

BORISLAV MIHAČEVIĆ\*

## HEIDEGGER AND ΔΟΞΑ: AN AMBIGUOUS AFFAIR

Keywords: δόξα, Heidegger, Being, appearance, truth, Aristotle  
Słowa kluczowe: δόξα, Heidegger, bycie, fenomen, prawda, Arystoteles

### Introduction

We can start our investigation of δόξα with Aristotle's clarifications. Aristotle declares in *Nicomachean ethics*, book Z, that δόξα is always present (Aristotle, 2009). In other words, δόξα as an opinion is not something we search, but something we always have. It is daily expressed in our assertions about the world. Although we can change our opinions, we cannot change our perspectives as such. A man without δόξα is not a man at all. On the other hand, an animal has no δόξα because it has no λόγος, faculty of speech, nor a conviction, which is present in an opinion (Aristotle, 1907). Therefore, Heidegger concludes that an animal has no world, only environment, *Umwelt* (Heidegger, 1995). The animal is “poor”, it has no ability of

---

\* Dr. Borislav Mihačević – affiliated with the Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy from the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. His main scientific interests are phenomenology, ancient philosophy, and history of philosophy.

Address for correspondence: Pot na Fužine 53, 1000, Ljubljana, Slovenia. E-mail: mihacevicboris@yahoo.com.

world-forming. It most certainly has an αἴσθησις, perception apparatus, which is a condition for forming a view, opinion of something, but it is unable to distinguish beings as such. Because a man has none of the shortcomings animals do, it can distinguish between different beings. That means that δόξα is oriented toward truth or falsity. It can “miss” and “hit” the target. Given the nature of contingent facts, then the same opinion or judgment can be true and false, but regarding things that cannot be otherwise δόξα is not at one time true and at another time false, but rather the same opinion is always true or false (Aristotle, 1933). For example, the statement “The table is black” can be at one time true, and at another time false, because we can repaint the table in some other colour. But if we say “Water is H<sub>2</sub>O”, then the same statement cannot be at one time true, and at another time false. Therefore, contingent truths and scientific ones have a point of departure from δόξα. We will show this ambiguity further on when we will discuss the nature of the premises according to different beings.

But what this also shows us is that all predication *as* something is based upon our intellect (διάνοια), upon different operations in our intellect regarding separation and synthesis. Aristotle declares: “Falsehood, in fact, never arises except when notions are combined. For, even, if white to be asserted to be not-white, not-white is brought into a combination” (Aristotle, 1907, p. 137). Thus every apophantic statement is oriented toward falsity or truth, under the condition that is a combination. The statement “Table is black” is then a combination of the subject and its attributes. In asserting something as something, I give a judgment, an opinion, that this table is black, even though it can be green. But what is a condition for making combinations? Aristotle’s answer is νοῦς ποιητικός, active, unmixed mind or reason, which produces a unity for our intellect, passive mind, νοῦς παθητικός, in order for the latter to think, to judge, to make opinions, etc. In short, to make combinations. Or to put it differently; the function of an active mind is to show unity, ἔν. It is an underlying presence, which enables us or our intellect to make combinations (Sheehan, 1983). Νοῦς is like a light; it enables everything to show itself.

From Aristotle’s previous quotation, we can conclude that if I am to make a false judgment, then it is required for me beforehand to know something that is in my judgment confused with something else. If we can describe this phenomenon in Heidegger’s terms, we could say that the domain of making-present is always broader than what is present at hand. For example,

some person confronts us. We take him as John, our dear friend. We grasp him based on our way of representing him. Thus, in experiencing what confronts me as John, I do not simply take in what I perceive, but I take him based on my representation of him, based on my prior, definitive opinion of him. Heidegger concludes: “Human beings move in the direction of what immediately confronts them, but at the same time they move within the grasping of the content domain, that is, what they have experienced earlier. All cognition has this remarkable double character. Δόξα is both” (Heidegger, 2010, p. 199). Δόξα is the first principle of how life understands, moves itself. Hence, δόξα is not an illusion of some sort because it encompasses the whole world. It is not a subjective fantasy but also not something absolute and valid for all. On the other hand, δόξα is so close to us that mainly we do not reflect on it, and by that, we do not reflect our perspectives towards the world. However, we do not need to reflect everything anew we see, know, perceive, etc. That is impossible. Δόξα, in this sense, is receptive not only to prejudice but also to a certain authority.

If δόξα is by its nature ambiguous, meaning that it encompasses the whole world, then for true convictions, we have to state our reasons for it. This is necessary for contingent truths and also for scientific truths. Given the state of contingent truths in the domain of practical reasoning, we have to elucidate δόξα, make it transparent. That is a task for the so-called art of persuading, rhetoric, even though the rhetoric is not a τέχνη in the fullest sense of the word. Rhetoric belongs to practical understanding, prudence or φρόνησις, and by that extension to politics, to a world of appearances. Heidegger tells us that word δόξα means not only an opinion but also glory, brilliance, splendour (Heidegger, 2000). This latter notion of δόξα is motivated by Heidegger’s presocratic return to the sense of truth as showing, ἀποφαίνεσθαι. Having said that, this article is structured in two parts. One will analyse key aspects of Heidegger’s reflections on δόξα through his phenomenological readings of Aristotle within the fundamental ontology of *Being and Time*. The second part will address δόξα through Heidegger’s 1935 lecture *Introduction to Metaphysics*.

## Heidegger's investigation of δόξα within fundamental ontology

Heidegger was not satisfied with the phenomenological approach in the form of privileged noetic ego, Husserl's transcendental ego constituted beyond the worldliness of the world. The method of going back to the "things themselves" must be in accordance with life's own motives. We must see the ground out of which concepts have arisen, how the "things themselves" meant by these concepts are viewed, in what context they are addressed, etc. Thus, the method of phenomenological looking at the "things themselves" is not a matter of rigorous science. Phenomenology is not a science, as Husserl hoped for it to be, but rather a leap in life itself. Heidegger states: "This primacy of the theoretical must be broken, but not in order to proclaim the primacy of the practical. . . , but because the theoretical itself and as such refers back to something pre-theoretical" (Heidegger, 2008, p. 47). The practical does not need help from theoretical to orient itself. On the contrary, it has its own "sight", the intentionality of dealing with things. Therefore, basic experience is primarily not theoretical but lies instead in the commerce of life with its world (Heidegger, 2009). We cannot objectify life to come to the Archimedean point of view. Instead, Heidegger insists, life is a *how*, a category of Being, and not something wild or mystical.

For the Greeks, basic determination of human beings was λόγος. Term λόγος can mean many things, has many meanings, but the most decisive one is speech. Λόγος is not only a basic determination of human beings but a fundamental one. Speaking is like living. Hence, speech is not only a medium, an instrument for communication, but it determines human beings in their essence. The Greeks did not know the word for language, but only for speech. The Greeks took language as discourse. And only because there is a discourse, there is language. It is no coincidence that the Greeks were known to be "blabbers". Hence, origins of concepts are hidden in the pre-theoretical sphere of facticity, which means that rhetoric is the first part of an attempt to grasp the forms of conceptuality developed in scientific logic.

A concept has two sides. One side has a nominal character; it gives in its generality something that everyone can understand it. The nominal definition of the concept gives the existence of the thing, while the real definition gives us the essence of the thing. Hence, if the nominal side of a concept is given, then it means that everyone already understands it without the need to question it further, to investigate it. This state of affairs is a result of the

fact that life has already been interpreted by itself. I grow into a language, I grow into common intelligibility, which has a peculiar character of averageness. When I utter a word, then it belongs to everyone; words are often consumed without an explicit relationship to the matters spoken about. This common intelligibility is not something that we can put aside; it is a positive phenomenon because the Greeks conceived the truth as something negative in the sense that must be wrested from concealment. As Heidegger puts it in his Marburg lectures *Plato's Sophist*: “Ἀλήθεια means: to be hidden no longer, to be uncovered. This privative expression indicates that the Greeks had some understanding of the fact that the uncoveredness of the world must be wrested...” (Heidegger, 1997, p. 11). Therefore, truth is not some “value”, truth is not a state of objective affairs as some universal validity. Something can be universally binding and still not be true. But how is then the truth given?

When we are talking about Being, we are talking about the truth of Being. And disclosure concerning ἀλήθεια is itself a mode of Being and the beings, we call a human being (*Dasein*, being-there). If according to Heidegger, human life is nothing else than a *how*, category of Being, then we must view man's connection toward the truth of Being in accordance with different modes in which truth is given. The truth is disclosed within these different modes. This refers back to Heidegger's investigation of “dianoetic virtues” in *Nicomachean ethics*. There are five in number: art, scientific knowledge, practical wisdom, philosophic wisdom, and intuitive reason (Aristotle, 2009). These modes are ways in which the soul is most of all true. Being of beings is unconcealed in a true primordial safekeeping of them (Heidegger, 2002). They constitute “virtues”. Within these modes, we are given a terminological, explicit meaning of Being of beings. Hence, these modes are ἀληθεύειν, modes of disclosing the truth of beings in their Being. But is a δόξα mode of disclosing the truth? The short answer is yes, it is, but not completely. We can have opinions which are true, but also which are false. That is why Aristotle does not place δόξα among these modes. But Heidegger states that in chapter 5, book Z of *Nicomachean ethics*, in the delimitation against scientific knowledge, φρόνησις or practical wisdom emerges as δόξα (Heidegger, 1997). Is then practical wisdom some kind of δόξα?

If practical wisdom is orientated towards a human being who can perceive and most importantly, act in accordance with his best self-interest,

then strangely enough φρόνησις indeed looks like δόξα because in my immediate disclosure of the world I have a strong sense of belief in my opinions and strong opinion of myself. All our daily affairs are built around certainties that are unshakeable and understandable (Bonic, 2005). But if all men have opinions, then all men are not prudent. Why is that? Because the possibility of actualizing φρόνησις rests upon πράξις. Even if I have the best opinion on a situation that needs resolving, it is not guaranteed that I will practically resolve the situation in the best possible way. Actions determine who I am. However, it may be so that I am determined to act in such and such a way. In other words, I have such and such an opinion to act in such and such a way. Nevertheless, what follows the decision on how to act is deliberative thinking. Thinking is searching, but δόξα is not searched. And in contrast to a decision, I can have the best possible opinion on a given situation, but the decision, and therefore the choice is oriented towards what is good or bad, not towards what is true and false (Aristotle, 2009). Furthermore, I can have opinions about impossible things, but choice or decision is always what is in my power to do. Hence, φρόνησις is not a δόξα; it only looks like one. In any case, it is important to know that for Heidegger the phenomenon of φρόνησις plays a key role in his fundamental ontology. How? It derives from the fact that for Aristotle, virtues were indeed conceptually distinguished, but not separated from one another because Aristotle had a definite view of *unity* and movement of factual life. Contemplative life was for Greeks indeed highest *how* of life, but a possibility that was not separated from modes of art and practical wisdom. As Gadamer states: “Practical reasonableness, though, is the precondition for engaging theory and in developing theoretical reasonableness. At the same time, practical reasonableness is also something highest” (Gadamer, 1986, p. 176). Because we are mortals, and not gods, wise men should not neglect to act in practical ways and *vice versa*. Or for example unity of τέχνη and φρόνησις; τέχνη or art is not only directed to the production of artefacts (ποίησις) but is in a broader sense knowledge. I do not need to know how to build a table or chair, but I know how to use one. In everyday existence, I know how to manipulate things in their usefulness. In *Being and Time*, this state of affairs is described as *Umsicht* or precisely as prudence because what is at first given in my immediate disclosure of the world, namely things, there are at the same time other people present. They as much, like myself, are “busy” with daily caring about projects, and so forth. Through my involvement with

daily things, others are also present, from which I am not separated. We all share the same hopes and fears. But how is this concretely viewed? Τέχνη is a mode, which has a manipulative behaviour regarding things – art is in a specific manner cleverness, ingenuity. And in my daily facticity, there is a tendency to view and deal with others in the same way, I do with things, namely manipulative. Or to put it differently; it is based on routine. On the other hand, in practical wisdom, I cannot manipulate with my Being, and by that with others. The question is not if the goal is achieved but rather how it is achieved. Means are important as much as the goals are. Therefore, we can see why was this very problematic for Heidegger, and his notion of authentic φρόνησις. The “solution” of this problem had a consequence of how Heidegger viewed the importance of δόξα. How does Heidegger resolve this Aristotle’s unity of virtues? We will address this later on.

The intelligibility in which human being or *Dasein* moves, the One, is grounded in δόξα, in the average meanings of things and of oneself. From there, δόξα has a peculiar feature of authority or stubbornness, and stability in guidance of being-with-one-another in the world. Because I am not alone in this world, because I, for the most part, do not distinguish from others, δόξα has a specific character of elusiveness. But if δόξα is also that which can be otherwise, then it is a possibility, δύναμις. Therefore, in matters which can be negotiated the peculiar authority of δόξα can be questioned, brought into disclosure. This is the task of rhetoric.

Heidegger began an analysis of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* in the summer semester of 1924. The title of this lecture is *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*. Heidegger’s analysis of rhetoric is not a random one. On the contrary, it is a part of the elucidation of life’s basic movement. We have established that the human being is a being endowed with the faculty of speech. And the concrete human being with others, that is in average existence is totally dominated by language and its meanings. The elucidation of rhetoric is important, because we in daily existence do not rely upon absolute truths but on probable opinions. And he who is capable to uncover the truth is also capable to uncover the truth in probable opinions (Aristotle, 1909). Therefore, the elucidation of δόξα in rhetoric indeed presents some kind of search because we are after the truth already implicit in the opinions or probabilities. This is the reason rhetoric is not sophistry, because what seems probable may not be probable. In other words, for a sophist, everything is possible and probable, so it is important to separate cleverness from practical

wisdom. For a rhetorician, the task is to know how to separate the real from apparent syllogism. And because of its manipulative character, rhetoric is not a τέχνη, but rather is connected to φρόνησις. In an attempt to persuade people, a prudent person is more likely to be able to convince listeners than a non-prudent person. Furthermore, a prudent person would know not only how to talk to others or with others but also how to listen. He would know how to listen to what is good, bad, or dangerous for his Being. Therefore, not only speaking in the right way is important but also being able to listen (Kisiel, 1993). This is how Heidegger started his reinterpretation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Heidegger declares: "The human being is not only a speaker and a hearer, but is for itself such a being that hears itself" (Heidegger, 2009, p. 72). What Heidegger describes here is nothing else than a description of Socratic two-in-one, which was from Plato on conceptualized as thinking. Men do not exist in the plural as do all earthly beings but have an indication of this plurality within themselves. The ability to have a dialogue between me and myself is nothing other than the ability to think. If I can rephrase this in Wittgenstein's manner, we could say that not without language, we could not communicate with one another, but rather without language on others, we cannot communicate and influence in a such-and-such way (Wittgenstein, 2009). While I am alive, I cannot escape this condition. The other in me is a basic condition of living.

But every listening is not hearing; to hear means to take something, to follow up, reflect something. It means I will not pay attention to all of the talking, I will not be immersed in "babble". In other words, I will discard every talking about everything and everybody. Of course, there is also a counter possibility that I become even more absorbed into the basic danger of language, its banality. My view does not change; it becomes even more hardened. But whether I follow up on my friend's advice, or not *decision* rests solely upon myself. I can, or I cannot disclose the truth of my δόξα. What is in the community shared, heard, talked about, etc. I will take up without any reflection. And in this manner, Heidegger says that rhetoric is not a school discipline, not a τέχνη, because it has no subject area, but rather a hermeneutic interpretation of concrete *Dasein*. Because rhetoric is δύναμις, it is a possibility of seeing, what is given at the moment, it is a faculty. It is a possibility for the elucidation of δόξα in speaking with others and thus speaking with myself. In short, it is the elucidation of λόγος itself.



On the other hand, the ambiguity of δόξα shows itself concerning scientific knowledge; having a view presupposes certain disinterestedness with regard to that which the view is about. If I possess knowledge of something, in the sense that I have true information about it, I can say something about it even if I do not have it before my eyes. Δόξα is akin to scientific knowledge because it is a yes-saying, affirmation of something. But in relation to ἐπίστίμη, a view is still not a knowing, because it only has an orientation to the being. This notion of the Greek conception of science Heidegger presents in connection to Aristotle's *Topics*, however what is important for the purpose of this paper is a practical orientation of δόξα.

We have already pointed out the importance of φρόνησις in Heidegger's thought. And now we have to analyse this phenomenon in its relation to δόξα. To some degree, it was shown that within φρόνησις relation of a decision to δόξα exists some kind of hierarchy. Which kind? To be able to answer this question, we have to turn our attention to another Heidegger's lecture: *Plato's Sophist* from the winter semester 1924/25. In other words, we have to go back to Aristotle's investigation of virtues and find Heidegger's solution for Aristotle's unity of life. Lecture encompasses Plato's late dialogue named *Sophist*, but the main goal for Heidegger is to approach Plato with the help of Aristotle. What was implicitly said about in Plato (truth, Being) must be explicitly rendered with Aristotle, because Aristotle represented a synthesis of all the Greek thought. We will only focus on φρόνησις.

When we said that for Aristotle virtues are conceptually distinguished, but not separated from one another, we meant that in the form of a higher mode of living, namely contemplation, other modes are not discarded, on the contrary, they become explicit in their completion. I do not become more or less practical when I am engaged in a life of wisdom. Σοφία is the highest mode of life, is most free and truth orientated, because its activity is the excellence, virtue, itself. The same can be said for φρόνησις, but the realization of prudence is still dependant on πρᾶξις. Both φρόνησις and σοφία are most authentic modes because κίνησις in both cases is most authentic, self-sufficient. However, that is not the case with τέχνη, because with art there is no authentic movement; it is impossible to say that at the same time I am building the house and have built it (Aristotle, 1933). The unity of τέχνη and φρόνησις is the ontological "basis" of our orientation in the world. It carries with it our implicit knowledge of the world. Heidegger describes this unity in *Being and Time* as *a priori perfect* (Heidegger, 1996). It denotes the

difference between self-sufficient movement and non-self-sufficient movement, but in a way that this self-sufficient movement is still associated with the ontic side of facticity. In other words, it is still burdened with average, ontic, everyday facticity associated with τέχνη.

Heidegger concluded in his analysis of Aristotle that life itself holds a ἀρχή, cause, to “see more” (μάλιστα εἰδέναι). And for Heidegger it is φρόνησις, not σοφία, the highest faculty to “see more”. But why is φρόνησις so important for Heidegger? Because φρόνησις is not just ordinarily understood as ἔξις, a composure of the soul. If I can lose ἔξις of a τέχνη, for example, the ability of table making, I cannot lose ἔξις of φρόνησις, but I can only distort it. Practical prudence is more than a ἔξις. This is a correct view of looking at the matter because Aristotle himself gave a strong hint. Practical wisdom is not only a part of the soul’s reasoned state, but “this is shown by the fact that a state of that sort may be forgotten, but practical wisdom cannot” (Aristotle, 2009, p. 107). If practical wisdom is more than a ἔξις, then what is it? Heidegger gives an answer; it is *conscience*. “Φρόνησις is nothing other than conscience set into motion, making an action transparent. Conscience cannot be forgotten” (Heidegger, 1997, p. 117). What I learned through art and scientific knowledge I can unlearn, forget, whereas φρόνησις is in each case new. Even more; practical wisdom issues a command, same as conscience. Therefore, the faculty to “see more” is in connection to φρόνησις; the goal of φρόνησις is to make my Being transparent, authentic. In short, the unity of φρόνησις and τέχνη must be sublimated or in case of Heidegger even broken to achieve the transparency of understanding my Being, under which also falls authentic disclosure or understanding of Being itself. This gives us an orientation towards δόξα.

If the unity of τέχνη and φρόνησις must be breached, then what about the unity of φρόνησις and σοφία? This is also insufficient. Why? Because Greek ontology drew its roots from the sphere of τέχνη. Οὐσία still retained its relevance in the sphere of everyday objects of use (Heidegger, 2009). And in return, Heidegger thought that σοφία was also “contaminated” with this notion. Heidegger tells us: “As we have seen, Aristotle strives, precisely with his idea of σοφία, to go beyond λόγος to a νοεῖν that is free of λέγειν. But closer inspection shows that even his determination of the ultimate ἀρχή, the ἀδιαίρετον, is acquired only within an orientation toward λόγος” (Heidegger, 1997, p. 155). In other words, Heidegger tells us in this quotation that Aristotle’s σοφία is problematic because it is still bonded to

λόγος, to λέγειν as addressing something *as* something. This is a powerful hint that Heidegger gives us. Hence, the unity of σοφία and φρόνησις is not acceptable as an authentic mode of revealing the Being of beings. The task for Heidegger is now to elucidate φρόνησις alone in connection to νοῦς or νοεῖν, meaning to “see” or to grasp the ultimate causes of Being of beings. Λόγος becomes problematic because all three modes of truth are connected to it. Practical wisdom, scientific wisdom, and art are all connected to λόγος. Precisely speaking, they are forms of syllogism. Therefore, λόγος as speech, as the possibility of addressing something *as* something, is not a privileged place of truth.

Φρόνησις must be freed then from λόγος in its path to “see more”. This seeing, εἰδέναι, must be an authentic one. Practical wisdom must be liberated from λόγος to achieve pure perceiving. Both σοφία and φρόνησις have this in common, namely the ability of pure grasping what is disclosed. They are both possibilities of νοῦς; φρόνησις discloses what is in each situation most extreme concretion, and σοφία discloses the most extreme general universality (Heidegger, 1997). Therefore, for Heidegger φρόνησις is a mode of transparency of our Being in which perceiving, not speaking or deliberating with others, holds a privileged position. Regarding φρόνησις, we must make a situation transparent from the start to the end. The moment, *Augenblick*, upon I make a decision, or choice of action is only and always mine. Immediately grasping the look of the situation is καιρός, moment, in which there cannot be any falsity; this is a reflection of the pre-predicative work of active νοῦς. This is so-called hermeneutical “as” structure, which is different from apophantic speech (Sheehan, 1983).

When all deliberating stops, then it is time to act. But strangely enough, for Heidegger, the action does not have any advantage, plays no role, certainly not in the sense that Aristotle had in mind for the political sphere, but only perceiving. Why does not action have any validity in Heidegger’s φρόνησις? Because in acting, politically speaking, I am never alone, I move within public space with others, and their δόξαι, their opinions. Hence Aristotle’s φρόνησις is different than of Heidegger’s reinterpretation. Heidegger’s one is an ontological one, but this is not what Aristotle had in mind when talking about practical wisdom; it was meant to be a mode where others are present, where there is the elucidation of δόξα (Taminiaux, 1997). In short, where rhetoric is present as a mode of understanding my Being. Rhetoric is indeed part of practical prudence. But all of that is absent from Heidegger’s

reinterpretation (Zickmund, 2007). Prudence, an authentic one, is in *Being and Time* described as a call of conscience (Heidegger, 1996). To put it differently; conscience call is no Socratic two-in-one. In doing so, Heidegger excludes others from the authentic mode of existence, and from any participation in sharing a world in deeds and words (Smith, 2003). It is not, then surprising that δόξα in *Being and Time* is reinterpreted one-sided; it is a part of average, everyday facticity and the public world.

### Δόξα as Being

The starting point for this part of the paper is Heidegger's 1935 lecture *Introduction to Metaphysics*. To understand δόξα as a Being or becoming into unconcealment, it is necessary to explore the presocratic notion of ἀλήθεια. How did the Greeks understand beings? The answer is through φύσις, "nature". The beings of φύσις are on their own emerging into the unconcealment. But φύσις is not a being itself, it is not nature in a sense we today are talking about it as a part of natural processes; on the contrary, φύσις is Being itself. For example, a human being is not a φύσις, therefore φύσις is *not* a being, but it is in accordance with φύσις. Aristotle states in his *Physics*: "For instance, for fire actually to rise, as distinct from having the tendency to rise, neither is nature nor has a nature; but it comes about by nature and is natural" (Aristotle, 1929, p. 111). What does this mean? Nothing other than that we are dealing here with Heidegger's ontological difference, which was still present in Aristotle, although only as a clue. There is a difference between being and Being. This is the oldest difference there is, oldest as language himself. It is not in the natural processes that the Greeks experienced φύσις, but the other way around: based on the fundamental experience of Being in poetry and thinking, φύσις disclosed itself to them (Heidegger, 2000).

What is then a connection between φύσις as a Being of beings and δόξα? Regarding the necessity of recovering the original experience of φύσις, Heidegger tells us that it is urgent to address Being in connection to its restriction. This restriction with the difference to Being was known throughout metaphysical tradition – "Being and becoming", "Being and seeming", "Being and thinking", "Being and the ought". These differences are not arbitrary ones, they are historical ones in which Being was delimited

against the others, and thus already had a determinateness. Even more, these differences played in the history of the West key role in formulating Being as an everlasting presence. For example, the pair “Being and becoming”, which is also a most familiar restriction echoes the pair “Being and seeming”, because every appearance is mere appearance, an illusion, in the sense of unsteady becoming in contrast to constant Being as an unchangeable presence. On the contrary, Heidegger insists that we must grasp the unity of Being and an appearance. In short, we must understand the unity of Being and becoming and with that unity of Being and seeming. Hidden unity of Being and an appearance consists of three aspects of showing. The first way or mode of seeming is *Schein*, shining, or glitter. The second way is *Scheinen* as appearing or manifestation, self-showing. The third way as *Schein* is a mere semblance or mere appearance. The decisive manner of showing is the second mode because it occupies *Schein* as a glow as well as a *Schein* in the sense of mere semblance. Self-display encompasses *Schein* as lustre and as mere appearance. Therefore, Being cannot be differentiated from appearance and becoming because appearance as a self-glowing display means Being. In other words, ἀλήθεια as a truth of Being is appearing. The presocratic notion of truth that can be found in such thinkers as Parmenides and Heraclitus is not in relation to the validity, to “objective” state of affairs, and so forth. Being of beings is never full presence, it is never full disclosedness. Φύσις, as a Being of beings, is emerging in its self-showing, from concealment to unconcealment. And it is here where we come to δόξα; beings are dispersed in manifold ways in their path from concealment to unconcealment.

What appears in this or that way is given an aspect, δόξα. Hence, δόξα is an aspect in which one stands. Every being in its display and look possesses δόξα. Heidegger maintains that δόξα was for the Greeks the highest manner of Being. Δόξα also means glory; I show myself, I step into the light. I reveal myself in the glory of the words and deeds. Δόξα is a “product” of the unity of Being and appearance. But because Being, φύσις, consists in appearing as offering looks and views, there is a possibility of a look that precisely covers over and conceals what beings are as themselves. We said that *Scheinen* could also mean mere semblance. It stems from the fact that φύσις is not an actualized presence, but a possibility, and hence beings can show themselves in many ways (Brogan, 2005). For Heidegger, this becomes very problematic because if beings can show themselves as something they are *not*, then there

is a need for some other mode to protect the Being of beings in appearing. Even if Heidegger is maintaining the unity of Being and appearance, and therefore the tragic faculty of appearing as such, it is precisely because of the latter that there is a need for another mode for defending beings in their standing-in-the-light. What mode is that? Answer: τέχνη. However, this is not a τέχνη we had found in *Being and Time*, which was understood in unity with φρόνησις in our daily, average facticity, but it is reinterpreted based on the presocratic notion of ἀλήθεια. Here τέχνη is still knowledge, but not in the service of our daily dealings. On the contrary, τέχνη, now free from its daily dealings, belongs to very few creators. For example, a national State is also a being that is created by the creators. These creators, Heidegger points out, are rising high in the site of history. As creators and doers, they also become ἀπόλις, without city and state, lonesome, uncanny, with no way out amidst beings as a whole and at the same time without limit “because they as creators must first ground all this in each case” (Heidegger, 2000, p. 163).

Although this notion of Heidegger’s presocratic ἀλήθεια, and with it, a notion of how ἀλήθεια is disclosed, is in contrast to Plato’s ἰδέα, it still establishes a hierarchy. Doing so, Heidegger becomes in his anti-platonic manner very much a platonic thinker (Villa, 1995). Regarding the ontological status of δόξα, the result is the same as in *Being and Time*; the possibility of authentic, discursive action with others is reduced to a zero. Wresting, unconcealing the truth from the “irresponsible” majority is the task only for the lonesome, few creators. The elucidation of hermeneutical self-understanding, rhetoric, which is only possible with others, is also reduced to a zero.

## Conclusions

Heidegger’s *Destruktion* of the Western metaphysics, which from Plato and Aristotle on conceived Being of beings as a presence (*Anwesenheit*) in the form of οὐσία, resulted in a differentiation between *Who* and *What* of those beings who are only capable of understanding Being as such. A man is not a thing, he is not created, etc. The critique derived from Greek ontological prejudices of privileging understanding Being in the form of τέχνη. This is the reason, I argue, that this distinction can mislead us into thinking that with Heidegger we are not dealing with the philosopher’s traditional views

on the community because *Dasein*, according to the distinction, cannot be an isolated subject that subsequently needs connection with the world (Heidegger, 1996). However, it was shown that Heidegger's *Selbst*, this *Who*, in authentic disclosure of the truth, is not only alone but also lonesome. In other words, what was once regarded as a condition for the activity of thinking, namely a company that I keep between myself and me, Heidegger dismisses as an illusion. Hence, ultimately resoluteness is radically private, opposed to anything public, which relegates δόξα into fallen everydayness. But plurality exists even when I am alone because in thought I do not live only with others, but also with myself. I can never escape the realm of plurality. I live in a world of appearances. Furthermore, we saw how Heidegger reformulated Aristotle's φρόνησις by evading its plural dimensions. A prudent man is not only a man who cares for oneself in his solitude. This is clearly stated by Aristotle himself: "For all these faculties deal with ultimates, i.e. with particulars; and being a man of understanding and of good or sympathetic judgment consists in being able to judge about the things with which practical wisdom is concerned; for what is equitable is the common concern of all good men in their dealings with others" (Aristotle, 2009, p. 113).

Heidegger's version of practical wisdom is reformulated βίος θεωρητικός. Given the structural connectedness between modes of truth, namely dianoetic virtues, we could say that Heidegger's reformulated φρόνησις is on course with Aristotle's because a wise man is indeed a prudent man, but for Heidegger Aristotle's idea of σοφία was not radical enough; it was still connected to λόγος. It was connected to the possibility of addressing beings, and where there is λόγος, there is also a possibility of falsity. This led to the identification of Being with nothingness, which in turn had a consequence of identifying Heidegger's authentic *Selbst* as a "master of Being" because he can imagine that he stands in the same relationship to Being as the God stood before creating the world, *creatio ex nihilo* (Arendt, 1994). This is also the reason why actions of this *Who* are not just God-like, but divine itself. We could even say that *Being and Time* is a reformulated Plato's *Republic*; from the standpoint of others, plurality, it reveals a kingship of the philosopher. The latter one in authentic disclosing the truth of Being becomes a solipsistic ruler of the community, which must be "liberated" from everyday fallness. Hence, no δόξα is possible; it cannot shine nor appear. Consequently, the result is the same in the second part of our dealings with δόξα; to be able to show oneself, to be seen and heard by others was for the

Greeks great privilege attached to public life. Disclosure of the truthfulness of our opinions is conducted by persuading (rhetoric) because persuasion does not come from truth; it comes from opinions. Heidegger's deficit was an inability to disclose ἀλήθεια in its connection to plural elements of δόξα. Instead of doing so, he chose the mode of authentic disclosure, which does not need any public sphere; it is not bound to a plurality – τέχνη. A creator can create in solitude. In both cases, authentic *Selbst* is beyond Being and appearance. He is voluntarily absent from the world of appearances. It is only later that he joins others, much like Plato's liberated prisoner of shadows, but he joins them not as an equal, but as someone who has all sovereignty, just like the creator.

In the end, I have to agree with Hannah Arendt who said, that what separates philosopher from other men is not the ability of wonder, the pathos of wonder, but rather that other men are unable to endure it (Arendt, 2005). The pathos of wonder is a fundamental condition of men but the inability to endure it led to a conflict between πόλις and the philosopher because if most people are not capable of enduring wonder, then this has a consequence in forming stable opinions, which are in contrast to the philosopher, who when returning to the realm of appearances will not have any opinions. Furthermore, he will most likely despise them. In other words, the philosopher also arrives at his δόξα, because of thinking dialogue of the two-in-one. The difference is not that he possesses any special truth from which others are excluded, but that he always remains ready to endure pathos of wonder.

## Bibliography

- Arendt, H. (1994). What is Existential Philosophy? In: J. Kohn (ed.), *Essays in Understanding* (pp. 163–188). New York: Schocken Books.
- Arendt, H. (2005). Socrates. In: J. Kohn (ed.), *The Promise of Politics* (pp. 5–40). New York: Schocken Books.
- Aristotle (1907). *De Anima*. Trans. R.D. Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aristotle (1909). *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*. Trans. R. Claverhouse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Aristotle (1929). *The Physics*. Trans. Ph. H. Wicksteed. London: William Heinemann LTD.
- Aristotle (1933). *The Metaphysics (Books I–IX)*. Trans. H. Tredennick. London: William Heinemann.
- Aristotle (2009). *The Nicomachean ethics*. Trans. D. Ross. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bonic, N. (2005). Obviousness and Semblant Truth with Heidegger. *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 67 (1), 61–93.
- Brogan, W.A. (2005). *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1986). *The Idea of Practical Philosophy*. Trans. P.Ch. Smith. New Haven: Yale University.
- Heidegger, M. (1995). *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*. Trans. W. McNeill, N. Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*. Trans. J. Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1997). *Plato's Sophist*. Trans. R. Rojcewicz, A. Schuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2000). *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Trans. G. Fried, R. Polt. New Haven: Yale Nota Bene.
- Heidegger, M. (2002). Phenomenological Interpretations in Connection with Aristotle: An Indication of the Hermeneutical Situation. In: J. Van Buren (ed.), *Supplements* (pp. 111–147). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2008). *The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of Worldview*. Trans. T. Sadler. New York: Continuum Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2009). *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*. Trans. R.D. Metcalf, M.B. Tanzer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and Truth*. Trans. G. Fried, R. Polt. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kisiel, Th. (1993). *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Smith, D.L. (2003). Intensifying Phronesis: Heidegger, Aristotle, and Rhetorical Culture. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 36 (1), 77–102.

- Sheehan, Th.J. (1983). Heidegger's Philosophy of Mind. In: G. Fløistad (ed.), *Contemporary Philosophy: A New Survey*. Vol. IV: *Philosophy of Mind* (pp. 287–318). The Hague: Nijhoff Publishers. Retrieved from: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2zuyt5\\_UZUqbDc0enhpNnlmWjQ/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2zuyt5_UZUqbDc0enhpNnlmWjQ/view).
- Taminiaux, J. (1997). *The Thracian Maid and the Professional Thinker: Arendt and Heidegger*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Villa, D.R. (1996). *Arendt and Heidegger: The Fate of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G.E.M Anscombe, P.M.S. Hacker, J. Schulte. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Zickmund, S. (2007). Deliberation, Phrōnesis, Authenticity: Heidegger's early Conception of Rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 40 (4), 406–415.

## HEIDEGGER AND ΔΟΞΑ: AN AMBIGUOUS AFFAIR

### Summary

The purpose of this article is a clarification of Heidegger's philosophical stance on δόξα. Although it is not explicitly mentioned in his *magnum opus*, *Being in Time*, δόξα is always in the background of philosopher's analyses of *Mitsein*, being-with-others, rhetoric or speech (*Rede*), our self-understanding in the world, etc. Much of Heidegger's stance towards δόξα derived from his early analyses of Aristotle and presocratic notion of ἀλήθεια. While δόξα is in itself ambiguous, namely it is not aimed only at what is possible, contingent (πρακτά), but also what is eternal (πάντα), what cannot be otherwise, it is also true that Heidegger's treatment of δόξα is very ambiguous. Many of Heidegger's commentators have split views regarding the intersubjective nature of others in fundamental ontology; based on his strong anti-Cartesian *Geschmack*, some view it positively, others do not. In the article, I will argue for the latter in the sense that his phenomenological reflections on δόξα paradoxically led to the conclusion, which Heidegger tried to avoid, namely the hierarchy between Being and appearance.