

BEYOND IN HEIDEGGER'S FOURFOLD

Saša Horvat

UDK 211.2

165.62 Heidegger, M.

Introduction

In this paper we are trying to answer the question: how to *think* about the Beyond? We have not even had a chance to pronounce the word, and already we are forced to choose sides. Across from us, the opposing side has arisen. Between our side, which we say is the here and now, and the other side — that is over there — the dividing line rises up. The borderline is that which separates us from the Beyond, and seemingly, that which we now want to conceptually traverse. The effort of that crossover is caused by separating power of the borderline. From whence the strength of that power? From which human weaknesses does it draw its alleged impetus?

It seems that Beyond, in the everyday way of thinking, is in a manner of opposition. We are here and the Beyond is somewhere over there. Above the horizon or on the other side of any borderline we fathom between our life and life after death.

To be opposite means to be radically different, to oppose that which is on the other side. Such entrenchment in a position of contrariety demands above all to bring about a prevailing. However, when one opposite prevails, then the life game of the Beyond and the here-sidedness ceases. In the takeover of Beyond, disappears here-sidedness. In the takeover of here-sidedness, the Beyond disappears from the horizon.

Does such tension lie in their original relationship? Or is this a venture to overcome the expression of desire and fear on the part of humans? When speaking of the Beyond in a manner of opposition, we must suspect that it is not the only possible projection of the essence of the Beyond. It is obvious that our movement from the moment of dualism led in an unwanted direction. Yet, how then is one to understand the essence of Beyond?

* Saša Horvat, horvat.sasa@gmail.com, University of Zagreb

We will first briefly summarize how we daily interact in relation to the Beyond. It will be revealed to us how human thought does not fathom the Beyond in the essence of the Beyond, but rather in the fashion whereby we grasp the world in which we live. In order to overcome that chasm, we make use of Martin Heidegger's concept of the fourfold (*das Geviert*) earth and sky, gods and mortals, and by way of this concept, we attempt to overcome the everyday manner of understanding the reality of the Beyond.

"Beyond you..."

The power of the boundaries between Beyond and us is first seen in the daily use and understanding of expressions of beyond. What does the word beyond say about beyondness? In German "Das Jenseits" means "hereafter, next world; *jemanden ins Jenseits befördern* — *to send somebody to kingdom come* (inf)".¹ The term "jenseits" is also used to express "on the other side of" — for example: "jenseits von Gut und Böse" — "beyond good and evil". Similarly, the meaning of the word "beyond" in the Croatian language means something that is on the other side.

In English "beyond" expresses something that is "further away in the distance than something else; outside or after a stated limit; something that is beyond compare; beyond belief..."

However, "beyond" is also used to express something that we do not understand: "If something is beyond you, you are unable to understand it."² Except, how to go about understanding this "beyond you"? What is hidden in the appointment of these words?³ In this paper we are inquiring precisely into what it is that language has set for us as incomprehensible. But how it came to be that language can even dictate that something of the ulterior world is incomprehensible?

Let us take a look at an example. Let us imagine that we want to climb no less than the highest Austrian mountain, The Grossglockner, and to reach the settlements located in the valley on the other side. We are on the one side, and the village is on the other side. Scattered hotels and cottages in the beautiful green valley are situated in the beyondness of the beyond.

1 *Collins e-Glosswörterbuch Englisch 4.0 Deutsch-Englisch*, Langenscheidt KG, Berlin und München und HarperCollins Publishers Ltd, 2004.

2 *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Third edition, Cambridge, 2008, 129.

3 "In truth, here and in the rest of the cases it is not that our thinking lives off etymology, but rather that etymology along with the dictionaries still think too little." Martin Heidegger, "The Thing," in *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures. Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking*, trans. Andrew J. Mitchell (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012), 13.

We are standing at the foreboding foot of the mountain and are trying to come up with the best path. Maybe there already exist well-known and safe roads? Maybe it is possible even to pass between the two pinnacles — the Grossglockner and the Kleinglockner? Perhaps an experienced climber from a nearby village knows the way?! As the ideas multiply, the gravity of the venture becomes more and more clear. Planned beyond seems increasingly more distant and inaccessible, and the awareness of our own smallness increasingly apparent.

During this initial uncertainty, when it is still unknown whether the roads over this giant have long since been secured, there is an increasing awareness of one's own body. My body is now becoming too heavy a burden for the peaks of the Grossglockner. The spirit wants to go over the mountain, but the body does not move. Physical in the man is now stronger than ever before weighing down upon the land on which he stands.

Body weight is not measured here in kilograms, but in a growing sense of immobility. Thanks to immobility, I am becoming aware of being planted to the ground underfoot. My very own place in being is grounded on and by the ground. This is no longer a matter of localization via GPS cell phone signal, longitude and latitude or location with Facebook announcement so that my friends know what a very nice place I am visiting. My Here and Now are existentially experienced, in the world in which we exist. I am embedded in this world, or in Heidegger's way of saying — humans "dwell in the world as world"⁴, which encompasses the mountain in front of me and what is behind it. But what is behind it, for now is not available to me. It is the "beyond me" that is beyond my finitude.

These "difficulties" are regularly produced when we think of the Beyond — with a capital B. As in the case of the mountain, we want to go to the other side and come back, but we cannot. No man has ever returned. However, that does not mean that the Beyond does not hint at the sense in which we should try to understand it.

4 Heidegger, "The Thing," 20. Dwelling is a sense of "being-in" the world, "residing among or being familiar with. This sense of 'in' is what is expressed, for example, when I say that I am *in* to jazz, or that I just cannot get *in* to living in suburbia." Timothy Stapleton, "Dasein as being-in-the-world," in *Martin Heidegger. Key Concepts*, ed. Bret W. Davis (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2010), 51. In Heidegger's first speaking engagement after the Second World War, in Bremen lectures "Insight Into That Which Is" (Martin Heidegger, *Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge: 1. Einblick in Das Was Ist: Bremer Vorträge 1949, 2. Grundsätze des Denkens: Freiburger Vorträge 1957. GA 79*, ed. Petra Jaeger, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994), more specifically in "The Thing" and "Building Dwelling Thinking", he addresses the homelessness of modern humankind and "describes an original dwelling and being at home in the world that is rooted in a homeland. People may only dwell if there is a place where they can be at home. Heidegger formally indicates this abode as the fourfold." Frank Schalow / Alfred Denker, *Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy*, Second Edition, (Lanham — Toronto — Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), 40.

Nonetheless, have we managed — by means of our bodily connection with the earth — to experience meaningfully the phenomenon of the unreachable and fleeting Beyond? Of course not. When it comes to the other side of the mountain, we can try to visualize it for ourselves by the use of photos, Google Maps, or the stories of others who were already there. However, it still remains inaccessible in its full being. The gap between the Beyond and us attempts to overcome thought through the help of imagination.

Except, what thought thinks the Beyond? Is it a special way of thinking? Alternatively, does our way of thinking also affect the thought of the Beyond; as well as other phenomena that we come across on a daily basis? Surely, the opinion of the Beyond, even if it were special, would be based on the ordinary kind of thinking in which we are always primarily oriented. Yet, are we not going too far here with the question of “how does the thought think”? However, if we do not know how and on what terms we think about Beyond, why even speak of Beyond?

The call for papers of the International Forum *Junge Theologie* clearly indicates a matter that deals with the fundamental issues of how we think about the Beyond. The invitation reads as follows: “Speaking of the beyond makes religions vulnerable to philosophy and natural sciences, since it lacks an empirical basis while at the same time being functionalized.” However, is it merely the matter that religions are threatened by talk of Beyond or does the same *danger* also threaten philosophy? Undoubtedly, the task of philosophy is to come within the *danger* of the discourse on the Beyond, even if only to reach the border — to reach the mountain valley. Except, from where does *danger* threaten, who establishes it? The quoted excerpt from the invitation to the conference already hinted: natural sciences based on empirical research.

Now we ask the question: what do the natural sciences definitely include from the realm of empirical research? German philosopher Martin Heidegger is quoted as saying: “Science only ever encounters that which its manner of representation has previously admitted as a possible object for itself.”⁵ It is about the force of knowledge, which explores and illustrates the world only upon its own terms. Heidegger called such a state of mind representational thinking (*vorstellenden Denken*). Yet, what could even appear to such a rationale? “What presences is thus an oppositional object for representation; representation, as *percipere*, is the cogitare of the *ego cogito*, of the *conscientia*, of consciousness, of the self-consciousness of the subject.

5 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 8.

What stands over against (*der Gegenstand*) is the object (*das Objekt*) for the subject.”⁶

Does such an authoritative rationale allow for Beyond? Haven't we already experienced this subject–object relation at the beginning of this paper, when the Beyond primarily came to us as something opposite? From what position are we as rational subjects to approach the Beyond as an object? How did we even get into this kind of opposition? Who put us in this relationship? Now the all-important question arises: *what kind of thinking thinks the Beyond?*

The will for overcoming distance

We must go back to the foot of the Grossglockner. Movement towards the distant village wants to get close to it, and reasoning is fixed upon the goal of overcoming the distance. Let us imagine that we actually achieve the feat. After a brief euphoria, we would come within the immediate vicinity of the village, have a little look around, and take photographs to satisfy our curiosity. From that moment on, the resort is available for future ventures. We know how to reach it — it is at our disposal.

The beyondness of the settlement was not treated in the essence of beyond, but rather it was put forth as a point that one needs to get to. Our wanting to cross the distance and put everything “in its place“ reflects the will that drives today's mentality. Ever faster cars, trains, airplanes, rockets, as well as the Internet, cell phones, television, radio and other modern technology machinations reduce all known distance. Everything that surrounds him, man wants to reduce to the minimum distance. At this time of an epiphany in the removing all possibility of distance⁷, it is the inevitable destiny of humankind to know all the hidden corners of the universe.

The will for overcoming distance, *child* of Nietzsche's will to power, directs human thought. Therefore, when we stand at the foot of the mountain, that which presents a challenge is not a mountain as a mountain, neither is it the Beyond, but it is rather the distance that must be covered.

Once the distance to the village is overcome, the village remains without–distance (*distanceless*). “The distanceless dominates. (*Das Abstandlose herrscht.*) All shortening and abolition of distances, however, brings no near-

6 Martin Heidegger, “Positionality”, in *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures. Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012), 37.

7 Martin Heidegger, “The Point of Reference”, in *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures. Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012), 3.

ness. What is nearness?"⁸ The essence of proximity for Heidegger is that it brings closer to us (*nearing*) objects nearby.⁹ It allows things to come closer to us, but also to move away. Approaching and retreating is the decision coming from the essence of things. However, our mindset wants to dictate distances. Because it is conquered, beyond on the other side of the Grossglockner no longer has any distance. As such, it can no longer come within our vicinity. Without closeness and distance, the beyond of the settlement cannot even hide or reveal itself to us. It is now always accessible and available for use. In other words, the essence of beyond has escaped us. What do we mean by that?

The world in which we exist and things that surround us we value, measure, try to make use of it in a way that they are always at our disposal. That which has allowed us such access to all is technologically oriented thought. The point of technology is the setting up and ordering (*requisitioning*) of everything within its place, where it will be available and replaceable, like a ready reserve. Such gathering Heidegger calls *positionality* (*das Ge-Stell*). "Positionality names the universal ordering, gathered of itself, of the complete orderability of what presences as a whole."¹⁰ The world and all that occurs in it is requested and delivered to the infrastructure: "requisitioning has wrested away all that presences and placed it into complete orderability".¹¹

But what about man? For Heidegger, man offered himself for such an arrangement and positioning, and thereby has become its employee. "Humans are thus, individually and in masses, assigned into this. The human is now the one ordered in, by, and for the requisitioning."¹² Man is within such positioning, either to serve machines, or to design and build them. "In the age of technological dominance, the human is placed into the essence of technology, into positionality, by his essence."¹³

Requisitioning affects everything: from nature and history, through man to the gods. How then to understand the Beyond, meant with a capital B, in such a setting? Heidegger criticized thinking of God in a subject-object relation influenced by positionality. He even mentions theologians who use the results of modern atomic physics and with the help of these try to ensure

8 Heidegger, "The Thing", 16.

9 Ibid., 16.

10 Heidegger, "Positionality", 31.

11 Ibid., 28.

12 Ibid., 29.

13 Ibid., 35.

the existence of God, whereby God himself they place in a realm that can be requisitioned.¹⁴

So, the Beyond imposes positionality through challenge, at least for short periods. From the Beyond it is expected that it bow down to the galloping progress that in the world is placed under its rule of efficiency, availability and ready reserves. Almost immediately, since the Beyond is not something available as a material source, it becomes obvious that the Beyond is not technologically useful and is therefore “unnecessary”.

Beyond remains on the one side, but is no longer experienced as being on any side. Beyond is no longer a part of man's world. It was forcibly removed from the world. Removing it has left emptiness, as well as the border that separates us from it. The more the Grossglockner seems to us superfluous, the more technological thought takes control, making its boundaries become more noticeable. The removal of Beyond becomes apparent and gives a wink of its sense. Except, who can answer to this wink?

The fourfold

In his later work, Martin Heidegger reflects on things, the world and man's position in it. The background of his reflection is a criticism of metaphysics, which holds that, since its inception forgot to ask the question of being (*Seinsvergessenheit*).¹⁵ As a result of the neglect of being, nihilism overuled, and Nietzsche declared that “God is dead”.¹⁶ The place of a Christian God is now empty. Heidegger thus prepares a overmastering of metaphysics through thought based on the truth of being. In the same stretch, he also prepares an overcoming of the God of metaphysics, with divinity that comes in the form of a hidden God.¹⁷ Why is the divine so important for him? Heidegger emphasises that the modern world can be called secular

14 Heidegger, “Positionality”, 30.

15 Martin Heidegger, “Einleitung zu: Was ist Metaphysik? (1949)”, in *Wegmarken*, GA 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976), 371.

16 Friedrich Nietzsche, “Die fröhliche Wissenschaft (1882)”, in *Kritische Studienausgabe*, Band 3, ed. Giorgio Colli — Mazzino Montinari (Berlin, 1988), 573.

17 Bernhard Welte, “God in Heidegger's Thought,” *Philosophy Today* 26 (1982) 1, 94. To understand Heidegger's notion of the gods and of the holy is not an easy task, and in this paper we don't have space to present it. Why it is such a problem, Gall put's it straightforward: “First of all, Heidegger's talk is not at all ‘uniform’ with regard to this matter, insofar as he talks of gods, divinities, angels, the god, aether, and the holy. In addition, since such talk arises first of all in the context of his elucidations of Holderlin's poetry, it might be considered unimportant, a bit of poetic license with no bearing on ‘theology’ and ‘religion’. Furthermore, to the Judeo-Christian mind, such talk smacks of paganism; and, to those who hoped for better things from a thinker who is trying to overcome metaphysics and its onto-theo-logical thinking, it suggests a relapse by Heidegger into some sort of ‘quasi-

only when compared with the old world of myths and gods from which it originated. In the modern world, everything is subjected to machination (*die Machenschaft*). Only one dimension eludes man's manipulation, and that is the experience of the escaping of the gods into Beyond. Heidegger holds that this experience enables the development of the highest extent of human possibilities, which opens the vastness in which we become capable of that which we have not had within our reach — the divine.

However, how does Heidegger think of the world? Now it is time to introduce the concept of the fourfold (*Das Geviert*) that names the gathering of earth and sky, gods and mortals. First of all, we need to understand that for Heidegger there is a close relation between a single thing and the whole world.¹⁸ We have seen that every single thing in positionality has become an object of research and a replaceable reserve. Heidegger is trying to reacquire lost value of the thing and it now becomes a point where the fourfold is gathered.¹⁹

Heidegger uses the pouring jug as an example of the gathering. Because of the gift of water and wine from grapes and rain, in the jug abides the sky and earth. In the gift of the pouring jug there is also “a libation for the mortals. It quenches their thirst. It enlivens their efforts. It heightens their sociability”.²⁰ But, if the gift of the jug is for consecration, then “the pour is the oblation spent for the immortal gods”²¹. In the single gift of the pouring jug — earth and sky, divinities and mortals each abide differently, but in a single fourfold.

“The essence of the jug exists as the pure giving gathering of the simple fourfold in a while (*eine Weile*). The jug essences as thing. The jug is the jug as a thing. But how does the thing essence? The thing things. Thinging gathers. Appropriating the fourfold, it gathers the fourfold's duration (*des-sen Weile*) each time into something that abides (*je Weiliges*): into this or that thing.”²²

ontotheo-logical' thinking that vacillates between metaphysics and 'transmetaphysics.'” Robert S. Gall, *Beyond theism and atheism* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1987), 74.

18 The cruciality of this relation between the thing and the world, is also stressed by Held who claims that “after the *Kehre*, Heidegger's thinking becomes phenomenologically concrete again, it finally gets to grips with the real ‘subject matter of phenomenology’: the world as a referential totality and with it the embedding of the individual thing in this totality”. Klaus Held, “Heidegger and the principle of phenomenology,” in *Martin Heidegger. Critical Assessments, Volume II: History of Philosophy*, ed. Christopher Macann (London — New York: Routledge, 1992), 316.

19 Held, “Heidegger and the principle of phenomenology”, 316.

20 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 11.

21 Ibid., 11.

22 Ibid., 12.

But, how a thing is related to the world? For Heidegger, thinging brings the nearness of the world, because the world is the fourfold.²³ World guards thinging of the thing, and as such, “the world is the guardian of the essence of being” and the world is “the truth of the essence of being”²⁴.

Heidegger's fourfold is often dismissed as an esoteric and poetic reflection of his later thinking, which as such carries no philosophical weight.²⁵ On the other hand, some understand the fourfold as “the counter paradigm for ontotheology”²⁶, “as the antidote to modern technological rationality”²⁷, “a primordial concept of world”²⁸, or as “a retrieval of the Greek cosmos in an attempt to heal our fragmented world”²⁹. In this paper, we hold and will try to show that the fourfold is a fundamental concept, and not an accidental and fleeting inspiration.

How, then, do the four elements — earth and sky, gods and mortals — “deliver” the world?

Earth. Land extends from under foot and in the form of a mountain looms high above us. We are surrounded by the proliferation of life: trees and streams, mountain roads and snowcaps, bears, owls and wolves, and all the other animals. The manner in which the valley is determined by the mountain directs our gazes and life paths. When we think of earth, for Heidegger within the same horizon we are thinking of the sky, gods and mortals, but we are not aware of their oneness (“the simple oneness of the four”).³⁰

23 Martin Heidegger, “The Danger”, in *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures. Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012), 46.

24 *Ibid.*, 46.

25 “This conception (the fourfold) is developed in a way that one can only call mythic, and its philosophical import is therefore far from clear.” Frederick A. Olafson, “The unity of Heidegger's thought”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles B. Guignon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 117. “None of Heidegger's basic concepts has been more ridiculed than the fourfold. (...) The inherent poetry of these four terms, and the fact that Heidegger gives no clear explanation of their meaning, has led to widespread avoidance of the subject.” Graham Harman, *The Quadruple Object* (Alresford: Zero Books, 2011), 83. Nevertheless, Harman holds that “earth, sky, gods and mortals are not the mere poetic distractions of an elderly sage, but are instead the ultimate destination of his lengthy path of thinking”. *Ibid.*, 82.

26 Ben Vedder, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Religion. From God to the Gods* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2006), 224.

27 Philip Tonner, *Heidegger, Metaphysics and the Univocity of Being* (New York: Continuum, 2010), 174.

28 Otto Pöggeler, “Being as appropriation”, in *Martin Heidegger. Critical Assessments, Volume I: philosophy*, ed. Christopher Macann (London — New York: Routledge, 1992), 302.

29 Schalow / Denker, *Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy*, 41.

30 “Earth is the serving bearer, blossoming and fruiting, spreading out in rock and water, rising up into plant and animal. When we say earth, we are already thinking of the other three along with it, but we give no thought to the simple oneness of the four.” Martin

Sky. As long as we are on earth, we are under heaven. After all, here occur changes of the sun and moon, the glow of the night and the stars, smooth flowing clouds and blue horizons. When we think of the sky, at the same time we are thinking of the earth, gods and mortals — but we are not aware of their oneness.³¹

Gods. That which penetrates into the unit of the fourfold are gods as messengers of God's essence.³² In brief encounter of gods and men, gods wink³³ at mortals and *mediate a sense* of how we should understand the divine essence. This is the breakthrough from and of the Beyond. Heidegger's God³⁴ appears from the Beyond into presence or withdraws back to the Beyond. When we think of the gods, at the same time we are thinking of the earth, heaven and mortals, but we are not aware of their oneness.

Mortals. Within the fourfold, people take their place as mortals. Heidegger names humankind mortals not because of the finitude of life, but because they are the only ones who can die. Mortality is not something given to humans at the start of their life. To be a mortal is something humans need to achieve, to be capable of. "The mortals we now name the mortals — not

Heidegger, "Building Dwelling Thinking (1951)", in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York, Harper and Row, 1971, reprinted by Harper Perennial, 2001), 147.

- 31 "The sky is the vaulting path of the sun, the course of the changing moon, the wandering glitter of the stars, the year's seasons and their changes, the light and dusk of day, the gloom and glow of night, the clemency and inclemency of the weather, the drifting clouds and blue depth of the ether. When we say sky, we are already thinking of the other three along with it, but we give no thought to the simple oneness of the four." Heidegger, "Building Dwelling Thinking (1951)", 147.
- 32 "The divinities are the beckoning messengers of the godhead. Out of the holy sway of the godhead, the god appears in his presence or withdraws into his concealment. When we speak of the divinities, we are already thinking of the other three along with them, but we give no thought to the simple oneness of the four." Heidegger, "Building Dwelling Thinking (1951)", 147 — 148.
- 33 "In der Kehre spielen die Winke des letzten Gottes als Anfall und Ausbleib der Ankunft und Flucht der Götter und ihrer Herrschaftsstätte. In diesen Winken wird das Gesetz des letzten Gottes zugewunken..." Martin Heidegger, *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*, GA 65 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1989), 408. Heidegger comprehends winking as a primordial language of gods. Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlins Hymnen "Germanien" und "Der Rhein"*, GA 39 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klosterman, 1999), 128.
- 34 "The Fourfold — earth and sky, mortals and gods — is a deeply Hölderlinian conception that Heidegger derived from his reading of Hölderlin's poetizing of the Greek world. So the god that emerges in Heidegger's late writing is a profoundly poetic god, a poetic experience of the world as something sacred and deserving of reverence. This god is a much more pagan-poetic god and much less Judeo-Christian, ethico-religious God. It has virtually nothing to do with the God whom Jesus called *abba* or with the religion of the cross that Heidegger found in Luther." John D. Caputo, "Heidegger and theology", in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, ed. Charles B. Guignon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 283. Again, under the influence of Hölderlin, for Heidegger the poet is the one who can name the holy and so "prepare" the meeting of gods and mortals.

because their earthly life ends, but rather because they are capable of death as death.”³⁵ Man dies as long as he is a part of the fourfold: on the earth, under the sky and before the gods. When we think of mortals, at the same time we think of the earth, the sky and gods, but we are not aware of their oneness.³⁶

Earth, sky, gods and mortals are united “in the single fold of the unifying fourfold.”³⁷ Upon each of them is reflected (*mirroring*) the essence of the rest. Mirroring is not only the display of the reflection. Rather it is the illumination of each of them in the fourfold and thereby gaining their own essence. It is a game (*the play*) in which each of the four adds one to the other.³⁸

It is precisely the mirror game of fourfold that for Heidegger yields the world: “We name the appropriating mirror–play of the single fold of the earth and sky, divinities and mortals, the world. The world essences and that it worlds. This says: The worlding of world is explicable neither by nor grounded upon anything other than itself.”³⁹ In other words, man is not able to give an explanation of “the worlding of world” (*das Welten der Welt*). The inability for explanation of the essence of the world lies not in human thinking, but more “in the fact that things like causes and grounds remain unsuitable for the worlding of the world”⁴⁰. In this way, as soon as man through his understanding of cause–effect attempts to grasp and explain of “the worlding of world”, he does not grasp the essence of the world, but rather in a way falls below the essence of the world. Man fails to grasp the simplicity of the union of fourfold, but instead views them as individual entities and thereby

35 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 17.

36 “The mortals are the human beings. They are called mortals because they can die. To die means to be capable of death *as* death. Only man dies, and indeed continually, as long as he remains on earth, under the sky, before the divinities. When we speak of mortals, we are already thinking of the other three along with them, but we give no thought to the simple oneness of the four.” Heidegger, “Building Dwelling Thinking (1951)”, 148.

37 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 17. How earth, sky, gods and mortals “hold together is articulated through the gathering power of the German prefix *Ge*— (also to be heard in *Ge–Stell*, positionality, the gathering or collection of all puttings and placings, of modes of *stellen*).” (Andrew J. Mitchell, Translator’s Foreword to *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures. Insight Into That Which Is and Basic Principles of Thinking*, by Martin Heidegger (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012), ix.) The single fold of the four (*die Einfalt der Vier*) names the simplicity, “the simple belonging together of the four”. *Ibid.*, IX.

38 “The four are so deeply connected that each automatically indicates the other three. All four are dependent on each other; there is no sky without earth, no divinities without mortals, etc. An intervention into one of them always has consequences for the other three: they are related as a mirror–play.” Vedder, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Religion. From God to the Gods*, 212.

39 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 18.

40 *Ibid.*, 18.

suffocates them in their essence.⁴¹ In this way, things in the world do not come as things, but they remain trapped in the region of representational thinking.⁴² Such a way of thinking of the world opens the way to technological machinations.

How to save the thinking of the world?

Nonetheless, how then can a mortal think of the world and everything that surrounds us, including the Beyond? So as to save the fourfold and its essence. “Saving does not only snatch something from a danger. To save really means to set something free into its own presencing (*etwas in sein eigenes Wesen freilassen*).”⁴³ This notion “to set something free” or *freilassen* is very important for Heidegger’s latter period. He will even claim that the deepest sense of Being is “to let beings be”. “Es kommt hierbei darauf an, zu verstehen, daß der tiefste Sinn von Sein das Lassen ist. Das Seiende seinlassen.”⁴⁴ This “to let go” of beings is the essence of freedom and possibility to preserve beings as they are.⁴⁵ We can agree with the attitude that earth, sky, gods and mortals are meant by Heidegger “quite literally” and will try later on “straightforward reading of the fourfold”⁴⁶ on the example of the Grossglockner.

41 Ibid., 18. “If the fourfold is the measure that gives humans their dwelling among things, it does not originate in a thinking construction; the modalities of fabrication or constitution turn out to be radically inadequate to apprehend the essence of the Geviert. It is the free and originary disposition of the world that offers itself as world.” Jean-François Mattéi, “The Heideggerian Chiasmus”, in *Heidegger from Metaphysics to Thought*, by Dominique Janicaud and Jean-François Mattéi (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), 103.

42 Heidegger, “The Thing”, 19.

43 Heidegger, “Building Dwelling Thinking (1951)”, 148. / Martin Heidegger, “Bauen Wohnen Denken”, in *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, GA 7 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000), 152.

44 Martin Heidegger, “Seminar in Le Thor (1969)”, in *Seminare*, GA 15 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1986, 2nd edition 2005), 363.

45 “Was scheint leichter, als das Seiende nur das Seiende sein zu lassen, das es ist? Oder kommen wir mit dieser Aufgabe vor das Schwerste, zumal wenn ein solches Vorhaben — das Seiende sein zu lassen, wie es ist — das Gegenteil darstellt von jener Gleichgültigkeit, die dem Seienden zugunsten eines ungeprüften Seinsbegriffes den Rücken kehrt? Wir sollen uns dem Seienden zukehren, an ihm selbst auf dessen Sein denken, aber es dadurch zugleich in seinem Wesen auf sich beruhen lassen.” Martin Heidegger, “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes (1935/36)”, in *Holzwege*, GA 5 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1997), 16. For more about notion of “letting go”, see: Damir Barbarić, *Zrcalna igra četvorstva. Heideggerova kasna misao* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2008), 37.

46 Mark A. Wrathall, “Between the Earth and the Sky: Heidegger on Life After the Death of God”, in *Heidegger and Unconcealment. Truth, Language, and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 2010), 205.

Heidegger claims that mortals save the fourfold when they perceive the sky as the sky, the seasons they allow to change, stars and planets are left to their orbiting, and they do not turn day into night. Deities are received as deities and an eye is kept on their signs, just as with the arrival–departure, so too with the absence thereof. From the signs of the Beyond, mortals are allowed to understand their own final point. Mortals save themselves insofar as they are obedient to their own essence — the final essence that is being able to die.

And finally, mortals save the earth so as not to be exploited and put under the control of the positionality. Therefore, the Danube River is no longer seen as the fastest and cheapest shipping route, as convenient for a dam and power generation, as something that should be directed to irrigate fields. Forests are not seen as a bunch of tree trunks ready for a paper manufacturing plant. Wild animals are no longer attractive opportunities for tourism and hunters, but a gift of biodiversity that surrounds us. Valleys are no longer divided into pieces of country and harnessed for the production of agricultural goods. Valleys are now opened up as the place of our residence, birth and death.

However, how the Grossglockner is now becoming exposed to us? The epitome of positioning everything within reach and reserve, in full force reveals itself to us on the celebrated the Grossglockner High Alpine Road.

With the detonation of explosions, August 30th, 1930, began the blasting of a tunnel through the depths of the Grossglockner and the laying of a route of 48 kilometres of highway. The reason for this was to provide opportunities for “motorized tourism”, as well as work for 3,200 people in the then ailing Austrian economy.⁴⁷ Tourism and an economy that must be maintained conquered the mountaintops that had previously belonged to the divine heights. Machinations that pierced the way for the Grossglockner High Alpine Road almost to the tops, but still significantly below, later on proudly erected a billboard signed “ZIEL”⁴⁸.

Is the epitome of technological prowess embodied by “ZIEL”? No, the climax of triumph is revealed in that which withdraws in the face of “ZEILs” assault.⁴⁹ That what withdraws is the essence of the thing that gathers the fourfold.

47 “Grossglockner,” Wikipedia, accessed August 02, 2015, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grossglockner>; “Grossglockner High Alpine Road,” Wikipedia, accessed August 02, 2015, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grossglockner_High_Alpine_Road

48 Billboard signed “ZIEL” is just one of billboards we can find on the Grossglockner High Alpine Road.

49 This assault is not something that was initiated merely with the development of modern technology. Already in 1561, when the Viennese cartographer Wolfgang Lazius mapped the mountains, basis for an exploitative conquest had been established. Nature had already been prepared in advance for positioning and marketing in the form of resources.

When we try to perceive the Grossglockner as a thing that gives a fourfold, allowing it to appear without the shackles of roads, it comes before us as God's great work. His power emanates from the depths of the earth and ascends to the heavens. When we stand at the foot of the Grossglockner or any mountain that overwhelms us with its height, and when we get divine afflatus about the beyondness of the Beyond, then Heidegger's gods are winking at us. The ecstasy of the heights opens the essence of our mortal physicality, which is buried in the finality of the world. In the same motion, enthusiasm impassions us for that which is on the other side of the border, according to the Beyond.

The beyondness of the Beyond is the further progression of the fertility and richness of the world. It carries a gift that has yet to be discovered and preserved. The givingness of the gift springs from its inaccessibility, and that which it gives is the possibility that something is hidden from us and that it can at the same moment be close to us, just as it only wishes for itself. Hiding and coming into appearance, which is lost in technological positioning, is the basic way of nature that Heraclitus experienced: "Nature loves to hide" (φύσις κρύπτεσθαι φιλεῖ).⁵⁰

The beyondness of the Beyond in the mirror-play of the fourfold is now considered to be as part of the world. The Grossglockner peak is no longer a peak that is there because of a road. The Grossglockner, as a matter of this world, now unites event of the earth and the sky, divinities and mortals, in which it conquers and elevates our interment in earthly finality to the heights of eternity.

Conclusion

We asked about Beyond, and we came to the border. Don't we always come to the same borders? Yet, how have we perceived that border and "territory" that it divided?

We have abandoned the representational thinking (*vorstellenden Denken*), the subject-object relation, that prevented us to even start to think about the essence of the Beyond. Prevention was in a way a clean rejection of the Beyond as a needless phenomenon.

50 Heraklit, Fragment 123, in *Predsokratovci*, ed. Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, Band I (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1983), 160. Capobianco is thinking similarly: "We take in all that we are able — yet we realize there is more, always more, to manifestation — a richness of showing, a reserve of appearing, that can never be fully tapped. *Physis* endlessly arising and we endlessly astonished." Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 64.

We were searching for a path of thinking the wholeness of the world that includes the Beyond. Did we find a path out of positionality, out of jurisdiction of machination? With the help of Heidegger's fourfold, we have spoken about a world that indeed includes the aforementioned border and territory beyond it — the beyondness of the Beyond. It is a radically different way of philosophical understanding of the world and things in it. Illuminated by the holiness of the Beyond, thinking of the essence of the world requires the sacrifice of looking through the eyes of mortals and a conceptual leap through the fourfold. Because the Beyond is a part of the fourfold, other three parts are also mirrored by it, as a gift for our thinking.

The Beyond opens for mortals a horizon and gives them sight. That which sight includes is mortality of mortals, the earth where they stand, the sky above them and the divine signs coming from the Beyond. In Heidegger's fourfold, the Beyond while in hiding retains its transcendence and coming into sight it confirms itself as a part of the world. Thinking in the fourfold way is a "philosophical and theological givingness" that allows human thinking to take a stand that limits the further technological setup of the world.

Abstract

BEYOND IN HEIDEGGER'S FOURFOLD

In this paper we are trying to answer the question: how to think about the Beyond? In first step, we have showed why representational thinking (*vorstellenden Denken*), the subject–object relation, prevented us to even start to think about the essence of the Beyond. That is why in the second step we turned to often dismissed Martin Heidegger's concept of the fourfold (*das Geviert*): earth, sky, mortals and gods. In brief encounter of gods and men in the fourfold, gods wink at mortals and mediate a sense of how we should understand the divine essence. This is the breakthrough from and of the Beyond. The Beyond in the mirror–play of the fourfold is now considered to be as part of the world and that is a radically different way of philosophical understanding of the world and things in it, including humans as mortals.

KEY WORDS: Beyond, fourfold, God, Martin Heidegger, phenomenology, positionality, representational thinking, thing, world.

