine further on. The *Kouros of Mount Ptoon*, perhaps the zenith of Greek Archaic statuary, of circa 530-520 B.C. [Figure 6], is a statue that stands at 1.60 meters tall to his knees, as his legs are lost from below the knee cups. In *Dasein*’s *existentiell* historicity this youth is said to have stood in his Pharaonic rigid frontality at the entrance of the Apollo sanctuary in Boeotia. The slender bodily posture, left leg advancing confidently, the arms bent slightly forth on the sides in an eagerness for an impending participative action, the resolute chest beaming forth like that of a dasher at the finish line, all concord towards an overall exaltation. Although, as Ridgway notes, motion is not biomechanically expedited, there is a kinaesthesia denoted by a barely restrained eagerness, entirely uncharacteristic of the Egyptian canon from which the *kouros* was cut.

Besides the conspicuous presence of muscle narrative itself, the biomechanical contingencies for the possibility of embodied motility are collaterally engendered by subtler embodying permutations which are distributed throughout a rendition, and which are most clearly



discernible in comparative hermeneutics, in our case between the *Ptoan Kouros* and *Zeus*. Facial expression, structural torsion, intentionality, the breath, and the gaze, are such contingencies hearkening to the presence of musculature as the embodiment of primordial temporality towards an unprecedented disclosure of kinaesthesia. Insurrectionary transfigurations must manifest from no precedence whatsoever, to ground, found, and bestow the embodiment of the essential truth as monumental artistic disclosure, in Heidegger's understanding to "... bring forth of a being such as never was before and will never come again." (*Origin* 187) The metaphysical "negativity" which Heidegger saw in having said that "time is 'abstract' negativity", (*BT* 435) embodies itself as muscle narrative that resists the negation to live, now in physical specificity; in doing so, it alters the body profoundly and consummately.

The incarnation of negativity as the inevitability of time lapsing re-prioritizes what matters in the disclosure of corporeal constituency and signifies newfangled phenomenological structures now as a communal membership in *regional* expansion. Unlike a "space", a "region" is allotted and dwelled. From this inevitability of allotment and dwelling, the *human* body will now appear *as* space instead of in space, following up the necessity of *Dasein*'s embodiment to have also appeared *as* time instead of in time. In doing so, the embodied negation necessitates, dictates, re-prioritizes, regionalizes and excludes over bodily features which may have had already appear in "previous" renditions of alien embodiments (separate phenomenological structures of "legs", "hands", "heads", etc.) and which should be considered as intuitions of the "human body" not as such and in themselves, but only through the compulsory foregrounding of *Dasein* as the embodiment of the disclosive primordial temporality.



Figure 6: *Ptoan Kouros*, Greece, c 525 BC

This dictation, re-prioritization, and exclusion is grounded in the embodiment of primordial temporality, and, being a necessity for the being concerned for its own being, it now

becomes the equiprimordial constitution of Dasein as the Heideggerian concept of “care”. It is the muscle, that is, the embodied intuition of finite temporality as an existential pressurization, which dictates that the body must engender transitional planes in between features, then planes turned into features themselves both in resolution as higher definition and in resolution as resolve. The heedfulness to this embodying task is itself grounded in finite temporality. Heidegger showed how “*Care* itself has been ontologically defined and traced back to temporality as its existential ground.” (BT 351)

Heidegger brings to our attention an archetypal Roman fable, (BT 198) a “pre-ontological document” as he sees it, where Care was crossing a river and she picked up some Earth clay and shaped it into the human body. Care let Jupiter (Zeus in Greek mythology) to bestow the clay with spirit. The metaphysical dispute over which deity the clay would be named after, either Care, Earth, or Jupiter, is decided by Saturn (the god Chronos in Greek mythology, being the same word for “time” in Greek language). So it is essentially the archetype of primordial temporality, which decides that, since Zeus gave the spirit, then spirit should return to Zeus at death; and since Earth gave the body, Earth receives the body at death; and since Care gave the body shape, Care should possess the body as long as it lives.

## ***Endnotes***

20. Shigehisa Kuriyama, *The Expressiveness of the Body - and the divergence of Greek and Chinese medicine*, p. 8.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 111, 159.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 131.
23. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, pp. 42, 61.
24. Shigehisa Kuriyama, *The Expressiveness of the Body - and the divergence of Greek and Chinese medicine*, p. 149.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 144, 149.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 116, 112.
27. G.W.F. Hegel, *Introductory Lectures on Aesthetics*, p. 79.
28. Paul G. Bahn, *Prehistoric Art - Cambridge Illustrated History*, pp. 86-87.
29. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, p. 21.
30. Gottlob Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoön, and How the Ancients Represented Death*, pp. 38, 16-17.

## CHAPTER THREE

### DASEIN'S WORLD EMPTYING AND WORLD GATHERING

#### ***3.1 The Embodiment of Primordial Angst: The Gaze***

In the previous chapter we introduced a comparative hermeneutics between the *Ptoan Apollo* and the *Zeus of Artemision*, respectively as the culmination of Greek Archaic statuary and the insurrectionary disclosure of Dasein's world programme in the idealized embodiment of the Severe style. This comparison begun to address the two disclosive monuments in terms of their founding, grounding, and bestowing discrete fundamental ontologies, literally incommensurable worlds. In the last section of the last chapter we began discussing the collateral engendering of subtle embodying permutations in the a-causal shift from the *Ptoan Kouros* to *Zeus*, due to the *in-corporation* in the latter work of primordial temporality as muscle narrative. We understand this as an a-causal shift in between these two monumental world-disclosures both in Heidegger's conviction that "the establishing of truth in the work is the bringing forth of a being such as never was before and will never come to be again" (*Origin*, 187), but also in observing, accordingly, that nothing in the *kouros* embodiment foreshadows the fundamental ontological prescriptions that manifest in *Zeus*.

The realist will object that the two works already share natural features of the human body such as a "nose" and a "foot", so that they must actually be no more than artistic *representations* that do anticipate each other by belonging to the same world of substance ontology. The realist will have to be reminded of her own perceptual bias, i.e., that the eidetic

identity and epistemic facticity of the features in their origin and utility, their maintenance, their interconnectedness and interdependence in the human body in particular, as well as in their ties to the natural world in general, this prerequisite and indispensable movement of the understanding from the whole to the part and back to the whole which bestows to bodily features with their suchness, is itself possible only within the disclosive horizon embodied by *Zeus*, and within the exclusive perceptual field to which the realist himself belongs as a being-towards-death and a Heideggerian “preserver”. Bodily features, as all world features, are disclosed in their suchness only in the dialectic-synthesizing movement of the understanding, where the part belongs to the whole and the whole to the part. This cognitive kinaesthesia is patently embodied in *Zeus*, but is absent in the *kouros*. Thus nothing in what we understand about the *kouros* foreshadows what we understand to be embodied in *Zeus*. As we will further see in detail, *Zeus*’ unprecedented kinaesthetic appearance owes to its being no less than *the embodiment* of the movement of understanding, as this movement is described by Gadamer:

[T]he movement of the understanding is constantly from the whole to the part and back to the whole. Our task is to expand the unity of the understood meaning centrifugally. The harmony of the details with the whole is the criterion of correct understanding. The failure to achieve this harmony means that understanding has failed.<sup>31</sup>

We will return to see how it is possible for such an intelligible and intangible thing as “the moving of the understanding”, itself to be embodied as art and thus become corporeal and visible. What must be established at this point, however, is the observation that it is only in the cross-examination of works like the *Ptoan Apollo* and the *Zeus*, where we can see that the fundamental ontological values involved are not discernible on their own accord; that only in comparative hermeneutics - where we remain vigilantly aware of our own perceptual biases - we can discern how the accommodation of the primordial negativity affects the body and the gaze.

This comparative hermeneutics, however, because of the typical imposition upon the artwork of ontic facts, has thus far yielded only timid interpretations.

In the hindsight of their ontic project, art historians have typically seen an anticipatory continuity of “representations”, until, as they say, the human body is finally understood, by the Greeks. In this “progress” from the Late Archaic to the Severe styles, i.e., from circa 520 to 480 B.C.E., art historians have interjected a very small number of preserved works which are typologically awkward and belong to neither styles, but are dated to have been carved within this time span of some 40 years as a transitory phase in the sculptors’ contemporary understanding of the human body. The best-preserved and most representative works at this threshold between the Archaic and the Classical eras, which are showcased by more than 200 statues each, are just two statues, the *Kritios Boy* [Figure 7] and the *Blond Youth* [Figure 8].

The *Kritios Boy*, about half-size of the average human, is preserved with most of its body, while from the *Blond Youth*, a missing body of full size, we only have the head and part of the torso. What connects these two works in our fundamental ontological analysis, is their partaking the *seminal* abandonment of the archaic rigid frontality and the equally *seminal* sentiment for structural torsion, a subtly higher definition of detail from what preceded them, a relaxation of breath from the Archaic exuberance, and, most dramatically so, an uncanny facial expression which shares nothing of the preceding Archaic gaiety nor of the forthcoming Classical harmony. In these two preserved disclosures the exuberant smile of the *kouros* is radically decomposed into a grim countenance, which, while it does not yet attain the maturity of the severe determination and the sublimated wrath we meet with in the face of the *Zeus of Artemision*, it is a frozen gaze into a dark abyss, as if the *Boy* and the *Youth* have just heard some very bad news.



Figure 7: *Kritios Boy*, Greece, circa 485 BC



Figure 8: *Blond Boy*, Greece, circa 485 BC



Art historians discuss these two works in haste, as a brief and unceremonious transitional phase from the closing relics of orientalism to the advent of naturalism, attention typically focused onto what preceded and more so in what followed them. And although the economy of our own agenda cannot pay justice to the hermeneutic challenge that these works pose under the implications of Heidegger's metaphysics and theory of art, we can at least introduce the idea that, unlike the Greek Archaic statues which are the harbingers of a world alien to Dasein's existential project, these two works actually disclose something to the effect of the *aes-thetic* prolegomena for Dasein's embodiment. We may remain ontically naive and see only "technical innovations" in the loss of the archaic smile, the darkening of the gaze, and the inceptive structural torsion in all of its three spatial axes (slight tilt downwards, sideways, and to the right) of the *Blond Youth's* head (24.5 cm high); but in the light of what we have premised so far in our fundamental ontological analysis, the artistic disclosure especially of the *Blond Youth* is arguably *the most dramatic and consequential onto-poetic shift in the history of Western art*. Bruno Snell must have instinctively felt that there is something very special about this otherwise underplayed work, having chosen *this* face to illustrate the front cover of his 1953 classic book *The Discovery of the Mind – in Greek Philosophy and Literature*, although only a remote of an implication, since nothing about the *Blond Youth* is mentioned inside this important work.

There are at least three preliminary determinations we can postulate about the *Kritios Boy* and the *Blond Youth*. First, that in our analysis of fundamental ontology these works are evidently *monumental*; unlike their typical treatment as types of a merely historically authentic transitory phase, these works are actually authentically historic (the critical distinction made in section 1.2.), in the Heideggerian sense that they found, ground, and bestow a world as a prescriptive horizon of disclosure. It is in the monumentality of *these* two works, I suggest, that

Heidegger would have found to embody his claim that “Temporality first showed itself in anticipatory resoluteness.” (BT 332) Second, that to these works’ insurrectionary gaze into the abyss, belongs Dasein’s simultaneously fatal *and* world-productive absorption into the deficiency of existence. And third, that these two works are the embodied, palpable proof which validates Heidegger’s discourse regarding Angst as the primordial mood of world-thrownness.

Heidegger looked for that primordial mood which would have disclosed the being-towards-death as such. He found it in Kierkegaard’s analysis of anxiety, as a mood that owes its exclusive primordially amongst all other moods in its precipitating not out of fear for a particular threat, but as a predicament at once less identifiable than the anxiety from some specific threat, and even more burdensome. Heidegger argued that all other moods are possible because of the initial unconcealment of nothingness by the primordial mood of anxiety. “In anxiety I realize that I have been ‘thrown’ into the world and that my life and death - my Being as such - is an issue I must face. In anxiety, Da-sein finds itself face to face with the nothing of the possible impossibility of its own existence”, writes Heidegger. (BT 53)

This primordial “face” which allegedly faced the primordial Nothing, still according to Heidegger, must be disclosed as art. I suggest that this alleged face is no other than the face of the *Blond Youth*, since arguably no other idealized facial expression in the history of either “Greek” or world art contains so precisely and monumentally the *embodied* primordial predicament of the being for which its very being has become a burden *under no specific threat*. Specific threat is implied where the tip of Zeus’ javelin is aimed at, and the *Laokoön Group* struggles against the specific threat of Apollo’s sent serpents. But in the *Blond Youth* there is no specific threat to cause angst and darken the gaze. While *Zeus* and the *Laokoön Group* bear out the embodiment of Dasein as a *temporal* being, the *Youth* confirms Heidegger’s hypothesis

regarding the pre-temporal primordially of Angst, because the *Youth* has evidently cast his gaze into a threat less identifiable than specific, and yet even more burdensome.

The horizontal ticking of time within which the being-towards-death must encounter the engendering forms of the impossibility of existence, begins with this gaze into the Nothing, since the negation of the negation to live which is apportioned in temporal succession must begin only if this dark gaze into nothingness has been cast. This is the pre-ontological justification of Dasein's historical foregrounding, why the *Blond Youth* is befittingly understood by art historians to have immediately predated the *Zeus* in Dasein's datability. The gaze into the nothingness of the *Youth* must have come "after" the *kouros*' archaic smile and "before" *Zeus*' "severe" gaze, because it is the seminal gaze into the nothingness which anticipates in anxiety the possibility that Dasein would embody itself as a *muscular* being, so that it could resist, in nature and as nature, the every this and that which forces it to stagnancy and resists its will to live. This ultimate fundamental ontological prioritization was clear to Heidegger, who argued cryptically in his essay *What is Metaphysics?* that: "[t]he nothing is the origin of negation, not vice versa."<sup>32</sup>

As suggested at the beginning of this section, the fundamental ontological values involved are discernible only in *comparative* hermeneutics, not in the works themselves own accord viewed separately. So it is only in the comparison with the historiographically bordering gazes of the *Ptoan Apollo* and the *Zeus of Artemision*, where we find the *Blond Youth*'s facial expression to be "uncanny". Why "uncanny"? Because, here, in comparison, gone is the saturated, Dionysian gaiety in the gaze of the *kouros*, and nowhere to be seen is the razor-sharp, focused, lethal determination of *Zeus*' Doric gaze. The gaze of the *Blond Youth* has been summoned into a consummate silence. In facing the Nothing, the gaze has emptied itself.

Nietzsche said it, that when we stare at the abyss, the abyss stares back at us. *Abyssus abyssum advocat*. Heidegger's elusive theory of embodiment anticipates the existence of this empty gaze in the world's art history, even if such works were to have been destroyed or yet to be found in the world *as* art history. This art of the body escapes the imposition upon it of ontic facts, as this utterly silent face finds a voice to speak to us meaningfully in the context of Heidegger's fundamental ontology. Writes Heidegger: "The call speaks in the uncanny mode of *silence*. And it does this only because in calling the one summoned, it does not call him into the public idle chatter of the they, but *calls* him *back* from that to the reticence of his existent potentiality-of-being." (BT 277)

Although the *kouros* statuary was typically a funerary dedication, the *Youth* as all *kouroi* is not a representation, a commemorative portrait of an actual Greek man who lived and died. Portraiture depends on the possibility of individuality, as this individuality pertains to a temporal, that is, finite being. The possibility of individuality is disclosed only because of and after the *Youth*, rightly so in Dasein's archaeological datability, and with the advent of *Zeus*. The gaze of the *Youth* is the prolegomenon to Dasein's disclosure as world, the embodiment of the pre-ontological condition of individuation which Heidegger describes as the anxiety of being-in-the-world ahead of any world determination. "... [W]ith the phenomenon of Angst a distinctive kind of attunement has become the theme of our interpretation. Angst individualizes and thus discloses Da-sein as a '*solus ipse*'" (BT 188)

Havelock, Dodds, and Snell have comprehensively suggested, there is no sense of individual self as a unified agent and knower in the Archaic world. Instead of representing the facial characteristics of an individual man, what is actually unconcealed by the silent gaze of the *Youth*, is the prescriptive mood of Dasein's embodiment as a temporal being. As we saw above,

Heidegger thought that primordial temporality is conditioned on the even higher primordially of unspecified anxiety, on Dasein's threshold stare into the abyss, whereupon Dasein comes face to face with the possible impossibility of existence. This is why "the nothing is the origin of negation, not vice versa."

In primordial Angst the gaze has emptied itself of world; when Dasein is not katabatically situated in subjective fitness, the world has become irrelevant. The *Youth's* gaze is that art in which the embodiment of Dasein as the possibility for an emptied world is monumentally disclosed for its preservers, and Heidegger anticipates this artistic disclosure of Dasein's encounter with an unattuned world when he writes that: "[t]he nothingness of the world in the face of which Angst is anxious does not mean that an absence of innerworldly things objectively present is experienced in Angst. They must be encountered in just such a way that they are of no relevance at all ..." (BT 343)

Compared to the embodied world disclosures which preceded and followed in Dasein's "Greek" historical foregrounding, the *Youth's* mood lingers under the spell of a debilitating deficiency. Whereas the gaze of the general embodiment of the *Ptoan Apollo* transcends necessity as if not acknowledging it, the *Youth* is the embodied gaze of Nietzsche's Dionysian man, who in *The Birth of Tragedy* has taken the first peek through the veil of Maya, having: "... looked truly into the essence of things ... *gained knowledge*, and nausea inhibits action; for ... action could not change anything in the eternal nature of things; they feel it to be ridiculous or humiliating that they should be asked to set right a world that is out of joint."<sup>33</sup> Heidegger is more precise, his precision corroborated by Greek sculptic art, to have seen that knowledge is possible *because* of the deficiency as the primordial mood, the reason why historically *Zeus* may arrive only "after" the *Youth*: "In order for knowing to be possible as determining by observation

what is objectively present,” writes Heidegger, “there must first be a *deficiency* of having to do with the world and taking care of it.” (BT 62) Thus on either side of the *Youth*’s silent gaze, there lie incommensurable worlds.

In the face of the *Ptoan Apollo*, the predominant hermeneutic feature is the mouth, the so called “enigmatic archaic smile”. The lips curve to a consummate sensuality that tightropes between a fresh-born desire and its imminent satisfaction. The lips softly constrict with gratification, as if having tasted the ultimate sensual splendor. This mouth bespeaks of a world young and yet unspoiled, still affording the enchantment with its own Dionysian frivolity. There may be something carnal about this mouth, but the expression is carried with a sincere and naive loftiness and just about enough measure. It has nothing of the orgiastic degeneration, the one ridden with guilt we meet with in the comparable sculptic expressions of Roman bacchanalia. To this sublimation of gaiety by the mouth, also contribute the eyes. Lush, almond-shaped eyelids add to the face’s femininity and arch brightly around the eyeballs, unlike the world-denying, heavy eyelids of the typical Buddhist and Hindu renditions. The gaze of the *Ptoan Apollo* mirrors a trance into a region beyond the opaqueness of the fragmentary and contingent realm of cognition, a levity over an eternal field of spring blossoms, and a mesmerization with that implicit object of vision upon which this gaze is cast. The gaze of the *Ptoan Apollo* is that of sagacious acceptance of reality, an intelligence which goes beyond circumstantial knowledge.

There is no reverence and no harmony with nature, and beings do not emerge on their own terms in *Dasein*’s embodiment, as this embodiment takes shape to cast the gaze of the *Zeus of Artemision* and “later” in the *Laokoön Group*. In *Dasein*’s world, beings do not emerge “on their own terms”; they emerge on the whereupon of horizontal temporality, *on the terms of the being-towards-death*. Left in itself, “nature” is untemporal. “The primordial ontological ground

of the existentiality of Da-sein is *temporality*”, insists Heidegger. (BT 235) Thus the face of this *Zeus* is the face in the *Iliad* of Phoebus Apollo, who, summoned by the hubris against his priest Laokoön by the king of the Achaeans, rushes down mount Olympus: “*with his bow and his quiver upon his shoulder, and the arrows rattled on his back with the rage that trembled within him, with a face as dark as night.*” (*Iliad*, 1, 38-40) *Zeus*’ breath is Aeschylus’ “*lungs gushing out burning hot sleep.*”<sup>34</sup> Doric shadows chisel *Zeus*’ angular face, dwelling in the linear rendering of his mouth and eyebrows, following the cutting edge of the “Greek nose” downwards to attend the shrewd frontal outline of the beard, which projects like the relentless prow of a dreadnought. Dark eye sockets with eyelids thin and sharp as aluminum foil, recede under eyebrows stern and threatening as gun turrets. *Zeus* has lost sight of the *Ptoan Apollo*’s viewing the world as a totality; his gaze is fixed over his spear’s tip to a consummately specific, eidetic target. This frozen violence, this monumental sublimation of the resolute death instinct, is spelled out as the muscle chronicles of a will immanent in the lapse of irretrievable time reaching out of itself to resist its negated life. This is the triumph of the moment, but *Zeus* has lost eternity. And yet, Ionian wit still runs under his skin, for *Zeus*’ beard is not the patriarchal beard of Michelangelo’s *Moses* holding the Commandments, that wind-ruffled torment of a beard belonging to an irresolute soul. “In resoluteness”, writes Heidegger anticipating the monumental gaze of *Zeus*, “the most primordial truth of Da-sein has been reached, because it is *authentic*. The disclosedness of the there discloses equi-primordially the whole of being-in-the-world - the world, being-in, and the self that is this being as ‘I am’.” (BT 297)

Unlike in the *Ptoan Apollo* and the *Youth*, *Zeus*’ gaze is resolutely cast onto a specific threat, because *Zeus* embodies Heidegger’s “I am” in its being categorically situated. The halted, silent gaze of the *Youth*, and the accepting, all-encompassing frontality of the *Ptoan kouros*, have

yield to the confrontational footing of *Zeus*' being thrown, his being at a situational there. The threshold between a world to which we have no access other than speculating over its discrete ideal embodiment, and the world of the being which in its very being has made being an issue, has been crossed. *Zeus*' gaze is cast in the same way his javelin aims, *from a situated there to a situated there*. "Situation has its basis in resoluteness", writes Heidegger, envisioning Dasein's embodiment in the well-defined body of *Zeus*. "Situation is the there disclosed in resoluteness - as which the existing being is there." (BT 300)

In *Zeus*' severity Dasein embodies itself first as a thrown, temporal being. And in the numerous climaxing renditions of the great masters which follow from *Zeus* to *Laokoön* in Dasein's horizontal datability, unfolds Dasein's existential analytic as the embodied architectonic of meaning. *Zeus* is carved before *Laokoön* in Dasein's datability not because the sculptor who rendered *Zeus* lived before that other sculptor who made *Laokoön* some three centuries later - this order belongs to Dasein's foregrounding and appears only in vulgar temporality since for Heidegger it is the art which made the artists - but because the embodiment of care which, as we will see, climaxes with *Laokoön*, is intelligible only in temporal terms, themselves originally embodied in, or rather *as the Zeus*. Heidegger's fundamental ontology anticipates this embodied prioritization of primordialities in the datability of Greek art, having foreseen that, "[t]he articulated structural totality of the being of Da-sein as care first becomes existentially intelligible in terms of temporality." (BT 235)

Heidegger saw the fundamental ontological structures of Dasein to have effused from the ultimate primordiality of angst, to temporality, to care, *in this order*. As we saw earlier, the first link of this fundamental ontological dependency is thus organized because "[t]he nothing is the origin of negation, not vice versa", while the second link is arranged because "[c]are itself has



been ontologically defined and traced back to temporality as its existential ground.” Thus far we have seen how both the primordial mood of angst, and primordial temporality as the punctuality of the negation of the negation to live, embodied themselves in the history of “Greek” statuary art in the very same datable order which Heidegger suggested.

### **3.2 Time Gathering *Laokoön’s Knee***

Whereas the thing, is substantiated by extending in regional space its what-for thingliness in conjunction to the context of other thusly substantiated things, the constitutive tissue of the *agalma*, the statue, is secreted as a disclosure from without regional space. As we will see closely in the next chapter, the *agalma* is an aberration in nature, being the precept for the possibility of thingliness and thus of spatial expansion. In their ontic delimitation art historians and critics have indiscriminately seen only the thingliness of the *agalma*, not its “shining”, having encountered the *agalma* as a thing, its “what-for” thingliness being its representational function to copy as it were *the ideal* human form, without asking to themselves the question why the odd need for such an *ideal* “representation” in the first place. But the *agalma* is not itself a mere thing, inasmuch as it may be disclosing the precepts for the possibility of thingliness. *Laokoön’s* body is itself substantiated by the patent spatial secretion of these precepts. From Dasein’s ecstatic perspective, some works, like the *kouros*, may be legitimately encountered, to a degree, as things, but others, like the *Zeus* or the *Laokoön* and many in between, should not.

In the *kouros* statue the lack of transitional planes between features results in fractional rendering as an arbitrary selective process, so that the body is produced as the sum total of various otherwise unrelated parts *in space*. In analyzing the *New York Kouros* (600-590 B.C.) [Figure 9], Boardman also found details such as the relief patterns of the front of the body, the shoulder blades, the volute ears, hair, and knee-cups, to be “designed almost as independent

patterns.”<sup>35</sup> These characteristics are typical throughout the some 200 *kouroi* remaining from more than a century of Archaic sculpture.

What is present in the *Zeus* and the *Laokoön* but missing from the *kouros*’ embodied world disclosure, that which qualifies the existentiality of Dasein’s world and makes the two embodied world-projects incommensurable, is the possibility of kinaesthetic motion from the *noein* (intuition) to *dianoein* (thinking).

To circumspectively transverse the open range between body parts, and in this trans-*versing* to actually *render the distance* as a trail of articulated and defined in its what-for thingliness body tissue left behind, is to “go-through-it” as an act of *dianoia*. Fundamental ontologically speaking, and since space is not a vacuous container but a contingency of de-distancing within the horizon of disclosure, there is no other way of trans-*versing* the open range without leaving behind a newfangled trail of phenomenological structures as the embodying experience of the transversal.

Accordingly, classical art historian George Karo understood the overall effect of the transversal which brought forth the shift from the Archaic to the Severe rhythm as a problem of observation, where (my italics): “The entire body seems to shed a chrysalis. The interplay of joints and muscles is freed of the last shackles of archaism. Turns of head or trunk entail shifting of muscles which older artists had not observed.”<sup>36</sup> And in her book *Nationalism and Classicism*, Athena Leoussi preserves a precious moment of an inceptive and yet parochial reckoning with these structures, in the voice of a neoclassical artist and member of the British Royal Academy



Figure 9: *New York Kouros*, Greece, circa 580 BC

reacting at the sight of the “Elgin Marbles” upon their arrival in nineteenth century England:

The first thing I fixed my eyes on was the wrist of a figure in one of the female groups, in which were visible, though in a feminine form, the radius and the ulna. I was astonished, for I had never seen them hinted at in any female wrist ... and saw the outer condyle visibly affecting the shape as in nature ... That combination of nature and idea, which I had felt was so much wanting for high art, was here displayed to midday conviction ... <sup>37</sup>

This member of the British Royal Academy already knew of the existence of the said anatomical details as medically identified structures, but as we saw with Kuriyama, identified structures of the Western embodiment have in the first place appeared in art, or rather as art, before being acknowledged and given a name by medical science. The objectification of anatomical entities such as the “ulna” and the “condylus” is possible only through conceptual thematization, itself subject to the embodiment of the structures of care. As we will further see with Heidegger, thematization as *dianoisis* objectifies.

In fact not only those body parts which are supposedly discovered by more observant artists to lie in between more familiar landmarks in the body landscape become possible through circumspective transversal, but *all* body parts are thus engendered even within themselves. In pre-classical art not only the transitional planes are missing, but even the somehow defined unrelated parts are merely stylized patterns, not the “real” thing, so not only there is uncovered distance between the unrelated parts, but there is also uncovered distance within these unrelated parts not having related themselves as themselves to their suchness. Art historians studying the shift from the Archaic to the Severe rhythms first notice that fractionally and arbitrarily rendered unrelated parts are brought together by “careful observation.” Buschor, Boardman, Karo, and Steiner, share this view. But they also observe that those unrelated parts are *in themselves* eventually brought together to their suchness. In the following excerpt Boardman sees in the shift

both the integration of the whole through the transversal between body parts, but also the integration of the part itself for itself, a movement of the understanding which for Heidegger objectifies through the thematization of every motif.

The parts of the body become more accurately rendered. Ears are no longer patterns but begin to look like ears. ... Patterns of muscle and sinew which had been rendered by groove and ridge are carved in subtler realistic planes and the patterns themselves take forms to life – a double division between ribcage and navel, not triple or more, and over the knee-cups a proper symmetry of muscles. All this accompanies a growing skill at integrating these pattern elements into a more plausible whole ...<sup>38</sup>

Dasein reckons with the embodiment of its own world project when it notices art world disclosive events such that, as Boardman says, “ears begin to look like ears”, and “stylized patterns take the forms to life.” The reckoning with this embodiment is *tragic*, inasmuch as the quest for verisimilitude yielding the expansion of the body through the multiple structures of care is itself grounded in primordial, *finite* temporality. The engagement to trans-verse the distance by the *dianoia* (thinking) can only accrue in the punctuality of the lapse of *irretrievable* time, *thus grounding in temporality the structures of care which are employed in this engagement*. By circumspectively trans-versing and thus engendering the suchness of the distances into newfangled phenomenological structures, the embodiment of *dianoia* engages into a sequential negation of the negation imposed by the transversal of these distances and by the implications that must be anticipated when the distances between more than two - *in fact at once between all possible body parts for each other and for themselves* - must be trans-versed.

The anticipation of these implications is most spectacularly embodied in *Laokoön*. While in the *kouros* embodiment the figuration of body parts remains unchallenged, for it is not yet a *con*-figuration by a *con*-sciousness, in *Laokoön*'s embodied disclosure of the possibility for

thinking each and every identifiable body part, every one such part momentarily negates its own identity in order to anticipate the identification of any other, in an integrating, circumspective resolution towards the embodiment of the unification of consciousness. “For the first time”, writes Karo in his analysis of the shift between Archaic and post-Archaic sculpture, “the distinction of a straight carrying leg and a freely bent one is realized in its implications of a lower shoulder over the former and subtle changes in hips and abdomen.”<sup>39</sup> The synthesizing transversal is dialectically reciprocal, so that all body parts anticipate all others, until “ears begin to look like ears” and “stylized patterns take the forms to life.” Heidegger anticipates the embodiment of Dasein as it is disclosed in this Greek art alone, when he expects that “Da-sein understands its here in terms of the over there of the surrounding world.” (BT 108)

Heidegger, who does not discuss the trans-*versing* in terms of covering distances in Dasein’s embodying landscape, but only in terms of Dasein’s spatiality of being-in-the-world, employs essentially the same concept but coins it as “de-distancing”: “As being-in-the-world, Da-sein essentially dwells in de-distancing.” (BT 108) As if describing precisely how post-Archaic statuary art discloses the factual componentry (medical facts like the “radius” and the “ulna”) of the kind of the ideal body needed to have projected upon, belong to, and populate Dasein’s world, Heidegger understands de-distancing as “a constitution of being of Da-sein of which de-distancing something ... is only a definite, factual mode.” (BT 105)

Heidegger grounds the possibility of de-distancing in the fundamental existential disclosure of the *Blond Boy* that we saw earlier, where we encountered the embodiment of the possibility that the disclosure of the Nothing is the origin of negation, not vice versa. The ecstasis to de-distance is possible only because a primordial distance, a void that must be bridged, is intuited in the first place: “De-distancing ... must be kept in mind as an existential. Only because

beings in general are discovered by Da-sein in their remoteness, do ‘distances’ and intervals among innerworldly beings become accessible in relation to other things.” (BT 105)

Dasein *is* only “when” it is ecstatic to de-distance, “when” the being in its being reaches out of itself to heedfully associate remote beings in a factual mode. “Da-sein is ‘in’ the world in the sense of a familiar and heedful association with the beings encountered within the world.” (BT 105) The beings thus encountered in Dasein’s being-in-the-world are bestowed with their shape through their what-for thingliness, precisely as in Dasein’s primordially disclosive embodiment a medical doctor or a naive art critic would recognize the shapes of the radius and the ulna in their utilitarian functions, their “what-for” thingliness.

Whereas in the world’s horizontal expansion it would be less palpable a search to find exactly how distance disappears in between beings the thingliness of which obtains phenomenological structure in, or rather *as* the, understanding of their utility, Dasein’s embodiment is the primordial region that offers, especially in the *Laokoön* rendition, an opportunity for precise observation of how distance as void disappears through de-distancing and the *dianoëin*. Heidegger’s seminal idea is that “De-distancing means making distance disappear, making the being at a distance of something disappear, bringing it near.” (BT 105)

A closer analysis of *Laokoön*’s left knee, one of the “busier” regions in this embodied manifesto of Dasein’s existential analytic, in comparison with the counterpart body part in the *New York Kouros*, suffices to demonstrate how Heidegger’s metaphysics of the possibility for space is embodied in post-Archaic Greek art and therein alone. *Laokoön*’s knee alone conforms to Heidegger’s definition of the “region”: “... as that to which the context of useful things at hand possibly belongs, a context which can be encountered as something directional, that is, containing places and as de-distanced.” (BT 111) As is the case with each and every withheld

region in Dasein's spatiality of being-in-the-world, so it is in Dasein's ideal embodiment: *Laokoön's* knee is de-distanced by ever more resolute resolutions through circumspective heedfulness, so that, as Heidegger predicted, art discloses for (medical) science this knee as an ever more region within a region. *Laokoön's* knee is a "*perioche*", where as the Greek noun reveals, a "withheld" region is opened towards "... the freeing of beings for a totality of relevance." (BT 111)

The left knee of the *New York Kouros* is made of componentry which, in all its lacking, its falsity and irrelevance, embodies the disclosure of a world alien to being-there. As long as Dasein's circumspectively heedful perspective is concerned, from the total of four discernible features that make up this knee, one is both undefined and wrong, another is outright wrong, and two are irrelevant in themselves as well as to one another. Accordingly, the knee cup presents itself rather as a ball, the downwards direction of the tibia bone veers too much to the left as if to project its other end outside of the lower leg, the striations on either side of the lower leg's frontal area fail to render either the tibia bone or the muscles involved, while the chevron-shaped object perched over the knee cup is reminiscent rather of a mustache than the anatomical structures that ought to be there *for the body needed* by a being-towards-death.

Just as was the case with the Chinese embodiment in Kuriyama's report regarding the muscle, because of its essential lacking of a what-for thingliness this "knee" in particular as this "body" in general remains as foreign an object to (Western) medical science, as because of its essential lacking the disclosure of fundamental ontological precepts it is also foreign to Western metaphysics. It is only due to Dasein's ecstatic foregrounding that this body is courteously made to belong to Dasein's evolutionary ascendance. One may think that, since this archaic assemblage is still made of somehow recognizable and more or less well-arranged components,



eyes, nose, chest, abdomen, penis and extremities all put in the right place, *we* ought to conclude that the *kouros* partakes at least an earlier form of the disclosure of Dasein's existential analytic.

But such arguments come only from a consciousness which has lost sight of its own productive prejudices, one constituted by structures of the understanding which, as we are arguing here, are visibly absent in world-disclosive embodiments of non-Greek post-Archaic art. Heidegger somehow anticipates the otherwise illegitimate grasping of foreign ontologies as dissolvable within *Dasein's* world interpretation, when he writes that: "[o]ntologies which have beings unlike Da-sein as their theme are ... founded and motivated in the ontic structure of Da-sein itself." (BT 13) We shall later return for a closer examination of this point.

In *Laokoön's* knee alone we can sample the objectification of the transcendental structures of Reason appearing as Nature. From our frontal view, the region gathers and withholds in definitive resolution, function and relevancy at least nine components, the what-for thingliness of which assembles the body *as* the primordial space to authenticate what Heidegger argued regarding Dasein's spatiality in being-in-the-world. Accordingly, the knee cup is distinguishable into a higher part, the patella, and the lower, the meniscus, while in between them is clearly discernible the patellofemoral groove. Where the tibia meets the meniscus we can see the formation of the tibial plateau, and from the inner thigh, clearly seen to run down beside the knee is the femoral vein. In our frontal view three of the four muscle ligaments which hold together the femur with the tibia around the knee, (medial collateral, lateral collateral, anterior cruciate) are bulging around the knee, the fourth one (posterior cruciate) not being visible, but even so strongly implied by the rest. That much would a medical doctor see at first sight.

Heidegger saw the origin, the range, and the boundaries of the scientific project, but at least in his seminal works he did not anticipate that his metaphysics could turn over a

comprehensive theory of embodiment verifiable by ontic science through Greek art. The conceptual armature with which Heidegger builds up Dasein's existential analytic, just because it is thoroughly exchangeable to a fundamental ontological theory of embodiment that patterns *the actual* human body as "discovered" in its ideal form by "Greek naturalism", avails itself to confirmation by (Western) medical science, the science of the body.

The launching pad Heidegger provides for this confirmation, are the two ideas that the substance of things, including the human body as disclosed by Greek art and discovered by Western science, is the thing's extension, and that spatial extension unfolds as care. For Heidegger "what constitutes the being of the *res corporea* is *extensio*", (BT 92) and "[t]he full disclosedness of the There is grounded in care." (BT 351)

If spatial "ex-tension" as the expansion-exteriorization of Dasein's existential pressure is grounded in the formal structures of care, and if care is itself grounded in primordial time as the formal liability of the being-towards-death, and then if also what is liable to death is the self and that alone because "[t]he they never dies because it is unable to die, since death is always my own ...", (BT 425) it follows that *the self* as a temporal and spatial being is the original creative force of self and of world; Dasein's world initially and essentially is a *self* interpretation. And yet, as we saw in section 2.4, Heidegger also observes that *initially* the self is lost in the they, and in being resolute the self is thrown into the factual possibilities bestowed to it as the heritage of the they. (BT 385) What appears here as a contradiction needing to be clarified by the point where the initially lost self as a potentiality finds itself and creates world, can be elucidated by the fundamental ontological structures that make up the body in Greek art. Greek art embodies and discloses what Heidegger calls the "they-self", (BT 268, 318) as it simultaneously discloses the possibility of the they in the I and of the I in the they, by prescribing the blueprint of the

individual's ideal embodiment. In its ideality, *Laokoön's* knee is the knee that *every-one* ought to have, thus both the knee of the they and the knee of the I.

The binding together of the - at first glance - nine visible elements in *Laokoön's* knee into a rationally efficient and purposeful structure, the what-for thingliness of which hearkens to and anticipates natural limitations, is signifiable only from the perspective of a *situated* being, a self. In his *Introduction to Metaphysics* and his lectures on Heraclitus, Heidegger interprets Heraclitus' idea that: "Logos unifies by assembling. It assembles in that, in gathering, it lets lie before us what lies before *as such* and *as a whole*." (IM 142, 145, LS 70) At this point Heidegger also agreed both with Plato that "*logos* is always *logos tinos*", (BT 159) and with Kant in that "[a]ll binding together is an 'I bind together'. (BT 319) So that: "The 'I' seems to 'hold together' the totality of the structural whole." (BT 318) *Laokoön's* monumental knee is our own everyday knee, as the *kouros's* knee is not, in that this knee extends itself spatially by the situated immanency of the rational self as a being-towards-death. That which configures *Laokoön's* knee is an *anticipation* to something which itself is yet to materialize, something that lies in the priest's possible future being only a threat, so that the knee is gathered together as a what-for thingliness which is ahead of itself in order to anticipate that which the threat threatens for. The recognition of this *physical* anticipation of something *noumenal* is critical in arguing an *existential* reading of *Being and Time*, and Heidegger describes the futural ideality of this knee when, in explaining Dasein's spatiality of being-in-the-world, he writes that: "Primordially constituted by care, Dasein is always already ahead of itself. Existing, it has always already projected itself upon definite possibilities of its existence;". (BT 315) It is with the potentiality of *this* knee that *this* priest may succeed or fail to survive *this* threat sent by the god. It is with the potentiality of exactly *this* knee that this priest has been freed to die. In comparison, the *kouros's* knee, with all

its anatomical lacking, falsity, and irrelevance, belongs neither to itself nor to any other parts of the *kouros*' body, a mirroring subtotal of a body not belonging to nature and a body to where (Dasein's) nature does not belong. The being dependent on the "knee" of the *kouros*, cannot die.

The whereto of the spatial expansion, i.e., the locating belongingness of the substance of the parts that configure *Laokoön*'s knee, as well as to where the knee belongs as a whole, belong not to themselves, but always to some other whereto. The observation mentioned earlier by Karo that the rendition of any whereto of spatial expansion in the body of the statue carries onto itself subtle changes from the implications of configurations in each and every other whereto rendered, shows how Greek art embodies Heidegger's idea that: "Da-sein understands its here in terms of the over there of the surrounding world." (BT 108)

This unique, embodied form of world-disclosure in Greek art has been commented since the antiquity and institutionalized by historians ever since, as the "Polykleitus Canon." Although part of the literature amounts to nebulous references in posterity about elements with mystical numerical proportions suggesting Pythagorean influence, Galen preserved an earlier testimony by Chrysippos, who held: "... beauty to consist in the proportions not of the elements but of the parts, that is to say, of finger to finger and of all the fingers to the palm and wrist, and of these to the forearm, and of the forearm to the upper arm, and of all the parts to each other, as they are set forth in the Canon of Polykleitos."<sup>40</sup> This preliminary account suffices to demonstrate that nothing mystical is needed to explain the "beauty" attributed to the implementation of the Canon, other than the fact that the statue actually embodies and discloses Dasein's spatiality, precisely as Heidegger's existential metaphysics describe it.

The Canonical commensurability, or *symmetria*, that we casually intuit as "beauty" in *Laokoön*'s body, is no other than the blueprint of the belongingness which articulates the parts

within a possible whereto, a whereto prefigured either as a subsumed local totality or as an expansive general totality of purposeful heedfulness that determines Dasein's spatiality of being-in-the-world. *Laokoön*'s knee in particular and his entire body in general, embodies Heidegger's idea that: "The belongingness is determined by the significance constitutive for the world and articulates the here and there within the possible whereto. The whereto in general is prefigured by the referential totality established in a for-the-sake-of-which of heedfulness." (BT 111)

In the *kouros* knee, the here and the there do not belong. This is an *a-schemon* ("ugly") knee, ugly because it is not schematized. We saw that the tibial plateau which medical science would recognize in the *Laokoön* knee to connect the tibia with the meniscus, is in the *kouros* knee missing altogether, while the tibia projects itself out of the lower leg and the mustache-shaped object above the knee cup remains irrelevant to any functional purpose of a "knee", because the Archaic world-impulse which has somehow articulated the here and the there of this "knee" is not a circumspective heedfulness for-the-sake-of-which. Instead of a Heideggerian whereto, this "knee" is an *u-topos*, recognized as a "knee" only from Dasein's foregrounding consciousness which has lost sight of its own productive prejudices and cannot do otherwise but - to remember Gadamer - "immediately ... recombine with what it has foregrounded itself from in order to become one with itself again in the unity of the historical horizon that it thus acquires." And this holds for the rest of the *kouros*' body.

In discussing Dasein's spatiality of being-in-the-world, Heidegger understands that in order to articulate the here and the there within a possible whereto, belongingness must be freed to engender instances of spatial extension into a region as a totality of relevance. Only this openness to total relevancy de-distances innerworldly beings and reveals them in their what-for thingliness, not vaguely in space, but in an enframing region, a *perioche*. "The freeing of a

totality of relevance is equiprimordially a letting something be relevant in a region which de-distances and gives direction. It is a freeing of the spatial belongingness of things at hand”, writes Heidegger. (BT 111)

The suchness of innerworldly beings can be defined only through their what-for-thingliness, while their what-for-thingliness itself is decided with both meanings of a “resolution” (as resolve and as definition) and only if innerworldly beings are made to belong to one other by a heedful association within a region. The temporally grounded horizontal whereto upon which beings appear in their suchness, is the “region”: “We call this whereto of the possible belonging somewhere of useful things, circumspectly held in view in advance, and heedful association, the region.” (BT 103)

We notice Heidegger saying that the useful things are circumspectly held in view “in advance”. Something is already “*held in view*”, that is, determined in advance of the useful things’ resolute disclosure. It is a central tenet for Dasein’s spatiality in the world, the principle that “[a] totality of useful things is always already discovered before the individual useful thing.” (BT 69) The blueprint of this totality being “held in view” before the particulars of this totality are determined, is displayed in *Laokoön*’s body in general and his knee in particular, where the primordial impulse for circumspective heedfulness, i.e. the grounding awareness of the irretrievable time by the being-towards-death, must have “held in view” some early version of the spatial appropriation of all body parts ahead of any particular definition. For the body to be rendered otherwise than in this previewed heedfulness, would result in what we see in pre-classical statuary, where body parts belong neither to themselves as useful things, nor to one another: they have been rendered in and for themselves. Heidegger understands that there is an “initial”, pre-figurative stage of spatial determination, where the spatiality of Dasein lingers (my

italics): “In accordance with its spatiality, Da-sein is *initially* never here, but over there. From this over there it comes back to its here, and it does this only by interpreting its heedful being toward something in terms of what is at hand over there.” (BT 108)

Since this “there” must at some point and at least potentially be a somewhere else’s “here”, that “there” as a “here” must await for its determination to yet another “there”, so that this process of the object’s determination could potentially be carried on *ad infinitum*. In section 2.3, where we initially discussed the veiled identity between time and the muscle, we argued at that point against Heidegger, that the will to determine an object is more primordial than the determination of whether even the partially determined object is willed or otherwise. It is this necessity, this more primordial resistance of *determining* the object, which incorporates and integrates the muscle in Dasein’s embodiment as a *fundamental ontological* structure amongst the other four embodied structures of care. A medical doctor only sees that the muscle connects and activates all the otherwise disconnected and inert body parts. But, fundamental ontologically speaking, the muscle is primordial temporality in disguise, resisting the resistance of connecting and integrating the what-for thingliness between the here and the there in themselves and for one another. The muscle narrative, as it is patently unfolding in *Laokoön*’s body, gathers the parts into a whole where parts are hearkening to one another with the purpose to resist what resist’s Dasein’s will to live. As we mentioned earlier, that which configures *Laokoön*’s knee in particular and his body as whole, is *an anticipation* to something which itself is yet to materialize, something that lies in this priest’s possible future being only a threat, so that the knee is gathered together as a what-for thingliness which is ahead of itself in order to anticipate that which the threat threatens for.

Precisely as is the case with Dasein's spatiality for innerworldly beings, the what-for thingliness of body parts resists its determination until this pre-figurative resistance is overcome by at least a contingent viewing of that for-the-sake-of-which the body part is itself determined in heedful economy and accordance to the determination of the for-the-sake-of-which thingliness of every other body part. In the blueprint disclosure of the *Laokoön's* falling prey, that for-the-sake-of-which the body parts of the being-towards-death are determined are the threatening serpents. As we will see further, the serpents disclose in literal ontic form the *entanglement* or *falling prey* as Dasein's one of four structures of care.

What we see at the ontic level in *Laokoön's* body are tremendous muscular masses interconnecting and inter-activating highly defined body parts, which would otherwise be disjunct and stale body parts embodying the literal sense of a *u-topos*. Heidegger addresses the necessity for this connectivity, albeit only seeing it in time but not in the muscle, when he writes that "[t]emporality makes possible the unity of existence." (BT 328) And again: "*Ecstatic temporality clears the There primordially*. It is the primary regulator of the possible unity of all the essential existential structures of Dasein." (BT 351) Heidegger succinctly asks: "... what makes possible the totality of the articulated structural whole of care in the unity of its unfolded articulation?" (BT 325) It is the embodiment of time as the resisting *transcendental motility* which *con-figures* the body for the understanding, since: "... its essence is temporalizing in the unity of the ecstasies." (BT 329) And: "[t]emporality makes possible the unity of existence, facticity, and falling prey and thus constitutes primordially the totality of the structure of care." (BT 328) The empty space that surrounds this statue, though invisible itself, is nevertheless intelligible as a *topos*, a *perioche*, that is, a region, in that every detail and the overall muscular, skeletal, and anatomical configuration of this body is heedful to the threat imposed by and within this region.



The prescriptive operation precipitating behind the ontic level, however, is the discharging flow in between structures of care resisting their definition, of the irretrievable time lapsing at the expense of the being-towards-death, for those resisting structures of care to be summoned, de-distanced in circumspective resoluteness, in order to form themselves in their particular and their collective what-for thingliness. This temporal secretion cannot itself appear as anything else in Dasein's embodiment, other than as the muscle.

Civic awareness, philosophy, and history of art have come only close to understanding this threesome relation of identity between Reason, time, and the muscle, but did not make it far enough to the step where this relation bares at the nexus between Greek art, *Being and Time* and *Origin*. Heraclitus and Heidegger come close by concurring, as we saw, in that "[l]ogos unifies by assembling ... in gathering, it lets lie before us what lies before *as such* and *as a whole*." And so does Havelock in that "[l]ogos has something muscular about it."<sup>41</sup> Pericles' funerary speech *Epitaph* articulates the first preservers' sentiment of Dasein's absolute dependence to gather its spatiality on the embodiment of temporality as masculinity, since the Athenians: "philosophize without effeminacy and philocalize [embrace the noble] with economy." Thus, where Heidegger figured that "Da-sein can be spatial only as care", (BT 368) we must now add that Dasein can be temporal only as muscular agency.

The embodied shift from Archaism to Classicism, this world-shattering movement from the *noein* to *dianoein*, is the tragic yearning to transverse the mystifying distances *and their implications* which at once separate being from that which it is yet to be, and unify this being in its own circumspective resolution. *Laokoön*, the work we have chosen as the consummation of Dasein's existential analytic, is taken to have been modeled after a supposedly more ancient poetic narrative, the story of a Trojan priest attacked by serpents sent by Apollo to punish his

irreverent questioning the real purpose of the Trojan Horse which was offered to the city by the scheming Achaean warriors. And yet nothing can be more ancient than the perceptual prescriptions which the statue of the *Laokoön Group* embodies and thus discloses as its own world programme, prescriptions which determine the temporalization of temporality within which there may be any historical narrative to define Apollo, this priest, Troy, and the Achaeans as such.

The Polycleitus Canon alone, as it is profoundly implemented by the *Laokoön*, legitimizes only an *existential* reading of *Being and Time*, for it discharges Dasein's body as an electrifying current grounded in the formal structures of futural temporality and the embodying structures of care, the what-for thingliness of which stresses to the utmost the subject's needs as the needs of a being-towards-death. In his attempt to infer Heidegger's elusive theory of embodiment from the philosopher's late work, Aho looks for an alternative reading, having yielded to the critics who argue that Heidegger's concept of angst entails extreme subjectivism by overemphasizing individuation and the futurity of existence. But for as long as we medically and aesthetically identify with the ideality of *Laokoön's* body, *Laokoön's* superlative muscular narrative and the structures of care grounded on this narrative being the embodied primordial temporality in disguise, palpably suggest that there is no more radical sense of authenticity for Dasein's world other than that of a threatened and thus anguished being. Winckelmann saw this *existential* authenticity when he wrote that: "The action of these muscles in the *Laokoön* is carried beyond truth to the limits of possibility; they lie like hills which are drawing themselves together, for the purpose of expressing the extremest exertion in anguish and resistance."<sup>42</sup>

The German romantics who revived antiquity and launched aesthetics as an autonomous branch of philosophy, saw angst reaching monumental status in this work. But in their

preoccupation to understand art even of this monumentality as a mere copy of the world, they did not make the connection between angst and *truth*; this connection came only with Heidegger. Winckelmann, Herder and Goethe went only as far as to see beauty in angst, while Lessing did not even go that far. To see the beauty in the monumental idealization of suffering, is to reckon with Dasein's world-project, and Winckelmann does just that in seeing in *Laokoön* that: "... in the representation of this intense suffering is seen the determined spirit of a great man who struggles with necessity and strives to suppress all audible manifestations of pain."<sup>43</sup> As Winckelmann's commentator William G. Howard points out, "Winckelmann was emphatic in declaring beauty to be the principal object of art."<sup>44</sup> If Winckelmann saw only beauty but not yet truth in the *Laokoön*, Lessing fell even shorter, because he could see beauty only *apart* from suffering. Heidegger's connection with Greek art shows that the tragic essence of Dasein's idealized embodiment, which is grounded on temporality, derives from forms of struggle embodying the consequences of being a being-towards-death. Greek art shows that the ugly as the *a-schemon*, is the unschematized, the formless. Heidegger shows that schematization and form is possible only from a being grounded in temporality as the being-towards-death. But Lessing understands the embodiment of struggle as ugly in itself. In his treatise *Laokoön and How the Ancients Represented Death*, he patently misunderstood *schematization* as *disfiguration*:

The master aimed at the highest beauty compatible with the adopted circumstances of bodily pain. The latter, in all its disfiguring violence, could not be combined with the former; therefore he must reduce it; he must soften shrieks into sighs, not because a shriek would have betrayed an ignoble soul, but because it would have produced a hideous contortion of the countenance. For only imagine the mouth of *Laokoön* to be forced open and then judge! Let him shriek, and look at him! It is a form which inspired compassion, for it displayed beauty and pain at once. It has become an ugly and horrible shape from which we gladly avert our eyes; for the sight of pain

excites annoyance, unless the beauty of the suffering object change that annoyance into the sweet emotion of pity.”<sup>45</sup>

Both Winckelmann and Lessing, along with the rest of the German romantics, understood the statue strictly as a useful representation, a Heideggerian thing-at-hand. This convenient shortsightedness allowed the neglect of the problem of the asymmetry between the ontic and the ontological datability in the hermeneutic circle; it educated inauspiciously generations of art historians and critics, and it likely influenced Heidegger’s inattention to statuary art. But although the statue does appear within the immediate region of the temple, of the excavated earth, or of the museum, the statue as Dasein’s embodiment does not occupy space, inasmuch as Dasein itself does not occupy space the way beings at hand do. “... [T]his ‘occupying’ is to be fundamentally differentiated from being at hand at a place in terms of a region”, writes Heidegger, anticipating this condition for Dasein’s self-disclosure. (BT 108) The *post-Archaic* Greek statue is the only innerworldly being wedged exactly in between and entirely occupying the discretionary region between mind and world, embodying the primordial structures of time, angst and care, through which de-distancing and thus space is possible. As such, the statue is the elusive Heideggerian art which has disclosed in advance the possibility of a region within which the statue itself may appear. Heidegger makes this distinction when discussing the spatiality of Dasein: “occupying a place must be understood as de-distancing what is at hand in the surrounding world in a region previously discovered circumspectly beforehand.” (BT 108)

What makes possible for the statue as a transcendental disclosure, for its “godly” essence to appear casually within the region of mortal and perishable beings which itself prescribes, is its being made of Dasein’s primordial grounding, Dasein’s “substance” as a finite temporal being. There are no otherworldly deities to be somehow reckoned with here. This metaphysical “god” is

of *this* world in the most physical and non-Christian sense, because it is the *theo-s* (“Deus” in the Vatican’s inapprehensive Latin translation) that implements *theo-ria* as the only possibility of world-view. The tremendous muscular masses gathering and activating highly defined body parts disclosed as a There of a what-for thingliness through the structures of care in *Laokoön*, are regionally visible because they are ideally expedient to the world project of resistance by the tragic being held together and given a body by its own being having become an issue. “Care summons Da-sein to its ownmost potentiality-of-being in the call of conscience”, writes Heidegger, postulating the existential analytic of this embodied and physicalized summoning. (BT 317) And again: “[Dasein’s] ‘content’ is not founded in the substantiality of substance, but in the ‘self-constancy’ ... of the existing self whose being was conceived as care.” (BT 303)

In having its godly essence appear casually as a body amongst other innerworldly corporeal things, the statue brings forth what for substance ontology has remained an elusive continuity between the metaphysical and the physical realms. Being the blueprint for Dasein’s world disclosure, the statue is the test bed for checking Heidegger’s refutation of materialism in terms of his cardinal argument that Dasein can be spatial only as care, (BT 386) and that the full disclosedness of the There is grounded in care. (BT 351) Since the substance of all things, amongst them the identifying parts of the idealized and the living human body, cannot be the parts’ material constituency, Heidegger sees the structures of care *themselves* as “phenomena”, that is, things that appear, leading to “the phenomenon of the world.” (BT 335) To the dead ends of substance ontology, Heidegger counterproposes that the *res extensa* is made of the structures of care, themselves grounded separately in finite temporality.

Dasein is a unique spatial being, in that unlike the innerworldly beings which it itself produces, compiles and retrieves, relinquishes, or inherits as world by means and under the

pressure of existential signification, in principle itself does not dwell confined in space, but exists expansively as space. This existential pressurization is assembled by the fourfold structural manifold of care, and in being accordingly fourfold-grounded in primordial temporality it is the sole provision for self-constancy. Writes Heidegger: “Ontologically, Da-sein is in principle different from everything objectively present and real. Its ‘content’ is not founded in the substantiality of substance, but in the ‘*self-constancy*’ ... of the existing self whose being was conceived as care.” (BT 304) If, as we have argued after amending *Origin*, statuary art discloses the prescription of Dasein’s perceptual domain, this assembly of self-constancy must itself be embodied in art. That which we must show to be embodied, if we are to produce the implicit theory of embodiment of Heidegger’s *fundamental* ontology, is the very definition of care, as the: “‘being-ahead-of-itself-in-already-being-in’ - as being-together-with ...” (BT 196)

Thus far we have shown that the primordial, finite temporality in which the structures of care are grounded, has been promptly embodied as art, albeit in ontological and factual disguise. This proof has prepared the grounds for the demonstration that all four structures of care are also embodied in Greek art, so that Heidegger’s primordial prioritization can be upheld, because: “... the constitutional totality of care has the possible ground of its *unity* in temporality”, (BT 375) and because “... spatiality is existentially possible only through temporality ...” (BT 367) Care is grounded in temporality because the structures of care are themselves ecstatic, that is, they project Dasein’s definite possibilities into the future. Writes Heidegger: “Primordially constituted by care, Da-sein is always already ahead of itself. Existing, it has always already projected itself upon definite possibilities of its existence;” (BT 315)

Heidegger knows that, especially in view of his counterintuitive exposition marshaled against the “reifying consciousness” and the traditional beliefs of substance ontology, the

demonstration of Dasein's constitution as a spatial and temporal being is far from a simple matter. "The whole of the constitution of Da-sein itself is not simple in its unity, but shows a structural articulation which is expressed in the existential concept of care." (BT 200) Heidegger concludes *Being and Time* mystified, wondering over questions he does not answer: "Why is being 'initially' 'conceived' in terms of what is objectively present, *and not* in terms of things at hand that do, after all, lie *still nearer* to us? *Why* does reification come to dominate again and again?" (BT 437)

Yet the conceptual seeds to simplify the demonstration are themselves planted in *Origin*, where the first principles are laid to interpret the palpable and visible proofs provided by Greek art. To qualify for this demonstration, the disclosive body in Greek art must incarnate equiprimordially several preliminary habituations. First of all it must be *a tragic* body, the phenomenological structures of which are promptly housing a being-towards-death. This is because "[Dasein's] ontological constitution must be made visible by setting forth the concrete structure of anticipation of death", as Heidegger demands. "How is the phenomenal definition of this structure to be accomplished? Evidently by defining the characteristics of anticipatory disclosure which must belong to it so that it can become the pure understanding of the ownmost non-relational possibility not-to-be-bypassed which is certain and, as such indefinite." (BT 263) Secondly, this disclosive body must be the ideated body of the they-self; that is, although transcendent in its ideality, to still be the body of an *individual*, since from the first, tragic requirement, death can only be one's own. Our consummate identification with the physicality of Greek art may simplify the demonstration, since Heidegger seeks an *explicit* deduction of selfhood from the structures of care, "[b]ecause the self cannot be conceived either as substance or as subject, but is rather grounded in existence ... selfhood has been *explicitly* taken back into

the structure of care, and thus of temporality ...” (BT 332) To qualify for the task, Greek art must disclose the foundation of individualization through the anticipation of death, as well as to embody the proof that Dasein’s world is an exclusive club of individuals, because “[t]he non-relational character of death understood in anticipation individualizes Da-sein down to itself. This individualizing is a way in which the ‘there’ is disclosed for existence.” (BT 264) Thirdly, this testament of a body in art must be essentially and fundamentally constituted by the *experience* of resistance, if it is to have projected on itself, or rather *as* itself, its ownmost world project. Heidegger underlines this necessity: “Reality is *resistance* ... *The experience of resistance, that is the discovery of resistance in striving, is ontologically possible only on the basis of the disclosedness of world.*” (BT 210) Fourth, this body must summon the axiomatic proof through its own physical organization of how Dasein’s spatiality is ecstatic, thrown, and related, as these three existential dispositions accordingly define care as “being-ahead-of-itself-in-already-being-in as being together with.” Fifth, and ultimately, as a spatial articulation of the above *temporal* determinations, the embodied proof in Greek art of the temporal interpretation of everyday Dasein must itself be constituted by the four structures of care. The statue is the existential constitution of the *Da* of the human body as Dasein’s own world import, and as such it must *incorporate* the ecstatic existentials of understanding, of attunement, of entanglement, and of discourse. As we will see in what follows, *Laokoön* is *patently* such a body.



## ***Endnotes***

31. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 291.
32. Martin Heidegger, *What is Metaphysics?*, in *Basic Writings*, p. 105.
33. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, p. 60.
34. John Herington, *Aeschylus*, p. 54 , S93.
35. John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture - The Archaic Period*, pp. 23-24.
36. George Karo, *Greek Personality In Archaic Sculpture*, pp. 278-279.
37. Athena S. Leoussi, *Nationalism and Classicism*, p. 28.
38. John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture - The Archaic Period*, pp. 64-65.
39. George Karo, *Greek Personality In Archaic Sculpture*, pp. 278-279.
40. Rhys Carpenter, *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art, of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, p. 92.
41. Eric A. Havelock, *Preface to Plato*, p. 281.
42. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, p. 42.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
44. William Guild Howard, editor and commentary, *Laokoön: Lessing, Herder, Goethe*, p. CXXXVII.
45. Gottlob Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoön, and How the Ancients Represented Death*, pp. 16-17.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE EMBODIMENT OF CARE I

#### ***4.1 The Problem of the “Anthropopithique”***

As we qualified in section 1.3., the spatial expansion of *Das Man*, that is, Dasein’s world, must launch at the footing of *the statue*. The statue is the primordial center of the world as a centered expansive circle, the fundamental ontological hub of the “surrounding”, since in the most fundamental ontological way for Heidegger “[t]he closest world of everyday Da-sein is the *surrounding world* ... [where beings are] initially encountered within the surroundings.” (BT 66)

Given this center of expansive preservation of the perceptual possibilities disclosed by the statue as the incarnation of *Das Man*, and if Dasein’s fundamental ontological world project must itself be projected on the ideal human body because this body is instrumental and therefore must somehow remain inherently interfaced and connatural to this project, then the prescriptive provenance of that regional expansion as the articulation of that structural totality of the being of Dasein must itself be embodied in monumental sculptic art. Further following this qualification, and since the human body is the only innerworldly object exactly wedged and entirely occupying the discretionary region between mind and world, the modulation of the human body as any set of units to be variously fitted together must expand itself as space both *differently* than any other *res extensa*, and, simultaneously, expand *by the same rules* of the temporally horizontal expansion of the world within which this body acts, in order to maintain a body-world compatibility.

Was it otherwise, the human animal not to be distinguishable by means of its corporeality as the Aristotelian *zoon logon echon* from the non-rational animals with which humans supposedly share the realist's world as mere equals, then we, as the Heideggerian beings-towards-death, would end up with a body that does not belong to us, nor would we belong to it. The need for this distinguishability became a pivotal problem at the peak of the controversy which the nineteenth century discoveries brought forth in the human and natural sciences, where converging fields of speculation unable to ask the right questions turned into a boiling pot of conflicting ideas regarding the origin of man. The furry bodily contour of Darwin's primordial ancestor did not sit well with our gut feeling regarding our origins. As Leoussi lets be understood, the core values of the nineteenth century rising European ethnocentrism felt better to identify with a cold Greek marble statue, than with the living bloodline of the ape. In his 1886 *Traiti d' Anatomie, d' Anthropologie et d' Ethnographie Appliquées aux Beaux-Arts*, Catholic Frenchman Charles Rochet justifiably vented a vehement protest, though his protest was inflamed by the unsustainable assumption that the "true" human body has biblical origins:

*[Q]ui veut donner à l'Homme des origines simiennes ... Cette école négative de toutes choses, qui semble étudier l'Homme et ne voit que la ... Cette école barbare et cruelle dont les plus fervents adeptes ... inventent UN MONSTRE !! ... moitié homme, moitié singe, qu'ils appellent effrontément notre ancêtre ; UN ANTHROPOPIQUE ! qu'ils donnent comme ayant été le Précurseur de l' Homme : Le père de tous les hommes, l' affreux Adam de l' ignoble Genèse ! ... Voilà ce qu' on enseigne en pleine l'école d' Anthropologie, à Paris. ... Voilà ce que les disciples de Broca et les continuateurs de Darwin proclament, à travers le monde et dans tous les congrès comme étant la grande vérité du dix-neuvième siècle, la bonne nouvelle des générations futures!*<sup>46</sup>

Though impossibly ideal, it is not the warm-blooded body of our animal ancestor, but this cold marble object, the assembled and assembling structures of *Logos*, which we recognize as ours, the *human* body. Agalmatophilia describes the relation between Heidegger's preservers and

these cold marble things, which came to simultaneously populate and designate the secular and religious sites of Greece as such: the city agora, the temples, shrines, sanctuaries and graveyards. As Steiner reports, the cathectic engagement of the ancients with these otherwise strange objects were “visual discussions of desire”, “illicit longings of the bodies of the gods.”<sup>47</sup> “The statues that populate Greek myth, poetry, and drama”, writes Steiner, “are from the first intimately bound up with sentiments of love and fervent longing (*pothos*), and offer ways of exploring the pathology of desire ...”<sup>48</sup>

Paul Valéry pointed out that, (finite beings that we are) the body belongs to us a little less than we belong to it. At first sight this higher dependency of the mind to the body may, indeed, level mankind with the rest of nature. Yet that other body with which humanity so consummately identifies in the aforementioned pronouncement by the art historian that “the Greeks finally understood the human body”, i.e., the body composed in stone by the metaphysical decrees, one amongst which prescribes the natural law that living bodies have an expiration date, *now this must be a special body*. Strangely, by means of this law primordially disclosed in the body of the statue as a world-founding, grounding, and bestowal, to this body now nature belongs more than this body belongs to nature. The body of the statue may be equally susceptible to perishing, by means of violent destruction or by simple wear and tear in its exposure to the elements. To have noticed the aberrant body of the statue within nature, is to have administered Albrecht Dürer’s prescription, mentioned by Heidegger in *Origin*, that: “... art lies hidden within nature; he who can wrest it from her, has it.” (*Origin* 195)

The physical world accounts for the presence in it of no other embodied agency than the perishable bodies of human and animal. Thus in nature the free-standing body of the Greek statue appears as an anomaly. Even Heidegger does not provide a place for the body of the statue

in Dasein's natural history, since this body does not fall into neither historical categories of "useful things" or of "nature", which Heidegger mentions as the "secondarily historical beings" (the primary is Dasein), when he writes that: "... *secondarily* historical is what is encountered in the world, not only useful things at hand ... but also *nature* in the surrounding world as the 'historical ground.'" (BT 381)

Thus by all means, except by maintaining the defunct representational theory of art, the statue must be seen an innerworldly anomaly, although the more "Greeks" we become - by now "we are all Greeks", Shelley figured in his poem *Hellas* - the more natural we find it to identify ourselves with this anomaly in nature. In our post-structuralist days this identification has become a complex and multifaceted issue.

Although the Christian doctrine of creationism maintains a common origin of all life, i.e., God, Western religion instinctively understands that there must be some essential difference between the origin of the body of man and the origin of the body of the animal. It is only in the making of Heidegger's missing connection with the Greeks, and in Heidegger's implicit theory of embodiment as this theory is corroborated by Greek art, where we first realize that the human body as a *res extensa* differs fundamentally from any other body in nature, because to this as muscular as tragic a body now nature belongs more than this body belongs to nature.

The reversed dependency explains the essential difference between the human and the animal body, and is established once we notice that the human body, as "the Greeks finally understood it", is nothing less than the embodiment of the transcendental laws that disclose nature as a whole and nature as such. From this point on we begin to see that the origin of the human body as such, is primordial temporality phenomenologically available in art, whereas the origin of the animal body as such is in the understanding of man as the being-towards-death.

Heidegger claimed in *Origin* that “art is the origin of both artist and work.” (*Origin* 143) If Heidegger is right, it is art, not a Christian god nor a Big Bang, not religion, nor science, that disclosed the engendering of both the human and the animal body.

Since art may disclose the animal body only through the intervention of the *human* hand, this comparably higher proximity of the human body to art as the origin of predication, and the dependency on art through the human body for the disclosure of all corporeal bodies, bears the fundamental ontological explanation why the ideal human body as a *res extensa* differs from the body of the animal. Unlike the animal body, the human body must reach out of itself in order to understand and render the animal body in art. This ecstatic task is possible because the human body is housing the being-towards-death and is thus katastatically situated. Ecstatic embodiment manifests in the incorporation of primordial temporality, since for Heidegger “[t]emporality is the primordial ‘outside of itself’ in and for itself.” (BT 329) This exclusive proximity of the human animal to art as the origins of departure for the understanding, may be what Heidegger points to in his cryptic, concluding lines from Hölderlin’s mysticism in *Origin*: “Reluctantly/that which dwells near its origin abandons the site.”

The animal body may equally contain the muscle, and it is this equality which vouchsafes that both human and animal bodies are spatial expansions obeying to the same homogeneous and isotropic rules that maintain a compatibility between Dasein’s body and Dasein’s world. But this equality is not fundamental; it is only ontically congenial, the construct of muscle consciousness dwelling in the ideal Greek body. As we saw earlier with Kuriyama, the embodied influence of the muscle in understanding nature is not a universal partaking amongst life forms which are themselves physically emasculated, but contingent even in between presumingly cohabitant human cultures. The fact that musculature appears - to our “Greek” eyes - in the bodies of other

conscious life forms, from the mollusk to the ape and to the bodies of peoples from cultures other than the post-archaic Greeks, should not lead us to believe that these other conscious forms of life have embodied themselves as beings-towards-death. Alternative forms of consciousness may either have no art to disclose them in the suchness of what they are, or even if they do have such an art-world to disclose their embodiment as agency into a world, their art should be left alone to speak to us of that world instead of us imposing on it ontic facts emanating from Dasein's compulsory foregrounding. This cultural contingency is what we just pointed to, having said that the origin of the human body as such is primordial temporality made phenomenologically available in art, whereas the origin of the animal body as such, is man the being-towards-death.

In the previous chapter we have thus far evinced the embodiment into the idealized human form of the primordial mood of anxiety as the Nothing being the origin of negation, and, consequently, the human embodiment of primordial temporality as the negation of the negation to live in the world's horizontal disclosure. But the in-corporation of these two equiprimordialities into that regional *res extensa* which we recognize as the "finally understood" human body, is still far from being sufficient to demonstrate how nature belongs to that body more than that body belongs to nature. To complete the inference of Heidegger's implicit theory of embodiment by corroborating the embodiment in Greek art of the equiprimordiality of Dasein's existential analytic, we need next to demonstrate the embodiment of the structural totality of Dasein as care.

## **4.2 Agalmatophilia**

After primordial angst and horizontal temporality, care is the last most important concept for the production of Heidegger's theory of embodiment. It is through this fundamental ontological concept that the expansion of Dasein's idealized embodiment summons itself into a

thingly thing, the statue, which, nonetheless, lies too close and looks deceptively too familiar to be recognized for what it really is: the primordial prescription of space within the possibility for spatiality which it, itself, founds, grounds, and bestows. It is this uncanny familiarity, the essential Dasein itself staring upon the phenomenological structures of its own prescriptive essence, which leaves Boardman dumbfounded: “Staring at these works, in picture, cast or original, does not explain them; indeed their familiarity to some degree deadens perception.”<sup>49</sup>

The ancients themselves are said to have stood speechless before the incarnation of what Heidegger talked of as Dasein’s “equiprimordially of constitutive factors.” (BT 131) Steiner reports so in her recent book *Images in Mind – Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*:

[L]ate archaic and classical sculptors seem to have responded by depicting their gods with bodies that simultaneously declared their proximity to men and reminded the viewer of the breach between a familiar surface appearance and an ineffable, invisible reality that could be neither directly ‘imaged’ nor reproduced.<sup>50</sup>

Care is the intermediary concept between horizontal temporality and the disclosure in this horizon as a thereupon of the *res extensa*; care is the concept which binds time with space. Space is dependent for its disclosure as a *region* on the multiple structures of care. This is a threesome dependence, because, on the one hand, for Heidegger, “[t]he full disclosedness of the There is grounded in care”; (BT 351) and at the other end, “[c]are is being towards death.” (BT 330)

But what does this “care is being towards death” mean? It means that the being-towards-death, for which being has become an issue in that being’s very being, *cares* for its impending loss of world in view of its world-dispersed and world-attached will to live being constantly negated in the minutiae and at every turn of its head. The world is itinerant and “occurs” as a spatial expansion, being handed down as a having-been-there, when Dasein first becomes aware



of itself in the anticipation of resolving this constant negation. “In [anticipatory resoluteness] ... Da-sein understands itself with regard to its potentiality-of-being in a way that confronts death in order to take over completely the being that it itself is in its thrownness. Resolutely taking over one’s own factual ‘There’ means at the same time the resolve for the situation”, writes Heidegger. (BT 383) This *existentiell* pressure from the lapse of irretrievable time in everydayness, unites the constant and omnidirectional negation that *must* be taken care of, be dealt with, into the constitution of one, ecstatic, threatened consciousness as a “being-there” in its spatial configuration. “The temporality of factual being-in-the-world is what primordially makes the disclosure of space possible”, writes Heidegger. (BT 417) And again, “[t]he constitutional totality of care has the possible ground of its unity in temporality.” (BT 374) In his analysis of Dasein’s “material” constitution, Heidegger wants to know what *we* also want to know in our quest to explain the peerless articulation and the unification of this articulation of the ideal body in Greek art. “With the question of the meaning of care, we are asking *what makes possible the totality of the articulated structural whole of care in the unity of its unfolded articulation?*” Heidegger’s answer is that “[t]emporality makes possible the unity of existence, facticity and falling prey and thus constitutes primordially the totality of the structure of care.” (BT 324, 328)

The modal structures through which the ideality of care morphs into what is otherwise immediately and unreflectively perceived upon the temporal horizon to be the rigid and alienated materiality of the *res corporea*, are themselves complex. “[C]are’ means an existential and basic ontological phenomenon which is as yet *not simple* in its structure”, notes Heidegger. (BT 196) This is so, first because of Heidegger’s refutation of Aristotelian and Cartesian substance ontology, and its replacement by existential ontology. “[B]eings having the kind of being of Da-sein cannot be comprehended in terms of reality and substantiality ... *the substance of human*

*being is existence.*” (BT 212) Consequently, just because space is more objectively experienced and shared than time (the reason why Kant understood them respectively as “outer” and “inner” forms of intuition), the derivation of the *res extensa* from its grounding on the subjectively experienced primordial temporality, is counterintuitive. Space as the outer form of intuition contained phenomenal entities, and time as the inner form of intuition contained the noumenal, while the discriminating line between thoughts and things, between the ontic and the ontological, remained unclear. Upon meeting with this tradition of the equivocations between the ontic and the ontological understandings of the *res corporea*, this degenerative dichotomy between space and time which Kant himself had maintained, Heidegger found a: “hazy mixture of the two ... [where] behind this slight difference of meaning lies hidden the failure to master the fundamental problem of being.” (BT 95)

Dasein is a structured being, so that our production of Heidegger’s implicit theory of embodiment ought to address the embodiment of these structures. “All explications arising from an analytic of Da-sein are gained with a view toward its structure of existence”, writes Heidegger. (BT 44) The nexus between *Being and Time* and *The Origin of the Work of Art* tacitly anticipates the primordial embodiment of the multiple structures of care in art, or rather *as* art, and Heidegger himself was looking for a blueprint of these structures as a *primordially* unified *phenomenon*. This very important requirement is evident in the following passage: “... This would require a blueprint. The being of Da-sein, which ontologically supports the structural whole as such, becomes accessible by completely looking *through* this whole *at a* primordially unified phenomenon which already lies in the whole in such a way that it is the ontological basis for every structural moment in its structural possibility.” (BT 182) What we have argued all along,

is that this “*primordially unified phenomenon*”, this “blueprint” which “lies in the whole in such a way that it is the ontological basis”, is the statue.

The statue must be seen as the primordial “region”, in which time and care fuse into the disclosive *res extensa*. The representational interpretation of statuary art has no access to this primordial region as the embodied prescription, hence all its various ratiocinations are ultimately begging the question. Steiner’s research brings up the ancient belief of mortals that the statues contained some indefinite “power”, a belief which itself is said to have “informed modes of portraying the immortals in plastic form.”<sup>51</sup> Carpenter followed up in trusting ancient understanding (Galen and Chrysippos), who explained the “beauty” of Greek statuary as consisting of “the working of Number”, so that “... the employment of a great many numbers would almost engender perfection in sculpture.”<sup>52</sup> Boardman thought that “the Greeks fashioned their gods in the likeness of men.”<sup>53</sup> And Winckelmann attributed the “superiority” of Greek art to the region’s climate and politics.<sup>54</sup> Yet none of these seemingly endless ontic explanations of the statue, can derive *the origin* of predicating “mortals”, of “region”, “the artist”, “climate”, “Greece”, or “politics”, as such.

Contrarily, the *presentational* - or, to rather use Heidegger’s core concept – the *disclosive* interpretation of statuary art, as validated in our making the double connection first between Heidegger’s *Origin and Being and Time*, then also in between Heidegger and Greek Classical statuary, explains the productive necessity and the provenance of all innerworldly eidetic structures. The statue discloses itself as a blueprint, that is, it *presents* itself as a *parousia*, (presencing being), not as *eidolon* (mirroring image), and by means of this *parousia* it casts the essence of innerworldly beings in their suchness. In the statue’s presentation, *ousia* (the essence of being) is *par-ousa*, (the essence of being is itself present).

The representational approach to statuary may be the prevalent understanding today, and its power may be traced as far back as Plato's critique of art as the *eidolon* of an *eidolon* (the copy of a copy). But at least in the initial appearance into the world which themselves disclosed, the statues were reportedly indeed experienced as the *presence* of the god's essence. Accordingly, and amongst other such suggestive instances, Steiner notices a section in the *Iliad*, where "[a]t no point in the episode does the poet distinguish between the deity and the statue standing in the temple."<sup>55</sup>

Steiner also reports that "older" statues inspired much stronger cult functions, a deeper cathexis to the preserver, and notices that some of those "older" statues resist specific contextualization.<sup>56</sup> Both these observations suggest that - while upholding Heidegger's ecstatic hermeneutic principle in the temporalization of temporality, where "the future is *not later* than the having-been, and the having-been is *not earlier* than the present" - we ought to make a fundamental ontological discrimination between those "older" and generic, world-*prescriptive* works, the type of *Zeus* or the *Laokoön*, and "later" world-*descriptive* statues. In the disclosure of the possibility for individuality by the "older" works, the "later" ones must have themselves been made to actually copy and represent the situated physiognomy of certain individuals, a trend with the advent of portraiture of prominent figures in the Roman empire.

The disclosure of the "older" works is Dasein's essence and substance of being; it is the existential pressure in the lapse of irretrievable time, the embodied awareness itself that in its being, being is negated. If Dasein's world must be disclosed as art, as Heidegger argued, and if that art is primarily Greek classical statuary, as I am arguing, then this world-disclosive essence of the existential pressure must substantiate itself, must "materialize", as the very flesh of the abovementioned "older" and generically rendered statue. But how can a mere abstract idea, an

“essence” turn into tangible flesh? Thus far it has been shown how the world-founding, grounding, and bestowing essence of being, i.e., transcendental temporality, has embodied itself in ideal semblance as the muscle, in order to act upon and resist its life’s negation in the physical world. But the muscular narrative we meet with in Greek statuary from *Zeus* to *Laokoön*, is itself a phenomenological *structure* the intelligibility and the appropriation of which as a spatial expansion, what Heidegger refers to when he talks of the “substantiality, materiality, extendedness, side-by-sideness” of things, (BT 68) is dependent on the fourfold articulation of care. Encountering the serrated muscular clusters on the sides of *Laokoön*’s torso, Winckelmann’s attention is captured by this appropriative intelligibility, by this heedful care through which muscular narrative must so and so develop, but he understands it as preternaturalness. Heidegger points out both that “discourse articulates intelligibility” (BT 272), and that the disclosed articulation of intelligibility is carried through by the structures of attunement and understanding being the structures of care. (BT 220, 335) But then, besides the muscle narrative, Dasein’s entire embodiment consists of more transcendental componentry, the structures of care made intelligible only in their appropriateness.

For the body of the statue to appear as a *disclosive* innerworldly *thing* within *Dasein*’s world, that is, within a perceptual domain that this body prescribes as this domain’s blueprint, this *thing*’s transcendental componentry must be *paradigmatically* “gathered” into a definite “region”, and only in this way to dissent from the indefinite and disjointed spatial expansions with which we meet in Greek Archaic and other comparable world-disclosive art. Lacking this regionalization, a *kouros* statue, though evidently a world-disclosing artwork itself, is a mere innerworldly thing in Dasein’s world, a thing gathered, not a thing gathering. The regionalization of space is enacted by Heidegger’s four structures of care, namely understanding, attunement,

entanglement, and discourse, which gather and de-distance Dasein's body, since in Dasein's world "thinging is a gathering". Though this concept is absent in *Being and Time*, in his 1951 essay *The Thing*, Heidegger premised that *Logos* unifies by assembling, so that "thinging is gathering". (TT 172) The Greek statue, it could be *Zeus* or any competent intermediary work between *Zeus* and the *Laokoön*, is in this primordial "gathering" Heidegger's sought for "primordially unified phenomenon".

*Laokoön* patently discloses the "regional" constitution of space, in two conducts. First, primordially so as its own embodiment, having gathered its own world-prescriptive decrees as parts that reciprocally *belong* to one other. In this disclosure, this art-"thing" qualifies to Heidegger's sought "primordially unified phenomenon". In having projected on its own body its own world project, *Laokoön* also determines the perceptual possibilities within which this body is thrown as a resolute agency to act upon the predication of its own predicament. *Laokoön's* body expands *as* space through *the very same* determinations which the world within which this body acts itself expands spatially.

Ontologically speaking, there are only three distinguishable kinds of things as *res extensa* in Dasein's world: the human body as a thing, the statue as a thing, and any other man-made or natural innerworldly being as a thing. The constitutive "substance" as the thingliness of these three things, differs fundamentally. The "substance" of the human body is its existence; the substance of an innerworldly object like the hammer, a boulder, or the human body as instrument, is its usefulness. To these postulations by Heidegger, we now add that the "substance" or essence of the statue is its world-disclosive prescription.

Accordingly, Heidegger postulates that the human body as a thing is made by its existential pressure. "Essentially the person exists only in carrying out intentional acts, and is

thus essentially *not* an object. ... The ‘*substance*’ of the human being is not the spirit as the synthesis of body and soul, but *existence*.” (BT 48, 117, 212) The substance of innerworldly things other than the human body or the statue, is made out of human involvement and action. Heidegger noticed the common stock in the Greek language of the words “*pragma*” for “thing”, and “*praxis*”, for “action”. (BT 68) He deduced that this language has preserved the fact that the suchness of the “thing”, and the world overall, takes form only when intentionally acted upon. Hence the thingly suchness of the hammer, its hardness, is disclosed in the *what-for* of the hammer. “The act of hammering itself discovers the specific ‘handiness’ of the hammer.” (BT 69)

Regarding the constitutive essence, and thus the substance of the statue, *Origin* dedicates a section, titled *Thing and Work*, but in it Heidegger fails to encounter a problem so pivotal for the proof of his metaphysics because he asks the wrong question: “With what essence of what thing should a Greek temple agree?” (*Origin* 162) But the temple falls into the category of useful things, housing the god and the people, and hence that which the temple is made of, the essence with which the temple “agrees” as a useful thing, is still the *praxis*. It is man-made, not man-making, and this determination is randomly acknowledged in Heidegger’s understanding that “[b]y means of the temple, the god is present in the temple.” (*Origin* 167)

Heidegger makes in that section from *Origin* a shy ontic-ontological distinction of thingliness between the industrial arts (the shoes as equipment) and the fine arts (Van Gogh’s *painting* of the shoes), of which the latter’s essence is “the truth of beings setting itself to work.” (*Origin* 162) But the *aletheia* of the work in unconcealing the truth of being in the fine arts - the work letting us “know what shoes are in truth” (*Origin* 161) - is still world-descriptive, ontological but not yet *fundamental* ontological, not disclosing the constitutional *possibility* for the quest for truth, which for reasons that we have already argued, must itself be *embodied*. It is this

fundamental ontological *aletheia* that the statue alone discloses as its own “substantiality”, which Buschor understands in his *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, that: “the particular sculptural energy which breaks forth from the edges and from the pores of these statues is closely connected with their vicarious power, with their concentrated substantiality ...”<sup>57</sup>

Greek statuary alone corroborates Heidegger’s paradox claim that “... the road toward the determination of the thingly reality of the work leads not from thing to work, but from work to thing.” (*Origin* 165) This radical reversal from substance to existential ontology through art is not supported by world-*descriptive* works, and thus leaves Heidegger exposed to the aforementioned criticism. *The critics of Heidegger’s metaphysics will be answered only if the thingliness of the thing that discloses Dasein’s world is found to be constituted by no less than the embodied prescriptions of time and space.* So far in this chapter we saw how the tissue of the Greek statue is made *of* primordial temporality disguised as muscular narrative. The statue’s being made *of* space, instead of made *in* space, is due to its *agalmatic* quality.

The statue is not a man-made thing; it is an “*agalma*”. This Greek noun for “statue” encompasses the ecstatic radiance of the work as a “shinning”, its agalmatic quality resting in its capacity to disclose the essence of being. It is this agalmatic quality which breeds the “theophany” of the statue, naively understood by both pagan ancients and doubting Christians as the appearance of the “god” in the statue. For it is only through the metaphysics of Dasein, that we are now able to make the connection between Greek art and our own origins, the connection making any such naiveté and doubting a moot point. Steiner mentions Christian critiques from Dio Chrysostom and Minucius Felix, the latter demanding the proof that: “the image is cast, hammered, erected ... when does the god come into being?”<sup>58</sup> For Steiner’s factual understanding, agalmatophilia is the fervent longing, the pathology of desiring this essence; for



Heidegger's fundamental ontology, agalmatophilia would be the "preservation" of this essence. This longing for, is the reckoning with the essence of being upon the encountering before their embodiment in the *agalma* of primordial temporality and the transcendental structures of care grounded in temporality. "Preserving" the essence of the statue is casting an identifying gaze to the blueprint of our own possibility to exist, that is to be.

#### **4.3. *The Embodiment of Understanding***

Dasein is a temporal being only inasmuch as it *understands* that it dies, for as long as it *understands* what it is like to be *dying*. Heidegger characterizes this mode of being in understanding as "authentic", and distinguishes the mode's absolute determination of death as a death of one's own. It is *no other* configuring impulse but the understanding as the experiencing of its own finitude that "sets the factors", that is, *configures* Dasein's spatial expansion and Dasein as a spatial being. So writes Heidegger:

*Authentic* being-toward-death cannot *evade* its ownmost non-relational possibility or *cover* it over in this flight and *reinterpret* it for the common sense of the they. The existential project of an authentic being-toward-death must thus set forth the factors of such a being which are constitutive for it as an understanding of death-in the sense of being toward this possibility without fleeing it or covering it over. (BT 261)

In *Laokoön's* body *the mere possibility* of this authentic mode of being in understanding death is made manifest so consummately and immanently, and its sight lying so close to us, that we actually do not see it for the awesomeness of what the spatial configuration of this work actually is, i.e., the embodiment *of the understanding* of death. It is the immediate familiarity with the constitution of our own world project as a dwelling in the understanding of our own finitude, which renders us rather unfazed to the meaning of this art, the reason behind Boardman's earlier concession that, "[s]taring at these works, in picture, cast or original, does

not explain them; indeed their familiarity to some degree deadens perception.” *Precisely* as Heidegger anticipates, the *existentiell* mode of the myth having the Trojan priest dying by Apollo’s serpents, covers over and reinterprets death for the common sense of the they. But hidden under our *existentiell* flight to tell the work what the work is about, is what the work is trying to tell us, its preservers, as a fundamental ontological disclosure: namely the how of the constitution of our own world comportment as spatial beings through the understanding of ourselves as beings-towards-death. It is in this understanding, and therein alone, that the statue configures itself as a *res extensa*, by the very same modality that *Sein* discloses its *Da*. (BT 144)

Promptly so, Heidegger initially distinguishes between two definitions of understanding, one factual or *existentiell* and one primordial or existential. Later on we will encounter here a third kind. In our case the factual is our understanding of the *Laokoön* as a representation of the hero in the Trojan myth, a statue made by the sculptor Agesander of Rhodes and his sons Polydorus and Athenodorus, using tools of such and such kind, carved at this particular period, at this particular workshop, etc. Factual understanding is about the particular what, and as such it is an “... existential derivative of the primary understanding which constitutes the being of the there in general ... one possible kind of cognition among others ...” (BT 143) Primordial, or primary understanding, on the other hand, is the existential understanding which *Laokoön* discloses to its preservers by having embodied it. “In understanding as an existential, the thing we are able to do is not a what, but being as existing”, notes Heidegger. (BT 143)

As it is the case with all four structures of care, primordial understanding is individually grounded in finite temporality, so that in this temporal grounding Dasein discloses to itself the finite being that it is. Accordingly, “[u]nderstanding is the existential being of the ownmost potentiality of being of Da-sein in such a way that this being discloses in itself what its very

being is about.” (BT 145) The disclosure of what Dasein’s very being is about, is tautological, and therefore existential, in the sense that, *that* which “sets forth the factors of such a being” is the being itself, which in its being is setting the factors. And yet this being fails to recognize itself as the being which in its being sets the factors of its own being, because of its inescapable indebtedness to interpret itself through the scientific project and the hermeneutic circle.

This “*Da*”, Dasein’s world, although a there where Dasein does recognize itself albeit as a finite and incomplete being, is for the same reasons also a there where Dasein fails to establish its own identity as an absolute productivity. In having a world, Dasein has been rigorously determined, that is, “attuned” to regional *existentiell* possibilities, and thus obliged to interpret itself under the three aforementioned predicaments of the hermeneutic circle. Understanding is equiprimordial with attunement: “Attunement always has its understanding, even if only by suppressing it.” (BT 143) Writes Heidegger: “... since understanding is attuned and attunement is existentially surrendered to throwness, Da-sein has always already gone astray and failed to recognize itself. In its potentiality of being, it is thus delivered over to the possibility of first finding itself again in its possibilities.” (BT 144)

The teleology of consciousness established by Dasein’s predicament does not get out of a situation by thematizing every motive, but in taking in every occasion the consequential option of the shortest cut; for as long as it lives, Dasein escapes one situation in such a way that it is only to be thrown into another, thus remaining into a chain of situations that maintain the entropy of the truth of the deficiency of its being. In this succession of situations Dasein projects itself to exist as a mere potentiality of being, because “... understanding means: *to be projecting toward a potentiality-of-being for the sake of which Da-sein always exists.*” (BT 336)

Arguably alone amongst all monumental, world-disclosive art, Greek post-Archaic statuary embodies both Dasein's understanding of the deficiency of being and the understanding of the summons. *Laokoön* discloses Dasein's *understanding* of the deficiency of being through its disclosure of a frozen moment taken out of *one* conceivable sequential con-figuration, where in anticipating the threat of death in a particular situation this body has been thrown into fragmentation and refraction, having chosen *one rather than all possible* body con-figurations, as well as *this rather than another* attuned application of its summoned constituency to resist the resistance against its will to live.

To the hermeneutic event of the threat, *Laokoön's* body arrives with the retrieval of a certain fitness, having brought to the event a certain physical past out of the possibility of a certain future, confirming Heidegger's expectation for the constitution of Dasein, where "... acting in the direction of the future ... the past come[s] alive."<sup>59</sup> This certain fitness is not arbitrarily gained and randomly brought to the hermeneutic event of the threat, but has been itself accrued as a retained record of authentic understandings of death as a death of one's own, being the body's own formative experience, out of which the thisness of this body has gained its substantial fitness as a reified spatial expansion. The fundamental ontological disclosure of Dasein's ecstatic deficiency of being is possible only through *an embodied* authentic understanding of death, understood by a body which is both negatively determinate and positively indeterminate. A body is negatively determinate if it arrives before the hermeneutic event of the possibility not yet to face, but at this point to *understand* death, with a certain subjective fitness, where the fitness of this subjective fitness to understand may be decided only by the body's constituency having been freed to possibly fail the understanding of what threatens it. Subjective fitness to understand one's death summons the body into phenomenological

structures disclosed for their *serviceability*, *usability*, and *detrimentality* the totality of which discloses the body as a pathology of the desire to live. Conversely, objective fitness is a privative definition of fitness as the absence of the pathology of that desire, and it is this homeostatic fitness that we come across in the *kouros* and other non Greek world-disclosive art. We will see more of the difference between homeostatic or objective, and heterostatic or subjective fitness when we examine the embodiment of discourse. On the other hand, a body is positively indeterminate if its potentiality to understand death depends on the body's componentry having been freed to possibly understand death by means of the body's own intelligibility. In this freedom to understand death the body becomes meaningful, because the body is disclosed as that expediency in terms of which the understanding of death has become possible. This body is also meaningful, that is, intelligible, because it discloses how the kinaesthesia of the body is possible so that in this kinaesthesia the body can resist what resists its will to live. In Heidegger's words: "Meaning signifies that upon which the primary project is projected, that in terms of which something can be conceived in its possibility as what it is. Projecting discloses possibilities, that is, it discloses what makes something possible." (BT 324) Negative determination and positive indeterminacy are equally necessary for the embodiment of Dasein's understanding of the deficiency of being, because in freeing the body to either fail or succeed its embodied interpretation of death through the body's intelligible configuration, they are the conditions for understanding as an ecstatic existential possibility grounded in primordial temporality.

Art historians have promptly acknowledged this fundamental ontological disclosure of Dasein's ecstatic deficiency of being as a *Greek* "invention", but they have always understood it in *existentiell* modes, accordingly as a certain "kinaesthesia", a rendition "determined by lines the center of which is constantly changing", and as a "displacement of equilibrium." Gisela M.A.

Richter saw this thrust in Greek art, which starts decisively with the *Zeus of Artemision* and arguably culminates with the *Laokoön Group*, as an escalating development of anatomical definition resulting to movement, a development where “by 480 B.C. the Greek sculptor was”:

... in possession of a full repertory of anatomical forms. Such details as the serratus magnus, the swelling of the trapezium, the lachrymal caruncle – which in the preceding period he had only tentatively indicated – he now regularly featured. ... Artists were ready for the new problem, equally important in the development of sculpture, of adapting these forms to action and movement.<sup>60</sup>

Buschor, who curiously understood Greek statuary as being a misunderstanding, that is to say, an “ingenious misunderstanding of Oriental-Egyptian prototypes”, nonetheless punctually intuited the embodiment of Dasein’s deficiency of being in Greek art as a certain “displacement of equilibrium”, where “... the center of gravity has ... shifted toward a more dynamic disunity”, and where “... forms quietly ‘blossom’ forth toward their futures, while the Egyptian and Eastern statues simply ‘are’”.<sup>61</sup>

Winckelmann intuited the disclosure of the understanding of the deficiency of being in Greek art as a “beauty” produced by an underlying non-mathematical geometry: “The forms of a beautiful body are determined by lines the center of which is constantly changing, and which, if continued, would never describe circles.”<sup>62</sup> What does Winckelmann mean here? What is the “center of a line”? How could a line possibly “describe circles”? And is it the center of the lines, or the lines themselves that if continued would never describe circles? Winckelmann does not explain, but it seems that for once someone had stepped beyond the factual understanding typical to art criticism, to observe in the work fundamental ontology at work. Of course one can only hypothesize over what Winckelmann saw here in *Laokoön’s* body. His mentioning of a “constantly changing center” within *Laokoön’s* body, and of centered lines which “if continued

would never describe circles” hint an awareness of two fundamental ontological events Heidegger described and Greek art disclosed: first, that the center which decides the periphery of this body as a regional expansion can be taken to be located at *any* given point of this regional expansion, as if decidedness is self-assertively centrifugal from any point; second, that the centered lines are so outwardly expansive out of the body, that their imaginary extensions would never return to the body, in such a way that this exteroceptive vectoring is revealing something about how the body relates to surrounding space as a horizon of disclosing other beings.

Essentially all three art historians cited are observing in an increasing understanding the same two embodied fundamental ontological events. Richter’s adaptation of a higher resolution of body parts towards action and movement, is what Buschor sees as a displacement of equilibrium and a dynamic disunity, which is what Winckelmann understands as a shifting body center expanding outwardly. Winckelmann’s insight comes closer than the other two art historians to observing embodied fundamental ontology, because his sight of the “constantly changing center” within the body recognizes Dasein’s constitution of the self within the “they-self”. If the center of *Laokoön*’s body as such can be located to decide the periphery as such from any given point of this body, this is because *Laokoön* embodies and discloses Dasein’s constitution of the individual as a central being-there-ness *situated* anywhere within the they. Heidegger describes the constitution of individuation always within the *Mitda-sein* of others, from which the individual emerges in anxiety. Thus while it is true that “[a]ngst individualizes and thus discloses Da-sein as ‘*solus ipse*’”, (BT 188) and “[f]earing discloses this being in its jeopardization, in its being left to *itself* [my italics]”, (BT 141) it is also true that “Da-sein is individuated, but as being-in-the-world.” (BT 189) Writes Heidegger: “Here the fact can become evident to Da-sein that in the eminent possibility of itself it is torn away from the they, that is,

anticipation can always already have torn itself away from the they. The understanding of this ‘ability’, however, first reveals its factual lostness in the everydayness of the they-self.” (BT 263) Winckelmann identifies aesthetically with *Laokoön’s* body as a body constituted by any center that can decide the body’s periphery from any of this body’s given point, because Winckelmann as an individual himself reckons with Dasein’s embodied world project disclosed by this art.

Dasein’s deficiency of being is obliquely understood in the embodiment of this deficiency in Greek art, by Buschor as a displacement of equilibrium, by Richter as a definitive adaptation toward action, and by Winckelmann as an uncentered ecstatic projection. The summons is prescriptively manifest in *Laokoön’s* body, first because this body is *our* body, and as such it prescribes the possibilities of our world comportment. But then the summons also manifests *as Laokoön’s* body because the reified “substance” of this body is nothing more “substantial” than the gathering of its what-for-thingliness which makes this body possible in its applicability. This what-for-thingliness is gathered by the freed to be themselves distinct beings which medical science understands as the componentry of the human body, beings recognized strictly in their *serviceability*, *usability*, and *detrimentality*, disclosed as modes of spatial expansion in understanding. *Laokoön’s* body is disclosed in the attunement from fear and as a trenchant potentiality against the threat of the serpents, substantiating an embodied confirmation of Heidegger’s hypothesis that understanding discloses the there as a mere potentiality of being. (BT 145) Heidegger refers to how Dasein’s *world* comes to being as a spatial expansion, but his exposition fits precisely the mode of construction of *Laokoön’s* body, both as a body *qua* body in general but also as this body’s parts: “[In the world’s disclosure by understanding] not only is the world, *qua* world, disclosed in its possible significance, but innerworldly beings themselves are



freed, these beings freed for *their own* possibilities. What is at hand is discovered as such in its serviceability, usability, detrimentality.” (BT 145)

Both as its parts and as a whole, *Laokoön*’s body is constituted not for, but *as* a situational hearkening for the summons first to understand and then to resolve the threat. Summoning the body first of all means to gather its componentry of indefinite mode, that is, to *con*-figure it. In this summons, for this body to have *con*-figured itself by having chosen *this* rather than that *con*-figuration, or rather than having chosen all possible *con*-configurations (the thematization of every embodying motive), this body must have *understood* the minutia of the threat. Heidegger coins this summoned *con*-figuration through understanding, “attunement.” Understanding and attunement are equiprimordial existentials, and *Laokoön*’s blueprint summoning palpably shows how “Dasein is constituted by disclosedness, that is, by attuned understanding.” (BT 261) In *having understood* the threat, and in being attuned for it, *Laokoön* embodies Dasein as an authentic temporal being, since as we saw at the beginning of this section, Dasein is a temporal being only if it *understands* the threat of death.

In view of Heidegger’s refutation of substance ontology, the ecstatic existential of the understanding is most important for the analytic of Dasein’s constitution as a spatial being, because it is primarily through the understanding that innerworldly beings must now attain and maintain their “substantiality”. The world-constitutive project of understanding has its own possibilities, a development Heidegger defines as interpretation. In interpretation understanding appropriates what Dasein has understood in an intelligible way, where *that which has become understood always as a thing-at-hand does not show as something different, but rather as the understanding itself*. Interpretation is by its nature circumspectively resolute, so that what has been circumspectively interpreted according to its in-order-to as such, that is, what has been

explicitly understood, obtains the structure of something as something. For Heidegger interpretation does not acknowledge a distinct object to be understood aside from the object's understanding, but develops the possibilities projected in understanding as the object itself. This understanding of "understanding" does away with the need to explain innerworldly beings in terms of a material substance that obtains independently of perception. So writes Heidegger: "What is at hand comes explicitly before sight that understands. All preparing, arranging, setting right, improving, rounding out, occur in such a way that things at hand for circumspection are interpreted in their in-order-to and are taken care of according to the interpretedness which has become visible." (BT 149)

As we observed in the previous chapter from the comparison of the particular embodied region of the knee interpretation between the *New York Kouros* and the *Laokoön*, the former rendition does not constitute a "region", because the "understanding" which interprets to render this knee is all lacking, false, and irrelevant. This is a "knee" rendered monumentally by an embodied art-world disclosure evidently not grounded in finite temporality, because at the very least it is not circumspectively heedful enough to interpret the knee as a knee expedient to an embodied consciousness that has understood death as the death of one's own. Contrarily, *Laokoön's* knee, and with this knee his entire body, is prepared, arranged, set right, rounded out and occurring in such a way that this knee's and this body's constituents are things at hand anatomically interpreted in their in-order-to so that they have become not only visible, but more so, *intelligible*, and thus, for Heidegger, *meaningful*. And again: the fact that the *kouros's* knee is not intelligible in interpretive understanding, is a giveaway sign that its mere visibility rather owes to Dasein's compulsory understanding which cannot do otherwise but to immediately

recombine with what it has foregrounded itself from in order to become one with itself again in the unity of the historical horizon that it thus acquires (Gadamer).

Besides the qualification that Dasein's embodiment as Dasein's prescriptive spatiality must be disclosed *as* interpretive, or existential understanding, as opposed to the factual understanding which as we saw earlier is one possible kind of cognition among others, Heidegger's fundamental ontology requires the disclosure of Dasein's spatiality at an even more fundamental level of understanding, one he coins "*pre-understanding*". This kind of understanding will bring us to a closer examination of the Polycleitus Canon.

Heidegger notices that innerworldly beings cannot be disclosed one at a time, as if "initially something objectively present is experienced which then is understood as a door, as a house ..." (BT 150) "[W]hat is initially 'there' is nothing else than the self-evident, undisputed prejudice of the interpreter ..." (BT 151) Innerworldly beings can be disclosed as things at hand only in their relevance to every other being as thing at hand *within an expansive region*, a region and its contents which must have somehow been "pre-understood" although not yet fully disclosed in their suchness. "[W]hat is encountered in the world is always already in a relevance which is disclosed in the understanding of world, a relevance which is made explicit by interpretation. Things at hand are always already understood in terms of a totality of relevance", writes Heidegger, referring to the "pre-" of the pre-understanding. (BT 150)

A totality of relevance in pre-understanding is necessary because innerworldly beings have to be "freed" if they are to appear in their what-for-thingliness, that is, to be signified in their significance by the pre-understanding consciousness within a world as a totality of relevance. "The discoveredness of things at hand and objectively present is grounded in the discoveredness of the world; for if the actual totality of relevance of things at hand is to be freed,

this requires a pre-understanding of significance”, writes Heidegger. (BT 297) It is not as if innerworldly beings are objectively present and somehow kept somewhere enslaved and waiting for their freedom, since as we are told, such an idea would only be the (false) prejudice of the interpreter. And yet “dis-closedness” means that something closed “is” *sub-is*-ting in a privative mode, awaiting to be opened up by the same way in which *a-letheia* rectifies the forgetfulness of being. Innerworldly beings may not be kept before they are freed - that would be the false prejudice of the interpreter - but they somehow “are” un-dis-closed in forgetfulness. But, the only beings that could have been *there* in a privative mode, are the preexisting, retrievable perceptual constructs of the they, Dasein as world, awaiting to be reinterpreted and taken out of forgetfulness in their signification by the signifying needs of the interpreter as the *solus ipse* being the being-towards-death. This *there*, where the “I” meets with the “they” as a mode of interpretation, is an existential equiprimordiality. This is what Heidegger means when he writes: “The disclosedness of the there discloses equiprimordially the whole of being-in-the-world - the world, being-in, and the self that is this being as ‘I am’.” (BT 298)

But then, as we established above, since interpretation does not acknowledge a distinct object to be understood aside from the object’s understanding, and since understanding appropriates what Dasein has understood in an intelligible way where that which has become understood always as a thing-at-hand does not show as something different but rather as that understanding itself, and since what has been circumspectively interpreted according to its in-order-to as such, that is, what has been explicitly understood, obtains the structure of something as something, then those preexisting and retrievable perceptual constructs of the they as world in a totality of relevance cannot be anything more substantial or objectively present than that understanding itself. In particular, that understanding is the “pre-understanding”, *itself with its*

*own structure and possibilities of interpretation.* Thus in the last analysis what is “freed” to appear signified in its significance, is no other than that which frees. That which frees is the “pre-” of the pre-understanding. But what is it?

That understanding which both frees and then through two subsequent modes of understanding appears as that which is freed, must be some kind of an understanding more primordial than both the understanding which discloses beings in their significance (existential), *and* the understanding which accumulates facts about beings in any given mode of interpretation (*existentiell*). If it is really more primordial, then it must appear not as its own existential and *existentiell* aftermath world construct, as an interpretation of the freed thing-at-hand, but outright and already as the freeing disclosure. But if it is to be discernible, if indeed it is an actual disclosive factor to Dasein’s spatiality, how can this higher primordially of understanding *appear*, and more so, how can it simultaneously appear *as* a higher primordially? *Fundamentally ontologically speaking*, there is *something*, which being an understanding must itself have attained the structure of something as something, *something* which goes back and forth between the understanding of significance (ontological) and the understanding of the for-the-sake-of-which (ontic). This is because, as Heidegger tells us, “[t]he understanding of significance as the disclosedness of the actual world is again grounded in the understanding of the for-the-sake-of-which, to which discovering of the totality of relevance goes back.” (BT 297) What we wish to capture a glimpse of, is that understanding which in Gadamer’s earlier iteration “constantly moves from the whole [Heidegger’s existential understanding having obtained the structure of something as something] to the part [Heidegger’s *existentiell* understanding having obtained the structure of something as something] and back to the whole”. An understanding without which

Dasein cannot have a world, because “the failure to achieve this harmony means that understanding has failed.”

Heidegger does not cast enough light here, perhaps justifiably so because Dasein’s spatiality for which the modes of understanding obtaining the structure of something as something are themselves explicated as the spatiality of the universal scale in Dasein’s totality of relevance, while the modes themselves are abstract concepts to begin with, the objectification of which is difficult to account for in the macrocosmic scale of Dasein’s world constitution. The closest Heidegger comes to name the freeing pre-understanding, is as an “understanding of world”, as in the following passage: “... that for which innerworldly beings are initially freed must previously be disclosed. ... The previous disclosure of that for which the freeing of things encountered in the world ensues is none other than the understanding of world to which Da-sein as a being is always already related.” (BT 86)

But Greek art, having palpably and visibly disclosed Dasein’s original blueprint of all modes of understanding in the most concentrating scale imaginable, is most revealing. In Dasein’s embodiment that elusive *something*, the freeing “pre-” of the pre-understanding, the “understanding of world”, obtains the phenomenological structure of the body in its entirety, having correspondingly embodied no less than the prescription of Dasein’s spatiality as a world in a totality of relevance. The body in its totality is the elusive higher primordially, corresponding to Heidegger’s demand that the world as a whole must have been disclosed before the world’s parts. As we have already seen with Heidegger, in Dasein’s spatiality Dasein’s world as a whole comes before the world as its parts, so that if there is a body both as art and as life to embody this spatiality, this body must first manifest as a whole before its parts may be disclosed. In this pre-understanding our body is that which in freeing its parts in their what-for-thingliness

it frees our world, precisely because it can *thus* act upon it. Existentially speaking, without having such a freeing body, Dasein cannot have such a free world. In the last analysis, what makes us merely hopeful to capture a glimpse of the objectification of the “pre-” of the pre-understanding, is that this objectified consciousness lies the closest to us: it is *our body as a whole*.

If as *Origin* argues, Dasein’s fundamental ontology in general must be disclosed as art, then pre-understanding in particular must also appear originally as art. In our preliminary analysis we have already postulated that this original disclosure begins to precipitate as the body of the *Zeus of Artemision*, and in Dasein’s asymmetrical historiographical datability which re-prioritizes the ontic ahead of the ontological, this original disclosure climaxes some three centuries later with the *Laokoön Group*. In *Laokoön’s* body all of Heidegger’s three modes of understanding obtain the structure of something as something, so that this body becomes thoroughly transparent, that is, thoroughly intelligible and thus meaningful in its what-for-thingliness. When we focused on the *New York Kouros* and the *Laokoön* knee, we observed that only the latter knee is intelligible and meaningful, for no other reason than that this knee objectifies as the understanding that has obtained the structure of something as something in order to partake what makes body motion possible, so that this body can project itself as a possibility of world action.

As a prescriptive totality of relevance, being the embodied disclosure of a world, *Laokoön’s* body is a defined region. Within this region by means of the existential and the *existentiell* modes of understanding spatial expansion can be ecstatically and endlessly sub-regionalized, through the existential mode in different interpretations of the body, and through the *existentiell* mode as the region of the knee, of the chest, of the genitals, etc. It is this

spontaneous, ecstatic sub-regionalization by the existential and the *existentiell* modes of understanding which blinds us from seeing that body which lies the closest to us, our body as the total region that we primordially are, i.e., a temporal, finite, embodied ultimate truth. *Origin* anticipates that philosophy is an intermediary “happening of truth” between art and science. (*Origin* 187) Greek art warrants this anticipation. For whereas in the *existentiell* project of science the body does not even have to exist – theoretical biologists are adamant that the body “exists” only for-the-sake-of the genes without bothering to explain for whom would the genes exist - and for the existential project of philosophy as dialectic materialism Engels may interpret the body as a thermodynamic machine mustered to change an unjust world, it is only art at its highest prescriptive monumentality that discloses the body as the freeing pre-understanding of death.

The reason why we do not notice *Laokoön*’s body for the embodiment of the world freeing pre-understanding of death that it really is, the statue’s “familiarity ... deadening perception” as Boardman reckoned, is that it is so thoroughly intelligible it has become transparent. “*The being that we ourselves always are is ontologically farthest from us*. The reason for this lies in care itself”, notes Heidegger, albeit not referring to Dasein’s body, but to Dasein’s world. (BT 311) This transparency is negotiated through all three modes of understanding, along with the remaining three structures of care. At times Heidegger discusses this transparency of Dasein’s world as if it was a mere visibility instead of a transparency through intelligibility. But there are beings in Dasein’s world which can be visible without being intelligible; in terms of Dasein’s embodiment the *kouros* knee is visible, but not yet intelligible. Nonetheless, we understand that in such instances Heidegger actually means transparency through intelligibility and not mere visibility, because he refers to this visibility in terms of authenticity and totality, always connecting this visibility to the ultimate primordially of temporality as Dasein’s ecstatic



need to anticipate and resolve the highest issue of its being: “In its anticipatory resoluteness, Dasein has been made phenomenally visible with regard to its possible authenticity and totality.” (BT 311)

A resolute body in monumental art is *transparent* to the view of a self-consciousness, by being the prescriptive blueprint for a being which through this resoluteness to reach its ownmost potentiality of being as *a self*, has itself become transparent *to itself*. As Heidegger shows, being becomes transparent when “[r]esoluteness brings Dasein back to its ownmost potentiality-of-being-a-self.” (BT 307) But first of all, both the ideal or prescriptive and the real or actual self-transparency through resoluteness depends on whether the self is freed by the pre-understanding to be situated: “Resoluteness, transparent to itself, understands that the indefiniteness of its potentiality-of-being is always determined only in a resolution with regard to the actual situation”, notes Heidegger. (BT 308) We pointed out earlier that in our explication of Dasein’s embodiment the term “resolution” must be addressed in both its congenital meanings, as *resolve* as well as higher *definition*. This is because Dasein’s world-resolve embodies itself in no other terms than as in forms of ever higher definition. Conversely, art historians may have seen that the “evolution” of Greek art from Archaism to Classicism is “achieved” as “naturalism” mainly in terms of an ever higher descriptive definition, but it is only through extrapolating Heidegger’s analysis of Dasein’s world spatiality through the fourfold structures of care, that we learn both why and how this resolution as higher definition became possible, albeit as resolve.

Heidegger shows that a world in its entirety becomes transparent for Dasein if its innerworldly beings become transparent to themselves in being together with others. “We shall call the sight which is primarily and as a whole related to existence transparency. ... Existent beings glimpse ‘themselves’ only when they have become transparent to themselves

equiprimordially in their being with the world, in being together with others as the constitutive factors of their existence.” (BT 147) But the glimpse beyond opaqueness to the transparency of being is possible in the first place only because Dasein has understood *what* threatens it, by means of the summoning by that understanding of the existent beings to come together with other beings for-the-sake-of anticipating resolutely the universal threat. We already observed this summoning in *Laokoön*’s body, manifesting *as* body parts that have become transparent to themselves in having disclosed themselves to a high resolution through the attainment of a certain *serviceability*, *usability*, and *detrimentality*.

We need now Heidegger’s help to see how these summoned body parts, still in understanding, and not yet in attunement, throwness, and discourse, converge in their being summoned. From the outset Heidegger’s analysis shows how crude and rather misleading is Chrysippos’ account of the Polycleitus Canon, or at least of what has reached us about what the ancients made out of it. The Canon itself is of course perfectly sound as a canon, but that only as a mere recognition and an attempt to monumentalize an axiomatic truth as a singularity event in art. What is erroneous about it, is first the Canon’s being attributed to the understanding of the artist, who as such is made intelligible only by the singularity event axiomatized by the Canon and not the other way around. But even more erroneous is “Chrysippos” drawing our attention away from the actual fundamental ontological events that take place in the work. As we saw in section 3.3.3., Chrysippos’ formulation wants the beauty of the statue to have emerged from a certain commensurability, a *symmetria* of proportions between all body parts. This definition understands the “beauty” as an overall effect of proportionality, “of finger to finger and of all the fingers to the palm and wrist, and of these to the forearm, and of the forearm to the upper arm, and of all the parts to each other”. But “proportionality”, from *pro* and *portio*, at best merely

means a “part-for-part” “comparative relation in size”, or “to put [something] in relation to something else” (*Webster*). Thus Chrysippos’ formulation, although self-proclaimed and even largely accepted by art historians as an attempt to explain the relation and the gathering of “all the parts”, actually boils down the beauty of the Canon’s implementation as a relation of body parts in terms of their size. How misleading is this understanding, an understanding evidently grounded in substance ontology, can only be seen through Heidegger’s analysis of the spatiality of Dasein, and through Heidegger’s, by our own analysis of Dasein’s embodiment in Greek art.

At this point, it becomes clear that the factual *how* of the parts being related, is tautologically disclosed by Dasein’s primordial *why*.

From Heidegger’s analysis of Dasein’s world spatiality we understand that if *Laokoön*’s knee is rendered, that is to say, if the knee appears as a “knee” in its regional suchness, this is because that knee is implemented in its what-for-thingliness in order *for that which needs the knee to appear as well*. This is because “[t]o expose that upon which a project is projected, means to disclose what makes what is projected possible.” (BT 324) In other words, the projected project tells us something about the knee (it “exposes” it), but since the knee is itself an understanding as interpretation, through that knee the project can also tell us something about the project which needs the knee. Heidegger sees the need to pursue this undeclared project as the central research of his fundamental ontology. “This exposure requires that we methodically pursue the project (usually an inexplicit one) underlying an interpretation in such a way that what is projected in the project is disclosed and conceivable with regard to its upon-which.” (BT 324) Now, what “project” would that be, in need of such a knee in particular, and such a body in general? Heidegger explains: “What is projected is the being of Da-sein, disclosed in what constitutes it as an authentic potentiality-for-being-a-whole.” (BT 324) Heidegger goes one step

further to postulate that the being of Dasein is thus constituted as care: “The upon-which of what is projected, of the disclosed being thus constituted, is what itself makes possible this constitution of being as care.” To summarize this first step towards understanding *how* Dasein’s body becomes transparent in its being a resolute body through embodying the *why* of the body’s need for resolution, we postulate that *that* which needs the knee is the being of Dasein as care seeking to assemble itself (“*con*-stituted”) as an authentic potentiality-for-being-*a-whole*.

What informs the Canon’s having defaulted its own call to deduce the work’s “beauty” from the relation of “all the parts” in terms of their size, is Heidegger’s pursuing the “inexplicitness” of care seeking to assemble itself *as a whole*: “With the question of the meaning of care, we are asking *what makes possible the totality of the articulated structural whole of care in the unity of its unfolded articulation?*” (BT 324) The primordial impulse which brings body parts together in Greek art, that is, the “why” of the gathering as care, them parts being brought together *because* Dasein cares to assemble its own embodiment as an authentic potentiality-for-being-a-whole in the very same way it cares to assemble its own world, is also the “how” of the gathering. We extrapolate this possibility of an existential assembly of body parts to rectify the Canon, from Heidegger’s analysis of how innerworldly beings are themselves made to appear through their approximation to other beings in anticipatory resoluteness. Heidegger sees that, in the untenability of objectively present beings, the circumspective resoluteness as resolve which brings one being near another in the summons for the disclosure of the beings’ what-for-thingliness for the needs of the being-towards-death, makes one being adopt to the certain *serviceability*, *usability*, and *detrimentality* of another, now in terms of resoluteness as definition in making present. Heidegger provides that the movement of the understanding makes a world for itself, and thus may embody itself, by going back and forth in between beings as just parts, or

parts of parts, and in between beings as parts and beings as a whole. This ecstatic reciprocation is a practically infinite process which simultaneously both maintains and adapts and through this *explicit* maintenance and adaptation gradually bridges the distance and bonds the parts, in this *trans-versing* process disclosing the parts for what they are, by depositing in the gaps between beings the extension of their own “substance” as a what-for-thingliness. It is through the provisional success of this maintenance and adaptation, that beings, either Dasein’s body or Dasein’s world, may become thoroughly intelligible, and therefore transparent *for the needs of the being-towards-death*. In Heidegger’s words:

Only because Da-sein, awaiting a possibility (that is, here a what-for), has come back to a for-this (that is, retains a thing at hand), can *conversely* the making present that belongs to this awaiting retention start with this retention and *bring* it explicitly nearer in its reference to the what-for. The deliberation that brings near must in the scheme of making present adapt itself to the kind of being of what is to be brought near. The character of relevance of what is at hand is not first discovered by deliberation, but only brought near by it in such a way that it circumspectly lets what is in relevance be seen *as* this. (BT 360)

The movement of the understanding which assembles innerworldly beings into Dasein’s entire world so that a possible world can “be seen *as* this” world, is incomparably more readily observable in the prescriptive blueprint of Dasein’s embodiment in Greek art. *Laokoön* corroborates Heidegger’s pivotal contention that innerworldly beings are not objectively present, by the same palpable proof which demonstrates that the “beauty” resulting from the implementation of something called the “Polykleitus Canon” is not due to the proportionality of the size of body parts. To observe the validity of Heidegger’s arguments at an even more concise region than in Dasein’s entire embodiment, we return to *Laokoön*’s knee.

By describing the knee in medical terms, we saw that through its own development as a discipline, medical science distinguishes the knee’s regional componentry by ever more closer

definitions, a distinguishability which science may extend practically infinitesimally from the mesocosm to the microcosm and beyond, through observations rendered from biology, to chemistry, to physics. Remaining to definitions in biology, in terms of anatomy, one of the nine immediately distinguishable parts to assemble *Laokoön's* knee, the knee cup, was itself further distinguishable into three subsequent parts, the patella, the meniscus, and in between them the patellofemoral groove, whereas the tibial plateau was distinguished as a forth part precipitating below the knee where the meniscus meets the tibia. Unlike in the case of the *New York Kouros's* knee, where in all their lacking and falsity body parts remain irrelevant to the biomechanics of motion and thus appear essentially disconnected, *Laokoön's* knee parts seem to have effused out of one other, for there is no clear point, the more so the closer we look, say, as to where the tibial plateau ends and where the meniscus and the tibia begin at both ends of the tibial plateau, or where the ligament ends and where the muscle and the bone begin at both ends of the ligament. This continuity, so regnant throughout *Laokoön's* body that it is through it that *all* the necessary componentry effuses out of one other to produce the biomechanics of motion, squares out with Heidegger's idea of Dasein's ecstatic reciprocity of pre-understanding. This pre-understanding, as we just premised with Heidegger, simultaneously both maintains and adapts, and in the explicitness of this maintenance and adaptation gradually de-distances and bonds beings to one another and to themselves, in the process disclosing the beings for what they are in the transparency of their intelligibility by bi-directionally depositing in the gaps between beings the extension of the beings' own "substance" as a what-for-thingliness.

Were we to accept that the knee parts (and by principle of extrapolation also *Laokoön's* entire body), are primordially objectively present only to have been *discovered* by the observant deliberations of the artist and the anatomist, not only we would by distant implication have to

remain clueless regarding the origin of the artist and the anatomist as such, but we would be immediately unable to explain how these objectively present knee parts are themselves connected to one another. For once we accept the empiricist doctrine that the objectively present *in space* body parts are connected by our understanding - what else? - we would have to show the point where those objectively present knee parts end, and where begins the understanding that connects them. And this is impossible. As we already premised in multiple contexts with Heidegger, interpretation cannot acknowledge a distinct object to be understood aside from the object's understanding; that which has been explicitly understood obtains the structure of something as something; understanding appropriates what it has understood in an intelligible way where that which has become understood always as a thing-at-hand does not show as something different than as the understanding itself.

As already suggested by Steiner's research regarding the ancients' beliefs on statuary, the Greeks' account of the Canon as a harmonious combination of sizes betrays belief to the same old empirical and realist view of art. But after Heidegger we know better: were we to be satisfied with Chrysippos' doctrine that the knee parts are beautiful because they are brought together by means of their proportional size, we would remain clueless as to how it is *the size* of the patella which attaches it to the size of the patellofemoral groove, and how the size of the patellofemoral groove is attached to the size of the meniscus, and how the size of the meniscus is attached to the size of the tibial plateau, and so forth. By their size, the knee parts would still remain distanced and irrelevant, just as parts are detached and irrelevant no matter their size in the *New York Kouros* knee, where the stylized object above the knee cup shaped as a chevron or mustache remains an alien object, or where the tibia bone projects itself out of the lower leg. Both these objects remain as detached as they are irrelevant to the inexplicitness of care seeking to assemble

itself as an embodied whole, an inexplicitness which would constitute a “knee” for its what-for-thingliness.

At this fundamental ontological level of world disclosure, the “beautiful” is that which we may existentially identify with. This is the reason why consciousness, as explained by Heidegger’s existential analysis, finds post-Archaic Greek art more “beautiful” than whatever may have preceded it in Dasein’s foregroundings.

### ***Endnotes***

46. Athena S. Leoussi, *Nationalism and Classicism*, pp. 45, 47.
47. Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind - Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, pp. 184, 191.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
49. John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture - The Classical Period*, p. 240.
50. Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind - Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, p. 90.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
52. Rhys Carpenter, *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art, of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, pp. 92, 93.
53. John Boardman, *Greek Sculpture - The Classical Period*, p. 92.
54. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, p. 2.
55. Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind - Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, p. 134.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104, 219.
57. Ernst Buschor, *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, p. 8.
58. Deborah Tarn Steiner, *Images in Mind - Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, pp. 115, 124.
59. Kevin Aho, *The Missing Flesh: On Heidegger's Neglect of the Body*, chapter 3, III.
60. Gisela M.A. Richter, *Archaic Greek Youths*, p. 148.
61. Ernst Buschor, *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, pp. 26, 21.
62. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, pp. 21-23.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE EMBODIMENT OF CARE II

#### ***5.1 The Embodiment of Attunement***

At this point we have offered a preliminary analysis of the embodiment of the three modes of understanding as the first of the four structures of care, and may move on to see how Greek art embodies now care's second structure, attunement. Understanding is immanently connected with attunement because these two ecstatic existentials are equiprimordial. "Attunement always has its understanding, even if only by suppressing it. Understanding is always attuned", notes Heidegger. (BT 143) In its ontic appearance as mood, attunement delivers *Sein* to its *Da*. "All understanding is attuned. Mood brings Da-sein before the throwness of its 'that-it-is-there.'" (BT 266) Heidegger defines "attunement" as "dwelling", as "one if the existential structures in which the being of the 'there' dwells." (BT 143)

In this "dwelling", Dasein has now begun to explicitly deploy the formative acquisitions of the freeing, inexplicit project of pre-understanding, to give itself a "housing", as it were, a world in which to live. Heidegger distinguishes three modes of attunement as mood, the most primordial of which, still prior to world disclosedness, is circumspective heedfulness. We may understand this mode of attunement as Dasein's need to trip the inherent and inert inexplicitness of pre-understanding and make "*an effective move*", because "[l]etting things encountered in a circumspect heedful way has ... the character of being affected or moved." (BT 137)

Circumspective heedfulness, as the most primordial of the three modes of attunement,

logically lies the closest to the most primordial of the three modes of understanding, the pre-understanding. This is because this equally most primordial mode of attunement is the one through which pre-understanding frees beings so that these two primordialities can begin to construct Dasein's dwelling.

The other two subsequent modes of attunement are thrownness or being-there-with, and circumspective resoluteness, in this order of their corresponding pairing and deploying the explicitness of the remaining modes of understanding as the *existentiell* and the existential. (BT 136, 137) Heidegger distinguishes the primordially of circumspective resoluteness as the ontological mode of attunement, distinct from thrownness and the being-there-with, these latter two ontic modes being those that we casually understand as "mood". (BT 134)

Heidegger describes the most primordial mode of attunement as primordial Angst. The *primordially* of Angst owes to that this is not yet anxiety about a particular threat deriving from a world affair, since in the first place it is this primordially which discloses the world as world. "That about which Angst is anxious is none of the innerworldly things at hand." (BT 187) We already met with this mode of attunement, when in section 3.1. we discussed its original disclosure in the gaze of the *Blond Youth*. We postulated there that this work alone introduces the *aes-thetic* prolegomena of Dasein. Dasein's temporalization of temporality has promptly pigeonholed this world-disclosive art as a stage in its datability which follows archaism and is prior to the *Zeus of Artemision* and the *Laokoön*. We suggested there that it is *the facial expression* of the *Blond Youth* which embodies the Nothing as the origin of negation. Heidegger's analysis anticipates the embodiment of this face in art: "In *Angst*, Da-sein finds itself *faced* with the nothingness of the possible impossibility of its existence." (BT 266) As an existential ecstasis, primordial Angst is never objectively present in the world. "Angst as a

fundamental kind of attunement belongs to the essential constitution of Da-sein of being-in-the-world which, as an existential one, is never objectively present, but is itself always in the mode of factual Da-sein, that is, in the mode of an attunement.” (BT 190) “With the dominance of falling prey and publicness, ‘real’ Angst is rare”, Heidegger notes, and yet the *Blond Youth* and the *Kritios Boy*, the only works surviving to attest this rare disclosure, are palpable proofs of the objectification of Angst in art, precisely as *Origin* argues.

In recognizing through our comparative hermeneutics of Greek art the *Youth’s* gaze as a gaze into the abyss, and in constituting now the proof that the Greek art which immediately postdated this gaze embodies the negation of the negation to live, we are confirming Heidegger’s argument that (in Dasein’s datability) the Nothing is the origin of negation, and not the other way around. The gaze into the Nothing is *the condition* for the disclosure of primordial temporality as the constitutive grounding of all of Dasein’s ecstatic existentials, since it is this Nothing, the primitive and primordial total loss of world, which discloses the world’s resisting Dasein’s will to live in the irreversibility of time.

Now, since, as we previously premised, Dasein both as world and as embodiment is originally disclosed *in the they*, or at most as the inauthentic *they-self*, which as such always predate the authentic self, in the ontic modes of attunement primordial temporality must show itself not finitely, but “*in*”-finitely in the already having-been. Heidegger makes a linguistic observation that supports his metaphysics when he notes that, “[o]nly because primordial time is finite can ‘derivative’ time temporalize itself as in-finite.” (BT 331) Accordingly, whereas “[u]nderstanding is primarily grounded in the future; *attunement*, on the other hand, temporalizes itself *primarily* in having-been.” (BT 340) As mood, attunement is grounded in thrownness, in the being-there-with, the self finding *itself* situated in particular ways that matter, thrown within a

world “substantiated” by no other means than by the self’s own existential pressure, because in the last analysis and at each and every moment this is a world perilously ticking away. “*Being* thrown means existentially to find oneself in such and such a way. Thus attunement is grounded in thrownness”, writes Heidegger. (BT 340)

Primitive Dasein surrenders to world resistance and thus into self-constancy by attuning to what is already there to resist its particular postures of living, that is, by trimming itself into a certain potentiality towards a possibility to be-there. “... [R]esistance would be essentially undiscovered, if attuned being-in-the-world were not already related to having things in the world matter to it in a way prefigured by moods.” (BT 138) In this trimming, in tuning itself as a self, Dasein hearkens as it were to that specific waveband that voices out the intelligible, definite possibilities of *its* existence. Tuning itself onto the correct waveband, the self for the first time encounters the world concretely, in *existentiell* mode as resistance. “*In attunement lies existentially a disclosive submission to world out of which things that matter to us can be encountered.*” (BT 138) Once Dasein has been thrown and it is being-there-with, the two non-primitive modes of attunement as mood affect Dasein by disclosing forms of definite threat:

[B]eing affected by the unserviceable, resistant, and threatening characters of things at hand is ontologically possible only because being-in as such is existentially determined beforehand in such a way that what it encounters in the world can *matter* to it in this way. This mattering to it is grounded in attunement, and as attunement it has disclosed the world, for example, as something by which it can be threatened. (BT 137)

Confronted by the threat that triggers the *existentiell* modes of attunement, Dasein reacts initially by turning away. Turning away is induced by fear, itself not only a mode of attunement, (BT 142) but the *primordial*, pre-ontological mode of attunement, because “[a]ll modifications of fear as possibilities of attunement point to the fact that Da-sein as being-in-the-world is ‘fearful’.

This ‘fearfulness’ must not be understood in the ontic sense of a factual, ‘isolated’ tendency, but rather as the existential possibility of the essential attunement of Da-sein in general ...” (BT 142)

The incarnation of fear in *Laokoön* has been a heated issue since the German romantics. Goethe’s analysis is important in our context because it focused on whether the *Group* is in fear as the apprehension of approaching danger, or in terror as the effect of the moment.<sup>63</sup> Besides the first and the most primordial “aspect” of fear as Dasein itself being fearful, Heidegger promptly distinguishes between two more modes of fear, which correspond to Goethe’s, respectively as the fear which “fearing itself ... discovers ... [something approaching] beforehand in its fearsomeness”, and “that before which are afraid, the ‘fearsome’.” (BT 140-142)

In terms of the embodiment of Dasein’s *fundamental* ontology, we are for now primarily interested in the first, pre-ontological aspect of fear, because it is at this stage of Dasein’s constitution where being is delivered over to its being in such a way that it recognizes its own being as already “fear-*full*”, independently of the existential and *existentiell* modes of fear. Writes Heidegger: “As a being which is delivered over to its being, it is also delivered over to the fact that it must always already have found itself, found itself in a finding which comes not from a direct seeking, but from a fleeing.” (BT 136) We want to expose Dasein at this primitive world-staging act, because since Dasein’s *spatiality* is constituted by the structures of care, and since fear is the mode of being through which attunement “comes to the fore” as one of those structures, it is at this primitive stage where Dasein would be disclosed by art as an embodied blueprint that has made the prescription of space its own flesh. With the three modes or aspects of fear, “what we are afraid of, fearing, and why are we afraid ... the structure of attunement as such comes to the fore”, writes Heidegger. (BT 140) What we do not want, however, is to capture Dasein as art appearing *in* space; we want Dasein’s embodiment *as* space.

At the fundamental ontological level that we are investigating, there is no space to speak of, aside of the space prescribed within the art as disclosure. A statue could not possibly disclose Dasein's *fleeing*, as it were, by taking a *step back* in space. Dasein's fleeing must appear enframed *within the expansive spatiality* of the statue that discloses the structure of care as spatial prescription. Before *Origin*, our understanding of art remained naive. When this appearance of the statue *as* space instead of in space occurs, as it does occur in Greek art, art historians remain dumfounded and suitably perceive the essence of the work as having derived from beyond time and space. Buschor does just so, when he writes that: "[post-archaic Greek art] pulls us into a spiritual world, into a world without time and space ..."<sup>64</sup>

With the emulation of Greek art by the Italian Renaissance came the concept of the "Contraposto", an observation which institutionalized the phenomenon unique in world sculptic art, and which first appears as a negligible hint with the *Blond Youth* and the *Kritios Boy*. This "Greek invention" matures with landmark Classical statuary works such as Polycleitus' *Doryphoros* and the *Diadoumenos*, or Pheidias' *Warrior of Riace*, and perhaps climaxes with Agesander's *Laokoön*. The phenomenon is so prevalent throughout Classicism, and so driven more or less into all works by the same impulse, that it made Winckelmann talk about one unseen "master" behind it and all artists playing the same violin: "... all the works appear to have been executed by followers of one and the same school. As a connoisseur would recognize in different violin-players who had been taught by one master the style of their teacher, so the same general principles are visible in the drawing of the ancient sculptors, from the greatest to the least."<sup>65</sup>

"Contraposto" is defined as the rotation of the body's five horizontal axes, imaginary lines drawn through the ears, shoulders, hips, knees, and ankles. Throughout Archaic statuary

these lines had firmly held horizontally parallel to one another, one of the reasons for the statue's rigid frontality, whereas in the "evolution" from the Severe to Classical to Hellenistic works the lines gradually turn like the needle of a compass so that one axis may point at angles of different degree or even opposite to other axes. In the limb-spanning balanced *Zeus* this torsion is not as apparent as it is in later works, but it is there, subtly subsumed in relatively low degrees by the rotating body weight balancing itself for the hurling of the spear. In the aforementioned works by Polycleitus and Pheidias, as well as in works attributed to other contemporary masters, the contraposto attains monumental "beauty". In *Laokoön* the axis through the ears sinks much steeper downwards to the left than the following axis of the shoulders, while the axis through the torso counter-rotates slightly to the right. The axes running through the knees and the ankles counter-counter-rotate again to the left, and run somewhat parallel to one another. In *Laokoön* the torsional effect is much more complex and thus disclosive than in the aforementioned works which deploy mainly only the Contraposto, because in *Laokoön*'s body the Contraposto is combined with torsion on the vertical axis, and in fact in all three of the body's rotational axes, as the body also leans slightly forward. To realize what these "tricks", "modellings" and "conventions", as art critics routinely understand them, really mean in terms of Dasein's embodiment, we must return momentarily to Heidegger's analysis of the primitive mode of attunement.

In our earlier discussion of the *Ptoan Apollo* as the apogee of Archaism at circa 520 B.C., we first met with the rigid frontality which characterizes all of the some two centuries of Archaic Greek statuary, itself attributed to strong Egyptian influence. By circa 500 B.C. this frontality suddenly disappears from Greek statuary, and the reason for this total disappearance in Dasein's

foregrounding datability is that Greek art discloses as it embodies the existential structure of attunement.

We postulated above that Dasein's fleeing and turning away as an existential structure of spatial disclosure cannot be embodied by the statue taking a step back in space, as it casually happens in all other world art, as this other art is appearing *in Dasein's disclosed world*, since that space would be an ontic aftermath, and the possibility of ontic space must first be disclosed by Dasein's prescriptive embodiment. In other words, the fleeing and the turning away must somehow precipitate and manifest *within* the body *as* the body; the fleeing and turning away cannot appear as the body taking a step back in space, but as embodied spatiality. How is this possible?

For Heidegger being finds itself not only in seeking itself, but primarily in fleeing from itself; thus to locate Dasein's constitution of spatiality in its primitive mode of attunement *we must capture it simultaneously engaged in that finding as well as in the fleeing*. We want to bring up *that* attunement as mood in art which discloses Dasein as the original embodiment of an existential, pre-existential *torsion*, that is, ahead of Dasein's throwness, because this simultaneous finding *and* fleeing, the toward *and* the away, is in the last analysis a contrapostal and torsional effect. Dasein's "[m]ood does not disclose in the mode of looking at throwness, but as turning *toward and away* from it", promptly writes Heidegger (my italics). (BT 136)

Since attunement is a structure of care, and since primitive attunement is equiprimordial with pre-understanding which itself is another structure of care, and since care is grounded in temporality, the visibility of attunement in its most primitive mode must itself be temporal. Hence Heidegger's question: "How can the temporal constitution of attunement become visible?" (BT 340)



A closer look in post-Archaic Greek art reveals that Heidegger is getting a more visible proof of the temporal constitution of attunement than he may have hoped for. Physics describes “torsion” as “a measure of the tendency of a force to cause rotation.” Torsion is: “‘*stress*’ produced by two antithetical forces twisting a rod *along* its longitudinal axis [my italics].” The definition from physics, the possibility of which is first disclosed by art, is counter-informing our case in art. Primitive attunement embodies itself in post-Archaic Greek art - and there alone - as torsion, because the “two antithetical forces” that twist the “rod” *along* its longitudinal axis, in our case *Laokoön*’s body, are no other than primitive Dasein’s simultaneously finding and fleeing, one end of the “rod”, the body, turning one way, the other end of the “rod” the other way, thus stressing the body within itself, disclosing the turning toward and away *within* the body, or rather as the body. The temporal constitution of attunement becomes visible as the body resisting *itself*.

Gone now is the purposeless, exuberant levity of the Archaic *kouros*. Nowhere to be seen is the disclosure of spatiality by means of objective juxtaposition in space either of body parts or of entire bodies, which so thoroughly characterizes non-Greek and pre-Greek art, including sculptic art as relief and in the open, and whose historical precedence by seniority has been torpidly based on Dasein’s ontic datability and foregrounding by means of the aforementioned third predicament in the hermeneutic circle. It is this torpidity due to the asymmetrical buildup between the ontic and the ontological beginnings, to which Nietzsche points in his *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*, having seen that: “[p]eople who prefer to spend their time on Egyptian or Persian philosophy rather than the Greek, on the grounds that the former are more ‘original’ and in any event older, are just as ill-advised ... Everywhere, the way to the beginnings leads to barbarism.”<sup>66</sup>

To Heidegger's question of "how can the temporal constitution of attunement become visible?", we answer that all we have to do is take a fundamental ontological look at *Laokoön's* body and see it twisted in all its axes, in its having embodied *and within this body* disclosed the *temporal* constitution of attunement as the disclosive existential stress of the being-towards-death. Besides its contrapostal stressing on the horizontal level, *Laokoön's* body is also torsioned on its vertical axis. His "*torso*" (the pivotal body part literally embodying its torsional essence in language) rotates as it simultaneously drops to the left to counterbalance the step down of the left foot, while *Laokoön's* chest is twisted upwards and to the right, heedful to anticipate the serpent that has engaged the priest's upper right arm. Here every possible muscle - and for some commentaries even impossible muscles - every power-yielding fiber and sinew of the body, from the curling of the toes to the contracting facial muscles, is purposefully and synergistically appearing as prescriptive spatiality in pre-understanding and in primitive attunement to that which resists this body's will to live. Conceptually, torsional stress is itself a phenomenological mode of disclosing resistance, (here the resistance of the two antithetical forces of seeking and fleeing put against one another) and as such, just as the narrative of musculature that this bodily torsion marshals throughout the body, it makes primordial temporality visible, albeit in disguise. That evasive turning into and away *within* the body is primitive Dasein's embodiment at its earliest attunement, before the remaining two, *existentiell* modes of attunement, finally connect Dasein with its factual world. In Heidegger's words: "The first essential ontological characteristic of attunement is: Attunement discloses Da-sein in its thrownness, initially and for the most part in the mode of an evasive turning away." (BT 136)

Dasein's remaining two, worldly modes of attunement, must also disclose themselves as the *Laokoön*, if our hypothesis is viable. The rendition of the modes of attunement as mood is

factually accountable by the myth of the fate of the Trojan priest. The story varies in ancient literature, but the version in Virgil's *Aeneiad* (II, 199 ff), which this work was mistakenly understood to have emulated by Lessing's anachronism, has *Laokoön*: "making a sacrifice at the shore, where he suddenly sees his two sons overpowered by two huge serpents that come up out of the waves, and hastening to their aid, he becomes himself entangled in the deadly coils." The stark nudity of the priest, being a priest, of course does not make sense in this-world-denying Christian times; it actually caused outrage, and Lessing refers to "some [art critics?] who have detected a gross absurdity in making son and priest officiating at a sacrifice being thus represented."<sup>67</sup> This may very well be the case, since nor does the *factual* explanation of this work make sense anyway. The fact that the priest is rendered *naked*, is rather proof that transcendental Dasein has *forced* itself into and cannot be explained by the factual world.

The consuming factual disclosure in *Laokoön*'s body is this body's dwelling either in fear or in fear modification as terror, corresponding in Greek to either *fovos* or *tromos*, as also recounted by Goethe. Heidegger holds that all modifications of fear are possibilities of attunement, (BT 141) and we have already explicated the embodiment of the possibility of attunement of fear at its most fundamental level being equiprimordial with pre-understanding, as primordial Angst, where the fleeing Dasein recognizes its own being as already "fear-full". Heidegger differentiates ontological "fearfulness" from ontic attunement in that "[t]his 'fearfulness' must not be understood in the ontic sense of a factual, 'isolated' tendency, but rather as the existential possibility of the essential attunement of Da-sein in general, which is, of course, not the only one." (BT 142) The other two, *existentiell* modes, we already introduced as the modes which fittingly correspond to Goethe's fear and terror, namely as thrownness and being-

there-with, or the fear which fearing itself discovers as something approaching beforehand in its fearsomeness, and that before which are afraid, the 'fearsome'.

In throwness Dasein prepares itself toward the final ecstatic mode of attunement, at which point it will find itself already existentially determined beforehand, so what it may encounter in the world can matter to it. In terms of this mode's being an embodied blueprint of Dasein's spatiality, as *The Laokoön*, we should expect to visually encounter this mode as an intermediary, inter-spatial effusion of physical configuration, since neither is throwness directly involved with that worldly anticipation for which this mode of attunement prepares the body for to encounter the world as a matter-of-fact, nor is it connected to the primitive mode of the body's contrapostal and the torsional stress as the disclosure of the fearful Angst against nothing in particular. "It comes neither from 'without' nor from 'within,' but rises from being-in-the-world itself as a mode of that being", writes Heidegger about the second mode of attunement, albeit addressing not Dasein's body-spatiality, but Dasein's world-spatiality. (BT 137) If Dasein's world disclosure is indeed, blueprinted as the *Laokoön*, this ideal body must have configured itself ahead of this body's being-there-with, disclosing forms of spatiality that encounter the world's fearsomeness ahead of the specific constituency of its configuration which will contact the innerworldly fearsome. In other words, being in the world as a whole must attune, that is, configure, the body in its entirety, including body parts that are not immediately anticipating the fearsome world as-a-matter-of-fact.

In remaining open to understand the priest's fundamental ontological essence, we must notice that in between, on the one hand, those body parts formally consumed by primitive attunement (contrapostal and torsional configurations), and on the other hand those other parts of the priest's body which configure, that is, attune themselves to the world's matter-of-factness

(the left hand that grips the serpent, the hip area where the serpent is about to bite, the calf that meets the knee of the son, the thighs following the altar's angular contour, and the toes where they meet the ground), there is body as otherwise undeterminable *res extensa* which must somehow be formed not arbitrarily and at random, but hearkening to some principle related to either end of the primitive and of the factual spatial dwellings within which this intermediary spatiality itself dwells. In fact most of the priest's body must somehow be configured, that is, attuned, by this unaccounted principle, since the body parts attuned by primitive attunement or attuned to anticipate the world's immediate matter-of-factness are, *in this particular work*, much fewer in number than those which are not. This embodying of mostly forms in their preparatory averageness corresponds to the average everydayness of Dasein, and thus in comparison with other candidate renditions in Greek art once again confirms *Laokoön's* eligibility as a suitable interpretation of Dasein's existential analytic.

So we ask: How does that intermediary mode of attunement prepares the body *so that the world can matter to it*? To be prepared, the body must already be thrown, and yet thrown only into an *average* or generic configuration, since by means of the one extreme mode of attunement to which the averageness must be related the body configures itself by simultaneously finding and fleeing from itself, and on the other extreme mode of attunement to which the averageness must also be related the body is configured to affect and be affected by the world. Preparatory attunement cannot disclose either of these extreme dwellings in themselves, and yet it is needed by both, because otherwise the extreme disclosures would be dwellings into a totality to which nothing can matter. Without the preparatory mode of attunement embodying Dasein's average everydayness, Dasein's primitive attunement discloses nothing that can matter since this is an attunement in primordial Angst about nothing in particular. At the other end, if factual

attunement would be left alone to disclose itself as itself it would once again disclose no-*thing* that matters, since it would disclose the world's absolute productivity as a truth aside of error and doubt. But an average configuration preserves both the body's ownmost potentiality of being in primitive attunement, *and* remain preparatory to those modes of factual attunement where the body, in its falling prey to the world, would expose this potentiality and phenomenologically configure it as its ownmost deficiency of being. Heidegger anticipates this necessity, albeit not in terms of Dasein's body but of Dasein's world: "*Because it essentially falls prey to the world, Dasein is in 'untruth' in accordance with its constitution of being.*" (BT 222)

Throwness as Dasein's second mode of attunement is disclosed in *Laokoön's* body as that intermediate, "average" tissue and skeletomuscular, organic apparatus, which although to the third mode of attunement it relatively remains unmodified by the world, it is there to connect the body's torsional core with the body's interface with the world. Before the body can be-there-with, in this case be-there-with the serpents, the sons, the ground and the altar, the body has to be-there, to be thrown into the world's fearsomeness, but not yet into the world as the fearsome. In being-there, and ahead of being-there-with, the body contours to the form of an average mode in mere formal *anticipation* to that which matters to it. For this formal anticipation the body must have already been prepared by means of a physiognomy resolutely anticipating not yet the fearsome, but something approaching in its fearsomeness. By means of this average formal anticipation of Dasein's everydayness, a certain connective body configuration is made possible, as the body that has attuned not yet to the presently fearsome, but merely to the approaching fearsomeness. It is this attunement to the approaching fearsomeness which renders *Laokoön's* physicality spreading in between the body's existential, canonical core and the body's *existentiell*, local contour to deal with the fearsome. Physical localities which are not yet

summoned to-be-there-with but are summoned to be-there for Dasein's everydayness, physical entities such as *Laokoön's* penis, abdomen, nose, hair, etc., to only name a few immediate phenomenological structures aside of muscular clusters, are forms attuned to Dasein's everydayness, which may not be immediately engaged to the fearsome, but without which Dasein cannot be thrown because it cannot have the totality of a body.

In *Laokoön's* body it is much easier to observe the throwness of Dasein's indefinite averageness as the forming of the possibility of a physical presumption yet unmodified but available by just being-there, as a pre-symbiotic relationship with the world merely anticipating it, in comparison with the embodiment of the immediacy of the being-there-with. Be that as it may, Heidegger gives Dasein's average everydayness a stronger, *definitive* throwness, already entangled: "Being-in-the-world is always entangled. *The average everydayness of Da-sein* can thus be determined as *entangled-disclosed, thrown projecting being-in-the-world which is concerned with its ownmost potentiality in its being together with the 'world' and in being-with others.*" (BT 181)

*Laokoön's* hand is spatialized by the last attuned stage of the by now non-primitive, worldly Dasein, which, having begun from its ultimate grounding in primordial temporality and having moved through three modes of understanding and three modes of attunement, connects itself with an innerworldly being in space, with a "thing-in-itself". We may understand this point of convergence of body and world, in our case patently made by *Laokoön's* hand grasping the serpent, as the origin of the "There", the spatial moment of singularity out of which all expansive and formative being-there-ness is centrifugally effusing outwards. This "authentic There" and "moment of unique totality" is the canonical point of departure in Greek art towards the rest of the body and towards the rest of the world.

The hierarchical transversal of Dasein's spatial expansion from one existential structure of care to the next, moving from the primitive to the worldly Dasein, that is, from attunement (care's second structure) to entanglement or falling prey (care's third structure), has at this point become manifestly seamless, inasmuch as the analysis of Dasein's *attunement* as fearing is simultaneously the analysis of Dasein's *falling prey* to the fearsome. This is perhaps the main reason that Heidegger at some point does not distinguish between the structures of attunement and entanglement, reducing the structures of care from four to three. Whereas at the more primordial transversal from understanding to attunement we were able to observe the syzygy of Dasein as pre-understanding and of Dasein as fearful strictly within *Laokoön's* body as the embodied structures of primitive Dasein, now the *existentiell* structures of attunement as mood disclose both the body in its what-for-thingliness and the world as a useful or a threatening being. The inherent seamlessness of what we have dissected becomes now apparent because the spatiality disclosed at the interface between mind and world in the entanglement of the fearing with the fearsome is disclosed by means of a body which, being indispensably instrumental to both mind and world, belongs equally to both.

## ***5.2 The Embodiment of Entanglement***

The *sheer monumentality* of the *prescriptive* disclosure of Dasein's spatiality through the third mode of attunement into the third structure of care as entanglement or falling prey owes to the priest's hand anticipating the shape of the serpent as a perceptual constancy *even without the priest looking at the serpent*. The priest is reaching out in the opacity of sensation towards things he has in advance no key and which he nevertheless carries within himself the project. This synaesthetic normativity is disclosed exclusively at the zenith of post-Archaic Greek art.



It is only in the “normal” mode of being in the world, the mode of attunement disclosed by Greek art for its preservers, where the thing is inseparable from a person perceiving it and it can never “be” by itself. Heidegger’s concept that pursues the otherwise abandoned question of how significance translates into substance so that the fearful and the fearing as the human self may meet with the fearsome as the human world by making themselves phenomenologically available to each other in their interaction, is the concept of the “making present”, itself originating in Husserl. Heidegger addresses the abandoned question by first answering the other question, which derives from the highest moment in Greek art and connects man with nature, namely “what ‘humanity’ is that which the priest may invest to things like the serpent?” The concept of making-present elucidates the twofold structure of the “present”, the present as presentation and the present as now.

Heidegger saw the illusionary origin of the Cartesian idea, that molecular edifices or masses of cells are indissolubly, objectively present, by observing Dasein’s *spatiality* unfolding in the phenomenological structures of falling prey, which is temporally rooted primarily in the present, “making present of the Moment”. (BT 350) Heidegger implies that the objectification of things such as molecules or cells is actually no more than an *itinerant* illusion projected by the rigorous focusing of Dasein's dormancy as the fearful, awakened by Dasein's falling prey to summon a distant over there into an isolation disconnected from the rest of Dasein's world and cast into an immanent and concrete here. This cloistered casting is the “authentic There”, what we otherwise transiently see as a molecule or a cell objectively present. In Heidegger's words:

[I]n falling prey, and thus also in the bringing near which is founded in “making present,” the forgetting that awaits pursues the present. In the making present that brings something near from its wherefrom, making present loses itself in itself, and forgets the over there. For this reason if the “observation” of innerworldly beings starts in such a making present, the illusion arises that

“initially” only a thing is objectively present, here indeed, but indeterminately, in a space in general. (BT 369)

The rampant proliferation of innerworldly beings appearing objectively present originates in the constant modification and subsequent cultural sedimentation of the over there to making present and then once again depositing it back as an over there. This modification is grounded in understanding as de-distancing, because as we mentioned in concluding the previous section, falling prey is only technically distinguishable from attunement, itself being equiprimordial with understanding. “Da-sein can fall prey only because it is concerned with understanding, attuned being-in-the-world.” (BT 179) The present can be presented, that is, appear, as a now, only as *objectively* present. The constant pursuing and dispersion of the nows originates in Dasein's inability to be at once everywhere and nowhere; Dasein's primitive fearfulness is resolutely yearning for the Moment to be authentically There. The collective effect of this dynamic of de-distancing under threat of loss of world results into the ecstasis from primitive Dasein and the graduation from the second to the third mode of attunement towards the objective appearance of the world, otherwise subjective in its foundations. In Heidegger's words:

Making present is left more and more into itself as it is modified by the awaiting that pursues. It makes present for the sake of the present. Thus tangled up in itself, the dispersed not-saying turns into *the inability to stay at all*. This mode of the present is the most extreme opposite phenomenon of the *Moment*. In this *inability* Da-Sein is everywhere and nowhere. The *Moment* brings existence to the situation and discloses the authentic “There.” (BT 348)

In having demonstrated how innerworldly things attain only a transient status of objectivity in their presence as a now, Heidegger has promptly responded to the aporia of how significance and intentionality “dwell” in molecules and cells. The molecules and cells of the body appear objectively only where the body *is present in the now* as its what-for-thingliness, so

that the body, complete with all its molecules and cells, can be instrumental for what has to be done for and by the being-towards-death.

Heidegger's "Moment", the "authentic There", describes the singularity event in attunement where "objective substance" precipitates and may be epigenetically sedimented as the eidetic suchness of the fearing encountering the eidetic suchness of the fearsome. "Fear about as being afraid of always equiprimordially discloses, whether privately or positively, innerworldly beings in their possibility of being threatening and being-in with regard to its being threatened", notes Heidegger. (BT 142) In the existential ecstasis of falling prey Dasein understands itself both ontologically as an objective being and ontically as a threatened being who must take care of the threat if it is to continue having a world: "... falling prey, show[s] that this being initially and for the most part understands itself ontically in terms of the horizon of taking care of things, but ontologically defines being in the sense of objective being." (BT 293)

The reciprocal and *dialectic* - that is, discursive - disclosure of what is threatened through the disclosure of what is threatening in falling prey involves Dasein's ontic and ontological oscillation between the fearing and the fearsome. The roles of the fearing and the fearsome remain fully reversible in each and every encounter between Dasein and its world. In being thrown, primitive Dasein is at the same time both self *and* world, since that authentic self is itself but it is also the world being there for *any other* possible authentic self. "In falling prey", points out Heidegger, "Da-sein turns away from itself. What it shrinks back from must have a threatening character; yet this being has the same kind of being as the one which shrinks back from it - it is Da-sein itself." (BT 186)

When the self falls prey to the world, its ontic or factual constitution becomes transparent as Dasein glimpses the smoldering truth at the core of its own being, while its

ontological constitution turns opaque and out of joint because in falling prey to the world Dasein as self “*flees* itself to the they.” (BT 322) In order to disentangle itself from the they and back into self-transparency, Dasein as a self must first be entangled in the existential modes of everydayness, namely temptation, tranquilization, idle talk, curiosity, ambiguity, and alienation. (BT 175, 348) “[Dasein] is continually surrendered to the ‘world’ and lets itself be concerned by it in such a way that it somehow evades its very self. The existential constitution of this evasion becomes clear in the phenomenon of entanglement.” (BT 140) The smoldering truth at the core of Dasein's own being is that *Dasein is true only as untrue*, as *a-letheia*, a tragic plight which, on top of that, is a deficiency that must be *won* at each and every Moment of its ecstatic *existentiell* self-interpretations, themselves ontologically exacerbated by the threesome predicament of the hermeneutic circle. It is this tragic truth disclosed by Greek art, which in his *Birth of Tragedy* Nietzsche saw Hamlet resembling Dionysus: “[B]oth have once looked truly into the essence of things, they have gained knowledge, and nausea inhibits action; for their action could not change anything in the eternal nature of things; they feel it to be ridiculous or humiliating that they should be asked to set right a world that is out of joint.”<sup>68</sup>

It is into *this opacity of being that must be won* where the self first escapes, in order to free itself for the possibility to become that which is yet to be. “Because it essentially falls prey to the world, Da-sein is in ‘untruth’ in accordance with its constitution of being”, notes Heidegger. (BT 222) And again: “Truth (discoveredness) must always first be wrested from beings. Beings are torn from concealment. The actual factual discoveredness is, so to speak, always a kind of *robbery*.” (BT 223)

Heidegger has already told us that the existential constitution of the evading self into the they becomes clear in the phenomenon of entanglement. The term does not involve a negative

value judgment, but expresses Dasein's initial absorption in togetherness with the they of the world that Dasein takes care of. The inauthenticity of entanglement is by no means a being of lesser truth than the being in the authentic There of the self. Phenomenologically speaking, authenticity can only emerge on the background of inauthenticity, and this fundamental gestalt axiom is in the last analysis what drives the necessity of Dasein's initial fleeing itself into the they. Inauthenticity is still a *definitive* being-in-the-world as a definite recognition that *there is* a world in need to be taken care of. Thus the existential of entanglement must make phenomenologically available *the basic structures of Dasein as background*, so that “it constitutes precisely a distinctive kind of being-in-the-world which is completely taken in by the world and the *Mitda-sein* of the others in the they. Not-being-its-self functions as a *positive* possibility of beings which are absorbed in the world, essentially taking care of that world.” (BT 176)

Heidegger seeks the phenomenological structures into which Dasein as self falls prey. These world background structures, the inauthentic Dasein, must be already given, that is, *structured* in their inauthenticity. The eidetic suchness of an individual self, as an innerworldly being that it is, can rise only out of such structured world background, because “the discoveredness of innerworldly beings is grounded in the disclosedness of the world.” (BT 221) Heidegger seeks the defined basic structures of the world as something that needs to be taken care of by the self fleeing from itself in order to *discover* itself emerging out of these *disclosed* structures. Thus he asks: “What structure does the ‘movement’ of falling prey show?” (BT 177)

Idle talk, curiosity, ambiguity and alienation are such worldly structures, but we should notice at this point that categorically they are themselves a subset to the structured existentials of entanglement and falling prey. The subset of idle talk, curiosity, ambiguity, and alienation may

be discovered as an *existentiell* phenomenological structure in any form of art, but the existentials through the *disclosure* of which the *discovery* of the subset is possible are the *existential* structures of entanglement and falling prey. From this prioritization we understand that since our search for that art which embodies Dasein's fundamental ontology is a lookout for *disclosure*, the subset belongs to a posterior, world-descriptive and not world-disclosive art and therefore cannot be part of our agenda that seeks the embodiment of Dasein's structures of care.

Nonetheless, Heidegger cautions that falling prey, being an existential determination, “says nothing about Da-sein as something objectively present, or about objectively present relations to beings from which it is ‘derived’.” (BT 176) Be that as it may, Heidegger's cautioning here is first of all contradictory to what he says at (BT 293), where we already read that in falling prey Dasein initially and for the most part understands itself *ontically* and in the sense of an *objective* being. The cautioning is also apparently forsaken by the sheer monumentality of *The Laokoön Group* which, besides its disclosure of the structures of primitive Dasein as the fearful, it *does disclose* the existential structures of entanglement and falling prey as *factical*, that is, objective relations between beings. The *Group* suggests that Heidegger is rather correct at (BT 293) than at (BT 176), or maybe more likely that he meant something different in each case.

Our suggestion that *The Group* discloses the structures of entanglement and falling prey by having observed the *too apparent* entanglement of the three figures in the coils of the serpents must not trivialize our case as if it is fortuitously overstating it. Heidegger himself understood that at this, by now non-primitive stage of Dasein's constitution by the third structure of care (Dasein as understanding, attunement, falling prey) and by the third and last mode of falling prey (Dasein as fearful, fearing, fearsome), we stand before Dasein's *factical and objective* determination. As we already saw with Heidegger at (BT 293), in falling prey Dasein understands

itself *ontically* as an *objective* being in terms of the horizon of taking care of things. Whereas up to this point we had taken the radical stance to let the statue speak to us, we must now return to the interpretive mode of the typical art historian who imposes to the statue Dasein's temporalization of temporality with the facts that Agesander the sculptor created this art to represent an archetypal legend from Troy's history.

We should expect the aforementioned subset itself, phenomena of public absorption in ambiguity, idle talk, alienation, curiosity, etc., to be casually taken as the theme of world-descriptive art. And it usually is. But the larger structure, Heidegger's "movement" into which the subset conforms to in order to release the public space for the ecstatic performance of Dasein's primordially of care, belongs to a more fundamental world disclosure, the disclosure of entanglement and falling prey.

Since the subset as art is world-descriptive and not world-disclosive, it is the structures of entanglement and of falling prey *as such*, that is, in their factual disclosure, which we ought to seek the embodiment in art. The *Group* does make phenomenologically available in a monumental exposition the existential structures of entanglement and of falling prey, as these structures are imaged by Heidegger's fundamental ontology in the following expression: "Being-in-the-world is always entangled. *The average everydayness of Da-sein* can thus be determined as *entangled-disclosed, thrown projecting being-in-the-world which is concerned with its ownmost potentiality in its being together with the 'world' and in being-with with the others.*" (BT 181)

As a factual representation the *Group* describes Dasein's complete world, as earth and sky (the altar), as nature (the serpents), as the they (the sons) and as the self (the priest). As a fundamental ontological provenance the *Group* discloses all four modes of Dasein's average

everydayness according to Heidegger's above expression: accordingly, Dasein's entanglement in the world, Dasein's ownmost potentiality in its being together with the world, Dasein's ownmost potentiality in being-with with the others, and Dasein's concern with its ownmost potentiality of being. Dasein's average everydayness may be tantamount or at least constant to Heidegger's fourfold dwelling in the retrieval of the ancestral regime, a late-Heidegger concept, except *Being and Time* makes no reference to divinities, while *Building Dwelling Thinking* only discusses earth, sky, divinities and mortals, leaving out animals.

Regarding Dasein's entanglement as a concern for its ownmost potentiality of being, this determination is disclosed by the *Group* in the priest's immanent physicality. It is this *concern* that makes Dasein visible to itself as a self. This imminence is what makes the physicality of the priest's body more dramatically visible than the bodies of his sons. The concern for one's ownmost potentiality of being requires a certain maturation of an *embodied self*-awareness, which in the last analysis separates son from man as child from adult. This imminence is also the reason, unintelligible as we saw to art historians, why a priest's body may be so irreverent as to have shed its clothes, so that the body can escape its anonymity and free itself to disclose *its own* potentiality-of-being as a physical entity comprised by the *thisness* of a given physiognomic competence. It is this disclosed normativity, *this* existentially ideal body that both Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty anticipate; it is also this body as an *aesthetic* instrumentality to freedom that Nietzsche sought, but due to his unwarranted bifurcation between Apollo and Dionysos, could never attain. "When Da-sein is imminent to itself as this possibility", writes Heidegger, "it is completely thrown back upon its ownmost potentiality-of-being." (BT 251) The priest's body discloses the possibility of the body as the fearing hearkening to the fearsomeness of the world ahead of the actual encounter.



Regarding Dasein's ownmost potentiality in being-with with others, the *Group* discloses the possibility of a relationship between bodies unmet with in pre-Classical Greek art. Where Archaic statuary in the open always pertained to the *kouros* standing alone, here the fearing is shared by the they encountering the fearsome as a communal threat. Two or more figures appearing together was a rare occurrence in Archaic Greek monumental statuary in the open. The genre was introduced in the second quarter of the sixth century with the *Ramping Horseman* [Figure 10] and the *Calf-Bearer* [Figure 11], but both these works involved man with animals and not with other selves. Late sixth century renditions such as the *Gigantomachy* from the North Frieze of the *Sifnos Treasury* at the Temple of Delphi involved multiple “human” figures in unison encountering a common threat in battle, but the bodies are not rendered in the open, and as will further see, they by no means share any of the disclosures of the embodiment of temporality and the structures of care shown in our analysis of post-Archaic Greek art.

The *Group* discloses Dasein in its ownmost potentiality of being-with with others in two factual steps: first by displaying the *that* as well as the *how* of Dasein as a body trying to evade its having fallen prey being the body of a being-towards-death; second, in showing that this evasion is possible only in a relationship with other bodies. The first step is disclosed by the matter-of-fact posture of the priest's body. To the serpent's head attack from the left, the body is *consummately* staggered at the opposite direction to the right. As natural and commonsensical as it may seem *to us*, this consummately staggered movement is monumental in *that there is no precedence* to it either in comparative “Greek” or non-Greek world art. The second step of Dasein's embodied spatiality disclosing the possibility of inauthentically evading death together with others manifests in three embodying subsystems: first in the priest's body being staged *in*



Figure 10: *Ramping Horseman*, Greece second quarter of sixth century BC



Figure 11: *Calf Bearer*, Greece, second quarter of sixth century BC

between the bodies of others; second in that the bodies of the others *are identical* with the priest's body in at least their physiognomic capability to become full-fledged selves; and third, in that all three bodies face *the same* threat. The involvement of others as identical copies of one's body in being one's sons and in sharing the same threat introduces the possibility of an inauthentic reinterpretation of the threat, a concealment through genealogical procrastination to face the fact that being is always a being-towards-death. The disclosure that the evasion is possible only together-with with other bodies is demonstrated by the underlying truth that the priest can evade death only insofar as the other bodies around him evade death as well. Was the priest to survive the serpents but his sons to have died, the priest has not really survived, since the priest being Dasein's self that dies depends on the survival of his offspring as Dasein's they-they-that-never-die. Heidegger anticipates Dasein's world disclosure by such art as *The Laokoön Group*, when he writes that: "Being *toward* the end has the mode of *evading that end* - reinterpreting it, understanding it inauthentically, and veiling it. Factically one's own Da-sein is always already dying, that is, it is in a being-toward-its-end. And it conceals this fact from itself by re-interpreting death as a case of death occurring every day with others ..." (BT 255)

Regarding Dasein's entanglement and falling prey to the world aside from being concerned about itself and from being-with with others, once again this is a matter-of-fact dwelling where the itinerant objectification of innerworldly beings such as the altar (earth and sky) and the serpents (nature) is an objectification of the fearsome bestowed by and for the interests of the fearful fearing. For Heidegger, prior to sensory perception the body of the fearing has already anticipated the outward appearance of the object. "Like the concept of sight, 'seeing' is not limited to perceiving with the 'physical eyes'," writes Heidegger. "Perceiving in the

broader sense lets what is at hand and objectively present be ‘bodily’ encountered with regard to their outward appearance.” (BT 347)

Since a body in the world can only be *someone’s* body, the possibility for a communal body for which an object may exist in order to obtain its objectivity within a “concatenation of perspectives” and through the generic modes of which anyone’s body may have access to the object, this communal body can appear in the world only as a prescriptive idealization, that is, as monumental art. *The Laokoön Group* is such a prescriptive idealization, for in the priest’s letting the fearsome be bodily encountered despite of its being out of sight, and in this body’s objectifying the object in encountering it as the fearsome, this art displays Heidegger’s concession for pre-sensory perception as well as that the object is objectifiable only inasmuch as it exists by and for the interests of a body.

The access of the object through the normative modes of entanglement and falling prey of the communal body discloses the possibility for the objectification of world and body through an infinitely expansive range of phenomenological structures relating and thus signifying the fearing to the fearsome. These structures themselves first appear as natural innerworldly beings in this relation of making present. Entanglement and falling prey to the world objectify the fearsome for the interests of the fearing but also the fearing for the interests of the fearsome within this range and in the concatenation of perspectives. In the *Group*, this range patently objectifies the outright fearsome as the serpents, but no less it objectifies the indirectly fearsome structures of the earth and the altar upon which the bodies depend in order to encounter the outright fearsome. The earth and the altar, as well as the draping clothes hanging from the three bodies, are innerworldly beings objectified as indirect forms of the fearsome inasmuch as they

are or may possibly be a factor in the outcome of the encounter with the currently appearing as the outright fearsome.

This holds for any innerworldly being that may appear as a “natural” background to the fearing encountering the fearsome, since as we already know from Heidegger, the fearsome as part of the world may appear only within a world, that is, after a world has appeared as a whole. The movement of the understanding from the whole to the part as a fundamental phenomenological principle pertains to all regional de-distancing, whether towards the purposeful objectification of the fearsome or of the fearing. The objectification of the earth as ground and the sky as altar upon which the bodies have fallen prey in Dasein’s *everydayness* may seem self-evident - that is the idea - but it is no less a tenuous and itinerant objectification of natural forms out of Dasein’s concern which had to somehow be won, that is, disclosed by art in Dasein’s embodiment as an embodiment that anticipates a certain purposeful world. The unassuming demand for the itinerant objectification of nature as naturalness is demonstrated particularly by the intricate, as it were, *precise*, rendition of the phenomenological structures of the *Group*’s draping clothes. The unmitigated necessity for objectification of structures which otherwise are first seen as routine in Dasein’s everydayness, one mode of which is curiosity, can be best shown in the comparison of Archaic and post-Archaic statuary, in our case of producing Dasein’s communal body by comparing *Laokoön* with the *New York Kouros*. Whereas the *kouros*’ feet lay flat and incurious to the shape of the earth which in this way remains generic and unobjectified, *Laokoön*’s feet and buttocks objectify earth and the altar in their specificity by contouring around them purposefully in encountering the serpents as the immediately fearsome. Whereas the relaxed *kouros*’ body does not recognize the earth it stands upon because it has not encountered in it the fearsome, the stressful curling of the priest’s toes underscores the objective

resistance of the earth and the altar's sharp ledge as objects to be reckoned with by this entangled being-towards-death. In such modifications the body's world may be absent, but the body is telling what that body's world is like.

Dasein always encounters and objectifies the eidetic suchness of the fearsome, of the detrimental, or at least of the potentially detrimental. Heidegger provides that the objectification of Dasein's structures of everydayness as a definite regional background upon which the fearsome is staged may itself remain absent, but it is at least implied: "Shrinking back from what fear discloses, from what is threatening, is founded upon fear and has the character of flight. Our interpretation of fear as attunement showed that what we fear is always a detrimental innerworldly being, approaching nearby from a definite region, which may remain absent." (BT 186)

Just as Dasein falls prey into an objectifying world background constituency by extracting from the consciousness of art historians an interpretation through the temporalization of temporality of the origin of the *Laokoön Group* as a *cultural* innerworldly object, in the same factual dwelling Dasein seeks the objectification now of the *natural history* of the fearing and the fearsome, as this history is monumentalized by the *Group* disclosure. This entanglement assigns to the understanding the task of objectifying the primordial form of ontic fearsomeness, a task now taken by natural historians. It is in this factual dwelling that the serpent appears as the primordial form of ontic fearsomeness in the horizon of taking care of things by Dasein's *existentiell* understanding. Heidegger postulates that what we fear is always a detrimental innerworldly being; accordingly, the *primordial existentiell* form of this detrimental innerworldly being is no other than the serpent, both in western science and in western religion.

With the objectification of Dasein's natural history precipitating between the fearing and the fearsome, we conclude the last step of the necessary proof that the entanglement and the falling prey of being-there into an *existentiell* dwelling is an entanglement of body and world such as the one prescribed by the *Group*. The normative prescription of this art is that the world circumstantially objectifies through the investment into it of the body's interests by the body's pre-sensory perception as anticipation. By making a literal case of both Dasein's entanglement in the serpents' coils and Dasein's falling prey to the serpents' attack, the *Group* discloses the origin of the world as earth, sky and nature, and monumentalizes the authentic There as the cloistered casting of making present. Nothing preceding the *Group* in Dasein's datability had made public *the embodiment* of the tragic truth that Dasein is true only when untrue, that the world objectifies at the singularity moment when the being-there is summoning its ownmost potentiality of being against the negation of its will to live. The *Group* appears to the understanding as the literal disclosure of the truth that fearful Dasein's existential structure of falling prey objectifies reciprocally both the body in its what-for-thingliness and the world as a threat. This non-contingent, fundamental ontological proof establishes a foundation for the defense against the criticism of the supposedly missing connection between man and animal in Heideggerian metaphysics.

### ***Endnotes***

- 63. William Guild Howard, editor and commentary, *Laokoön: Lessing, Herder, Goethe*, p. 335.
- 64. Ernst Buschor, *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, p. 11.
- 65. Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of Ancient Art*, p. 72.
- 66. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*, p. 30.
- 67. Gottlob Ephraim Lessing, *Laokoön, and How the Ancients Represented Death*, p. 32.
- 68. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, p. 60.



## CHAPTER SIX

### THE EMBODIMENT OF CARE III

#### ***6.1 The Embodiment of Discourse***

Heidegger examines discourse as the last of the four structures of care, because it is through this existential that all others are *maintained*. As such, discourse is Dasein's most worldly and least primitive existential structure. The classification of discourse as the final step of the world's objectification may otherwise be seen as just a technical distinction for the sake of the analytics of Dasein within the unity of the phenomenon of equiprimordiality as a constitutive factor. This is because while attunement and understanding are equiprimordially *determined* by discourse, (BT 133) Heidegger notes elsewhere that discourse itself is *equiprimordial* with attunement and understanding. (BT 161)

Although Heidegger's analysis treats discourse as communication *in language* - we recall that for Heidegger the world-disclosive art is poetry - even there, this communication is sought to be "made visible". (BT 161) This call for visibility even where there is none, both simplifies and amplifies our own demonstration of the embodiment of Dasein's spatiality in statuary art, since the discursive expansion of Dasein's spatiality as care into a world of *res extensa* is naturally visible in statuary, where in poetry it is not. Whereas in language there can only appear as a cognitive, that is, unobjectifiable narrative, on the other hand the human flesh, either as disclosive ideation in art or as the subject of description by medical science, is literally made of the there in its visible and tangible what-for-thingliness.

Heidegger defines “discourse” as the articulation of the attuned intelligibility of the there. (BT 161) Discourse maintains the intelligibility of the there because in the compilation of the multiple existential structures of care the there ends up to be the regionalized receptacle of meaning shaping itself in this attuned receptivity. Innerworldly beings maintain their transient objectivity, their cloistered casting as “substance”, in the authentic there, for as long and inasmuch as they remain meaningful, because “[m]eaning is that wherein the intelligibility of something maintains itself.” (BT 151) In Dasein’s world objects are either meaningful or they do not appear, because meaning is not attached as an aftermath to objects already present, but is the constitutive intelligibility whereupon and through which objects become present.

Furthermore, discourse is an *attuned* intelligibility, because as we already mentioned it is through the three modes of attunement, namely circumspective heedfulness, thrownness, and being-there-with, that this intelligibility bestows Dasein with *definite* possibilities of existence in what matters.

Whereas the prior three existentials of care were either underlying, withheld, or disguised structures of primitive Dasein (as in the case of the pre-understanding, of circumspective heedfulness, of the fearful, and of primordial temporality), finally discourse is an *expression* and a *disclosedness*: “[t]he attuned intelligibility of being-in-the-world is *expressed as discourse*”, writes Heidegger. And again: “[Discourse] is the primordial existential of disclosedness.” (BT 161)

Discourse articulates what is significant, and it is in this articulation where the significant is signified in its eidetic suchness, or in other words, is objectively disclosed. Heidegger distinguishes four constitutive factors of how discourse manifests and maintains the world’s intelligibility: in the subject of what is discussed, in what is said as such, in communication, and in making known. (BT 163) The constitutive factors of discourse are not factual and cannot be

extracted empirically from language, but are themselves: “existential characteristics rooted in the constitution of being of Da-sein which first make something like language ontologically possible.” (BT 163) In other words, the factors are the formal, ontological containers of *existentiell* experience expressed in language.

In our exposition of the embodiment of understanding as a world-disclosure in Greek art, we established several modifications through which Dasein’s spatiality is disclosed. Amongst them: that pre-understanding goes back and forth from the whole to the parts and in between parts filling the gaps with the extension of beings in de-distancing; that pre-understanding summons the disclosure of beings inasmuch as they are relevant to other beings in terms of their *serviceability*, *usability*, and *perishability*; that the world’s intelligibility depends on being together in the understanding of what is at stake; that the world’s intelligibility is a transparency achieved through resolve both as resolution and as higher definition; and that through all three modes of understanding (pre-understanding, existential, and *existentiell* understanding) the world becomes transparent and intelligible. Heidegger observes that such communal modifications cannot be maintained otherwise than through discourse: “Discoursing is the ‘significant’ articulation of the intelligibility of being-in-the-world, to which belongs being-with, and which maintains itself in a particular way of heedful being-with-one-another.” (BT 162)

Dasein’s constancy, the world’s “substance”, depends in the last analysis on the ongoing maintenance of discourse. Heidegger expects this maintenance to be originally disclosed *in language*, where understanding and attunement may be expressed, because “[t]he *existential-ontological foundation of language is discourse*.” (BT 161) But this may hold only for the needs of a world which is already disclosed and has to be maintained, since as we premised in the first chapter here, it is not as a poem, that is, in language, that the being-towards-death comports itself

into and acts against a hostile world, nor could that world impose upon the self any threat if the self somehow objectified in the narrative of even a tragic poem.

Thus whereas Heidegger defines discourse within the binding of speech with hearing in saying that “... just as linguistic utterance is based on discourse, acoustic perception is based on hearing”, (BT 163) our task in demonstrating the disclosive embodiment of Dasein’s fourth structure of care in Greek statuary, just because “discourse is *constitutive* for the being of the there [my italics]”, (BT 165) is to show how the statue as the blueprint for Dasein’s spatiality maintains the connection of itself within itself through discourse, and how the statue maintains the connection of itself through discourse with its preservers.

Regarding the second task, the maintenance of this connection has been investigated by Steiner, who as we have already seen, found the preservers “bound up with sentiments of love and fervent longing (*pothos*) ... exploring the pathology of desire”. Steiner sites Heraclitus’ ridiculing those of his contemporaries who “pray to agalmata as if they were *chattering* with houses”, and sees the preservers’ engagement with the statues as “visual *discussions* of desire”, which “play centrally into some of the larger social and political currents in late sixth and fifth century Greece, where eros ... becomes a matter of public as well as private concern. [my italics]”<sup>69</sup>

Regarding the first task, at first sight the demonstration seems to depend on whether we can confirm that it is the four constitutive factors of discourse which *maintain* the intelligibility of the human body in statuary art. Not yet the *maintenance*, but the *communication* between body parts which leads to intelligibility we already confirmed in the proof of the embodiment in Greek art of the three modes of understanding, where we concluded that *Laokoön’s* body becomes thoroughly transparent in objectifying as the understanding which has obtained the

structure of something as something in order to partake what makes body motility possible so that this body can project itself as a possibility of world action. The confirmation that the communication of body parts is already articulated through the three modes of understanding shows in that if discourse may be *grounded* in understanding, the latter structure must be at least equiprimordial or rather even more primordial in primitive Dasein than the worldly structure of discourse.

And so seems to think Heidegger, who may have said that understanding is *determined* by discourse, and that discourse is *equiprimordial* with understanding, but said also that “discourse and hearing are *grounded* in understanding”, and that “[o]nly he who *already* understands is able to listen [my italics].” (BT 164)

Thus, finally, our task is not to show in terms of Dasein’s embodiment how “discourse is constitutive of Dasein’s being of the there”, but rather how discourse *maintains*, that is, services the preservation of this being already structured in understanding. Our demonstration can begin with answering the question why would Dasein’s structures of the there need maintenance, if they are already thoroughly installed by the understanding. The answer is that maintenance is needed because Dasein is *foundationally* an ecstatic being, to the effect that its existential structures remain perpetually exposed to the possibility of spontaneous transmutation. Something in these shifting structures of the there needs to be preserved, if Dasein is to survive the constant corruption that it prescribes to its foundations.

We recall from our analysis of Dasein’s inceptive disclosure as *Zeus of Artemision*, that we located Dasein’s original ecstasis for the foregrounding of consciousness, our postulation there that Dasein breaks off with tradition at each and every hermeneutic event in the temporalization of temporality since this event is always a rapture with the succession of the

ecstasies. Unlike in Dasein's ontic historiography, where there is an established epiphenomenal succession from past to present to future, itself also in need of historiographical maintenance, in Dasein's fundamental ontological constitution primitive Dasein must remain open to any and every perspective of reinterpretation so *that in this openness and therein alone* the future is not later than the having-been, and the having-been is not earlier than the present. If in Dasein's ecstatic, that is, *kinaesthetic* world-comportment what may at one horizontal interpretation be already established by the understanding remains subject to the constant and infinite possibilities of reinterpretation and recombination, something must be maintained as is or at least as was, so that in this kinaesthesia the being of the there, be that the factual Dasein as body or the factual Dasein as world, moves and changes, and yet remains the same.

Heidegger notes that the maintenance-functioning constitutive factors of discourse are not factual. "These are not properties which can be just empirically snatched from language, but are existential characteristics rooted in the constitution of being of Da-sein which first make something like language ontologically possible." (BT 163) From this idea and from the understanding that *logos* is always *logos tinos*, "any statement is *somebody's* statement", we gather that in looking to find these factors integrated in Dasein's embodiment in world-disclosive sculptic art we should not be interested for their content, which as such would change in each and every hermeneutical ecstasis of the self, but alone of their formal constitution and appearance. The factual content of these existential characteristics as they would appear in *Laokoön*, would be knowledge belonging to the discursive factors of "what is discussed", "what is said as such", "what is communicated", and "what is made known". In our case they would be facts such as that of the priest being attacked by the serpents (as that which is discussed), the details of the attack (as that which is said), the possibility to communicate the narrative (as that

which is communicated), and the possibility that the narrative may be established as knowledge (as that which is made known). And yet we are not interested in this frozen moment of factual knowledge, since if *Laokoön's* body were to start moving this knowledge would change with each and every kinaesthetic interpretation of Dasein's ideational embodiment.

What we are interested in is not *the that* as factual content, but the possibility of *that* it is discussed itself being embodied, *that* it is said being embodied, *that* is communicated being embodied and *that* it is made known being embodied. Usually this formal *that* is not expressed in language, but can be inferred from its having made possible a factual content. Heidegger points to the undeclaredness of the discursive *that* in pointing that: "Discourse is discourse about .... That which discourse is *about* does not necessarily have the character of the theme of a definite statement; in fact, mostly it does not have it." (BT 162) The undeclaredness of the *that* which as Dasein's existential form makes a factual content possible, is more visible when as a background to what is stated it formalizes itself as a certain intonation, modulation, or tempo. (BT 162) But, once again, these formalizations are not helpful as attributes that we may isolate in our quest to identify Dasein's structure of discourse in sculptic art. Thus if the factual content of discourse is too transient to objectify as a prescriptive structure in world-disclosive art, and if the undeclaredness of the *that* is not visible in statuary art being what it is, we are stuck.

However, a breakthrough is possible from a detectable division *within* the function of discourse. A fundamental condition for Dasein's ontological constitution requires both an *ecstatic* but also a *withholding* dwelling for the constitution of the being of the there. These two structures in the fundamental ontological division for the maintenance of Dasein's consciousness, are coined in Husserl's phenomenology, respectively as protention and retention. If there is direct correspondence between, on the one hand the *two* opposing functions buried

single-handedly within the Heideggerian concept of “discourse”, and on the other hand the Husserlian linguistic concepts of protention and retention, then it is *these* latter, purely visible phenomenological objects of the *phainesthai* as “appearing”, not anymore strictly linguistic structures, that may be identifiable as the embodiment of the existential structure of discourse in Dasein’s blueprint as sculptic art.

In discussing the possibility of kinaesthesia as a condition for the world’s objectification, Husserl points out that retention and protention are intentional linguistic modifications without which perception would be impossible. “[T]he object gives itself as ‘there’, originally there, present. But in this presence, as that of an extended and enduring object, lies a continuity of what I am conscious of, what has flowed away and is no longer intuited at all, a continuity of ‘retentions’ - and, in the other direction, a continuity of ‘protentions’.”<sup>70</sup> Husserl shows that the horizontal appearing of the objectified there making itself present as now and as presentation requires the function of these two other structures that remain implicit. Retention is the reenactment of a present which has passed, towards the maintenance of self-identity. Protention is the anticipation towards the maintenance of self-identity of a possibility of world objectification from which arises the ontic meaning of that which is in the future. “[T]he static ‘now’ ... has a horizon with two differently structured sides, known in intentional language as a continuum of retentions and protentions. These first prefigurations of temporalization and time, however, remain in the background”, writes Husserl.<sup>71</sup>

We began by explicating Heidegger's idea that discourse provides Dasein with the *maintenance* of its attunement and understanding. Our subsequent difficulty to locate the embodiment of discourse as the last existential structure of care in Dasein’s spatial constitution, surfaced in the realization that neither the factual content of discourse nor its formal structure



could appear in Dasein's idealized embodiment as statuary art. This is because the former content pertains to *existentiell* modifications and is thus disqualified from the embodiment of fundamental ontological structures, while the latter structure is indistinguishable from primitive Dasein's existential structures of understanding and attunement, appearing therein not as itself, being the embodiment of *discourse*, but as that which it maintains. Aided by Husserl's analysis, where the concepts of retention and protention are still accounted for in terms of linguistic discourse, our unburying the binary function of linguistic discourse in its ecstatic and withholding modifications bestows to the Heideggerian concept of discourse the visibility to appear in world-disclosive statuary as a fundamental ontological structure of the embodiment of the they-self.

The withheld ecstasis does not initially reveal the retentive structure of discourse; it only exposes Dasein's dwelling as *a-letheia* in the world's denied absolute productivity. But the world's denied absolute productivity as a futural determination is in the last analysis related to the withholding of a present that has passed and may be reenacted. Originally the withheld ecstasis pertains to Dasein's being as *a-letheia* in the world's lack of absolute productivity. To reach the retentive structure in language, we need to look in what Husserl says about the retrieval of the past as a necessity for the maintenance of self-identity. Whereas for Heidegger discourse simply maintains the intelligibility of the there, Husserl's deeper analysis at this point shows how this maintenance of intelligibility supports self-identity through the recollection of a continuity of presents themselves being withheld world determinations that lie in the past. So writes Husserl in *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*:

[T]his 'retention' disappears, but the 'disappeared' passing and being past has not become nothing for the subject in question: it can be reawakened. ... if the originally self-evident production, as the pure fulfillment of its intention, is what is renewed (recollected), there

necessarily occurs, accompanying the active recollection of what is past, an activity of concurrent actual production, and there arises thereby, in original ‘coincidence’, the self-evidence of identity; what has now been realized in original fashion is the same as what was previous self-evident.<sup>72</sup>

Husserl gives us the step for the necessary descent from the world to the self, of how the retentive function of discourse, being the fundamental ontological withholding of the absolute intelligibility of nature as a world interpretation for the they, trickles down into piecemeal retentions for the possibility of the objective, that is, physical, self-interpretation of the self. It is only from this point that Dasein can examine *Laokoön*’s body as its own, and as the ideal body of the they-self, and see how discourse - comprised by actually *two* functions buried within Heidegger’s last existential structure of care - is disclosed as a maintaining factor of both body and world.

Heidegger unwittingly bundles up both the ecstatic and the preservative functions of discourse into one existential structure, which is inscrutable in terms of Dasein’s embodiment in art. The bundling up is apparent when some passages of Heidegger’s analysis bring up the ecstatic function, while some others assume only the preservative. So it is the ecstatic function that gathers Dasein’s world which is referred to when Heidegger writes that discourse as the attuned articulation of intelligibility, “brings about the ‘sharing’ of being attuned together and of the understanding of being-with. ... Being-with is ‘explicitly’ *shared* in discourse, that is, it already *is*, only unshared as something not grasped and appropriated.” (BT 162) But it is the self-determination of the preservative, withholding function which is referred to when Heidegger understands that something must be maintained, that is, momentarily held back as the form of an “if - ...”, so that a “... - then” may be gained in discourse through circumspective deliberation. This conditional form requires this maintenance of a previous articulation of the attuned intelligibility of the there. The Polycleitus Canon is the primordial embodiment of the

conditional as a rule of inference being the enabling function of pre-understanding that must be deliberated in preservative discourse. Writes Heidegger: “We call the specific bringing near of what is taken care of by interpreting it circumspectly *deliberation*. The schema peculiar to it is ‘if-then’: If this or that is to be produced, put into use, or prevented, for example, then we need these or those means, ways, circumstances, or opportunities.” (BT 359)

We determine at this point that our task is to show how the statue, being the blueprint for Dasein’s spatiality, maintains the connection of itself with itself within itself through the ecstatic and the retentive functions of discourse. Since both the factual content and the formal structure of discourse pertain to modifications that are either not fundamental ontological prescriptions or they cannot appear distinguishably as the fundamental ontological prescriptions that they are, and since the binary function of discourse translates to the protentive and the retentive articulation of the attuned intelligibility of spatial expansion which maintains the self identity of a body, discourse must have ideally *em-bodied* itself in terms of protention and retention.

The discursive body is the body which arrives to its world task having retained its own past physiognomic experience so that this experience can be reenacted in anticipation of the body’s summoning the objectification of its own physiognomic future in the kinaesthesia demanded by the task. More precisely, the discursive body is the incarnation of the primordial conditional as a basic rule of inference, and a proof of Heidegger’s argument against Descartes of the instrumentalization of logical thought by the higher primordially of the intuition of finitude, where the “if - ...” is retained as past experience so that the “... – then” can be protended to anticipate a kinaesthetic, threatened future.

Discourse being one of the four *ecstatic* structures of care, and since for Heidegger the world’s history is reenacted afresh in every ecstatic world interpretation and the historiographical

disclosure of what may become the subject of history temporalizes itself out of Dasein's futural concerns so that the past is not fixed and immutable, then *both* the substructures of discourse must be ecstatic. For not only the protention into prospect embodying objectifications, but even the retention of physiognomic experience requires an ecstasis attuned to an intelligible recollection of only that past physiognomic experience which is germane to each specific kinaesthetic task towards the possibility of a future. Since discourse is the articulation of the *attuned* intelligibility of the there, only those kinaesthetic tasks can be anticipated which can be idiosyncratically afforded by the body's own perceptual history having objectified as subjective fitness, since the attuned body is, by means of the third and most worldly mode of attunement, the body which has attained its own fitness by having been-*there-with*.

The conditional is the primordial articulation of formal discourse, and the hypothetical syllogism as a compound conditional is the expansive possibility of an ever more complex articulation involving all the other applicable rules of logical inference. This ever more complex articulation must be maintained by discourse as an existential structure of care in a body the kinaesthesia of which "naturalizes", that is objectifies and substantiates, the body, by keeping it *intelligibly* dependent on the intercourse of the resolving rules of inference.

The hypothetical syllogism summons the body to its spatial presence as a now and as a presentation incarnating the authentic There. This is because *hypo+thesis* (for "hypothetical") objectifies the thetic sub-stantiation of the situated I-posit out of which signification ensues from what has become significant for the being-towards-death, while *syn+logos* (for "syllogism") gathers and maintains the inferential heedfulness of the being-towards-death as the being-there-with. These rational properties of the discursive body as a fundamental ontological disclosure, are, only now, visible in some statuary art and absent in other.

Regarding the retentive ecstasis, our comparative hermeneutics already exposed how it is only *Laokoön's* body that displays this ecstasis, but not that of the *kouros*. In closely examining the statues' knees, we observed that the *kouros's* knee is a non-region, constituted by physical objectifications that are irrelevant, lacking, or counterproductive to a “*knee's*” world task. The *kouros's* knee, as his entire body, is not discursive, because it does not retain into a regionalized body-space any physiognomic experience attuned to an intelligible recollection that is germane to a specific kinaesthetic task. A knee cup that resembles rather a mustache and a tibia bone that starts from the knee and projects itself out of the lower leg cannot summon the objectification of a physiognomic future in the kinaesthesia of the self. This knee cannot possibly act upon the world of the being-towards-death, for one reason because it cannot recall its being objectified through being-there-with with past attuned physiognomic comportments. What discourse there may be between each and every part of this knee does not discover what is factually possible in a kinaesthetic summoning between parts where each part is a being with other parts as a being-with-the-they. Nor does this *kouros* knee as a whole outside of itself shows any evidence that it has formed itself in a resolute heedfulness, that is, attunement, in being-with-the-they in the world as a whole. The most that *we* as Dasein can say about the discursive objectification of this world-disclosive knee, is that it does not belong to the body of the being-towards-death, and that its recognition as a “knee” owes rather to Dasein's ecstatic foregrounding, which just because objects will be either bestowed with meaning or will not appear, reaches out and makes its own even what is not.

Contrarily, *Laokoön's* knee, as his entire body, maintains the self-identity of the priest's body in having ecstatically reenacted *its own* past attunements of physiognomic experience as an objectified body part towards *this* mode of assail by *these* serpents. The conditional rule of

inference objectifies into a body through a concatenation of physiognomic modifications such as that: “*if* the serpent attacks from this or that direction, *then* these or those muscles alone must move this or that part of the priest’s body, so that if ... then ...”, and so on. When Heidegger writes that “*if* this or that is to be produced, put into use, or prevented ... *then* we need these of those means [my italics]”, he points to Dasein’s deliberations which employ the substructures of retention and protention of such a discursive knee and such a discursive body.

The embodiment of the discursive conditional objectifies the retention of past physiognomic experience and the protention of this experience into anticipating the maintenance of self-identity as a possibility of Dasein’s future existence. The embodiment of the conditional entails the assumption of *a subjective* fitness, that is, an uncertain eligibility summoned from past instantiations of entanglement into being-there-with-the-they towards the merely possible and merely ephemeral escape of one’s *own* demise. “And to what is one summoned? To one’s *own self*”, notes Heidegger. (BT 273) Since at both the fundamental ontological and the factual level death can be experienced only as one’s own death - the they never dies - in the conditional ecstasis which objectifies the body, the self is detached from the they: “Because only the *self* of the they-self is summoned and made to hear, the *they* collapses”, writes Heidegger. (BT 273) We observe the monumental disclosure of this detachment from the they in the priest’s body objectified exclusively in its preoccupation of being-there-with primarily with the serpents rather than with the bodies of the sons, although aside from their detached objectifications as selves, all three bodies are bind in their facing the common fate of humanity.

We compare how the priest’s body objectifies through this discursive detachment, also with the objectification of the bodies in the comparable work of multiple figures in the *Gigantomachy*. [Figure 12] In this late Archaic deep relief where the figures almost stand out in

the open, the bodies incarnate the privative definition of fitness, from which we may infer that in the world disclosed to its preservers by this art, the death of the fallen soldier is not the death of one's own. The striking appearance of the soldier moving into the center of the scene from the left with his head turned impossibly backwards, objectifies none of the four existential structures of care, nor does it ground these structures in the incarnation of primordial temporality disguised as muscular narrative. The soldier's chest and abdomen, in which the pectoral muscles are entirely missing and the abdominal ones are rendered as an unrealistic pattern, are also impossibly twisted sideways a full 90 degrees to face us, while the torso and the legs continue their stride straightforward. And there are no body parts on either level above and below of the soldier's belt to objectify themselves as the articulation of the attuned intelligibility of the there



Figure 12: *Gigantomachy*, Greece, last quarter of sixth century BC

in circumspective resolution of threat and task, so that these parts would connect what body is above to what body is below the belt. The same inexistentiality is disclosed and marks the relation between the impossibly turned head and the statue's neck. None of the multiple discursive deliberations that should have been summoned into skeletomuscular modifications by such an impossible torsion are there to provide the continuity of the upper to the lower body. To render these skeletomuscular modifications at the discursive level, this body would need to unleash and objectify the multiplicity of conditionals compacted into hypothetical syllogisms and all the other pertinent rules of inference that determine Dasein's body as spatial expansion. The attunement to threat and task would *de-liberate* each and every circumspective if-this-then-that of situational physiognomy, arriving protentively to the task as the reenactment of past physiognomy into subjective fitness.

The presence of objective fitness is evidence to that the fundamental ontological impulse made manifest as this body has not *understood* death. Heidegger's dictum that reality is resistance the experience of which is possible only on the basis of the disclosedness of world, suggests that this idealization of body does not even have a "world", and its placement by naturalists and art historians within the history of the world, owes to Dasein's gratuitous impulse to make its own what is actually not. In our explication of Dasein's embodiment of understanding, a body which understands death arrives to the self-interpreting kinaesthetic event negatively determinate and positively indeterminate, these determinations in understanding themselves being equiprimordially determined by discourse respectively as retention and protention. This binary function through which death is understood has to be deliberated by the binary substructures of discourse. In the lack of this deliberation the monumental discontinuity between body parts supports the factual impression that the head and the chest of the archaic



soldier, as well as the upper and the lower body divided by the belt, could have been rendered separately and even in entirely different contexts and just placed on top of one another. None of the communal modifications by understanding are there to begin with, so that they could be expressed and maintained by discourse. In fundamental ontological terms this art could not have disclosed the being-thereness of the self, this is not *Dasein's world*, since the parts that constitute this body do not *necessarily* belong to one another into one retentive and protentive consciousness.

The same privation for the possibility of the embodiment of self-identity is divulged by the objectification of the central figure's advancing left leg. Here the continuous arching striation which tries to be both a femoral muscle and a tibial bone is thusly neither, and the ensuing lack of intelligibility owes to the failure of this objectification to regionalize itself as the receptacle of meaning shaping itself in an attuned receptivity. This leg is truly alien to *Dasein's world*, because it is not objectified as a "being-*there*", where a recognition of threat and task afforded by the subject's physiognomic history would summon it. The leg's non-understood, unattuned, unthrown, and undiscursive constitution is not an articulation of body parts being-with-one-another understandingly; this articulation does not objectify the sharing of being attuned together and the understanding of being-there-with. Hence it is only through *Dasein's* gratuitous temporal foregrounding that this phenomenological objectification is recognized as a "leg".

What makes the two disclosed worlds incommensurable, is the harnessing in post-Archaic Greek statuary of "previously" squandered erotic impulse. The embodiment of primordial temporality and of the structures of care is a psychological expenditure accompanied by a certain "positive pathology", where the embodied demand for control from the embodiment of fear causes a bio-cultural endocrinological permutation, the speeding up of the body's

metabolism. The central figure in the *Laokoön Group* is a better athlete than the central figure in the *Gigantomachy*, and so is *Zeus* compared to the *kouros*. *Laokoön's* hypodermic fat has been sweated out, the body's weight-per-volume ratio is observably reduced by a great degree, and a thinner skin wraps around muscle clusters and supportive skeletal structures in the most efficient compactness. Much finer causal relations define the embodied spatiality reckoned as abdomen, chest, legs and arms. What we have here appearing as efficiency and performance, is a profound embodied repression of libidinal forces, where Apollo as sky harnesses Dionysian earth.

To our naive outlook the robust physicality of the bodies in the *Gigantomachy* appears as the objectification of fitness. Thick and bulging limbs, trim trunks, and a regimented kinesiology engaged in combative gesture all suggest monumental fitness. But if Heidegger is right to have seen that art no less than discloses a world, and if the being of a being manifests in the ecstasis of the subjective concern of that being for its own being, then the objective fitness evincing everywhere in Greek Archaic and every other comparable world art, is the privative definition of fitness as the absence of pathology. Heidegger's *existential* analysis of primordial temporality and of the ecstatic structures of care imply that in order to have lived, the body must first be free to die. Freedom to one's own death requires a body that is *subjectively* constituted, that is, discursively *de-liberated* to sustain the retention of its own past physiognomic experience and the protention of *this* experience as a *mere possibility and an ultimate impossibility* for future existence. None of these conditions for the interdependent constitution of life and death, as postulated in this chapter, objectify as art in Greek Archaic statuary, and arguably in any other comparable world art.

In Dasein's world beings objectify either in their what-for-thingliness *for* the being-towards-death, or/and in their *aes-thetic* self-awareness *as* the being-towards-death. These two

qualifications alone determine that since the beings which make themselves manifest as a world-disclosive embodiment in the *Gigantomachy* are not *aes-thetically* self-aware, their objectification owes to their historical signification constituting their what-for-thingliness in the temporalization of temporality by the being whose being is *aes-thetic*, that is, *situated*, because its own being has become an issue. It is no other than this embodied *un-aes-thetic* world-disclosure of the *a-schemon*, which makes the central figure in the *Gigantomachy* appear “ugly” in comparison with the schematized “beauty” of the central figure of the *Laokoön Group*.

### ***Endnotes***

70. Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, p. 160.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 169.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 359-360.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### CONCLUSION

#### *7.1 The Embodiment of Primitive Dasein as Greek Art: A Glimpse of the Invisible*

A summary of Heidegger's metaphysics reduced to the axioms of his fundamental ontology disclosed as Greek art is finally in order. This will be an applicable conclusion from which to launch future phenomenological projects based on our critical elucidation regarding the recovery of the question of being. Issues within philosophy such as Heidegger's defensibility from feminist critique or against his philosophy as mere product of his Nazi affiliation can be informed by our novel junction between theory of perception, theory of embodiment, and theory of art; this new light should radically change our larger-scope views regarding the world's buried and unconfessed origin, the obviation of the persisting schism between nature and culture, the origin of Western metaphysics, the essential clash between Greece and Judeo-Christianity within the purview of Western civilization, or the culture and identity wars and academic feuds from Afrocentrism and Vindicationism against the Greeks.

Our comprehensive hermeneutics allows a conclusive isolation and reassembling as a transcendental totality the world-determining primitive Dasein. In the reduction of the following schematism, where in Heidegger's three levels of inquiry the structures of care are grounded in corresponding levels of manifestation of primordial temporality, primitive Dasein appears in italics.

Table 1: Schema

Level of Inquiry	<u>Horizontal Temporality</u>	<u>Structures of Care</u>			
		Understanding	Attunement	Entanglement	Discourse
Ontic:	Freeing Body	Existentiell	Being-there-with	Fearsome	Factual Content
Ontological:	Muscle	Existential	Thrownness	Fearing	Formal Structure
Fund. Ontological:	<i>Tragic Body</i>	<i>Pre-Understanding</i>	<i>Angst</i>	<i>Fearful</i>	<i>Retention-Protection</i>

The pre-existential and pre-*existentiell* structures of care that we see in italics in the above schema, speculated in Heidegger’s philosophy and elusive if not entirely inscrutable in other forms of monumental art, yet perfectly visible exclusively in Greek statuary, are as primordial and prescriptive as is the horizontal temporality in which they are themselves grounded. The transcendental unity of the they-self composed by the fourfold biases of primitive Dasein, their grounding in horizontal temporality, and all that grounded in primordial angst, is the ultimate reduction to the origins of reality in Western metaphysics. This unity “is” *that* invisible ultimate cause which Heidegger alludes to in pointing out that the being of a being is not itself a (sensible) being, since the appearance of each and every world-being absolutely depends on whether that world-being’s what-for-thingliness has been recognized by the underlying and unseen primordial unity of primitive Dasein.

It is this invisible determination, the *proton kinoun aetion*, which we find concealed behind the otherwise trivial etymological sedimentation of the words “*theory*” and “*theos*”. Prior to our glimpse of primitive Dasein, *theo-ry* remained critically unrelated to *Theo-s*. In *Laokoön* the *theates* as the *theater*-going tragic being, *theory* as world-view, and *Theos* as world-creator are as intuitively as conclusively shown, to be the one and the same existential equiprimordiality that renders Dasein’s world’s dogged reification and religionization mere alienating epiphenomena.

To profile Dasein as a being that is not itself a being, we can imagine a quasimodal unity forged by primordial temporality to precipitate into the primordial structures of Reason, breaking through the doors of perception. In our case, however - and the contrasting comparison makes the case - primitive Dasein is not a vague intuition begging a swarm of epistemological questions, nor is it a causal essence nowhere to be found objectified prior to its phenomenal appearance. Primitive Dasein is both definable in the condensing fourfold structures of care and their traceable grounding in finite temporality and angst, *and* perfectly visible in disclosive Greek statuary, albeit unnoticed in its lying so close to us as to have assembled the ideality of our own body. *The momentous difference between previous systems of inferring the origin of reality and Heidegger's metaphysics being corroborated by Greek art, is that now for the first time we can observe in the Western embodiment a first cause, which while absolutely tautologous and inalienable to what is human, it nonetheless does not appear amongst phenomena, itself being only the possibility of appearances.* The embodied objectification of primitive Dasein allows us to profile that first cause as that intimate immanency, without reliance to the defunct causal, cosmological, teleological, and ontological arguments, in order to infer the possibility of a first cause, accordingly from the world's motion, from the world's precedence, from its order, or from that first cause's essence. In the Western embodiment, primitive Dasein is fully visible, describable and intuitively comprehensible.

Fearful at its core, and under the unremitting existential pressure for the gathering from the intuition of finite temporality, pre-understanding is tripped through Angst for the loss of world into abandoning the site of patterns of inauthenticity - this may be what Heidegger's cryptic quoting of Hölderlin means in: "that which dwells near its origin abandons the site" (*Origin*, 203) - and through circumspective resoluteness ventures back and forth between the whole

and the parts of its looming circumstantial concerns. In this oscillating venture to summon and gather, primitive Dasein de-distances and trans-*verses* into intelligibility the cognitive expansions that draft and make manifest the object of perception, because the thing-at-hand which is about to be explicitly understood through the trans-*versal*, for the first time obtains the structure of something as something in its what-for-thingliness.

The “versing” part of our own introduced parallel concept of the trans-*versal* contains what is missing from Heidegger’s otherwise evocative coinage of “de-distancing”, since de-distancing alone reveals the itinerant mode of the reification of the object of perception in the finite temporal horizon, but does not describe how in the process of de-distancing *the distance itself in between any two points of reference* obtains the structure of something as something. This unacknowledged function becomes intelligible in the “trans-*versal*”, since this concept contains both the ecstatic transition in between itinerant iterations of reification where the object is made present, but also the intuition that the hollow distances in between objects - for Heidegger space is an illusion - obtain substance in their discursive acknowledgment, having become “versed”. Even if the fugitive pre-understanding encounters no object of perception worthy of reckoning by its own circumstantial concerns, and even if the patterns of inauthenticity where from the pre-understanding is fleeing provide no signifiable grounds of self-realization, circumspective resoluteness credits that absolute empty space with quantifiability so that it is understood in its what-for-thingliness as a formal container towards a totality of relevance.

The four modalities of primitive Dasein’s spatial expansion into obtaining *a world*, remain elusive; instead of observing the pre-understanding, the torsional fleeing of consciousness from itself, the circumspective resoluteness, and the discursive retention and protention, we are immediately aware only of the world objects reified by the productive co-ordination of these

primordial modalities. In the Greek statue, however, where Dasein's disclosive productivity is scaled down into obtaining *a body* to act upon its world, these modalities are perfectly observable as a blueprint at work. To outline *primitive* Dasein's profile is to observe it independently of its perceptual productivity, to track down the being of a being which is not itself a being working beneath the reified componentry that we ontologically and ontically recognize as the human body. Observing Dasein at this level of disclosure entirely demystifies the monumentality of Greek art: understanding the embodiment of *primitive* Dasein for what it is.

In *Laokoön* the pre-understanding is observable as that totality of relevance which necessarily precedes the interpretive (ontological) and the factual (ontic) understandings of body parts in their efficient what-for-thingliness. Being pre-understood, each and every body part is *freed* to hearken and heed the imminent con-figuration of each and every other part of the body, so that it may commensurately affect and contribute to the con-figuration of all other parts, so that it is itself as well thusly con-figured. The primitive cause of the pre-understanding is not as tangible an affectation as are the rendering productions of the interpretive and of the factual understandings, and yet Greek statuary reveals that without it the production of intelligible kinaesthetic definitions such as those that must precipitate in the summoning of a body's componentry to counter-affect a threatening world, is impossible.

The grounding of the pre-understanding in *primordial*, finite temporality, as Heidegger wants it, is also demonstrable in Dasein's disclosive embodiment, from the intelligibility that the freeing of body parts to the disposal of circumspective heedfulness can have no other cause than the Angst for the impending loss of world in the priest's fighting the serpents. Just as Heidegger suggests, *Laokoön* authenticates that *only primitive* Dasein, that is, the pre-understanding alone,



is grounded in primordial temporality, since the less primitive, worldly interpretive and the factual understandings produce body parts as phenomenological structures that belong accordingly to cultural (ontological) and scientific (ontic) dominions, themselves subjects only to *infinite* temporality.

The proof of the grounding of the pre-understanding in primordial temporality suggests that primitive Dasein is a *metaphysical* first cause of world disclosure which, whereas it underlies and determines perception, it nevertheless *does* appear to perception, provided that we know where to look for it. Heidegger's brief art theory lead us almost to it, but his metaphysics is authenticated only by Greek *sculpture*. To further inform under this elucidation Heidegger's axiom that "the being of a being is not itself a being", we can say that primitive Dasein *is* an observable being in Greek art, though it is not *itself* a being.

The primordially of Dasein's second structure of care is even easier to discern in Greek art than the pre-understanding, since there is no worldly pressure for the body to torsion and flee itself from within, as it is clearly observable in the *contraposto*. In *Laokoön's* body the dramatic breaking into a multiple axial refraction can be attributed to have been triggered from without, from the imminent worldly concern of the serpent's striking from the left. But in less world-affected and equally monumental post-Achaic works such as the aforementioned *Doryphoros* the *Diadoumenos*, and the *Warrior of Riace*, where, as Winckelmann reckoned the *contraposto* ensues as if "all artists were playing the same violin", and where the body stands alone and relaxed, the pattern is as unmistakable as it is otherwise inexplicable.

In *Laokoön*, *Angst*, as the most primordial mood of attunement, is overlaid by Dasein's equally primordial dwelling into the torsional fleeing, as well as by the two subsequent worldly modes of attunement, thrownness and being-there-with, disclosing accordingly the possible and

the definite threat. Heidegger concedes that pure Angst is rare, but we do see pure Angst prioritized by Dasein's datability to the emptied gaze of the *Blond Boy*, which in Dasein's interpretive datability promptly precedes *Laokoön*.

The prescriptive pre-worldliness of fearful Dasein is suggested by its observable dwelling into a flight *from itself*, prior to the worldly concerns of being-there-with between the fearing and the fearsome. Since the Nothing is the origin of negation, whereupon Dasein negates the this-and-that which denies its will to live, the emptying of world that we observe in the radical adjustments of Dasein's embodiment from the Archaic to the Classical style is the metaphysical condition for the freeing by the pre-understanding of the world's what-for-thingliness, so that beings may present themselves in a totality of relevance. The pre-understanding, equiprimordial as it is with the pre-worldly mode of attunement, needs that mode, which is circumspective heedfulness, to trigger its inherent dormancy into encountering the world as a world that resists and therefore matters and has to be at first hand perceptually resolved before it can be physically encountered. We saw in chapter 5 how at this world-prescriptive stage Dasein is delivered over to its being by turning away from itself as it recognizes itself as *fearful*, finding itself already in a flight from nothing yet in particular.

Besides Heidegger's dictum that attunement is *equiprimordial* with pre-understanding, because pre-understanding is always attuned, the grounding of attunement in finite and therefore horizontal - that is, *transcendental* - temporality is indicated by the attunement's disclosing Dasein's still *indefinite* resistance. Prior to the embodied recognition of worldly resistance in throwness and being-there-with, which are phenomenologically structured by the body's ontological and ontic configurations, the contrapostal stance at the body's core divulges the recognition of a resistance between two opposing forces determining that the body *must be*

subsequently configured ontologically and ontically. This evasive stance is primitive Dasein's turning away from itself in having recognized its potentiality as a mere *finite* being.

In the third existential structure of care, of entanglement or falling prey, *primitive* Dasein discloses the fourfold possibility of the world's natural history, a manifold possibility ultimately grounded in horizontal temporality. Entanglement is primarily rooted in the present, as worldly Dasein makes present of the Moment, but what is de-distanced, regionalized, and reified, is ultimately grounded in horizontal, that is, finite temporality, because in the last analysis what is made present objectifies strictly in its what-for-thingliness for the sake of the being whose being is not itself a being. At its most primitive and disclosive mode, entanglement determines that the world objectifies only for the being-towards-death. The condition for the intelligibility and therefore of the objectification of the ever-effusing and evolving biotic and pre-biotic structures between the fearing and the fearsome, which constitute Dasein's natural world, is the situated, fearful Dasein, itself invisible to the scientific project but detectable by our mediating philosophical inquiry in the phenomenological disclosures of monumental art.

Accordingly, in the *Laokoön Group*, behind Dasein's structures of factual dwelling, the ontological and ontic determinations respectively of the work as myth and of the work as the natural objects that assemble and contextualize it, we can observe the prescriptive mode of the authentic There making present truth as untruth. The prescriptive mode of the objectification is fourfold, because as we saw earlier with Heidegger's compact formulation (*BT* 181) the manifold brings together Dasein's average everydayness in the structures of: (a) being entangled in the world, (b) being's ownmost potentiality of being together with the world, (c) being's ownmost potentiality in being-with with others, and (d) being's ownmost potentiality of being.

In the share of the fourfold where truth as untruth makes present *being's ownmost potentiality of being*, the priest's body flees the convention of the they by shedding its clothes, so that this body can bring to presence its imminent physiognomic competence as a mere *potentiality* apart from the idle certainty of the they which never dies. Primitive Dasein's entangled embodiment is disclosed both in the irreverence of the priest's nudity, and inasmuch as this body has so fallen prey as to have engendered itself from having *physiognomically* understood its predicament in encountering the fearsome. In the share of the fourfold where truth as untruth makes present Dasein's *being entangled in the world*, what is Dasein entangled to, i.e., *the world*, is made present as the authentic There being the itinerant circumspective resolution that objectifies the eidetic suchness or the what-for-thingliness of the fearsome for the being-towards-death, that is, for the being whose being is not itself a being. The *entanglement* is structured by the prescription that since the world is of that being's own making under the circumstantial summoning of horizontal temporality, that being cannot avoid being involved in the implications of its own ongoing world-project. *Primitive* Dasein is clearly seen in the comparison of alternative art-world disclosures: whereas the Archaic body remains unfazed at its interface with the world (*our* world, of the transhistorical observer's historical consciousness), *Laokoön's* toes are curling in circumspective heedfulness and circumspective resoluteness around the edging of the earth, thusly bringing forth the eidetic suchness of the earth to presence. And in the authentic Moment of the priest's left hand, the fearing anticipates and thus forges the shape of the fearsome. In this presence the fearful discloses *its ownmost potentiality of being together with the world*. Last, the share of the fourfold where the *Group* discloses the primitive structure of *being's ownmost potentiality in being-with with others*, that authentic There is made present as a common and inextricable destiny between self and world. At the ontic level this

disclosure makes present the phenomenon that the entanglement involves other natural bodies and world objects; at the ontological level the still worldly Dasein presents that all entangled natural bodies and world objects belong to beings which are themselves subject to decay; and at the fundamental ontological level, primitive Dasein preordains that the ownmost potentiality of being-with with others is for oneself to remain subject to decay, that is, to remain true as untrue for one's own interest and at the discretion of the other natural bodies and world objects with which this being is being-with.

In all the four structures of falling prey, in all the basic structures of Dasein as background that constitute the *Mitda-sein*, behind the ontic and the ontological dwellings of the fearing and the fearsome Greek art shows that we always run into the fearful, primitive Dasein, that for the sake of which the authentic There is made present in the fourfold entanglement. The infinite open-endedness of Western metaphysics, arguably unaccountable by substance ontology, is possible only because all the structures of primitive Dasein that we met with in Greek art, are intelligible only as existential, that is, ecstatic and horizontal phenomenological structures, to the effect that they instigate raptures from the Dasein that has-been-there and *situationally* reconstitute and reify the Moment throughout the entirety of the manifold of the fourfold entanglement. In the last analysis, all reality, all objectification, and all the ever-expanding situational minutia that transmogrify significance into existence in the entanglement of worldly Dasein, is solely due to the human investment, the capital of which is stored in the structures of primitive Dasein and disclosed in the monumentality of Greek art.

Discourse is the most worldly and least primitive of Dasein's ecstatic structures of care, and yet behind the ontic and the ontological structures of discourse once again we find primitive Dasein at work. The *factual* content and the *formal* structure of the attuned intelligibility of the

there may enunciate *what* is articulated and *that* it is articulated, respectively, but the constitutive structures of *the maintenance* of the attuned intelligibility of the there are themselves pre-ontic and pre-ontological. The fundamental ontological structure of discourse is the conditional rule of inference “if ... , then ...”, where the interdependent oscillation between retaining the antecedent and protenting the consequent makes discourse possible. The maintenance of the attuned intelligibility of the there towards the preservation and further employment of the formative experience that has already been structured in the understanding against the constant and spontaneous raptures of the ecstatic being to both its future and past, is possible only because something may be retained (*dis-currere*) while something may be sought-after-together (*syn-zetesis*).

The ontic content of the structure of discourse in the *Group* pertains to *what* is intelligibly articulated and made known by the physical presence of the figures and the world objects involved, namely who is attacked by whom, where, how and when and the reasons why. The ontological manifestation of discourse pertains to *that* there is a language, in the case of the *Group* a physical, body language. This physical language makes intelligible the spatial articulation of the there, expressed in the sustained, subjective kinaesthesia of bodies through which this narrative of significance and resistance is possible in the first place. Both the ontic and the ontological possibilities of the attuned intelligibility of the there are absolutely dependent on the fundamental ontological structures of discourse, the retentive and protentive existentials, without which neither the *what* the bodies are doing, nor *that* there are bodies, could be maintained into a kinaesthetic identity.

In the *Group*, these existentials of primitive Dasein are most visible in the body of the priest, for this is the one body in the *Group* that not merely is subject to death, as are the other

involved living bodies of man and animal in Dasein's intelligibility, but in its human aging has through and through *understood* death. The embodiment of the conditional of discourse "if ..., then ...", and the hypothetical syllogism as an infinitely compound conditional along with all the other applicable rules of logical inference, lie behind and make possible each and every ontological and ontic manifestation of this body. The there where Dasein has-been-with may have for ever passed away, but at least the more recent events of the concatenation of existential situations which once brought it into presence are sedimented into a physiognomy of potentiality and remain readily available for the enactment of the body's kinaesthesia. The "if ..." part of the conditional can somehow be *ecstatically*, that is discretionarily, reenacted by horizontal temporality as the incarnation of *Logos* to summon the body into the kinaesthesia of life and the freedom to die.

In order to pretend its possibilities to exist in the future, and in order to remain free to die, this body must retain its own past physiognomic experience (the antecedent of every possible kinaesthetic instantiation "if ..., "), in such a way that in the given circumstance the ongoing kinaesthetic modifications between the retentive and the protentive (the consequent of the kinaesthetic instantiation " then ...") the topo-graphic ecstasies are fully diadristic. The priest's body that has-been-there-with (the body's past), determines through its retained physical potentiality whether this body may have a future, but simultaneously so that the pretended future of this attuned body determines *which* maintained events of the body's retained physiognomic experience may be reenacted in being applicable to the circumstance which is thusly made spatially present. That the body itself exists (ontologically) and that the body exists in this or that action (ontically), both these subjective determinations are absolutely prescribed by primitive Dasein's phenomenological structures of the attuned intelligibility of the there, respectively

inasmuch as existence has precipitated out of situational significance, and inasmuch as any motion and every action is ultimately accountable by and for the being-towards-death. Through its pressing imminence, its godly immanence, and its utter intimacy to the human lot, *Laokoön's* monumental body as Dasein's blueprint of spatiality discloses that neither the *res extensa's* factual content nor its formal structure are possible apart from the binary function of primitive Dasein's fourth ecstatic structure of care.

In this brief yet comprehensive account of primitive Dasein, the monumentality of the *Group* which mystified art historians emerges inconspicuously due to its disclosure of fundamental ontological structures, out of which spatiality and reification ensues as follows: *primordial angst empties, horizontal temporality summons, pre-understanding gathers, attunement resolves, entanglement presents, discourse maintains.*

### ***7.2. Laokoön's Body as the Origin of All Subjectivity***

Our conclusion is the proof we have provided that the essential prescriptions for the possibility of any subjectivity are themselves, *and themselves alone*, constitutive of that body for which the world as such objectifies. And since our body is ontologically understood to be made of the very same substance that all the other world bodies and objects are made, this is a rigorous proof of the radical affinity between mind, body and world, inasmuch as it seeks to demonstrate no less than that *the structures which manifest as the operational blueprint for the constitution of the human body are by necessity the very same structures through which the world is interpreted and therefore constituted.* It is from these grounds of certainty that we may launch the reconciliation of the schism between nature and culture through the recovery of the question of being. The embodiment of the conditions of subjectivity through which the world is thoroughly interpreted beyond its biotic history as an epigenetic inheritance, lie too close for us to be easily



recognized for what they are. Realist theories of embodiment cannot see the human body other than as the object of an investigation by science. But the body in science is not *my* body.

When I take assertive action in the world, say when I kick-start my motorcycle to begin my workday, it is not my stomach which is hungry, my brain's frontal lobe figuring out that I must go earn a wage, or my leg that pushes down the kick-starter; I am not all these quantifiable things that get together to send me to work. It is that other peculiar object, *my* body, with which I identify. My body is peculiar, in that unlike the aggregate thingliness of *things* that make it, like my stomach, my brain, or my muscles, this body has no specific instrumental function other than to equilaterally conform and consummately fit as a wedge in between my thoughts and my world. It is this equidistancy which makes my body recognizable in the bathroom mirror as I'm getting ready for work. Was I to look in the mirror and all I saw were the thingly components whereupon my self is supposedly neurodynamically embrained or prenoetically embodied, that is, my slimy gastrointestinal apparatus, my brain's gray convolutions, strings of bright red muscle fiber and stretches of epidermis covering up all that mess, I would have great difficulty to identify with such objects, if not outright terrified. The body that I recognize as myself acting in the world, the body that "stores the self", to remain within empiricist grounds, and to which my world-task comportment proprioceptively belongs, is the structured expediency which exactly lies and entirely occupies the region *in between* my mind and my world. In this sense, any parts of my body that inhere on *this* side of the boundary frontier between my body and my world, (world objects such as my stomach, brain, muscles, bones, skin, etc.), are no less alien to who *I* am than those world objects which inhere on *that* side of my body (world objects such as my laptop, coffee cup, desk lamp, etc.) In fact my brain is even more alien to me than my coffee cup, because the bare sight of it would force me into wondering "how can my thinking be coming out

of this bloody mess?”, a question entirely unprovoked by the more familiar and comforting coffee cup, which bears my university’s insignia.

But how is the ideal body in someone’s mirror, and that world object alone, the body for which the world objectifies on either side of this body’s boundary frontiers? *If the world’s objectivity is through and through of subjective origin, and if the conditions of subjectivity manifest as that instrumental body for which the world objectifies, then there is nothing left in the world to be regarded as “nature” independently of culture.*

Our interjection that the possibility of our world is disclosed as the ideality of Greek classical statuary levels with Heidegger’s stipulation that the infinite regression for the discovery of the unification of the manifold of perception in the brain must be preceded and enacted by a more primordial unification of the manifold of perception, one that sanctions the disclosive intuition of finitude. In other words, the body as the whereupon of the original unification of the primordial manifold of perception must be *a tragic body* that has understood its own death, appearing as that pre-scientific object which manifests in between the limitations of action in the face of the human finitude, and the modifications that the recognition of these limitations have inflicted upon the instrumentality of action itself. We already suggested that this body is the Greek body.

## REFERENCES

- Aho, Kevin, *The Missing Flesh: On Heidegger's Neglect of the Body*, State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Bahn, Paul G., *Prehistoric Art - Cambridge Illustrated History*, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Boardman, John, *Greek Sculpture - The Archaic Period*, 1978, Oxford University Press, New York and Toronto, 1978.
- Boardman, John, *Greek Sculpture - The Classical Period*, Thames & Hudson Ltd, London, 1985.
- Buschor, Ernst, *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1980.
- Carpenter, Rhys, *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art, of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1959.
- Faye, Emmanuel, *Heidegger - The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London, 2009.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, second, revised edition, The Continuum Publishing Company, New York, 1999.
- Havelock, Eric A., *Preface to Plato*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1963.
- Heidegger, Martin, *What is Metaphysics?*, in *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, Harper San Francisco, 1992.
- Hegel, G.W.F., *Introductory Lectures on Aesthetics*, Penguin edition, 1993.
- Herington, John, *Aeschylus*, Vanijs Publications, Thessaloniki, Greece, 1988.
- Howard, William Guild, editor and commentary, *Laokoön: Lessing, Herder, Goethe*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1910.
- Husserl, Edmund, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1970.
- Karo, George, *Greek Personality In Archaic Sculpture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1948.
- Kuriyama, Shigehisa, *The Expressiveness of the Body - and the divergence of Greek and Chinese medicine*, Zone Books, New York, 2002.
- Leoussi, Athena S., *Nationalism and Classicism*, MacMillan Press Ltd., Great Britain, 1998.
- Lessing, Gottlob Ephraim, *Laokoön, and How the Ancients Represented Death*, General Books, London, 1914.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Birth of Tragedy*, Random House, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks*, Gateway edition, Regnery Publishing, Inc., Washington, DC., 1998.
- Richter, Gisela M.A., *Archaic Greek Youths*, Phaidon, London, 1960.
- Tarn Steiner, Deborah, *Images in Mind - Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton University Press, 2001.

Waldstein, Charles, *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*, McGrath Publishing Co., Washington D.C., 1973.

Winckelmann, Johann, J., *The History of Ancient Art*, General Books LLC, Tennessee, 2009.

Young, Julian, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Art*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2001.

### **MARTIN HEIDEGGER'S TRANSLATIONS**

*Being and Time*, a translation of *Sein und Zeit*, by Joan Stambaugh, State University of New York Press, 1996.

*The Origin of the Work of Art*, a translation by HarperCollins Publishers, 1977, 1993, HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.