

DECONSTRUCTION OF THE *DESTRUKTION* – HEIDEGGER AND DERRIDA

ZSUZSANNA LURCZA *

Abstract Derrida's deconstruction is closely related to Heidegger's programme of *Destruktion*, philosophy of difference and formulation of the claim of transcending metaphysics. In spite of the similarities and differences of *Destruktion* and deconstruction, Heidegger's thinking proves to be unavoidable for Derrida. Nevertheless Derrida's deconstruction can be interpreted as the deconstruction of the Heideggerian *Destruktion*. This study will outline the central points of the philosophy of *Destruktion* and deconstruction.

Keywords Martin Heidegger, Jacques Derrida, deconstruction, *Destruktion*, philosophy of difference, metaphysics

1. De-ConstrAction¹

"Deconstruction is not 'possible' if 'possible' [...]. Deconstruction is an explanation *with*, an experience *of* the impossible."

(J. Derrida)²

According to the classic description of deconstruction, Derrida created the concept known as deconstruction starting from the issues raised by the theory of language, literary theory and psychoanalysis. The action of deconstruction as "*plus d'une langue*", with the elaboration of critical concepts like *différance*, *dissemination*, *double bind*, *negotiation*, *traces of the trace* and *play*, displays the need to demolish the attitude and linguistic apparatus connected to the tradition of language, metaphysical language, the metaphysical nature of the language and the linguistic nature of metaphysics.

* doi: 10.26424/philobib.2017.22.2.11

Visiting researcher at the University of Kassel, Institute of Philosophy. lurcza_zsuzsa@yahoo.com.

¹ A more detailed version of this chapter was published in *Studia UBB. Philosophia* 62. (2017): 1. 97–106.

² Jacques Derrida, "Politics and Friendship," in *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971–2001*, ed. Elizabeth Rottenberg (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 192.

The action of deconstruction as “*plus d’une langue*”,³ “more than a language”, that is a “multiplication”, which transcends and splits language; “more than language”, but also “less than one”, the “dispersal”, the belatedness, the “less than merely *one pure language*” displays the forceful critical wave of the western tradition of metaphysics. Deconstruction resists becoming any kind of theory, method, or system, it turns away from the German tradition of idealism, the philosophy of identity, the unity of I and non-I,⁴ from Hegel’s dialectic – the conception of the identity of the identical and non-identical (non-A = A),⁵ the claiming and restoration of identity. Adorno, in his ideology criticism and negative dialectic in the spirit of the Frankfurt School, already calls for renouncing the Hegel-related dialectical, identity-centred, totality-centred principles. Derrida also criticises Hegel – as well as dialectic – who is the last notable philosopher in the European philosophy tradition of system construction, but Derrida, with the intention of deconstruction, acts against any kind of system or need for dialectic. Instead of system building, deconstruction is related to the unsuspended, the unfinished, the unclosed, and the undecided.

The unfinished, the unclosed, the undecided can paradoxically refer to the acceptance of the certainty of the unfinished and the unclosed, and this could also work as a kind of certainty if we accepted it as a system, a method, a principle, and we could be certain of its certainty. This signals on the one hand the paradoxical effect of deconstruction, while on the other hand it points to the experience of another kind of thinking. Deconstruction is thus rather an *unfinished movement*, for it lends its presupposed “self” to “its own” effect instead of building a system. Derrida accuses deconstruction “of never being established as such and with that name. Of never being able to define the unity of its project or its object. Of not being able to either write its discourse on method or to describe the limits of its field”.⁶ Deconstruction is therefore not a positive science, it is not organised as a system, it is not definitive, but its so-called “*end product*” is not the ruin. It cannot be its end product as long as it is incomplete. That is, it is itself *différance*, *dissemination*, *double bind*, *negotiation*, *trace of traces* and *play*. Just as the *différance* always starts, but never ends, deconstruction can also never be completed as long as there is a conceptual system, as long as there is language. For this very reason, deconstruction shares no constructive intention of systematization, but this is not a negative category or a simple lack, but a kind of (*paradigm*)*shift* (if one could speak at all about a paradigm here), or rather as a kind of shift of a series: “the excess — but can we still call it that — is only a certain displacement of the series”,⁷ Derrida claims. Derrida’s deconstruction can be seen thus as a revolt against the rule of the method, for it can be defined as lacking or going against, or rather deconstructing all methodological necessities.

³ Derrida, *Mémoires pour Paul de Man* (Paris: Galilée, 1988), 116.

⁴ Johann G. Fichte, *Grundlage der gesamten Wissenschaftslehre* (1794) (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1956), 44.

⁵ Georg W. Fr. Hegel, “Differenz des Fichteschen und Schellingschen Systems der Philosophie (1801),” in *Jenaer Schriften 1801–1807 Werke 2* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1970), 38.

⁶ Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997), 4.

⁷ Derrida, “Platos Pharmacy,” in *Dissemination* (London: The Athlone Press, 1981): 104.

Deconstruction is formulated as an opposition to the method and the structure, since the structure is precisely something that neutralises and always favours an essential centre.⁸ Derrida's deconstruction is a *textual operation* against constancy, a need for escaping the method. The deconstruction is therefore not a method, nor a procedure or a technique which may lead to some kind of "truth" or "understanding", it has no kind of programmatic message, but it is characterised by *event-like-ness*. The "truth" is that "*there is no truth*". The texts are event-like, process-like, encounters, deconstruction is thus event and progress, *a series of events* which tries to shift, dislocate, and overthrow the established systems and the system as such. There is no dialogical relationship, adequate mode of writing, there is no unitary or non-unitary method, no standard system of thought is formed. Deconstruction does not, cannot reach the method, but deconstructs it, remaining at all times in an intermediate space between permanent formation and readiness.

An important ~~concept~~ *assemblage (faisceau)* of deconstruction is the *negotiation*, which has no, can have no general rule, law, or method, but "there is" "[...] the impossibility of stopping, this means: no thesis, no position, no theme, no station, no substance, no stability, a perpetual suspension, a suspension without rest".⁹ In the interview entitled *Negotiations*, Derrida connects the status of deconstruction to *negotiation*. An essential aspect of negotiation is that "it is always different, differential".¹⁰ The deconstructionist *negotiation* is related to *decision*, while decidability to *undecidability*, for there must always be undecidability and unpredictability, or else negotiation would be nothing more than mere *calculation*, simple *programming*, *trafik*,¹¹ *causality*. The deconstructionist negotiation is thus connected to decision and undecidability. Undecidability is what gives way to a certain possibility of ethical or political decision.¹² Derrida expands on *negotiation* with the help of the metaphor of the *knot* that reminds one of weaving a *rope*.¹³ *Negotiation* is like a *woven rope*, intertwined, *negotiation* "is none other than deconstruction itself."¹⁴

The assemblage of *dissemination* also bears the effects of deconstruction, the dispersal of *dissemination* "opens up a *snag* in writing that can no longer be mended, a spot where neither meaning, however plural, nor *any form of presence* can pin/pen down (*agraphe*) the trace. Dissemination treats – a doctors – that *point* where the movement of signification would regularly come to *tie down* the play of the trace".¹⁵ Derrida's work reveals that the status of deconstruction is connected to these critical-deconstructionist terms,

⁸ Cf. Derrida, *Positions* (London: Athlone, 1981), 278–279.

⁹ Derrida, "Negotiations," in *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971–2001*, 13.

¹⁰ Ibid., 17 – "An essential aspect of negotiation is that it is always different, differential, not only from one individual to another, from one situation to another, but even for the same individual, from one moment to the next."

¹¹ Cf. Ibid., 13.

¹² Derrida, "Ethics and Politics Today," in *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971–2001*, 298.

¹³ Derrida, *Negotiations*. 29.

¹⁴ Ibid., 16.

¹⁵ Derrida, "Outwork, Prefacing," in *Dissemination*, 26.

meaning that deconstruction itself is *negotiation, double bind, dissemination, postponement* without an end product, *trace of traces, play* and *différance* without method and rule.

Another key term or *assemblage (faisceau)* of Derrida's deconstruction is the *différance*. Nietzsche already – also in the spirit of distancing himself from dialectic – radicalises the concept of difference and *change*, just as Heidegger does with the concept of ontological difference (*ontologische Differenz*) in his philosophy of *Destruktion* and difference. Apart from Nietzsche's and Heidegger's philosophy of destruction and difference, Freud's psychoanalysis, especially the concept of *dissociation (Dissoziation – disassociare, 'trennen, scheiden')*¹⁶ has *left its trace* on deconstruction. For Freud, this concept refers to the splitting of the I (*Ichspaltung*), and later it made its way into the psychological language as the disintegration, fragmentation of consciousness. Freud's psychoanalysis goes through a radical change, as the I is no longer in control of itself, the authority of consciousness is questioned, the modern psychological status of the I is decentralised, and the unitary conception of the "I", the "*subject*" is broken. The unconscious for Freud is not an entity hidden within itself, not a "being-there", not a "*Oneself*", does not substitute a "*Oneself*", it is not conscious, not a "being-there", but retroactiveness (*Nachträglichkeit*), not based on the opposition of "being-there"-"being-distant", but postponement, differing, created by differences.

Another important point of contact for deconstruction and *différance* is Saussure's structuralist theory of language. The instance of the Saussurean language theory important for deconstruction appears in the turn that, instead of a system of *identities*, the language is a system of *differences*, "*in der Sprache nur Differenzen [es] gibt*"¹⁷ – Saussure states in his work *Grundfragen der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*. In his interpretation of Saussure, Derrida emphasises the "play of differences",¹⁸ which is the sign's condition of operation: "the play of difference the functional condition, the condition of possibility, for every sign."¹⁹ The system of language consists of differences, "*this differences play a role* in language, in speech as well, and in the exchange between language and speech. On the other hand, these differences are themselves effects,"²⁰ not being ready. Saussure's semiology emphasises the sign's arbitrariness and differential character, and the idea of *difference* is prioritised over that of *identity*.

The *change* for Nietzsche, the ontological difference (*ontologische Differenz*) for Heidegger, the continuous modification (*kontinuierliche Modifikation*) in Husserl's phenomenology,²¹ the "pure difference" (*reine Differenz*) for Deleuze,²² and the *Differend* for

¹⁶ Sigmund Freud and Josef Breuer, *Studien über Hysterie* (Leipzig, Wien: Franz Deuticke, 1895), quoted in Susanne Lüdemann, *Jacques Derrida zur Einführung* (Hamburg: Junius Verlag, 2011), 32.

¹⁷ Ferdinand de Saussure, *Grundfragen der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967), 139.

¹⁸ Derrida, "*Différance*" (1968), Project Lamar: pp 278–301. Web. 20th of November, 2015. 291.

¹⁹ Ibid., 281.

²⁰ Ibid., 286.

²¹ Edmund Husserl, "Zur Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewußtseins (1893–1917)," ed. R. Boehm, *Husserliana X*. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), 29.

Lyotard play a central role in the respective philosophies as the various concepts of difference in the theories of post-structuralism and postmodernism. Based on these, the difference becomes the “object” of research increasingly as “*difference*”, “*differences*”, “*differentiated differences*”, and the differences become ever more differentiated, not merely as the opposition or denial or unity and identity. The new concept of *difference* is formulated in opposition to metaphysics, in the spirit of the “transcendence” of metaphysics, as a critique, a “project” or need to transcend metaphysics. Unquestionably, however, the various programmes to transcend metaphysics are also discourses embedded into the very spirit of metaphysics, and they can somehow only be that. Derrida emphasises that “difference remains a metaphysical name; and all the names that it receives from our language are still, so far as they are names, metaphysical”.²³ In spite of this, the dialectical tradition, the German idealist tradition and the philosophy of identity turn into the differentiation of the *difference* and the *philosophies*, *destructions*, *deconstructions of difference* and the *post-structuralist and postmodern theories*, that is, the tradition of unity increasingly turning against itself.

Derrida’s deconstruction recognises not the *transformation*, the *modification*, the *difference*, but the *différance*. The *différance* does not refer to a concept, but instead, Derrida uses the word *assemblage* (*faisceau*), claiming that the “the word ‘assemblage’ seems more apt to suggesting that the kind of bringing-together proposed here has the structure of an interlacing, a weaving, or a web.”²⁴ This idea is not merely about a shift from one concept to another, but a critique of the language, a critique of the metaphysical nature of language, and the critique of the conceptual system and the thinking pattern connected to the metaphysical nature of language, because when we speak of the critique of metaphysics, we also speak about the metaphysical nature and language and the linguistic nature of metaphysics. Derrida exposes in the semantic analysis of the French verb *différer* – and the Latin *differre* –, that the *différer* refers, on the one hand to temporal and spatial difference, it means postponement, belatedness, evasive temporal mediation, procrastination, the “taking-account of time and forces in an operation,”²⁵ that is, it means *temporalization*, which “suspends the accomplishment or fulfilment of ‘desire’ or ‘will’.”²⁶ On the other hand, it means *non-identity*, different otherness, it marks “of not being identical, of being other, of being discernible.”²⁷ *Difference* with an “e” cannot express temporization (*différer*), nor polemics (*différend*), that is why Derrida considers justified to use the term *différance*. However, the difference between the expressions *différ(e)nce* and *différ(a)nce disappears*, it hardly appears for the eyes and the ears, therefore the *différance* does not appear, it practically *does not*

²² Gilles Deleuze, *Differenz und Wiederholung* (München: Fink Verlag, 1992), 11–12.

²³ Derrida, *Difference*, 299.

²⁴ Ibid., 280.

²⁵ Ibid., 283.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

exist.²⁸ The situation is similar to the status of deconstruction as well. The concepts to deconstruct are circulating, but never end, never rest in an identity, never become permanent, never settle in a presence, never join a static meaning.

One of the rhetorical questions often asked about deconstruction is where the always renewing “destructions” lead. What is the play about? The “nothing”? Less about a settled, identical, unitary, definable presence. Where does deconstruction’s undecidability or lack of foundation lead? What can this “lack of foundation” be a foundation of? Will deconstruction become its own purpose? Should one speak about the self-deconstruction of deconstruction? Does deconstruction deconstruct the “deconstructable”, then “itself” too? How, if it has no “itselfness”? Will anything remain of it, where the “anything” is only presupposed and becomes an object of renewing deconstruction? In opposition to the Heideggerian *Destruktion*, founded on the unity of *destruction* and *construction* (*Einheit von Destruktion und Konstruktion*),²⁹ the deconstruction does not claim for itself an explicitly constructive intent; however, deconstruction is actually *radically constructive*, for it tends towards a new, unfinished context by its demolition and disassembling, without this always yet-to-come context ever settling or completing. Moreover, de-(con)struction always overwrites the opposition of pure destruction and construction, deconstruction and construction. The “context” of de-(con)struction no longer possesses identity, unity, “being-there”, the possibility to be founded on oppositions, and thus it is almost a non-existent context but one that lends its presumed self to de-(con)struction at any time. This is probably the reason that deconstruction is an “unfinished movement”, an *experience of the impossible*,³⁰ that is, “deconstruction is not ‘possible’ if ‘possible’.”³¹ Deconstruction can be described as anarchical, since it discredits the *arche*, the *origin*, the *command*, – “Deconstruction is undoubtedly anarchic; it would be in principle, if such a thing could be said. It puts into question the *arche*, the beginning and the commandment [...]”³² – while at the same time it is also constructive and radically creative.

What are the consequences, if the movement and duplication of the *différance* “spread over onto every word and concept and displays them for what they really are, while also prevents them from being what they really are”?³³ There is no “entity” or “id-entity” to which the movement of the *différance* would not extend. The deconstruction and its critical ~~concepts~~ *assemblages* (*faisceau*) lead/would lead, or point/would point to a kind of *beyondness*. From a deconstructionist point of view, the primary task is the demolition and

²⁸ Derrida, “Excerpt from *Différance*,” in *Margins of Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

²⁹ See Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*. 6. *Die Aufgabe einer Destruktion der Geschichte der Ontologie*. *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1967), 27–36.

³⁰ Derrida, *Politics and Friendship*, 192.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., 22.

³³ Geoffrey Bennington and Jacques Derrida, *Jacques Derrida* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993).

dismantling of the *consciousness of identity, unity, "being-there", pure origin, the basis of conceptual oppositions, the identity of meaning, the "centre", the centralization, centrism, west-centrism, ethnocentrism, etc., the transcendence of the conceptual system of metaphysics and metaphysics-policy and the transcendence of the associated thinking, practice, and "institutional framework", and perhaps the "transcendence" of the transcendence. The ~~concepts~~/assemblages (faisceau) of deconstruction* are thus not only new expressions, but also *operations and actions*.

In Derrida's deconstruction one can trace as the concepts analyzed "are becoming sheaves". In deconstruction perceived as the radicalization of the Heideggerian *Destruktion*, for Derrida the emphasis is no longer on *reinterpretation*, but on *picking into pieces*. The deconstructionist critical assemblages (*faisceau*) call for the deconstruction of the "being-there", the unity and identity, and the metaphysics of the "being-there", or of metaphysics as the science of "being-there". These terms, called assemblages instead of concepts, are not positive, ready-made notions. They do not answer the question "*What is...?*", but deconstruct them, and also deconstruct the kind of questioning which already presupposes a "*what*" or a "*who*". The language of deconstruction seems to contradict the questions of "*What...?*" and "*Who...?*", the tradition connected to the logos and logological attitude which necessarily speaks about some *Thing*.³⁴ Derrida's deconstruction points to one way of uttering and writing the language, attempting to somewhat shift the western European tradition of metaphysics. Just as deconstruction is *not* (es "ist" nicht), it cannot state that what there "is" ("ist"). What the terms *différance, dissemination, negotiation, trace, play, pharmakon*, and other critical term of Derrida "want to say" – if they have to say it – is something that comes *before the concept* ("vor" dem Begriff), *before word and name* ("vor" dem Wort), before the *something*, the "*what*" ("vor" dem "Etwas"), which has no being and "being-there".³⁵

Derrida proposes the deconstruction and dismantling of all the concepts which refer to some kind of "being-there", origin, centre, unity, identity, such as: "*eidōs, arche, telos, energeia, ousia* (essence, existence, substance, subject) *alatheia*, transcendentality, consciousness, God, man, and so forth".³⁶ The operation of deconstruction however also asks for the demolition of terminological and ethical, political, legal procedures: specifically the demolition of the unity- and identity-based conception of the *self*, the *subject, identity, culture*, or *cultural identity*, the deconstruction of ethical, political and legal systems based on these definitions, the deconstruction of *ethnocentrism* and *centrisms* like *west-centrism* or *Europe-centrism*. All this highlights the critique and need for deconstruction of identificatory conceptual thinking and the related practices, connected to the need for deconstruction of a

³⁴ Derrida: *Wie nicht sprechen?* ed. Peter Engelmann (Wien: Passagen Verlag, 1989), 63. – "Ein Logos spricht notwendig von etwas; er kann nicht vermeiden, von etwas zu sprechen; es ist unmöglich."

³⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 19 – "Es 'ist' nicht und sagt nicht dies, was 'ist'. Dies, was die 'différance', die 'Spur' und so weiter 'sagen-will' – was von nun an *nichts sagen will* –, dies wäre 'vor' dem Begriff, dem Namen, dem Wort, 'etwas', das nichts wäre, das nicht mehr dem Sein, der Anwesenheit oder der Gegenwärtigkeit des Gegenwärtigen [...] angehörte."

³⁶ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 19.

line of other concepts and practices: the deconstruction of the traditional formal perception of communication, consensus and cooperation, the deconstruction and reconstruction of human and political rights, social justice and west-centred democracy.

2. Deconstruction as the deconstruction of the *Destruktion*

“Constructing in philosophy is necessarily destruction”.
(M. Heidegger)³⁷

Derrida’s deconstruction is closely related to Heidegger’s programme of *Destruktion*, philosophy of difference and the formulation of the claim of transcending metaphysics. The young Heidegger outlines the idea of hermeneutical *Destruktion* already in his series of lectures entitled *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles* in 1922, expounding that the “actualization of philosophizing is carried out in the manner of a destruction,”³⁸ and hermeneutics can be thinkable only through destruction [*auf dem Wege der Destruktion*].³⁹ In 1927, in *Sein und Zeit*, beside the ontological analytics of *Dasein* (§ 5. *Die ontologische Analytik des Daseins als Freilegung des Horizontes für eine Interpretation des Sinnes von Sein überhaupt*),⁴⁰ the task of destruction of the history of ontology (§ 6. *Die Aufgabe einer Destruktion der Geschichte der Ontologie*)⁴¹ is formulated as historical-hermeneutical, ontological-phenomenological *Destruktion*. However, “beside” can be a highly misleading notion, since Heidegger’s programme of *Destruktion* may even be interpreted as a leitmotif,⁴² as Grondin points out (*primäre und originäre Aufgabe*). Although in Heidegger’s late work the term *Destruktion* occurs more rarely, *Destruktion* is radicalised rather than being pushed into the background. In his second period of creation, Heidegger formulates the *claim of transcending metaphysics*, which is closely related to *Destruktion* and is also connected with the Nietzschean orientation, and exercises a powerful impact on Derrida’s deconstruction. Heidegger’s programme of *Destruktion* provides a critique of the traditional concept and

³⁷ Heidegger, *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press Bloomington & 1982), 23. Original text: “Konstruktion der Philosophie ist notwendig Destruktion.” In “Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie,” ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, *Gesamtausgabe II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944*. Vol. 24 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989), 31.

³⁸ Heidegger, *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 51.

³⁹ Heidegger, “*Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles (Anzeige der hermeneutischen Situation)*”, ed. Günther Neumann, *Phänomenologische Interpretationen ausgewählter Abhandlungen des Aristoteles zur Ontologie und Logik* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2005), 368.

⁴⁰ Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 15–19.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 19–27.

⁴² Cf. Jean Grondin, “Die Wiedererweckung der Seinsfrage auf dem Weg einer phänomenologischhermeneutischen Destruktion,” Hrsg. Thomas Rentsch *Heidegger: Sein und Zeit* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2007), 22.

dichotomy of subject–object, the notions of I and identity, the thesis of *cogito sum*,⁴³ as the omission of the question of being, of the question referring to the mode of being of the *res cogitans* and the *sum*, the history of philosophy itself (*Destruktion der Geschichte der Philosophie*),⁴⁴ and last but not least, language and conceptual language.

In the 1927 summer semester lectures entitled *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, Heidegger expounds that the essence of the phenomenological method manifests in the belonging-together of *reduction*, *construction* and *destruction*.⁴⁵ *Destruktion* necessarily accompanies the phenomenological method that Heidegger called *reductive construction*⁴⁶ (*reduktive Konstruktion*),⁴⁷ “only by means of this destruction can ontology fully assure itself in a phenomenological way of the genuine character of its concepts”⁴⁸ (Echtheit ihrer Begriffe).⁴⁹ But what is this “conceptual authenticity”? Can we speak of conceptual authenticity at all? What can be an authentic concept, can it be authentic at all, and how can “authentic” concepts be accessed? In what direction should a philosopher turn, the one who questions the issue of authenticity of conceptual systems? – by always thinking in these conceptual systems, starting from them, so that starting from them and questioning them, revising them, he should “gain them back”, or more precisely, make them accessible. “The Husserlian principle ‘back to the things’ turns into the slogan: ‘back to the origins’, that is, ‘back to the historical origins’ at Heidegger”.⁵⁰ This destructive return to the origins wishes to destruct what the interpretation, according to a certain tradition and to the metaphysical tradition, produced, thus making it accessible again, outlining a new beginning and perhaps also a new metaphysics. The return to the Greeks alludes to the fact that Heidegger does not consider adequate the supremacy of conceptual systems, instead, he wishes to examine them in terms of their origin, since the “hardened traditions must be loosened up, and the concealments which it has brought about must be dissolved”⁵¹ – we learn from *Sein und Zeit*. The revision of origin and beginning is in

⁴³ “Destruktion des ‘cogito sum’,” in Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*. – § 18. *Bewandtnis und Bedeutsamkeit; die Weltlichkeit der Welt B. Die Abhebung der Analyse der Weltlichkeit gegen die Interpretation der Welt bei Descartes*, 89.

⁴⁴ Ibid. – “historische[n] Destruktion der Geschichte der Philosophie.” – § 75. *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Daseins und die Welt-Geschichte*. – Ibid., 392.

⁴⁵ Heidegger, *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 23.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 22–23.

⁴⁷ Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 31. – “Daher gehört notwendig zur begrifflichen Interpretation des Seins und seiner Strukturen, d. h. zur reduktiven Konstruktion des Seins eine *Destruktion*, d. h. ein kritischer Abbau der überkommenen und zunächst notwendig zu verwendenden Begriffe auf die Quellen, aus denen sie geschöpft sind.”

⁴⁸ Heidegger, *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 23.

⁴⁹ Original text: “Erst durch die Destruktion kann sich die Ontologie phänomenologisch der Echtheit ihrer Begriffe voll versichern.” Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 31.

⁵⁰ István M. Fehér, *Destrukcio és applikáció, avagy a filozófia mint ‘saját korának filozófiája’*. *Történelem és történetiség Heidegger és Gadamer gondolkodásában* (*Destruction and Application, or Philosophy as the ‘Philosophy of Its Own Age. History and Historicity in Heidegger’s and Gadamer’s Thinking*), 19–33.

⁵¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 44.

fact the revision of tradition and reckoning with the past, since tradition, “what it ‘transmits’ is made so inaccessible, proximally and for the most part, that it rather becomes concealed.”⁵² Tradition, by making the inherited almost self-evident or makes it appear as self-evident, conceals it in fact, “it blocks our access to those primordial ‘sources’ [...]. Indeed it makes us forget that they have had such an origin,”⁵³ and “Dasein has had its historicity so thoroughly uprooted by tradition.”⁵⁴

Based on Heidegger’s *Destruktion*, the historicity of *Dasein* can be concealment (*Verborgenheit*) or uncoveredness (*Entdecktheit*), the *Dasein* can discover, preserve and follow, tradition study it.⁵⁵ *Destruktion* does not mean the rejection of tradition or its demolition (*Zerstören*), or condemning or judging tradition (*Verurteilung*), and it does not mean its annihilation by any means; it means its decomposition (*Abbau*).⁵⁶ Heidegger’s programme of *Destruktion*, as the decomposition of the inherited – thus making it comprehensible again – has an expressly *positive aim* (hat *positive Absicht*),⁵⁷ “its negative function remains unexpressed and indirect,”⁵⁸ thus *Destruktion* and *Konstruktion* basically belong together. For Heidegger the *Destruktion* of tradition passed on in the course of history is also connected with Nietzsche’s destruction and criticism of historicity,⁵⁹ and also exercises an impact on Derrida’s

⁵² Ibid., 43.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 41.

⁵⁶ Heidegger, *Identität und Differenz* – “Destruktion bedeutet nicht Zerstören, sondern Abbauen, Abtragen und Auf-die-Seite-stellen – nämlich die nur historischen Aussagen über die Geschichte der Philosophie.” – *Was ist das – die Philosophie?* 3–27. 20.

⁵⁷ Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 23.

⁵⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 44.

⁵⁹ Modern philosophy’s criticism of historicity is related to Nietzsche. In his work entitled *On the Use and Abuse of History for Life* Nietzsche claims that “we do need history, but quite differently from the jaded idlers in the garden of knowledge [...]. We need it for life and action.” – Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Use and Abuse of History for Life* (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2005), 3. All this is related to *affirmation of life* and *affirmation*, as history is justified only as long as it serves “life”. Nietzsche provided the critique of the traditional view of time, introducing the notions of *unhistorical* and *super-historical* world view. He expounds on the essence of unhistorical world view by comparing humans and animals: animals are incapable of remembering and live in a constant state of oblivion, this is why they cannot grasp the continuity of time, thus they live “unhistorically.” – Ibid., 9. Contrary to this, with humans disposing of a historical view, the essence of life lies in continuity, this is why they turn towards the past and try to understand the present from the past, so man. According to Nietzsche, it is the *capacity of forgetting* that relieves this tension: “One who cannot leave himself behind on the threshold of the moment and forget the past, who cannot stand on a single point, like a goddess of victory, without fear or giddiness, will never know what happiness is; and worse still, will never do anything to make others happy.” – Ibid., 6. In the super-historical view, man no longer finds the essence in the process, as for him the world appears as being completed. Both views, “the unhistorical and the historical are equally necessary to the health of an individual, a community, and a system of culture.” – Ibid., 8. This depends on whether we are capable of forgetting in the right time and remembering in the right time: “we must know the right time to forget as

deconstruction.⁶⁰

Derrida's deconstruction can be interpreted as the reversal of the Heideggerian *Destruktion* or rather as its deconstruction, in the sense that Derrida's aim is exactly the *deconstruction of the origin*. While in Heidegger's *Destruktion* the return to the origin is the determining element of *Destruktion*, in Derrida's deconstruction it is the very illusion of *origin* and *pure origin* that becomes the "object" of deconstruction. Derrida deconstructs the positing of the illusory presence of origin, as "*Where and how does it begin...? A question of origin. But a meditation upon the trace should undoubtedly teach us that there is no origin, that is to say simple origin; that the question of origin carry with them a metaphysics of presence.*"⁶¹ Viewing from Derrida's angle, the return to a posited "origin" does not lead to any result, since such origin cannot be posited. "There are things like reflecting pools, and images, an infinite reference from one to the other; but no longer a source, a spring. There is no longer a simple origin. For what is reflected is split *in itself* and not only as an addition to itself of its image. The reflection, the image, the double splits what it doubles. The origin of the speculation becomes a difference."⁶² It is not by accident that Derrida speaks downright about the deconstruction of origin, as origin is often mentioned as "the first moment in an historical sequence,"⁶³ thus the origin wholly contradicts the Derridean idea of the *trace* and the *trace of traces*, as the origin is

well as the right time to remember." Ibid., 8. The challenge is to reveal the border where the past must be forgotten, that "not to become the gravedigger of the present." – Ibid., 7.

Nietzsche points at the fact that the historical man has virtually no idea of what it is like to think unhistorically, this is why he refers to the overgrowth of history and to the overestimated *authority* of the past, highlighting that antiquarian history "only understands how to preserve life, not to create it." Ibid., 20; "no longer preserves life, but mummifies." Ibid., 20; "For it knows only how to *preserve* life, not how to engender it; it always undervalues that which is becoming, because it has no instinct for divining it – as monumental history." Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 75. At Nietzsche the antidote of the overgrowth of history is the unhistorical and the super-historical. The unhistorical pushes memory into the background, or means exactly the capacity of forgetting; the super-historical reinforces the possibility of creation and creativity. Nietzsche reminds of the fact that history must serve the present rather than the past; for this, the knowledge of the past is indispensable, but in a way that creativity and openness towards creation should never cease.

Both Heidegger and Gadamer emphasise the uneliminable reality of historicity, but at the same time also the destruction of the authority of the past, this is what both Heidegger's destruction and Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics refer to. According to Gadamer, Nietzsche's anti-historical attitude cannot be applied to historical consciousness, but rather to "self-alienation it undergoes when it regards the method of modern historical science as its own true nature." – Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 304.

⁶⁰ In Derrida's deconstruction "the style of an historical movement which was meaningful – like the concept of history itself – only within logocentric epoch" within the confines of the historical-metaphysical age. – See about this: Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 4. Derrida points at the fact that the traditional concept of history is metaphysics of history, and the break from this presupposes the break from history and from the general concept of history. – Cf. Derrida, *Positions*, 58.

⁶¹ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 74.

⁶² Ibid., 36.

⁶³ Mark Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory* (New York: St. Martin's P, 1998), 83.

what is conceived as traceless, as the origin cannot be preceded by anything, either in space or in time, thus it has been posited as some kind of traceless abstraction. In Derrida's deconstruction such idealised purity and tracelessness of the origin cannot exist. The idea of the origin is itself based on an opposition awaiting to be deconstructed, since the origin is situated in the middle, in-between two artificially separated dimensions, a *traceless* dimension and one *full of traces*, where the state before the origin is the state of pure tracelessness, and the state after the origin is the state of saturation with traces. However, the saturation with traces is grounded in terms of unity, identity, presence and linearity. The origin as centre and the centre as origin, willingly or unwillingly, elaborated a mode of thinking operating with "being-there", identity and unity, and endowed it with history linearly derived from this centre and origin.

In Derrida's deconstruction, the *différance* also expresses the unsustainability of the belief in pure origin and beginning. There is no pure origin and beginning, there is no conception of a static centre, but the effects of *différance* prevail from the outset. "Precisely what is in question here is the requirement that there be a *de jure* commencement, an absolute point of departure, a responsibility arising from a principle,"⁶⁴ but "differences alone could be 'historical' through and through and from the start [...] Différance is the nonfull, nonsimple 'origin'; it is the structured and diferring origin of differences."⁶⁵ The *différance* could also be conceived as proto-writing, proto-trace;⁶⁶ however, these terms "reproduce here, analogically and provisionally, a phenomenological and transcendental language that will presently be revealed as inadequate"⁶⁷ – Derrida claims. The Derridean *différance*, contrary to the Heideggerian difference (*Differenz*), is conceived as being more primordial than ontological difference, even than life or language – *the différence is the critique of pure origin*.

Derridean deconstruction, as the reversal and deconstruction of the Heideggerian *Destruktion*, is also valid with respect to the issues of *being* and "*being-there*", as for Heidegger the basis of *Destruktion* is the *question of being*, and for Derrida *being* and "*being-there*" are also deconstructed. For Heidegger the question of being serves as the basis of destruction⁶⁸ (am Leitfaden der Seinsfrage sich vollziehende Destruktion),⁶⁹ since "these hardened traditions must be loosened up, and the concealments which it has brought about must be dissolved"⁷⁰ – all this constitutes the task of *Destruktion*; its guiding principle is the question of being – we

⁶⁴ Derrida, *Difference*, 282.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 286–287.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 288.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ István M. Fehér, "Destrukción és applikáció avagy a filozófia mint 'saját korának filozófiája.' Történelem és történetiség Heidegger és Gadamer gondolkodásában" (Destruction and Application, or Philosophy As 'Philosophy of Its Own Time': History and Historicity in Heidegger's and Gadamer's Thought), *Világosság* 43. 4–7 (2002): 19–33: 147.

⁶⁹ Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 22. – "Diese Aufgabe verstehen wir als die am Leitfaden der Seinsfrage sich vollziehende Destruktion des überlieferten Bestandes der antiken Ontologie auf die ursprünglichen Erfahrungen, in denen die ersten und fortan leitenden Bestimmungen des Seins gewonnen wurden."

⁷⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 44.

learn from *Sein und Zeit*. According to Heidegger, the rehabilitation of the question of being, more precisely, the *raising* of the question of being determines the direction of philosophising and “the question of Being does not achieve its true concreteness until we have carried through the process of destroying the ontological tradition.”⁷¹ For Heidegger, philosophy gets in the focus of being, as the world and the world view refer to the Dasein of all times, and the task of philosophy is to raise the questions referring to “what is universal in the world and ultimate for the Dasein – the whence [Woher], the wither [Wohin], and the wherefore [Wozu] of the world.”⁷² A multiple positivity⁷³ (*Positivität*) is inherent in world views, since it is rooted in the Dasein of all beings, it refers to the existing world and it interprets Dasein. Positivity “– that is, the relatedness to beings [Seiendes], to world that is [seiende Welt], Dasein that is [seiendes Dasein].”⁷⁴ Since at Heidegger “being is always the being of a being”⁷⁵ (Sein ist jeweils Sein von Seiendem),⁷⁶ therefore “it becomes accessible at first only by starting with some being.”⁷⁷ Although the ontological investigation starts from being, from there “it is *led away* from that being *and led back to its being*.”⁷⁸ This is what the essential point of the Heideggerian phenomenological reduction consists in, namely that we lead our investigations back from being to its being – Heidegger expounds in his work *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*.

But can any question be formulated in the focus of being and “being-there” from the outset? Heidegger also questions the *Nothing* and its mode of being, which, though it does not exist, still, it *arises*. He highlights the very fact that in order to make accessible being as being and to formulate an attitude towards it, “something is given which *must* be given if we are to be able to make beings accessible to us as beings and comports ourselves toward them, something which, to be sure, is not [*nicht ist*] but which must be given [*es geben muss*] if we are to experience and understand any beings at all”.⁷⁹ In spite of this and for this very reason, according to Heidegger, “being is the sole theme of philosophy.”⁸⁰ However, when thinking about being, we are necessarily confronted with the idea of Nothing, as otherwise we cannot

⁷¹ Ibid., 49.

⁷² Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 7. Original text: “Daß die Philosophie auf das Universale der Welt und das Letzte des Daseins, das Woher, das Wohin und das Wozu von Welt und Leben abzielt in der Weise der theoretischen Welterkenntnis, unterscheidet sie sowohl von den Einzelwissenschaften, die immer nur einen bestimmten Bezirk der Welt und des Daseins betrachten, als auch von den künstlerischen und religiösen Verhaltungen, die nicht primär im theoretischen Verhalten gründen.” – Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 8.

⁷³ Ibid., 9.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 10. Original text: “[...] diese Positivität gehört, d. h. die Bezogenheit auf Seiendes, seiende Welt, seiendes Dasein.” Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 12–13.

⁷⁵ Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 17.

⁷⁶ Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 28.

⁷⁷ Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 21.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 10.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 11.

define being, but Heidegger's fundamental question refers to being, to what is being and how it is possible to understand it.

Contrary to Heidegger's *Destruktion*, Derrida's aim is to deconstruct being and the "being-there", as deconstruction sees to decompose the very illusory presence of logic-metaphysics. Derrida points at the fact that thinking "from the pre-Socratics to Heidegger, always assigned the origin of truth in general to the logos."⁸¹ Heidegger also outlined that being gets shape as a result of logos: "Western metaphysics, as the limitation of the sense of being within the field of presence, is produced as the domination of a linguistic form."⁸² In *Of Grammatology*, Derrida expounds that deconstruction does not mean demolition but decomposing into layers, and announces the deconstruction of logocentrism, virtually the deconstruction of everything "that have their source in that of the logos."⁸³ Derrida condemns both Hegel and Heidegger. He criticises Hegel, because "he determined ontology as absolute logic; he assembled all the delimitations of philosophy as presence,"⁸⁴ and condemns Heidegger for his philosophy of "being-there". It is a fundamental deconstructive question: "is it not all that is profoundly meditated as the thought or the question of being enclosed within an old linguistics of the word which one practices here unknowingly?"⁸⁵ In fact Heidegger also questions "whether a primordial ontological interpretation of Dasein will not founder on the kind of Being which belongs to the very entity we have taken as our theme."⁸⁶ What does the "whence" and the "wither" of being actually refer to? The thought arises that our pursuit to understanding should not be conceived exclusively in terms of being and the existent, or more precisely, the formulation of the question derived from the grounding of being and the metaphysical system of thought positing being can be questioned.

In the wake of Derrida, the question radically changes its orientation, it gets reversed, and we no longer formulate the question *in terms of being*, but primarily deconstruct it as the basic fundament of metaphysical tradition. Based on Derrida's critique, "being-there" leads to "declaration of principle, pious wish and historical violence of a speech dreaming its full self-presence, living itself as its own resumption; self proclaimed language, auto-production of a speech declared alive, capable, Socrates said, of helping itself, a logos which believes itself to be its own father."⁸⁷ Derrida strongly defies the metaphysical tradition – from which Heidegger cannot remain aloof either due to his philosophy of being and "being-there" – and urges the radical deconstruction of the metaphysics of "being-there". According to the Derridean critique, Heidegger rather restores the truth of logos and being instead of its destruction. The word "being" and the words denoting being presuppose a kind of transcendentality and a priori impliedness, this is what Heidegger's *Being and Time* starts with – Derrida claims, and

⁸¹ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 3.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 23.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁸⁶ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 276.

⁸⁷ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 39.

“only this pre-comprehension would permit the opening of the question of the sense of Being in general, beyond all regional ontologies and all metaphysics.”⁸⁸ Derrida raises the importance of deconstructing logocentrism, transcendental phenomenology and fundamental ontology, the deconstruction of the philosophy of “being-there”, where emphasis is laid upon the *raison d’être* of being, as well as upon the deconstruction of the word and notion of being, upon disassembling its unity of signification.

* * *

In Heidegger’s oeuvre, within and/or beyond the programme of *Destruktion*, a philosophy of difference is also contoured. With the idea of *ontological difference* (*die ontologische Differenz*),⁸⁹ with the separation of Being (*das Sein*) and beings (*das Seiende*), as well as with the identity-centred critique of the I, and oneness, the road towards the philosophy of difference is emphatically opened. In pointing out the ontological difference between Being and beings Heidegger breaks the unity that had prevailed as the determining element of European philosophical tradition; this distinction can be interpreted as his step towards the philosophy of difference.⁹⁰ Heidegger also points to the diversity of the modes of being and at the polysemy of the copula. He asks the question “how is this equivocality of the copula to be eliminated?”⁹¹ First of all, the scientific and philosophical modes of being – occurring in logical, mathematical as well as philosophical sense – must be separated from each other, the existential characters must be distinguished, and first of all, their *difference* must be recognised.

Heidegger further differentiates the issue of existential character and the belief in the unity of the mode of being, separating from each other the categories of present-at-hand *Vorhandenheit* and being-there *Dasein*.⁹² What scholastics and also Kant call existence, Heidegger calls *Vorhandenheit*, by the term meaning the mode of being of natural things. Contrary to this, *Dasein* is particular being, human being, which *we are ourselves* (*das wir selbst sind*), and this can be grasped as *Dasein*.⁹³ Similarly to when he posits an ontological connection between art and human existence, in the course of the ontological analysis of aesthetic experience, with respect to mode of being and character of being, he also distinguishes the modes of being of the equipment (*das Zeug – weltarm*), the thing (*der Ding – weltarm*) and the work of art (*der Werk – weltbildend*).⁹⁴ In his analysis the mode of being of

⁸⁸ Ibid., 20.

⁸⁹ Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 452–471.

⁹⁰ Cf. Heinz Kimmerle, *Philosophien der Differenz. Eine Einführung* (Würzburg: Königshausen u. Neumann Verlag, 2000), 28.

⁹¹ Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 195.

⁹² Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, 36.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Cf. Heidegger, *Holzwege. Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes* (1935/36). *Das Ding und das Werk*, 5–25.

the work of art can be interpreted as manifestation, (ἀλήθεια),⁹⁵ thus art as “poetry”⁹⁶ (*Dichtung*),⁹⁷ is the manifestation of being, stepping out of unconcealment (“in this way self-concealing beings becomes illuminated”),⁹⁸ “happening of the truth”,⁹⁹ the “setting-itself-to-work of truth”¹⁰⁰ (*Sich-ins-Werk-Setzen der Wahrheit*),¹⁰¹ which also means nuancing the issue of existential character. Since the *mode of being of being* is characterised by contradictoriness, in two respects: on the one hand, it is manifestation, but also withdrawal to concealment, on the other hand, in this manifestation the manifesting always manifests differently from what it actually is. Beyond the differentiation of the modes of being, in Heidegger’s *Destruktion* and philosophy of difference, the notions of the I, identity and oneness are destructed and differentiated. Heidegger places the status of traditional ontology into crisis and raises its relief from the traditional fetters of I, identity and oneness, at least the possibility of this “relief”. Heidegger points at the impossibility of the *equation a=a (der Satz der Identität)*,¹⁰² his existential hermeneutics – where oneness appears as a structure of antecedence, *Being-ahead of itself (Sich-vorweg-sein)*,¹⁰³ not-yet-being (*etwas noch nicht sein*)¹⁰⁴ – functions as the shaking of identity and unity.

In conceiving Dasein as *care (Sorge)*, Heidegger grasps the essence of *Dasein*: “Dasein is always ‘beyond itself’ [‘über sich hinaus’] not as a way of behaving towards other entities which is *not*, but as Being towards the potentiality-for-Being which it is itself.”¹⁰⁵ Thus Heidegger grasps Dasein as “*Being-ahead of itself*” (*Sich-vorweg-sein*), as *ahead-of-itself-Being-already-in-a-world*¹⁰⁶ (*Sich-vorweg-im-schon-sein-in-einer-Welt*).¹⁰⁷ In the analysis of Dasein Heidegger pointed out that as long as “Dasein is as an entity, it has never reached its ‘wholeness’,”¹⁰⁸ “Dasein ends in unfulfilment”,¹⁰⁹ if it does, it brings along the loss of its “being-there”. A being-outside is always inherent in Dasein – as long as it is –; this being outside can be dissolved only by the attainment of our finality. In Heidegger’s formulation, “‘not-yet’

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Heidegger, *The Origin of the Work of Art*, 44.

⁹⁷ Heidegger, “Holzwege,” in *Gesamtausgabe I. Abteilung: Veröffentlichte Schriften 1914–1970. Band 5*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977), 59.

⁹⁸ Heidegger, *The Origin of the Work of Art*, 32.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 44.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Heidegger, *Holzwege*, 21.

¹⁰² Heidegger, *Identität und Differenz*, 34–36.

¹⁰³ Heidegger, “Das Sein des Daseins als Sorge,” in *Sein und Zeit*, § 41, 191–196.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. § 45. “Das Ergebnis der vorbereitenden Fundamentalanalyse des Daseins und die Aufgabe einer ursprünglichen existenzialen Interpretation dieses Seienden,” 231–235.

¹⁰⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 236.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 237.

¹⁰⁷ Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 266.

¹⁰⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 280.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 288.

'belongs' to Dasein as long as it is"¹¹⁰ ("je etwas *noch nicht sein*"). Based on this, it can be stated that, for Heidegger, the traditional status and temporal structure, the simultaneity with itself of the I, identity, oneness and subject is broken, which leads to the conclusion that we can never attain our perfection. The self-preceding-being carries in itself the possibility that we always presuppose, anticipate and predict ourselves. Thus the oneness will be a *volitional issue*, in which there manifests the "freedom" of the subject: the fact that we *can choose* ourselves. This suggests as if we could lose and leave ourselves behind, we could run away from ourselves in the sense of inauthenticity (*Uneigentlichkeit*)¹¹¹ and the anyone, one of the "who?" of Dasein, the "they" (*das Man*),¹¹² – who "even hides the manner in which it has tacitly relieved Dasein of the burden of explicitly *choosing* these possibilities."¹¹³ The Self of everyday Dasein is the *they-self*.¹¹⁴ In Heidegger's view the "they", "this kind of Being is grounded the mode of everyday Being-one's-Self [Selbstsein]; the explication of this mode will enable us to see what we may call the 'subject' of everydayness; – the 'they'".¹¹⁵ Heidegger connects the state of the anyone with the notions of inauthenticity; as opposed to inauthenticity, authenticity (*Eigentlichkeit*) means ourselves grasped by ourselves. In this way we can actually attain ourselves in the sense of manifesting our capacity of devotion, the authenticity (*Eigentlichkeit*) and *our ownmost potentiality of being* (*das eigenste Seinkönnen*),¹¹⁶ which means that *Dasein* is a *possibility*. Thus for Heidegger the "subject" acquires an active role,¹¹⁷ since *Dasein* "always understands itself in terms of existence – in terms of authenticity of itself: to be itself or not itself. [...]. Only the particular Dasein decides its existence, whether it does so by taking hold or by neglecting."¹¹⁸ But to what extent can the *Myself* be chosen? Can it be chosen at all? What does the "own" consist in? What is the own's own? What is the "ownmost"? What does it mean to choose ourselves? Is the "Myself" indeed optional? "What" can the decision consist in? "*Who*" is the one "*who*" decides? Is there a "*Who*", who is situated above the possibilities of decision?

According to the Derridean critique, for Heidegger "Even if *Dasein* is not the subject, this point of departure [...] remains analogous, in its 'logic', to what he inherits in undertaking to deconstruct it. This isn't a mistake, it's a no doubt an indispensable phase."¹¹⁹ In Derrida's deconstruction the lack of origin, the split, the *différance*, the dissemination, the division, the belatedness, the critique of "being-there" and the split of the unities "of all times" prevail, the

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 286.

¹¹¹ Heidegger, "Das alltägliche Selbstsein und das Man," in *Sein und Zeit* § 27, 126–130.

¹¹² Ibid. § 27. "Das alltägliche Selbstsein und das Man," 126–130.

¹¹³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 312.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 167.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 150.

¹¹⁶ Heidegger, "Das Da-Sein als Verstehen," in *Sein und Zeit* § 31, 142–148.

¹¹⁷ For Heidegger the subject gains an active role, contrary to Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, in whose theory of play the freedom of play has primacy over the freedom of players (subjects).

¹¹⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 33.

¹¹⁹ Derrida, "'Eating Well,' or The Calculation of the Subject: An Interview with Jacques Derrida," ed. Eduardo Cadava et al, *Who comes after the subject*, 104.

deconstruction of the subject and identity, at the same time the pointing at the contradictoriness of the critical, destructional and deconstructional aspects of the subject can be traced. In a deconstructive sense, the “Ex-appropriation is not what is proper to men. One can recognize its differential figures [*figures différentielles*], as soon as there is a relation to itself in its most elementary form (but for this very reason there is no such a thing as elementary).”¹²⁰ In Derrida’s deconstruction “ex-appropriation cannot be absolutely stabilized in the form of the subject. The subject assumes presence, that is to say substance, stasis, stance. Not to be able to stabilize itself *absolutely* would mean to be able *only* to be stabilizing itself. [...]. Ex-appropriation no longer closes itself; it never totalizes itself.”¹²¹ Derrida speaks about expression “used in its deconstructed sense,”¹²² with disseminating, non-static and non-identical meaning, which points to a different *direction*, points or intends to point *beyond* its earlier “self”. These concepts point *beyond* “themselves”, but lead to no target, send to no “truer” “Self”, they have no true or truer Self. The *beyond* renewed remains thus, for the time being, only a *question*, to which the “answer” is its *questionability*. In spite of the similarities and differences of *Destruktion* and *deconstruction*, Heidegger’s thinking proves to be *unavoidable* for Derrida.

Translated by Emese Czintos and Judit Pieldner

¹²⁰ Ibid., 105.

¹²¹ Ibid., 106.

¹²² Ibid., 24.