

**Unofficial and incomplete translation** by Will Britt (please do not cite)

Part 1: Toward the Essence of Language

*The Saga*

6. *The Three Insights and Knowing* (p. 9)

The insight awakens:

1. Being essences in the clearing of time.
2. In addition, something singular and hitherto concealed must essence: Da-sein.
3. Being's truth, for which "time" is the preliminary name, provides for metaphysics not merely a more ordinary ground.

Knowing is bestowed:

1. Beyng brings truth to essence [*erwest*].
2. Truth determines "essence" through the voice of beyng.
3. Beyng is what essences, yet not what's highest – indeed, measurable from nowhere at all.

[...]

37. *Where Is a Measure?* (p. 32)

Not outside of man, nor in man, but surely in the way that man is appropriated by beyng, to which man belongs.

Thereby, we think we know what "outside" and "inside" signify; as if man were a spatial, space-filling being [*Wesen*], whose spatial boundaries run somewhere (for some, at the surface of the body).

We say, too, that man is "outside himself," and this ecstasy can mean the relatedness to beyng; such meaning only supposes that then, in being alongside himself, man is still man and has been trimmed, as it were, around that relatedness.

But if "ecstasy" signifies here the relatedness to beyng, then man is only man in this standing beyond and standing out, and then this provides the realm within which alone man can be alongside *himself* and can be himself.

Self-hood is of such a deep essence that reference to I-ness merely makes familiar something accidental, which can occasionally serve as the distinctive mark not of being-a-self but of a special kind of self-representing.

Hence it may even be said, with respect to the relatedness to beyng, that the measure is just as much outside of man, in beyng, as in him, just insofar, however, as the inside means the self-like relatedness to beyng.

And yet, the measure is neither in the relatedness for itself, nor in beyng in itself, if in turn "in itself" signifies: thing-like individuation. Beyng "itself" "is" in each case as event of appropriation and never "in itself," not because it might be compared each time to objectivity for a representing, but because it withdraws into itself (concealing) by appropriating man into Da-sein (to *be* the Da). Insofar as man is grounded in Da-sein, he comes into the proper domain of the event of appropriation, i.e., of beyng itself. And for that reason, only to the ground of the

*human* essence may the name of a being [*eines Seins*] be addressed in the sense that man *is* Da-sein (inheres in the Da). That plants and animals, mountains and rivers also “are” and, as befits this being, belong to what-is, is of another sort and not to be elucidated through a series of levels directed otherwise: stone, plant, animal, man, angel, God (for here, “spirit,” spiritual possession, and lack of representation, or graduated levels – monadology – is guiding).

But why are we looking for a measure? To what extent is something such as requires measuring?

Measure means how much, how far, the whither of belonging; but also moderation, staying within one’s entitlements, to which man has been consigned as one who essences.

Staying within is, as inherence in the Da-, readying and preserving the clearing of beyng, by which everything is first handed over to its essence from out of the word.

Such a measure as staying within what has been allotted is only questionable because and where beyng itself bears the essence of what-is by clearing. But this is determined for man.

Where a measure is, there is the nearness of *repose*, that inceptive gathering of all history in the event.

Only where a measure can be is also the measureless, which achieves its greatest extremity in the movedness of power and its essence as machination.

We are still hardly fit to think beyng, since we are familiar with it only in the disguise that metaphysics has cast over it in the “form” of beingness, which runs us directly into what is attenuated and empty.

Still we are seeking, not for the first time alienated from beyng, to replace that empty beingness with “something symbolic,” i.e., just exactly to confirm it in its still-conceded essential validity; for how else could this wandering addiction to groundless and invented symbols still trigger activities and let man, ignorant of his expulsion from being, search for a “myth”?

Even if we admit that we no longer have any “myth,” which admission could be a step toward meditation, we take this barely attempted and blindly ventured step back by just aiming to find a “myth” or to replace the not yet found one with something invented.

But “myth” has been for a long time merely the counter-word to “logos,” which in modernity is conceived as “reason.” And “myth” then becomes “the irrational” practically for free. “Myth” is the word that is supposed to name the pre-inceptive realm, in which being has not yet come into the open. It always remains “negative,” namely in a “negativity” that every time has as its presupposition the onset of “Ratio.” And for that reason, all talk of “myth” is only bad “rationalism” that goes off-track and can never find a ground on which a decision about truth, i.e., about its essence, could succeed.

The apparent conflict over myth and logos corresponds only to the decisionlessness of an age in which, fully concealed, being’s abandonment of what-is completes itself.

[...]

46. *Time-Space* (cf. *Contributions*, “Grounding”), p. 39

Time-space initially appears like the emptiness that is sparsely filled by what-is and yet unfillable.

Is it not itself the fullness of the essencing of beyng’s truth?

[...]

*The Word*  
*On the Essence of Language*

(A Projection of a Hint)

*The Cheering Aspect of the Word* (p. 43)<sup>1</sup>

The word cheers: it clears by bringing joy, in that for the (one saying) it refers [or: interprets, *be-deutet*] the structure [*Gefüge*] into being.

*Be-deuten*: to concern [*angehen*] in *beckoning* and to escort into the secret [*Hehl*].

The cheerful [*Das Heitere*] essences in the secret.

The cheering secret.

The cheering aspect of the word is simultaneously the way in which it accommodates [*behaust*] – keeps secret [*verhehlt*] in the accommodation – the human *essence* and with it what-is [*Seyende*] as such.

*The Birth of Language* (p. 43)<sup>2</sup>

Height hints at the greeting of depth.

Sows from on high the seeds of the word.

Brings from the depths word's ripening into saga.

Protects silence for the unspoken.

Builds from silence the accommodation of man: language.

Prior to man rules his essence,

Calls to birth the pure accommodation,

In auguring the cradle of dwelling.

Language is the singular first accommodation of man. Earth becomes cultivable, world becomes usable, earth bears world, and world supports earth only in the lingering expanse, which is consigned to language to be kept safe.

Language accommodates man by granting commemoration [*Gedächtnis*] a dwelling in the event's lingering expanse. **[commemoration is the human essence]**

The expanse is the tending nearness of the cleared distance. The while is the sparing hesitation of clearing arrival.<sup>3</sup> While and expanse are uniquely unified, in essence the same. This is the secret [*Hehl*].

The secret is the cradle of the open region, which is cleared for the gathering that closes up.<sup>4</sup>

Fencing [*Hehlen*] is the sheltering that appropriates. To it belongs at once the unsheltering that dedicates (the unhiding [*Enthehlen*]) and the concealing that consigns (keeping the secret [*Verhehlen*]).

---

<sup>1</sup> [Cf. GA 4:16ff., trans. p. 34ff., where *das Heitere*, what cheers or brightens, is linked to *verweilen* (lingering), *die offene Helle* (open brightness), and making space, then eventually to truth. See my translation of the relevant passage at the end of this document.]

<sup>2</sup> [Taken surprisingly literally.]

<sup>3</sup> [Both are aspects of clearing because time-space depends on the clearing.]

<sup>4</sup> [The secret = time-space. So, being's essencing (= the event) as hesitating refusal clears a time-space for concealing; this time-space opens the open region within which what-is can show up and being/mystery can be kept safe.]

Fencing permits the internal relation [*das Innige*] between the expanse and the while, from which all time-space first stands forth; its unity not only essences prior to time and space, but it is not yet at all familiar with time as succession of nows or space as the realm of bodily extension.

The while is the pre-temporal appropriating of time.

The expanse is the pre-spatial appropriating of space.

The expanse tends by bringing near in hesitant sparing. The while spares by hesitating in the bringing near that tends.

The lingering expanse is not familiar with the empty uniformity of time and space. Strange to it, as well, is the limitation to mere extension – of bodies and of passage.

The secret is the heart of the non-temporal, pre-spatial time-space as which the intimacy of the lingering expanse takes place.

The heart's essence is the secret. Therefore, too, the cradle of the open region is the heart of what closes up. The cradling heart of the event keeps the secret in its inward [*innigen*] fencing: that the secret keeps the mystery safe. [how?]

The mystery rests in this: everything that appropriates is the same in the event and finds its own proper domain therein. Everything proper to the event is the same. The event is the unifying singularity that is "one and all." If the saga dares to say in what the mystery rests, then it does not clear the mystery. Nor does it veil the mystery. The saga merely helps the mystery to remain itself in the saying. Such helping is originary advising. The saga works the enigma [*rätsel*] in the face of the mystery.

The expanse of the secret abides in the mystery. The mystery expropriates itself into the secret. But it is also the expropriation by which the mystery first brings itself into its proper domain.

The proper domain – that in which the event remains with its own – is grace.

Grace is mystery's favor. By allowing itself into the mystery as the expanding while of the secret, grace remains and remains thus singularly hale [*heil*] in what's dear [or: in the dear one, *im Holden*]. Everything beautiful is always merely the reflection of what's dear.

What's dear heals [*verheilt*] gaiety [*die Heitere*] into the rift.<sup>5</sup> This healing appropriates the whole [*das Heile*] as the purely assimilating [*vereignende*] unification of all that is the same into the singular.

But how do gaiety and the rift enter into the healing of grace? They do not first enter into it. They are what's proper in the event, appropriated to it. In expropriation, grace tears itself away from what's proper. It is there that the rift is, which first divides grace into favor, so that, stemming from the rift, grace may be able to tear away [*entreissbar*]. But the rift divides by first joining the open region, which is suited to [*eignet*] the mystery of grace. The rift appropriates grace's fitting rift [*Fugriss*].

[this is how the rift is proper in the event]

In the rift, grace grants its favor. The rift expropriates the grace of the mystery so that the mystery may be properly itself as the cradle of the secret. In that the rift expropriates by [both] dividing and joining, it first appropriates the allowed grace into what is dear. The rift joins grace by dividing (not splitting up) favor from what's dear, and, in the parting, by appropriating into the mystery the intimacy of the lingering expanse.

[so, grace both remains and is expropriated]

---

<sup>5</sup> [Rift is masculine, so perhaps the healing is a sexual union.]

The rift is pain's essence. Pain essences in grace and remains of an event-related essence. It is not first the opposite of joy. That is mourning. The rift, as essencing pain, is the clearing, joining response to that which, through the rift, blossoms for what's dear as gaiety. Without the appropriation by the rift, gaiety would have to dissolve herself away into her own light – one that lacks the fitting rift – and thus lose herself.

Therefore, what's dear essences in such fittingness [*Fug*] that it heals gaiety into the rift. Only the rift can heal. But it does not thereby disappear, because the joining rift is the dear healing itself. The dear healing in the rift is the fencing intimacy of singular assimilating.

[how is gaiety proper in the event?]

What's peculiar to all assimilating is the healing into the rift. This healing is the origin of all the modes of unifying from out of the unity of what's one, which is one-time the singular.

The healing rift is the mystery of grace.

What's dear in grace is the whole,<sup>6</sup> in which all appropriating rests [*ruht*] as assimilating.

The resting is the whole [*heile*] proper domain [= grace], out of which the appropriating and only along with this the essence of movement is favorably inclined toward [*zugewogen*] all moving [*Bewegen*].

[how did we get to movement?]

From rest and from time-space, but that's sort of weak]

For the waymaking [*Be-wegen*] has its essence in ap-appropriating, which – by ap-appropriating, catching sight of, and productively seeing – brings to itself what has been rendered suitable [*das Er-eigte*], so as thus to grant that the latter may essence as what's proper, the same in its self.

The going back and forth that sees productively and allows has its remaining, its "path," in the going. The word "path" signifies this: going back and forth. Waymaking movement [*Be-wegung*] is: to be on the path. This proceeds as appropriating. Otherwise, thinking – namely, metaphysical thinking – determines movement from the alteration of a thing, of its location and its point in time, or even from the alteration of a state. But why shouldn't movement be thought from the path – as waymaking movement? Why doesn't thinking follow the word's hint?

What remains on the path is underway. What walks such a path is "gone." It is away. It lingers in the expanse of the distance and spares the arrival. The path, however, essences in the parting that the rift joins out of grace.

[so, time-space is what's on the path]

Movement rests [*ruht*] in the rift. It rests on the repose of the hale [*des Heilen*].

[what has been healed by the rift]

Repose is not the end of the movement, but its beginning, if this word does not only mean leaving. Repose is the cradle in which all movement arises and swings. In the repose of the cradle, movement rests.

Only what rocks [back and forth] is capable of bringing into movement, namely, the scales and the balancing. Only what has rocked [or: carried weight] can weigh, can have weight. The truly weighted human being has moved a lot on all paths, is experienced in them. Only the weighted human being can balance. Only the one who, rocked in the cradle, is capable of balancing may take a risk.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> [*Das Holde der Huld ist das Heile...*]

<sup>7</sup> [Earlier, it was the saga that took a risk in saying what the mystery is. This paragraph's translations in order: *wiegt, Wage* (= *Waage*), *Wägen, ist gewiegt, Wiegen, Gewicht haben, gewiegte* (x2), *wägen, gewiegt, Wiege, wägen, wagen*.]

The internal relation [*Das Innige*] of the over and back in appropriating is the footbridge [*Steg*]. Footbridges grant the crossing to going (to the path). Everything – cradle and path, footbridge and weighing, what’s weighted and balancing, scales and daring – as the same, comes from the healing repose of grace.

The cradle shelters (fences) the repose. The repose of what’s dear brings to rest the movements of appropriating. Repose soothes. It does not eliminate movement. Repose calls the movements back into the cradle and thus fills them with the fitting rift of their essence; it soothes them. Insofar as the repose – and it alone – soothes the movements by calling them back and filling them, it is stillness.

Stillness is the calling back which points, by greeting, into what’s dear, which ordains the grace within the healing rift to the favor of the secret.

Stillness’s calling back that greets and points is beckoning. The stillness of grace that beckons from the rift is the essence of the word.<sup>8</sup>

The stillness of grace is the event’s cradling womb [*Schooß*, variant for *Schoß*].<sup>9</sup>

The human essence has been sown in this womb as its commemoration. [its = essence or womb]

To sow is to let descend into the dear stillness of the inward secret for the sake of emergence into the blossomy ripening of gratitude, which heals all recollection into the singularity of the event.

Because the human essence has thus been sown into the womb of grace, but this grace appropriates the parting that heals into the greeting of the rift and of gaiety – a greeting that encounters responsively [*entgegenende*] – that’s why the two-fold recollecting is also favorably inclined toward commemoration, as befits the split [*Zwiefalt*] of the lingering expanse that stems from the mystery’s secret. [i.e., the split into time and space]

The lingering expanse of the rift is depth.

The expanding while of gaiety is height.<sup>10</sup>

Depth itself does not descend. To it is suited [*eignet*] the darkening astonishment by which height is cleared into the inclining arrival of grace. In its astonishment, depth has been elevated into height.

Height itself does not rise. To it is suited [*eignet*] the clearing conception [*Ersinnen*] by which depth is included in the distancing nearness of grace. In its conceiving, height has sunk deep into the depths.

Depth astonishes height.

Height conceives depth.

In that the astonishment and the conception, within the responsive greeting, overtake each other into the darkness of gaiety and into the illumination of the rift, they retrieve, by bringing, what the healing stillness of grace once called to them. From out of this self-retrieval of astonishing depth and conceiving height, the celebration of retrieval takes place in commemoration. This retrieval remains just as removed, by an infinite essence, from empty succession as the sparing hesitation of the arrival (the while) from the sequence of nows (time).

---

<sup>8</sup> [Here we get the intimation/beckoning that separates time-space into time and space, but now that intimation has internal structure.]

<sup>9</sup> [It seems like this should remind us of the *khōra* as mother/matrix/pre-space in the *Timaeus*.]

<sup>10</sup> [Again, see GA 4 and my translation below.]

The healing of gaiety into the rift is the measure, resting in grace, of appropriating. Under this measure, commemoration has peacefully departed for the intimacy of split recollecting that responds from depth and from height.

To be the commemoration of depth is the human essence of the steadfastly singular woman.

To be the commemoration of height is the human essence of the steadfastly singular man.<sup>11</sup>

Because the human essence has been sown into the womb of the event, there is an outset.

The outset is the event in commemoration. Each time the event abides purely in the expanse of commemoration, there is the celebration. The fact that in greeting, grace assimilates commemoration into the responsive greeting from out of the astonishing depth of the rift and the conceiving height of gaiety – that is the outset.

The responsive greeting, however, takes place when, as what's greeted by the stillness of grace, it readies itself always to attend to the beckoning of stillness so as attentively to bring the silence face to face with the soothing repose, so that the word may find its way into the answer – to which the saga is consigned in what's unspoken.

The measure of the singular receives such greetings – which are appropriated from grace and answer to what is dear – and joins itself to the healing of gaiety into the rift.

The propriated greeting unfolds at the outset the split in recollection toward/onto the fact that the essence of commemoration fulfills itself in celebration.

In setting out the unspoken from the beckoning stillness of painful grace, the human essence sets out upon the saga toward the birth of language.

The veiled intimacy of the astonishing depth and conceiving height calls into the nearness that draws near:

[See poem, above]

When does man learn dwelling on this earth? Only when he is called into his essence and has at first learned to hear and to say the singular accommodation of his essence, the language that is born in the word of the event.

But when does he learn such a thing? When he finds in commemoration in the event.<sup>12</sup> This takes place when the event comes into commemoration, so that from such arrival, stillness as the headmistress may teach the human essence to celebrate the presence of grace in the bearing silence of the unspoken. That takes place in the outset. It joins the split of the human essence from out of the rift into greeting gratitude.

The greeting split of commemoration essences in the event infinitely other than sex and its opposition within living beings.

Earlier than the generation of man, the grounding of the human essence at the outset essences toward the word's saga into language.

It first requires learning to dwell in the appropriated human essence. But how can dwelling be learned if the pure accommodation concerning man does not set out beforehand and continuously on its blossoming?

Plant and animal do not have language. For that reason, they remain sheltered in a kind whose essence only thinking is capable of interpreting from the event.

---

<sup>11</sup> [This seems to be as much an interweaving as the lingering expanse and expanding while above, since gaiety (feminine) there was height – meaning that commemoration here is of the other. If I'm wrong about gaiety being female and the rift male, then everything lines up quite traditionally – women astonish men, men think women.]

<sup>12</sup> [Something is missing grammatically. It could be “he finds it” or “he is found.”]

Plant and animal remain in a kind because they “are” outside of the reach of the calling stillness, without the while of the sometime, and yet are not commemoration. This being [i.e., the kind] is life. It bears in itself no lack, since it is not capable of missing anything. That is only granted to recollection. The realm of the essence of living things is still closed to thinking. Biology is the unknowing will to exclude thinking from this realm of essence.

Biology is the metaphysics of living things. It thinks the living being as the individuating of a genus. Biology thinks what specifies within the kind, and the kind itself, starting from the production of “individuals,” with respect to reproduction for the maintenance of the species.

Metaphysics thinks the kind as the sensible. Insofar as it represents man by preconceiving him as a living being and yet has to recognize language as the distinctive essential possession of man, it transfigures the sensible into the supersensible of the ensouled and spiritual. Soul and spirit are interpreted, for their part, according to the species of living things.

Thus, metaphysical thinking reaches neither into the originariness of the sensible, nor into that of the supersensible, nor even into the origin of this distinction.

But the originary aspect of the sensible is in no way the depths. For the lingering expanse of the astonishing rift has already surpassed the sensible and its distinction from the supersensible, together with the supersensible itself.

But the originary aspect of the supersensible is in no way the heights. For the expanding while of conceiving gaiety has already surpassed the supersensible and its distinction from the sensible, together with the sensible itself.

More sensing than all sensibility of living things is the astonishing depth, and therefore “more sensual” than everything related to drives.

More astonishing than everything supersensible in the human spirit is the conceiving height, and therefore “more spiritual” than all spirit.

Yet the difference of the high depth and the deep height from the sensible and the supersensible is not one of degree in the same realm of a classification. The difference affects the realms themselves and is grounded in the essential differentiatedness of being and the event.

Therefore, language is also of an infinitely other essence than that which is familiar to metaphysics when metaphysics assembles the word out of the sensible body of sound and the supersensibly spiritual aspect of the word’s signification [*Wortbedeutung*].

And yet:

The enigma of life and the mystery of language rest [*ruhen*] simply divided in the same cradle of being, which thinking now names event. Everything suited [*eignet*] to this is the same. The unifying oneness of the singular is the puzzle of the enigma.

Everything that essences of the event is the same. The *Hen* illuminates as named early on yet remaining unknown in its veiled appropriating.

The same essences unitarily as the singular. To think this means: to experience everything simply as the same from out of the hale [*heilen*] grace of the healing [*heilenden*] rift. The rift grants the simple joining.

To think everything as the same easily gives the impression that such thinking would hardly require attentiveness, since only the unconsidered mixture of everything with everything would belong to it; which, indeed, would follow already from the sheer negligence by which all boundaries and junctures remain smudged.

Yet the simpleness of the same takes place out of the abundance of fittingness. But the playful playing with opposites is not familiar with the fittingness’s joining.

What in the saga is taken as assertion and may appear, in the representation initially awakened by that saga, like a putting of oppositions and as a playing with their sublation is [in fact] regioning [*Gegnen*] out of the event.

This regioning is not hung up in the represented unity of opposites, since the unity of the singular remains event-related, such that the unity of all regioning, along with what regions itself, is never confined to the twoness that has a unification above it as a third.

All that regions has once been surpassed in what's proper to the event, in which everything is the same.

When thinking experiences everything as the same, each thought turns back to each and shows itself in the continuous turn back of one to the other. Thus, there arises here the new impression that thinking proceeds in a circle. But this would be a mistake, because customary thinking and opining shows everything in proving it, which advances without any turn back from one to the other.

But the impression of circling is the genuine sign, or at least can be the sign, that thinking in the ring of being has found its path as footbridge of the event. The sameness of the same and the same of the self's selfhood are only to be thought from out of the event, since the latter keeps in itself the secret of the healing unification from the unity of grace's singularity.

To think everything as the same is the heaviest thinking. Heavier than precious stones and gold weighs the weight of what is to be thought. For it comes from the cradle [*Wiege*] of being and steadily leans back into the mystery.

The costliness, leaning favorably out of the cradle, of heaviness brings into thinking the slowness of footbridges. But in the rocking of the cradle and in the balancing of the scales, the game reigns – the beckoning of the beautiful that rests [*ruht*] in what's dear.

The language that is proper to the saga remains in the unspoken. It can never be spoken directly in a typical day or used for notification.

Unspoken, it is solely the address and the dictum of conversation at the outset. The saga of the unspoken is no asserting, which describes the objective. The saga is the commemoration of what is to be said itself. [i.e., not *Gerede*]

From out of the conversation at the outset, the dictum only slowly brings usual daily language to care for speaking. Its structure and flow arise from the concealed fittingness of the event.

Follow in saying the hints of the word.

Avoid the pointing of wordless terms.

Thinking from out of commemoration as the human essence experientially learns its path underway on the footbridges.

Thinking is astonished by the astonishing depth. Therefore, it conceives everything proper to the event as the same, rocked in the cradling womb of grace, rocked into the intimating watchfulness of those who protect.

Be silent in the word.

Thus language is grounded.

### *The Outset*

Attending to the word's beckoning, thinking thinks this word thus:

The outset is the event in commemoration. But to be commemoration in the event is the human essence. The outset is what's like the human essence [*Menschenwesentliche*], but not merely something human.

Called human beings may belong to the outset. But the outset does not belong to human beings.

*Ginnen, ginnan* (to separate out) – the word is old and means: to break, to take apart (bread), to have the use of/enjoy [*geniessen*], to make use of it; to use [*brauchen*] (*frui* [to enjoy]) it.

In *ginnan*, thought as using that breaks apart, there lies a reference to the rift and what grants itself, which in the using inclines itself toward what's used and raises it toward itself into the unified essence.

The out-set separates out by setting-out. In the outset, the event essentially makes use of the human essence.

“To use” originally signifies: to make use of a thing.<sup>13</sup> The way the event makes use of the human essence, uses (and never mis-uses) it, is nonetheless to be thought from out of the event. The event sets out by appropriating and *is* the outset, in that it lulls [*wiegt*] the human essence as split recollecting into compliance with the stillness of grace. The aspect of the outset that rocks to sleep [*Das Einwiegende*] is the using that appropriates. Because the human essence is what's thus used, beyng needs (it is in need of) the human essence. The word “to use/to need” is in everyday use for us. As a result, we only think slowly and with difficulty the pure essence of the using that intimately [*innig*] appropriates.

### *The Singular*

The word names the event as beyng's keeping-true that wells up. In this truth, beyng veils itself and remains sheltered in its essential (appropriating) relatedness to the human essence as commemoration in the event. Beyng is only beyng as the appropriating of the human essence for commemoration of the appropriation of beyng itself into truth.

Appropriating, by flowing out from the cradle of grace, is the unifying that keeps safe, in which the peculiarity of each proper thing in the event has its unity of agreement with each proper thing.

The one of the unity that unifies *everything* proper and excludes nothing, the event, as the non-isolated but appropriating one of grace, is the singular that keeps everything safe.

The event is the all-one [or: all-in] singular; the sole singular that shelters the essence of the originary unifying. The alone singular is never what excludes and thus is exclusive. It is what includes, yet this not subsequently but in its own originary sustaining [*Austragen*] from the healing grace whose wholeness [*Heiles*] heals into the rift the clearing gaiety and everything cleared in it.

The solitarizing unity of the singular can only unify by assimilating everything proper into its proper domain. The singular is familiar with neither the isolation that excludes nor the standardization [*Vereinheitlichung*] that extinguishes everything proper. Both are, moreover, subsequent in essence, since they themselves never come from the appropriating.

The sole singular is never “only the one” under rejection of the others as the rest.

But the singular is at the same time exclusive in an essential sense; namely, such that it can let nothing at all essence in its expanding while against which it would be capable of setting itself off.

Therefore, too, recollecting the singular alone has been uniquely decided. At its source, such recollecting has already escaped capture in rigid distinctions without lineage. Having thus escaped from the outset, it never gets lost in willed rules of opposition.

---

<sup>13</sup> [Literally, something like “to serve oneself of something/someone”: *sich seiner bedienen*.]

This decisive recollecting that appeared by grace alone is the sole commemoration in the event. It is the concealed wellspring of the freedom of the human essence. Uttered in the name “the singular,” the event easily encounters us again and again like something objective, which it seems to give parceled out, like the names uttered among the terms of a language, names which, as spoken and only in that way heard, nonetheless never name, i.e., never bring the originary word to saying. The merelessness of mere terms consists in that they have fallen out of the realm of the compliant answer to the word. But now if language as a whole is only encountered as such a stock of words suspended in the net of grammatical rules, then language appears merely as an utterance of human speaking equipment. In that way, language is a human organ and in such a shape is dependent on the organism, which organism counts for biological representing as the space of essence for the living being “man.” If it is loosed from its “organic” captivity, language belongs nowhere any longer. Language itself is without homeland. Language, which in truth will remain the first steady<sup>14</sup> accommodation for the human essence. Yet this remains accommodation first and only when it takes place in the expanding while and dwells in the secret in which the word responsively en-encounters the answer.

How, then, shall we ever be able to hear the word, the one that speaks in this name, when to us the name “the singular” is merely one among many other terms, and when we do not intimate the essence of language?

The sole recollecting that assimilates at the outset toward its singular gratitude has its lineage from the singular aspect of grace.

This lineage is from the one-time. It is the oldest lineage, never able to be outstripped in its descending [*Herkommen*]. What the oldest lineage may possess from the singular is what alone is noble. “Noble” signifies: to bear this singular lineage solely in temperament [*im Gemüt*]. The temperament, however, is the blossom of commemoration. Those who solely recollect are the noble-minded ones; for noble-mindedness is the blossom’s blooming.

The blooming is the graceful self-clearing of the beautiful aspect of ripening toward the fruit that is singular and one-time. But fruit is the unspoken language born at the outset. Noble-mindedness is the intimately safe-keeping commemoration of the healing agreement that rests [*ruht*] in the unifying of the singular.

The event is the cradling unification out of the singular, is its very singularity.

## Additions

### *The Various Modes and Levels of Silence*

in reference to grace, stillness, word, saga, the unspoken, the spoken.

*Silence and commemoration*

(the still commemorating),

the speechless wonder,

the heedful commemoration,

the word that twists free,

the asking back into the legacy.

---

<sup>14</sup> [Reading *stetige* for *stätige*.]

*The Word*

is the stillness of grace, a stillness beckoning out of pain.

grace

stillness

the beckoning

pain

the beckoning stillness

beckoning out of pain

Why is the saga of the unspoken necessary  
now – in the descent – for the readying of language  
from out of the word?

the beckoning and the arrival

the turn back

event

*Pain and stillness; why not likewise joy?*

(event) appropriation

grace

pain

stillness

the word

(event) commemoration

the answer

the saga

the *unspoken* ↓

speaking

language

the spoken word

language as the shrine of the word

*pain*: the time-space of *beckoning*  
stillness stills [or: soothes] time-space  
pain – *rift* – outline – the cheerful  
Language as tearing-away,  
taking the word  
out of the rift into *sounding*.

commemoration: recollecting

saying after (poetizing)

pondering/sensing after (thinking)

pre-saying

co-saying

saying with one another

the conversation

speaking out

speaking

language

*The Descent into Concealed Language*

The nobility of the descent is suited only to that which is sheltered in the originary arising. The rest just withers into devastation.

\*

*Language: The Dwelling-Place of the Human Essence*

Language readied in the unspoken

from out of the word through the saga.

How commemoration, as the human essence,

lets historical humans dwell in language.

Dwelling in language

and interpreting [or: laying out].

Speaking out – speech – laying out.

\*

*Language Tears Away*

the word – from stillness.

To take from the rift and carry forth<sup>15</sup> into sounding and the voice.

\*

*Stillness:*

to still a thirst – *to still tears*.

Stilling from out of stillness; stillness alone stills. But what is *stilling*? (What does it still?) Or stilling (intransitive) but through (event)! Still – “restful” – sheltering rest, and for that reason bestowing

“Rest” – gathering up of movement into the descent of its arising.

“Restful”: not loud! – “Quiet!” – against noise

Stillness – rest – gathering – *lingering* – time-space – sheltering

Everywhere referred to word, but not yet breaking,

rather beckoning.

Sheltering and beckoning – (event)

*Be-deuten* [see p. 43] – legacy

Stilling in the event – commemoration

Showing and calling back, showing that calls.

To call as to outstrip, to overtake, to re-peat.

Not what’s *soundless*! Sound and noise are not call.

The showing that calls: *vocation*, appealing, naming, appointing, determining, dispensed destiny [*Ge-schick*].

Stillness, style, fit, impression.

Stillness –

1. not privative

2. hence also not in-determinate; *hulē*

3. *calling* and commemoration – commemoration and heeding.

\*

*Stillness:*

silence like the outset,

originarily *stilled* at the outset from out of stillness,

the *pre-word*.

*Stillness*

*The departure* (of the gods):

no new god,

because no god at all,

because holier and first whole the holy.

Not anthropomorphic,

not atheism,

not indifference.

[...]

---

<sup>15</sup> [Reading *forttragen* for *forttragend*.]

*The Thinking That Turns Back*

*The impression of fetching forth mere significations of terms*

(e.g., event – truth,  
outset – using).

1. In which respect does this impression consist?
2. Why does it come thereto?

The *alienation* from the word, the *violence* of the “*actual*.”  
Forgottenness of being – being’s abandonment.

3. The inhuman in man,  
the *articulated refusal in the face of the word*,  
to be incapable of dwelling in stillness.  
*Tekhnē* and the pressing-forward of what-is in front of being.  
*Tekhnē* – *eidōs* – *idea*.

[...]

*The Word – The Sign – Conversation – Language*

I. THE WORD AND LANGUAGE

12. *The Word and the Hand* (p. 75)

Because being in essence is on its guard [*Hut*] for its essencing, it shies at its own clearing. The ground of being’s inception is thus this protection [*Hut*] as keeping, the incipience-related grounding of which the essence of keeping-true first indicates to us.

As keeping, the truth is inceptively the concealing that keeps the beginning safe. To this concealing corresponds the necessity of reticence, from which the word and its rarity stem.

The essentially safe-keeping word, however, is first protected in the sign as what shows itself in marked pointing, which for its part nonetheless can only point in the clearing of the sign and as {?} word.

The hand, pointing, and signifying.

[...]

II. THE SIGN

(Its Event-Related Essence)

36. *The Sign and Protection – The Departing Abyssal Ground* (p. 88)

From out of the protective essence of keeping-true, sheltering stems.

From out of the sheltering protection, the essencing of showing takes its essence.

[...]

41. *The De-parting Essence of the Sign* (p. 90)

For the distinctive mark: the metaphysical signum –  
by ex-posing, starting *from presence*, into what-is.

The sign – as *hint* into the abyssal ground.

Only from out of the *turning* itself, i.e., in the realm of beyng's truth, can the inceptive essence of the sign be experienced.

The sign and the turning.

The turning – the inceptive sign itself.

Sign – not referred to man, but essencing of beyng and only *as* this essencing in relation to man.

\*

*Being as presence* – (the basic trait of beingness and all metaphysical determination, even and precisely [where] being as becoming)

*Being as departure* – (the basic trait of beyng's inceptive essence)

*Presence* toward what-is and its prevalence – dominion and actuality, order.

*Departure* – away from what-is, i.e., from its arrogance of priority, and yet not cutting loose, but *departure*; – not sheer absence, but the shattering of the twisting free/conversion into the descent as the incipience of the abyssal ground.

*Departure* – the incalculable remaining, which is only experienced in the pain of splitting up.

The most split up: the nearest.

\*

Against essence [*Wesenswidrig*] is every effort to want to make the inceptivity of language into a technique of everyday discourse.

The inceptivity of language demands in itself already the enactment of the leap into incipience and suffers no negotiation or mediation, in which nothing {can} be subordinated to the transformation.

[...]

### III. CONVERSATION AND LANGUAGE

56. *Thanking* (p. 99)

– appropriated pointing into the hints of beyng's truth – *liberating and bringing*.

[...]

68. *To Become Attentive to Beyng (Event)*, p. 104

from out of protectiveness for the keeping-true of beyng.

Protectiveness stems from protecting.

Protecting lets the shepherds learn (to instruct in wandering).

69. *Word – Truth of Language*

What is unprethinkable, shocking, surpassing, compelling in the word.

[...]

71. *Language and the Conversation* (p. 105)

The conversation – in the proper sense – speaks out of the dictum of beyng, whose word is the resonating light of the event.

Conversation is appropriating – historically.

To what extent it can be willed, made, achieved.

About what, how, with whom, and why it's spoken.  
The mere *issue conversation* – “abstract.”

\*

Conversation and conversation with oneself.

[...]

78. *How the Saying of Language* (p. 107)

in the conversation is a bringing and liberating.

How bringing and liberating have their intimacy and their silence in the gifts of the homeland.

79. *That We Are Without Language*

– to what extent are we that?

without silence: -

without event

80. *The Word – The Human*

The word (the stillness of appropriation) appropriates the human to inherence in the keeping-true of being.

[...]

90. {*Event and Language*} (p. 111)<sup>16</sup>

Event  
Word  
Truth  
/ \  
Earth World  
\ /  
Language

91. *Language and Thinking*

*Language – the stillest and most loyal confidant [Vertraute] of thinking, appropriated to the unity of the proper domain.*

92. *Conversation – The Transformation of the Address*

Not merely speaking out and expression of otherwise [existing] relations, but as the transformation of the address, it is in itself the stillest relatedness of humans *to* one another (not merely with one another), to one another on the path of the footbridges.

Conversation – no continuation of discourse; the silence, the being surprised, the unexpected, the unsayable – and yet precisely in the *saga* – the *remaining*.

[...]

---

<sup>16</sup> [Proceeding downward: the event says its word, which opens the space-time of truth, which comes to human language through the strife of earth and world.]

96. *Language and Keeping-True* (p. 112)

Language as *saga* keeps the event safe; it keeps safe the un-sayable and unprethinkable; it keeps safe what has been and what is coming. Where it speaks (talks) about the present, it is often gossip, drivel.

Language keeps safe *and* peddles, uses and distorts and devastates *the protective aspect of beyng's truth*.

Language keeps the event safe – because it arises from the word and remains with the word. Language is the *promise/mis-speaking* of the event to the appropriated human being. In language and as language, the word of beyng promises the truth (promising).

Speaking and *promising/mis-speaking*.

[...]

98. *Ver-sprechen* (p. 113)

Not the customary and obvious, but the unexpected – singular – completely unusual and not to be secured by achievement.

Promising (properly) is enigmatic, keeps the fulfillment safe, spares it.

*What spares in promising.*

Ver-sprechen as the out-set.

Setting-out and de-cision.

Decision – sustaining.

“Fulfillment” – not added and afterwards, but in the promising the fulfilling sets out.

*The coming and the transformation.*

Promises and *commanding* (calling – to carry the name), to let *carry the name and to let belong to beyng*.

99. *Ver-sprechen and Retaining and Keeping* [Halten] *One's Word*

To promise – to place into view? No; announcement of one's own fore-having? No. But yet to *promise* [zu-sagen] what is coming as the remainder.

*Ver-sprechen* – to let come and to *keep* the latter *safe*, keeping the coming safe, the <dispensing and keeping safe> – *granting*.

Can a person ever promise something? At best, when he has already himself been owned [ge-eignet].

To *keep* one's “word” and – to *break...* – the “word,” to give one's word, the *word* – the *given promise*.

In language and its terms, in saying, the *word* has been *given* to man, beyng has been *promised* [or: *mis-spoken*] to him.

The *promise is kept* – to what extent and why? The question is, whether and how man *has and assumes it, holds himself to it*, i.e., inheres.

*Ver-sprechen* event-related – the consigning dedication of the word into language, to *disseminate* [ausgeben] *the word into language*. Thus language becomes – but only thus is it even – what is promised, but mostly not noticed.

100. *Conversation (authentic)*

is *not* communication – announcement – teaching. For its essence-determination, there is no schema other than the word itself.

But word as word of beyng and beyng ↔ man.

“Conversation” – seems, in distinction from acting and achieving, like mere talk and idle talk; it looks as if nothing happens, and here everything happens. All activity a consequence or sustainment.

Conversation – *inherence in the word*; hesitating, surpassing, diffidence and the wager, what is unexpected and expecting/surmising.

[...]

## V. THE WORD AND LANGUAGE

### 120. *Word and Basic Attunement – “Voice” and Sounding* (p. 132)

The attuning essence of stillness – as the reticent “voice.” “Voice” here in the essential ambiguity of the *appeal* [Anruf] – but the soundless one, which precisely attunes properly, i.e., accomplishes the displacement into the Da.

The basic attunement and its “voice” (appeal and displacement), by displacing, open the in-between.

The sounding is an essential consequence of the stillness and its “voice,” because the stillness as the in-between carries through the strife of earth and world; this strife as *rift* provides the first (seen as befits the essence) sound, *breaks* the stillness, but even breaks the stillness and essences only as a break and *breaking-off* of this stillness. Sounding [is] a privation of this stillness. [i.e., not the other way around]

### 121. *The Stillness*

as clearing of the Da – the *first word*.

Reticence as *refusing preservation*.

### 122. *Heeding and Inherence in the Da*

not as “hearing” – to receive with the ear –

but as being-still: *to be – stillness*.

But what is this *stillness*? And of what sort this “being-”? *Da-sein*.

Heeding thus loses the standard relation to the *ear*, but also to mere *paying attention*. That sensibility and rationality do not reach far enough to enact *Da-sein* and to comprehend enactively: *to be inclusively*.

They subsequently show themselves to be the unconceptualized foreground of *Da-sein* and the last background of metaphysical questioning.

Heeding [Hörchen]: as *quieting* [or: *bearing silence*] – not only before and beyond all sensing, but before and beyond all objects, before and beyond all that is and customary comportment. Inherence in the clearing of beyng.

[...]

### 132. *Attuning and Calling* [Rufen] (p. 137)

Appeal and call [Zuruf] in the sense of inherent clearing and transporting.

Basic attunements as clearing appeals to hear and answer [Er-hörung] beyng as appropriation.

*Beyng's call*, as quieting [or: bearing silence] of the abyss's clearing, is the word.  
*Speaking out about what-is* is "language."  
Basically different beginnings of the relation to saying.  
Inventive saying ↔ speaking out.

[...]

## VI. WORD AND "LANGUAGE"

140. *The Word and the Human* (p. 144)

The word belongs to sustainment as event in beyng's essence (quieting/bearing silence of sustainment), and it is only in virtue of allocation into beyng's truth that "man has the word," that "it" depends on him, that "the" decision is up to him, that the human essence is decision-related and capable of language.

[...]

"To have the word" – in a completely different sense: that the decision is up to man whether he merely belongs to what-is (and to beingness) and proceeds with it, or risks the grounding of beyng's truth. The "word" – here, the essence of decision – from out of the beyng-historical essence of the word, i.e., man does not "have" the word, but the word "has" man.

The word belongs to the sustainment. In the responsive encounter, it is "*conversation*"; in the conflict, it is conversational *naming*; and thus in sustainment: naming conversation – ground of truth – site of the Da.

Possibility as essential possibility of man, whom we initially meet and see metaphysically always just as the actual, causal one, and *then* – remaining in the realm of metaphysics – explain from the first cause, be it "God" (creator), be it reason, or be it "life." Conversational naming as grounding – the word of poetry.

## VII. THE ESSENCING OF THE WORD

142. *Beyng* (p. 149)

"is" the clearing "of" refusal. But the clearing does not essence as opening up, in which and for which the refusal would then first be what is opened up and objectively graspable – but the clearing is also not merely an accompanying appearance stemming from the refusal; rather, the whole designation "clearing of refusal" is the ap-propriation of the appropriative event. (The twisting free into departure.) The refusal, however, means the keeping to itself of the sustainment, and accordingly the refusal holds into the light the *anbrechende Fügung* of the in-between. [The untranslated phrase suggests a stroke of fate that breaks like the dawn.]

Refusal does not mean that beyng is withdrawn or even merely unknowable, "ir-rational" as metaphysics says. On the contrary: beyng as clearing of refusal is in a way experienceable, by contrast to which every [...] remains constricted. Beyng is neither merely "clearing" nor merely refusal; rather, the refusal that clears intrinsically and appropriates the clearing (hesitation).

[...]

147. *The Truth of the Word* (p. 151)

is not to be defined as *adaequatio* or *homoiōsis*, nor according to sign-like correspondence or settlement or establishment. The word compels nothing, but rather lets free in the essential sense of first displacing – by attuning – into the attuned clearing, the free region. The word is the opening up of freedom.

Only what is free and inherent in *Da-sein* can be attuned and, as attuned, can become what listens.

The word liberates into freedom, and freedom seeks for itself – that it might keep safe its essence – the “law” in the sense of the fittingness of that which belongs in the sphere of the clearing of respective freedom.

[...]

149. *The Erschweigen of Stillness* (p. 152) [cf. the end of the Heraclitus lectures, GA 55]

*Verschweigen* [reticence]: not to say something sayable, i.e., not to communicate it; and this again from various motives (opportunities and aims).

*Schweigen* [silence]: to want to say something unsayable, but to be unable (silence from incapacity); to leave something unsayable in its unsayability (silence from capacity). The unsayable always various, because the “adequate” “word” is lacking; because the thought is not mastered; because not at all to be considered within the usual realm.

*Erschweigen* [to bear silence]: the unsaid – because essentially in all saying [it is] pre-said, co-said, and after-said in its ground, to preserve back the ground of its unsaidness and to preserve all saying in order to retain it as grounded.

This ground of this unsaidness is the abyssal ground as which being itself essences.

The *Er-schweigen* does not arise from the deficiencies of talk, but from belonging to stillness and for stillness.

The word is, inceptively, the silence-bearing [*erschwiegene*] voice of stillness.

The stillness of the abyssal ground of ap-propiation.

Bearing silence must, at times – in the transition – itself go into saying, but this saying does not break the stillness so much as testify that the saying itself is not capable of forcing what bears silence, since the saying must be appropriated by it.

[...]

151. *Stillness* (p. 153)

*Stillness*

*without* movement – to sit still, becalmed,  
*without* sound.

Holding still, being still, “to still”: *hunger and thirst*.

Stillness: gatheredness, restraint, “*pain*”

shelter, rest, stopping [*Anhalten*].

Stillness: neither privation of sound nor merely privation at all.

*Stillness: the over-flow of the abyssal ground.*

Overflow from and as articulated refusal [*Versagung*] – refusal [*Verweigerung*].

*Stillness: to bring to silence; to repose, to gentleness.*

*Stillness and soothing* – to let cross over gently into rest.

[...]

154. *Beyng*

*In the articulated refusal, it bestows its truth:*

stillness – as attuning, opening *displacement* into the clearing of what conceals itself.

In bestowing the truth, it ap-propriates the de-parture. As ap-proprietation, it grounds its own essencing as sustainment.

## VIII. IMAGE AND SOUND / THE SENSIBLE

156. *Not Image-less Thinking*, (p. 159)

*but to think back from the simple images into this.*

*Image* – the (compliant) look that joins itself into the hint.

What is insignificant in the simple image.

157. *Pain*

That we are not yet agreed about the *sensible version* [Sinnenhafte] – still to represent it errantly and not yet *to think* it.

The naming is already *wrong* – the sensed, *felt*.

158. *What Is Event-Relatedly Inceptive “in the Sensible”*

(Sensible-Nonsensible, sound – pain)

The *sensible* is more “sensual” than metaphysics thinks:

earthier – more sheltering – *more inceptive*;

the *non-sensible* is “more supersensible” than metaphysics thinks:

more clearing – more unsheltering – *more inceptive*.

Why the “difference” sets in here, and how man *adjusts* himself within it as the unexperienced and inceptiveless open region – the affixing by *tekhne* – *eidōs* – *hulē*.

The *sensible* counts as *affection* and excitation, “*stimulus*” and pleasure-unpleasure; *dull* – signless; *sheer thronging or tearing forth or activity*.

The *earthy*: what shelters the open region and calls the sky, and moreover only in the ring-dance of the event.

Only thus the *strange* – the self-fulfilling shelter of what’s trusted [or: the familiar, *Traute*] – what greets.

[...]

## IX. LANGUAGE

160. *Language* (p. 163)

The conversation of *beyng*’s saga is the *junction* of letting, protecting, dwelling releasement into freedom, is the fortress, the inconspicuous, sheltering one, the protector of the event.

Juncture of dwelling

Fortress of pain.

[...]

## X. LANGUAGE

162. Note (p. 169)

Regarding Hamann's claim [*Wort*]: "Reason is language, *logos*."

If *logos* is supposed to be thought in Heraclitus' sense, then this claim says: *gathering, sheltering – namely, what presences into the unity of presencing*. Yet Hamann's interpretation [of *logos*] (certainly according to the sense of the Gospel of John) can be set aside here.

More essential here is why it gets called "reason." Reason stands for the reception [*Vernehmen*] of beings in their being, of objects in their objectivity; this [objectivity] is receivedness [*Vernommenheit*] in reason, is reason. The being of beings, their beingness, is reason. Even if the fact does not come to light, this [objectivity] remains determined from the difference of beings and being, remains attuned to this difference. But this difference takes place in the divergence [*Unter-Schied*] for world and thing. The divergence takes place as the ringing of stillness [*Geläut der Stille*]. This is the speaking of language. In everything this leaves unthought, there essences hiddenly what Hamann thinks when he says: Reason is language. Hamann has thought nothing of all that; nevertheless, he has looked into the abyss of language.

Hamann's claim gives a hint into the concealed relation of language to the essence of being, in the sense [or: direction, *Sinne*] of the difference itself.

163. *logos*

Once again, it requires meditation on the question: How did *logos* attain the meaning of saying and speech?

*legein* – (cf. Heraclitus lectures 1942/43) – *lesen* – gathering

Gathering what presences into presencing –

presencing in itself [as] gathering from out of *Alētheia* –

*bringing-forth* and thus clearing – sheltering in unconcealedness, collecting the one with the other – *holding-together-with: Eon – Logos*

Accordingly: *legein* – as *homologein* (Heraclitus, Fragment 50)

*Legein* is saying – not [understood] starting from uttering aloud, but from the *cor-responsive gathering* of the inceptively emergent gathering; starting from the relation to the presencing of what presences – (from the still unthought and inceptively unthinkable *looking after* [*Schonen*])

*Das Gewese* – as the gathering of presencing.

To Edouard Mörike's Poems [July 12, 1955]

*September Morning (1827)*

In the fog, the world *yet rests*

Forest and field yet dream:  
Soon you will see, *when* the veil falls,  
The blue heaven undisguised and unmoved [*unverstellt*],  
Autumn-mighty the dampened world  
In warm gold *they flow*.

*At Midnight (1827)*

Serene, night settles over the countryside,  
Dreaming, leans against the mountains' wall,  
*Her eye now sees* the golden scales  
Of time resting silently in *equal* pans;  
And the springs rush forth more boldly,  
They sing to the mother, the night, into the ear  
Of the day,  
Of the day that was today.

The ancient old lullaby,  
Does not warn her, she is tired of it;  
*To her sky's blueness still sounds sweeter,*  
*Equally* curved yoke of fleeting hours.  
Yet always the springs *retain* the word,  
In *sleep* the waters still go on singing  
Of the day,  
Of the day passed today.

This evening, I would like to enter into a conversation with you. Such conversations are a matter of fortune. And in a proper conversation, it depends less on the resourcefulness of speaking than on the carefulness and persistence of listening.

/174/

Now, today's effort is especially *risky*.  
For it breaks in – at least, so it seems – from the *outside* and *unmediated* – into the regulated course of your studies.

Nonetheless, there exists a connection, and precisely to the pedagogy of German language teaching. There you learn of grammar, penmanship, and reading – and about the construction of the language, about writing, about reading and listening to what is spoken and what is written. This pedagogy deals with the manner according to which you are supposed to educate the young to the right use of the *mother* tongue.

We grow into the *mother* tongue; or, better, from out of it – we grow as from out of a *root* into the maturity of life. The mother tongue is for us so *customary* and so *near* that we have a hard time attending expressly to it.

Therefore, we *mistake* all too easily *its power and its fullness*.

Herder says once, concerning the mother tongue,

“A mountain, against which the small number of philosophical abstractions [are] a molehill artfully thrown up – some drops of spirit drained off against the world-sea!”

The everyday use of language serves the intelligibility of people among each other, serves communication. This representation of *language pushes today into the extreme*. We hardly attend to this process and do not measure its reach [*Tragweite*]. You know that today, in connection with the constructions of the electronic brain, they are building not only calculating machines but even thinking and translating machines. (Language machines)

/175/

All of this is no longer something strange and no incidental excess. The modern form of intelligibility and information *aims* at these machines. The building of such machines is only possible in that we grasp language in advance as *an instrument of information and only* as this. The relationship of human beings to language is conceived in an uncanny transformation. The trial of this transformation is carried out in *all silence*.

Over against that is the discovery, the use of *atomic energy* – toward which we constantly strive – a *very crude matter*, which is enacted in the *outer regions* of our being-there.

For all that, we shall not here make a value judgment about this *process*. It is only necessary to point to it. As if of itself, this pointer gives us a *motive to reflect* on *how* it stands with our *relationship* to language – *how* it stands with *language itself*.

It remains *inarguable*: language is a means for intelligibility.

Language is that *everywhere in the everyday*, where it deals with *customary relationships*.

But there are relationships *still other* than the *customary ones* –

Goethe simply calls them the “*deeper*” ones and says of language:

“In *common* life we necessarily make progress with language, because we designate *only superficial* relationships. As soon as the talk is of *deeper* relationships, at once there enters in *another* language, the *poetic*.”

Goethe distinguishes everyday language from poetic language.

Because in this matter the talk is of deeper relationships, *we hope* to reach *through poetic* language even *deeper* into the *essence and reign* of language.

/176/

That’s why I have selected for our conversation two *poems*.

The choice of the poet, Edouard Mörike, just as much as the selection of the two poems, at first appears *arbitrary*.

Only the selected *poems* themselves are capable of *justifying* the choice. The two poems [are] titled: “September Morning” and “At Midnight.”

Both are composed in the same year (1827); Mörike’s poetry first appeared in 1838.

We will now simply read the poems; “*simply*” – i.e., unmediatedly and such that we leave behind us the *manifold considerations* that have already been raised.

Poems! Why still poems? *Whither* do “poems” belong? And even to speak *about* poetry –. It is still always and unavoidably a speaking that falls apart [*Zerreden*].

We are supposed, if possible, “to experience” [*erleben*] poems – everyone finds the “experience” in such a case most optimal, if he leaves a poem alone, undisturbed for itself – in a moment, where it perhaps pushes him to grab for a volume of poetry.

But now – to treat concerning “poems.”

Yet let us consider them. We will read the first poem.

“September Morning” [see above]

We have read and understood everything – ;  
no other language than the customary – ; perhaps a single word – at the start of the penultimate line, “*Autumn-mighty*” – Mighty in the manner of autumn:

1. powerful – fully developed – “ripe”  
fruits
2. Power sheltering in itself – seed –  
promising – the blooms to come.

And in the same line, *perhaps yet another* word

“*dampened*” – a certain contrast to “*autumn-mighty*”

“*to dampen, to muffle*” – “to make the fire smoke / *to moderate* fire”

/177/

The forcing [of plants, as in hothouses] and blooming, the luxuriance of summer.

“*withdrawn*”

“*restrained*” and thus denser, more capable – “*mighty*”

“*September Morning*”

“*in warm gold*” –

Gold – | *warm* Illuminating – warming – pomp – splendor

Bringing – guarding – resting

Cf. Pindar, *Isthm.* V:

O Mother of Helios, goddess rich in names,

By your will, men believe gold to be

Great in might [*megasthenē*], overwhelming all else.

Have read – *to read?* To assemble word for word.

| to concentrate on what is said –

what is unsaid.

What does the poem say! |

Description of nature and, by contrast, man

“*Making a statement*” – “*Expressing feelings*”

Title: “*Time of year and time of day*” | *September* – Autumn

(Writing style!)

*Decline* of the year

*Morning*: Arising [or: emerging]

Dawn [or: earliness]

Which saying? “*No propositions*”

Instituted: *Emergence of the autumn day*



| | saying itself [as] *singing!*

What is language? To speak about language!  
To talk about poetry.

And yet!

*On the sea* – to return to old shores  
the traditional representation – “grammar”  
“logic”

*Wilhelm von Humboldt* (Herder – Hamann)

“Man is only man through language; but in order to invent language, he had already to be man.” *On the Comparative Study of Language*, 1820

“Language is worldview”

“Expression of spirit and the worldview of the speaker.”

“... a true *world*, which the spirit, by the interior labor of its might, has to set between itself and the objects.”

/180/

*Language as energeia* [being at work] *and ergon* [work, product]  
Humboldt German Idealism | Kant – Leibniz |

Every *speaking about* – to take back –  
to set the poems free into their “shape”  
gathering of *placing-toward* [Zu-Stellen]  
of “what endures” (event)

*Astonishing* –

to learn wonder – before the mystery of the inapparent.

Language – saying – *the nearest and the near*.

*The way to what is near is the longest.*

#### Additions

1.

Humboldt On the Comparative Study of Language 1820

“Man is only man through language; but in order to invent language, he had already to be man.”

“Language must lie ... wholly and already in context in man.”

“Language is the character of our reason, by which alone it achieves shape and grows forth.”

Herder

/181/

2.

Herder: *Poesy* is the *originary language* of humanity.  
But what is *poesy*?

3.

*Every institution [Stiftung] is inexhaustible.*

### *Image and Word*

The *theme* of this seminar is *circumscribed* by the title "*Image and Word.*"

Thereby we avoid, where possible, all detours, but we also do not preconceive the matter. Rather, we let the conversation itself attain it; *initially*, an indication will suffice of what is supposed to give to the conversation the *always necessary foothold*. We take the *guiding threads* from *five* regions that seem to lie far apart from one another, namely:

1. From Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 10, Chapters 7-8
2. A designation from "the experience of thinking"
3. From Tsuang-Tse, "The Bell-Stand"<sup>17</sup>
4. Paul Klee's Jena talk "On Modern Art" 1924 - main ideas
5. Heraclitus, Fragment 112

One could well think that already a single one of these guiding threads would be broad-ranging enough to spend a few hours on, to follow it with some meditateness.

But the threads named are so properly *interwoven* that a *web* becomes visible in them, one which shows into an area of concern [*Gewese*] that we do *not* otherwise catch sight of.

(We are addressed by it from a great distance through the title "*Image and Word.*")

The necessarily *fleeting* pursuit of the five guiding threads would like, however, to become *at the same time* a *motive*, to pursue *further on!* in thought the web that is the texture of a veil, which unveils in that it veils over, namely, the imageless aspect of the wordless.

*Preparation* for the single hours consists comparatively little in knowledge of the named texts. It is more a matter of *concentrating on the capacity* to listen to one another, i.e., to receive what the individual, in each case in conversation, precisely is *not* in a position to *say*.

Such concentration demands a *readiness* for the *puzzlingness* of the matters and contexts that *approach* us in conversation.

---

<sup>17</sup> [This is the story of wood-carver Khing, who explains his art as a matter of fasting until he has forgotten himself and his purposes and can see the potential in the wood. In one translation, it is section 10 of chapter 19, "The Full Understanding of Life."]

The style of such a conversation does not admit of being described beforehand; it must arise as an image *from out of the matter*, as measured by *how* we are *approached* by it and *thus* learn that we are already admitted *into* it.

Because the pressing questions are manifold, the class size remains nevertheless limited; *interventions* [or *interruptions*] cannot be avoided, as little as certain *school*-mandated practices.

This demands, or at least so it seems, already at the start, that we first of all propose univocal statements concerning what is meant by the names in the title: What does 'image' mean? What does 'word' mean?

If we wanted to answer these questions *on the well-worn track of definitions*, then we would destroy for ourselves by such a procedure the *way* into the *conversation*.

Fortunately – because from destiny – we *understand* now already what the names say, even if this *understanding* is bound by unproven opinions and at the same time blurs in *indeterminacy*.

More important than completeness in the possession of definitions, which only offers the appearance of a rigorous thinking, is, meanwhile, to attend to the following: that with the elucidation of the themes "image and word" we stand amidst the distress of our age and deal with no side issues or merely aesthetic things.

The transformation of essence of image and word – and that of the *human relation* to both – does not first arise from a contemporary cluelessness and a consequent misuse of image and word; the designated transformation is really driven by an *im*-pulse from whose essential origin one looks away.

Therefore, we are led in the course of the conversation, if not to work out definitions for 'image' and 'word,' yet *to clarify the region* into which the two names speak.

But that requires, of course, a rough *indication* of the *direction* of the way that the conversation would like to go.

## Part 2: Toward the Question Concerning Art

### *Toward the Question Concerning Art*

#### *Art and Space*

#### *The Artwork and "Art History"*

#### *Meditation on Essence and Conduct of the "Science" of Art History*

From GA 4, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*

GA pp. 18-19/ *Elucidations* 37, on truth:

In the Alps, the ever-stiller self-surmounting of the high up to the highest takes place. The peaks of the mountain range, which is the outermost messenger of the earth, soar into the light, toward the "angel of the year" [= light]. That's why they are "the peaks of time." Yet still higher up, above the light, the cheerful [*das Heitere*] is first cleared into pure brightening up, without which, even for the light, its brightness would never be spaced in. What is highest "above the light" is the streaming clearing itself. According to an ancient word of our mother tongue, we call what purely clears, what first spaces in, i.e., grants the open region for each space and each time-space, "gaiety" [*die Heitere*]. At one and the same time, it is the clarity (*claritas*) in whose brightness rests everything clear, the grandeur [*Hoheit*] (*serenitas*) in whose rigor stands everything high, and the merriment [*Frohheit*] (*hilaritas*) in whose play vibrates everything liberated. Gaiety maintains and has everything within what is undisturbed and hale. Gaiety heals originarily. She is the holy. "What is highest" and "what is holy" are the same for the poet: gaiety. As the origin of everything joyful, she remains the most joyful. In this greatest joy, the pure brightening up takes place. Here in "what is highest" dwells "the height," which is who he is as the one re-joying "in the play of holy rays": *the joyful one*. If he is always one, then he seems inclined "to create joy, with us." Because his essence is brightening up, "he loves" "to open up" and "to illuminate." Through clear gaiety, he "opens up" the things into the rejoicing aspect of their presence. Through merry gaiety, he illuminates the hearts of human beings, so that their courage is open for the solidity of their fields, cities, and houses. Through grand gaiety, he first lets the dark depth gape open in its clearedness. What would depth be without clearing?