4-7-2016

Divine Temporality: Bonhoeffer's Theological Appropriation of Heidegger's Existential Analytic of Dasein

Nicholas Byle
University of South Florida, nbyle@mail.usf.edu

Divine Temporality: Bonhoeffer's Theological Appropriation of Heidegger's Existential Analytic of Dasein

by

Nicholas Byle

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy
with a concentration in Philosophy and Religion
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Michael DeJonge, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Michael Morris, Ph.D.
Lee Braver, Ph.D.
Benjamin Crowe, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 25, 2016

Keywords: *Act and Being*; *Being and Time*; Christology; ontology; anthropology; epistemology

Dedication

For Natalie

Acknowledgments

The completion of the following project was gratefully assisted by the University of South Florida's Dissertation Completion Fellowship. Conclusions, opinions, and other statements are my own and are not necessarily those of the University of South Florida.

I thank both the University of South Florida's Religious Studies and Philosophy Departments for offering a welcoming and conducive atmosphere within which to grow as a scholar, a teacher, and a person. I would like to particularly thank Dell deChant, from whom I learned much both academically and personally.

I also thank my dissertation committee. Michael Morris' masterful understanding of and ability to explain Kant and Hegel and his general support throughout my doctoral work are greatly appreciated. Charles Guignon's and Lee Braver's expert knowledge of Heidegger were most welcome. Benjamin Crowe graciously lent his expertise and was consistently supportive. Michael DeJonge has been especially positive and helpful throughout my graduate career in all its aspects going beyond any expectation or hope I could have for a mentor.

I thank my family and in particular my wife, Natalie, for their consistent support of my graduate work overall and their dependable encouragement at every step of the project.

I also thank Gütersloher Verlagshaus for granting permission to use portions of my previously published "Heidegger's Adam and Bonhoeffer's Christ: Evaluating Bonhoeffer's Appraisals of Heidegger " published in: Dietrich Bonhoeffer Yearbook 5 – 2011/2012, edited by Clifford J. Green, Kirsten Busch Nielsen, Christiane Tietz. © 2012, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, Gütersloh, in der Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

BT	*Being and Time*
DBW	*Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke*
DBWE	*Dietrich Bonhoeffer Works* (English)
GA	*Gesamtausgabe* (Martin Heidegger)
LW	*Luther's Works*
SZ	*Sein und Zeit*

Abstract

This dissertation's guiding question is: What was the impact of Martin Heidegger's early philosophy on Dietrich Bonhoeffer's theology? I argue that Heidegger's analysis of Dasein, his technical term for human existence, provides Bonhoeffer with important conceptual tools for developing his Christology, from which the rest of his theology follows.

Part of recognizing Heidegger's importance to Bonhoeffer involves understanding the latter's critiques of previous notable philosophers such as Kant, Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler. As Bonhoeffer evaluates these philosophers, they lead to theologically unacceptable positions. Heidegger, in contrast, has come to a theologically profitable understanding of human existence and epistemology. Though there are theologically useful elements in Heidegger's philosophy, there are elements that require significant alteration, and even rejection. Heidegger recognizes that epistemology must be based on actual human existence, and he can account for the historical continuity of human existence; however, because of Heidegger's anthropocentric philosophy, he cannot account for God's transcendence necessary for proper theology. Bonhoeffer then applies the conceptual tools he has appropriated from Heidegger to revelation, Christology, and the church. This eliminates the anthropocentrism that made transcendence impossible, while maintaining the benefits of Heidegger's philosophy in order to account for Christian existence.

Understanding Bonhoeffer's appropriation of Heidegger is additionally important for understanding Heidegger's potential relation to theology. This dissertation concludes by placing Bonhoeffer in the context of other theological appropriations of Heidegger. In light of this

context and Heidegger's own understanding of philosophy's relation to theology, I argue that Bonhoeffer represents one, viable theological use of Heidegger.

Introduction

The publication of Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time* was a generally agreed upon watershed event in the history of twentieth-century philosophy. As a consequence of its publication, Heidegger, who had been struggling to find a permanent academic position, received immediate fame, even filling Edmund Husserl's position at Freiburg. Of course with the publication of *Being and Time*, philosophy had to respond. Describing the general reactions to Heidegger in 1929, Heinrich Petzt recounts, "It seemed as if Heidegger dominated the intellectual scene of the university even where he was not actively involved—finding opposition as well as agreement. While some were enthusiastic about him, others resisted and mocked him."[1] And Hans-Georg Gadamer, one of Heidegger's most notable students, remarks that "the brilliant scheme of *Being and Time* really meant a total transformation of the intellectual climate, a transformation that had lasting effects on almost all the sciences."[2] It is well-known that Heidegger and his *Being and Time* had immediate and enduring effects on such notable philosophers as Hannah Arendt, Herbert Marcuse, and Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Time* is now a ranking member of the philosophical canon.

It was not merely philosophy that felt the need to respond to Heidegger, however; so too did theology. Looking back from 1956, Rudolf Bultmann writes, "[T]he work of existential philosophy, which I came to know through my discussions with Martin Heidegger, has become of decisive significance for me. I found in it the conceptuality in which it is possible to speak

[1] Heinrich Wiegand Petzt, *Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 12.
[2] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, trans. David E. Linge (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 139.

adequately of human existence and therefore also of the existence of the believer."[3] In response to such open reliance on Heidegger and repeated attempts on Bultmann's part to bring Karl Barth and Heidegger together, Barth replies in 1931, "I can only repeat that with your [Bultmann's] well-known attachment to Heidegger you have done something that one ought not to do as an evangelical theologian (not because he is Heidegger but because he is a philosopher, who as such has nothing to say to and in theology)."[4] Bultmann and Barth represent two opposed and extreme options for theology's engagement with Heidegger specifically and philosophy generally. Bultmann, for his part, may appeal to the long and illustrious theological practice of drawing on philosophical sources to expound and restate traditional theological doctrines. Notable examples include Augustine's use of neo-Platonism and Aquinas' use of Aristotle. Barth, for his part, has an equally well-established tradition to appeal to including Tertullian's rejection of Athens in favor of Jerusalem.

Theologians did not have to, nor did they in fact always, choose one or the other of these extremes. Between Bultmann's explicit and extensive use of Heidegger and Barth's obstinate, principled silence on Heidegger, which was only broken now and then to reaffirm it, there are responses by other notable theologians such as Emil Brunner and Erich Pryzwara. Barth, for example, accuses Brunner of holding a position that one may arrive at from following Heidegger or Kierkegaard.[5] It is true that Brunner does not outright reject Heidegger and his possible theological use as Barth does. But neither does he accept Heidegger as easily as Bultmann. Rather Brunner believes that a good theologian will seriously ask what consequences for faith

[3] Rudolf Bultmann, "Autobiographical Reflections," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, trans. Schubert Ogden (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), 288.
[4] Bernd Jaspert and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, eds., *Karl Barth-Rudolf Bultmann Letters 1922-1966*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981), 65. Translation altered.
[5] Karl Barth, "No!," in *Natural Theology*, trans. Peter Fraenkel (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1946), 114.

result from appropriating philosophical concepts.[6] From his brief tussle with this question, Brunner concludes that while "Heidegger's ontology may do [theology] the service of sharply discerning the being and understanding of being of the natural humans" there is still "every reason for guarding against drawing too close a connection with it."[7] Przywara, a Catholic theologian, for his part worries that Heidegger's understanding of being closes the world in on itself leaving it incapable of relating to anything transcendent.[8] Yet Przywara also believes that Heidegger's ontology, particularly its understanding of the relation between existence and essence, has the ability to renew Thomistic Scholastic theology and philosophy, particularly their understanding of the *anologia entis* (analogy of being).[9] The theological reactions to Heidegger's *Being and Time* are diverse.

There was another contemporary theological reaction to Heidegger deserving an extended analysis, that of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer does not categorically reject Heidegger as Barth does. Nor, however, does he offer unqualified praise and simply adopt Heidegger as one might say of Bultmann. Like Brunner's general position, Bonhoeffer is open to the possibility of theology's use of philosophy, yet always mindful of possible inappropriate appropriations. Bonhoeffer then represents some intermediate position between Bultmann and Barth. This in itself might be enough to warrant a closer examination. However, as I will argue, Bonhoeffer does not simply adopt some elements from Heidegger's philosophy which appeal to him and discard those that do not; rather, he theologically transforms central elements of Heidegger's philosophy, especially fundamental and essential elements of his existential analytic of Dasein. Bonhoeffer's complex and nuanced reaction to Heidegger is succinctly captured in the seemingly

[6] Emil Brunner, "Theologie und Ontologie, oder: Die Theologie am Scheidewege," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1931): 114.
[7] Ibid., 121–2.
[8] Erich Przywara, "Drei Richtungen der Phänomenologie," *Stimmen der Zeit* 115 (1928): 252.
[9] Ibid., 264.

disparate assertions, which occur in the same paragraph of his post-doctoral dissertation *Act and Being*, that Heidegger's philosophy must be "highly instructive" and yet "inappropriate" for theology.[10]

Taking Bonhoeffer's statements seriously the present work asks: What, if any, influence did Heidegger's early philosophy have on Bonhoeffer? What are the specifics of that influence? And what can Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger tell us about the theological implications and possibilities of Heidegger's early philosophy? Such questions should be taken seriously by both Bonhoeffer and Heidegger scholars, particularly those concerned with Heidegger's relation to theology.[11]

Bonhoeffer's assessments and uses of Heidegger are not uninformed and, therefore, require serious attention; in fact, by the time he encountered *Being and Time*, Bonhoeffer was well-positioned to critically and accurately engage it. Describing his work in a 1930 *Curriculum vitae*, Bonhoeffer writes, "I have also continued to study the newer and most contemporary philosophy, especially phenomenology."[12] This retrospective self-assessment is also supported by earlier accounts of his work and the actual use he makes of phenomenology prior to encountering *Being and Time*. "After I finish Weber, I intend to read Troeltsch's work on the social teachings of Christian ethics and work through Husserl," so Bonhoeffer reports to his mother in 1924.[13] Though Bonhoeffer owned a copy of Husserl's *Ideas*, cites Husserl's *Logical Investigations*, and explicitly assesses Husserl in his post-doctoral dissertation, *Act and Being*, Husserl himself does not make much of an appearance in Bonhoeffer's 1927 doctoral

[10] DBWE 2: 72-3 (DBW 2: 66-7).
[11] To date the best general and judicious treatment of these questions is Stephen Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 301–32, which states that more than "a single essay" is needed to do proper treatment to the subject.
[12] DBWE 10: 235 (DBW 10: 190).
[13] DBWE 9:133 (DBW 9: 141).

dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*;[14] other phenomenologists and students of Husserl, however, do have prominent positions. Most notably, Max Scheler makes many positive appearances in *Sanctorum Communio*; though Bonhoeffer's appraisals of Scheler will be largely negative by *Act and Being*. Bonhoeffer also cites a 1922 article by Edith Stein, Husserl's student and Heidegger's friend, published in the former's *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Phänomenologische Forschung*, the same publication where Heidegger's *Being and Time* was first published.[15] Bonhoeffer, therefore, seems to have been in a good position to engage Heidegger's *Being and Time*. And it is most likely through his cousin, Hans-Christoph von Hase, a student at Marburg, that Bonhoeffer first learned of Heidegger.[16] Nothing remains of Bonhoeffer's thoughts on first encountering Heidegger. What is certainly clear is that Bonhoeffer was well-versed in the phenomenological tradition, primarily in the form of Husserl and Scheler and that by *Act and Being* the positive role these earlier phenomenologists played is replaced by Heidegger's "genuine ontology."[17]

The brevity of Bonhoeffer's direct engagement with Heidegger is perhaps one of the greater obstacles to taking the question of Heidegger's influence seriously; yet, brevity does not in itself negate the intensity of Bonhoeffer's engagement with Heidegger, nor the pivotal function Heidegger plays at this formative period in Bonhoeffer's theology. Bonhoeffer directly and explicitly engages Heidegger roughly between 1928 and 1932. The evidence and content of this engagement is isolated to Bonhoeffer's post-doctoral dissertation, *Act and Being*, his Inaugural lecture based on, and a lecture in the 1931-32 Winter semester, of which unfortunately

[14] DBWE 1: 30-1n[4] and 70n5 (DBW 1: 17n[10] and 43n5).
[15] DBWE 1:30-1n3 (DBW 1: 16n3).
[16] Eberhard Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, ed. Victoria Barnett, Revised edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 82–3. Cf. DBWE 10: 596 (DBW 10: 593). Plant cautiously suggests that it is possible that Bonhoeffer received notes of Heidegger's lectures from von Hase. Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 314n40.
[17] DBWE 2: 60 (DBW 2: 54).

nothing remains save some fragmentary notes on Heidegger and Eberhard Grisebach. Though admittedly brief, there is some circumstantial evidence that indicates the significance of Bonhoeffer's engagement with Heidegger. Again, Bonhoeffer was engaged in the developing phenomenological tradition, of which Heidegger was the latest and most explosive addition. In *Act and Being*, Heidegger makes a comparable appearance; he is cited more often than Barth and comes second only to Martin Luther.[18] While "Dasein," which has made its way untranslated into common English technical philosophical parlance thanks to Heidegger, is a common enough German word, there is not one instance of it in Bonhoeffer's dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*; in *Act and Being*, however, it becomes the central anthropological term. The very title itself, *Act and Being*, and the project of combining the two title terms may be an indication of Heidegger's influence, who sought to overturn the philosophical assumption prominent since Plato that being and time are strictly divided. And most importantly, there are Bonhoeffer's own statements that Heidegger achieved some form of solution to the problem of act and being with his concept of Dasein, which, I believe, should be charitably interpreted as sincere and, therefore, significant. If Bonhoeffer is sincere, then he has credited Heidegger with solving a problem that, according to Bonhoeffer, has plagued philosophy until Heidegger and plagued theology until Bonhoeffer.

Because Heidegger's contribution to Bonhoeffer's theology is intimately connected with Bonhoeffer's unique formulation of the problem of act and being, it is necessary to fully elucidate the nature of this problem. Those unfamiliar with Bonhoeffer's *Act and Being* are surely as likely to be unfamiliar with the meaning of the phrase "the problem of act and being." To my knowledge, no one but Bonhoeffer and those drawing on Bonhoeffer talk about the problem of act and being. The term itself and the presentation of the problem are unique to

[18] Christiane Tietz points to this as sufficient reason to take Bonhoeffer's engagement with Heidegger seriously. Christiane Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1999), 59; Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, 133.

Bonhoeffer; however, the general contours of the problem are not. During the argumentative development of *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer identifies various manifestations of the problem of act and being in philosophy and theology. One or more of these manifestations are likely to be familiar to the reader. As a philosophical example, one can see, as Bonhoeffer does, the development from Immanuel Kant's transcendental idealism to Hegelian idealism as centered around the problem of act and being. Put simplistically, Kant's epistemology is concerned with the relation between the knowing *act* of the subject and the *being* of the phenomenal object of knowledge. There is a strong sense in which the act of the subject creates the being of the phenomemal object; yet the knowing act of the subject is importantly limited by the noumenal thing-in-itself. Hegel, also simplistically put, finds this limit unsatisfactory arguing that the limit itself is the creation of the knowing act and thereby subjects all being to the act of the knowing subject. As a theological example, one may take the debate surrounding the point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*). For Brunner, there must be something in the *being* of humans, some point of contact, predisposed to receive the *act* of divine revelation.[19] If there were no point of contact, according to Brunner, it would be difficult to talk about the mechanisms of grace, what roles church, sermon, and sacrament play in such grace, and human responsibility vis-à-vis sin and grace. For Barth, in constrast, there is no point in the *being* of humans ready-made to receive divine *acts*.[20] Such a doctrine risks, for Barth, limiting God's completely free *act* of revelation.[21] Though not immediately obvious, for Bonhoeffer these are particular manifestations of the common problem of act and being.

[19] Emil Brunner, "Nature and Grace," in *Natural Theology*, trans. Peter Fraenkel (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002), 31.
[20] Barth, "No!," 89.
[21] In more practical confessional and historical terms, according to Barth, Brunner's advocating for a point of contact makes it difficult to distinguish him "from a Thomist or Neo-Protestant" and may earn "the applause of the 'German Christians'," a fairly harsh criticism, but one that points to the urgency of issues encompassed in Bonhoeffer's "problem of act and being." Ibid., 90.

A full elucidation of the problem of act and being is also necessary to properly assess Heidegger's role in helping Bonhoeffer come to a theological solution to the problem. Bonhoeffer's formulation of the problem is complex and multifaceted. It would have to be to allow for so many apparently disparate manifestations. The problem may manifest as too act- or too being-oriented; it occurs at different conceptual levels; and there are a number of criteria that any possible solution must meet in order to qualify as an actual solution for Bonhoeffer. Without fully grasping the complexity of the problem it is easy to misinterpret Bonhoeffer's presentation and assessment of a particular philosopher or theologian. According to Bonhoeffer, various theologians and philosophers, such as Heidegger, have met some criteria and failed at others. Without a full conceptual map of the problem, we may unduly focus on particular failures, successes, or misinterpret one for the other. Chapter one will then be devoted to explaining the intricacies of Bonhoeffer's understanding of the problem of act and being.

In light of Bonhoeffer's assessment, Heidegger is most notable for coming closer than any previous philosopher has to an actual solution to the problem. To appreciate this general compliment Bonhoeffer has paid Heidegger and its particulars, it is first important to understand Bonhoeffer's assessments of previous philosophers. Part A of *Act and Being* is "The Problem of Act and Being Portrayed in a Preparatory Manner as the Epistemological Problem of an Autonomous Understanding of Dasein in Philosophy."[22] Here there are, in addition to Heidegger, four other notable representatives of philosophical attempts to solve the problem: Kant, G.W.F. Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler. Kant is notable for providing Bonhoeffer with some essential elements necessary for a solution to the problem; though as we shall see much has to be done, according to Bonhoeffer, to shore up these positive elements and avoid its slip into idealism. Husserl, Scheler, and particularly Hegel represent, again for Bonhoeffer, failed

[22] DBWE 2: 33 (DBW 2: 27).

attempts at a solution. These attempts also differ from one another manifesting different forms of failures and successes. Presenting Bonhoeffer's synopses and assessments of these philosophical attempts is useful for providing more concrete representations of his criteria of success. This should make Bonhoeffer's presentation and assessment of Heidegger more comprehensible since he holds Heidegger to the same standards. It should also make the degree of Heidegger's success more apparent.

It is also important to note the word "preparatory" in the chapter title for it indicates that Bonhoeffer's purpose in going through the philosophical attempts of Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Scheler, and Heidegger is to test and indicate what features of such attempts may be transformed into a viable theological solution. This philosophical section is, then, not isolated from the rest of *Act and Being*. Understanding the philosophical attempts prepares us for understanding Bonhoeffer's theological attempt. Chapter two is then devoted to presenting Bonhoeffer's understanding and assessments of Kant, Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler.

Following on the heels of the assessments of previous philosophical attempts, Bonhoeffer says that Heidegger has reached a "genuine coordination" (*wirkliche Zusammenordung*) of act and being, a statement of high praise which deserves a detailed explanation and analysis.[23] Part A, the philosophical section, of *Act and Being* is, again, preparatory. Theological counterparts to the philosophical failures should, for Bonhoeffer, be avoided. Philosophical successes, however, should be theologically adapted. If Bonhoeffer's praise is genuine, then those elements in Heidegger's philosophy that were instrumental in that success should reappear in theological clothing. Such theological clothing, however, may hinder attempts to recognize their philosophical origins. To mitigate this hindrance we must know what such elements are and how they contribute to Heidegger's success at the problem of act and being.

[23] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65).

Heidegger's philosophical success is not the complete account, however. Shortly after crediting Heidegger with coordinating act and being in such a way that it "must be highly instructive for theology," Bonhoeffer states that "Heidegger's concept of being […] remains unsuitable for theology."[24] This does not negate the previous attributions of success. Rather the standards of success have shifted slightly. Most simply put, Heidegger's solution is adequate to philosophy. What Bonhoeffer, the theologian, is searching for, however, is a theological solution. Given important differences between these two sciences (*Wissenschaften*), solutions in philosophy do not straightforwardly translate into theology.

Clearly cataloging, explaining, and evaluating the successes and failures of Heidegger's philosophy is particularly important in light of the complexity of Bonhoeffer's understanding of the problem of act and being with its different conceptual levels, manifestations, and criteria of success. Not doing so can lead to a number of problems. First, one might not adequately explain or appreciate Heidegger's successes from Bonhoeffer's perspective. This is the most common problem of secondary literature dealing with Bonhoeffer's relation to Heidegger. The origin of this inadequacy might, however, lie in Bonhoeffer's account itself. Bonhoeffer will identify a success or element of Heidegger's philosophy that contributes to its success and quickly move on with little to no elucidation of the point. Secondary literature often follows suit, however. Tomi Karttunen, rightly I think, identifies Heidegger's intimate relating of human existence and historicity as a successful element.[25] Without further explanation, however, he immediately moves to how this is still inadequate. Christiane Tietz identifies, also quite rightly, Heidegger's concept of temporality as important for Bonhoeffer, but does not explain how or why this is.[26]

[24] DBWE 2: 72-3 (DBW 2: 66-7).
[25] Tomi Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit: Erkenntnistheorie und Ontologie in der Theologie Dietrich Bonhoeffers* (Joensu: Joensuun yliopisto/Teologinen tiedekunta, 2004), 230.
[26] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 76.

Or Michael DeJonge claims, again quite rightly, that Dasein's structure itself presupposes the interrelation of act and being.[27] Obviously, with *Being and Time*'s nearly five-hundred pages, the structure of Dasein is quite detailed and complex. What specifically about the structure of Dasein presupposes an interrelation of act and being? Overcoming this difficulty, then, requires clearly identifying an element of Heidegger's success and returning to its origin in *Being and Time* in order to provide a fuller explanation.

A second problem that often arises from not properly distinguishing Heidegger's successes and failures is the tendency to allow Bonhoeffer's theological critiques to overshadow the genuine positive appraisals. For example, the ways in which Karttunen and Tietz intermix the successes and failures of Heidegger could, even if unintended, give the impression that Bonhoeffer believed Heidegger 'cheated' in coming to a solution.[28] This only arises, however, if one expects Bonhoeffer to expect philosophy to be able to arrive at a complete solution that would be equally applicable to theology. Or, in other words, if one believes Bonhoeffer holds philosophy to the same exact standards as he holds theology. This is not so and arises from not adequately distinguishing between the subtle variation in standards between philosophy and theology. That Bonhoeffer is a theologian and Heidegger is a philosopher is fairly obvious. What is perhaps less obvious is Bonhoeffer's understanding of the relation between philosophy and theology. For Bonhoeffer, philosophy's relation to truth can range from completely and dangerously wrong (Hegel) to getting important aspects right, though falling short of the whole truth (Kant and Heidegger). Even the best philosophy, as it stands, is inadequate for theological purposes, unless it is appropriately transformed according to proper theological standards.

---

[27] Michael DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation: Berlin, Barth, and Protestant Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 30.
[28] Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, 95. Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 73 and 73n360.

It is important to address the concern that Bonhoeffer might have arrived at this solution without Heidegger's help. Jens Zimmermann, for example, states: "We have little evidence that Heidegger's influence extended beyond serving as a useful philosophical justification to conjoin human reflection to action and to confirm Bonhoeffer's own incarnational instinct that Christian theology must ever be historically conscious. Both of these tendencies, moreover, are already in Bonhoeffer's first dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*."[29] Zimmermann is quite right to point to these tendencies as pre-existing in *Sanctorum Communio*. There are also, in fact, other important tendencies in *Act and Being* that are already present in *Sanctorum Communio*. Another interpretation, perhaps equally plausible and conjectural, is that these pre-existing tendencies predisposed Bonhoeffer to find Heidegger a valuable philosophical source. But tendencies are not solutions. Clifford Green also argues that many, if not most, of the important themes and issues that will orient Bonhoeffer's future work originate in *Sanctorum Communio*. Yet Green also notes that Bonhoeffer's concept of person in *Sanctorum Communio* is overly act-oriented by *Act and Being*'s standards.[30] There might just then be important advances from *Sanctorum Communio* to *Act and Being*. This coupled with Bonhoeffer's assertion that Heidegger must be "highly instructive for theology" warrants at least the provisional view that Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger was not merely and disingenuously pragmatic. Yet it is still important to account for what is and is not already present in *Sanctorum Communio*, and what does and does not undergo important alterations by the time of *Act and Being*. Though dealt with as needed, this topic will also have particular priority in chapter three.

[29] Jens Zimmermann, *Humanism and Religion: A Call for the Renewal of Western Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 292.
[30] Clifford J. Green, *Bonhoeffer: A Theology of Sociality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999), 70.

Chapters three and four are devoted to overcoming these problems by clearly distinguishing, explaining, and evaluating the successes and failures of Heidegger's philosophy from Bonhoeffer's perspective. Chapter three is specifically devoted to Heidegger's philosophical successes; while chapter four is devoted to the theological inadequacies of the same. Along the way, though particularly in chapter four, Bonhoeffer's understanding of Heidegger will be evaluated for correctness, something also often lacking in the secondary literature.[31] By clearly cataloging the successes and failures of Heidegger's philosophy to solve the problem of act and being with all its various nuances we should then have a good resource for determining what successes Bonhoeffer anticipates maintaining in his theology and what failures he wishes to avoid. This again is Bonhoeffer's intent in treating various philosophical attempts at solutions to the problem of act and being.

Bonhoeffer, in fact, makes considerable use of Heidegger's philosophical successes in coming to a theological solution to the problem of act and being. Bonhoeffer transfers many of these successes from Heidegger's human Dasein to the person of Jesus Christ and Christ as the church. This also has the effect of theologically avoiding or rehabilitating Heidegger's failures, many of which occur, for Bonhoeffer, simply because it is philosophy and not theology. Demonstrating that this is the case, how Heidegger's Dasein is theologically transformed, and how Bonhoeffer's theology works in light of this are the subject of chapter five.

Bonhoeffer does not grapple with Heidegger merely because *Being and Time* exploded on the philosophical scene; Bonhoeffer found in Heidegger valuable tools for dealing with a central problem in contemporary theology. The central tool Bonhoeffer adapts from Heidegger is

[31] To my knowledge, Tietz and Boomgaarden have come furthest in this regard. Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 74–5; Jürgen Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit: Dietrich Bonhoeffers systematische Theologie und ihr philosophischer Hintergrund in Akt und Sein* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1999), 254–99.

the former's explanation of Dasein's temporality in order to account for revelation's relation to time and history. Bonhoeffer was the academic child of two competing theological schools, liberal theology and dialectical theology, between which at times arose rancorous conflict. A central problem between these two schools was revelation's relation to time and history and the nature of the theological method that arises from the different answers. The differences and the apparent impasse between them are perhaps best exemplified in the 1923 publication debate between Adolf von Harnack and Barth, the most prominent exponents of liberal theology and dialectical theology respectively. Harnack rhetorically asks in question fourteen of his "Fifteen questions to the despisers of scientific theology,"

> If the person of Jesus Christ stands at the center of the gospel, how else can the basis for reliable and communal knowledge of this person be gained but through critical-historical study so that an imagined Christ is not put in place of the real one? What else besides scientific theology is able to undertake this study?[32]

That is, the objective analysis of history is the only means to come to proper theological truths. The assumption that Christ and revelation have a positive relation to time and history lies behind this position. Simply put, Christ and revelation are *in* time and history and, therefore, available to historical analysis. Barth replies,

> Whoever does not yet know […] that we *no* longer know Christ according to the flesh, should let the critical study of the Bible tell him so. The more radically he is frightened the better it is for him and for the matter involved. This might turn out to be the service which "historical knowledge" can render to the actual task of theology.[33]

For Barth, Harnack's critical-historical method can serve only a negative function. It can only tell us that Christ or revelation are not available through an analysis of history.[34] That Christ or

---

[32] Adolf von Harnack, "Fifteen Questions to the Despisers of Scientific Theology," in *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, ed. Martin Rumscheidt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 87.
[33] Karl Barth, "Fifteen Answers to Professor Adolf von Harnack," in *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, ed. Martin Rumscheidt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 90.
[34] Barth also states this clearly and emphatically later; Karl Barth, "An Answer to Professor Adolf von Harnack's Open Letter," in *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, ed. Martin Rumscheidt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 100.

revelation are opposed to or beyond time and history lies behind Barth's rejection of Harnack's position. Bonhoeffer finds both positions unacceptable. The liberal theological position risks making Christ one object among others available to human understanding apart from divine revelation. The Barthian position risks making Christ completely unavailable and thereby jeopardizes key theological tasks and themes such as preaching, ecclesiology, the foundation of Christian identity, and theological ethics. As we will see, particularly in chapters three and five, Bonhoeffer theologically adapts Heidegger's concept of temporality to solve the problem of act and being for theology and move beyond this impasse. For Bonhoeffer, Christ or revelation are neither opposed to time and history nor straightforwardly in time and history; rather, Christ is temporality from which time and history extend.

Heidegger's influence is not merely limited to *Act and Being* and its immediately surrounding period. If Heidegger's influence were limited to the period of *Act and Being*, then perhaps Heidegger's influence is only of minor import. If, however, Heidegger was important for *Act and Being* and if the constructive theological position that Bonhoeffer comes to in *Act and Being* continues to influence his later, more mature works, then Heidegger's influence should also be present in Bonhoeffer's later works as well. This would make Bonhoeffer's relation to Heidegger important for a significant portion of Bonhoeffer's corpus. I believe this is the case and there is some scholarly precedent for believing so. Plant, with reasonable caution, argues that Heidegger is still important for Bonhoeffer's "Lectures on Christology."[35] I believe Plant is quite right here; though, as I hope to show, one does not have to be quite so cautious. Consider, for example, Bonhoeffer's opening and guiding question of the lecture: "So the christological question is in its essence an ontological question. Its purpose is to bring out the ontological structure of the *who*, without getting caught in either the Scylla of the 'how question' or the

[35] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 303 and 323–6.

Charybdis of the 'that question'."[36] This is certainly a Heideggerian opening and framing of the issue. And Bonhoeffer's answer maintains and expands on many of the themes and answers that he adapted from Heidegger in *Act and Being*.

Bonhoeffer's analysis and use of Heidegger represents one of the earliest, most thorough, and accurate Protestant theological engagements with Heidegger. Though Bultmann knew Heidegger since the latter's move to Marburg in 1923, it was not until the 1928 publication of Bultmann's "The Eschatology of the Gospel of John" that Heidegger's influence became apparent.[37] And Bultmann did not give an explicit account or defense of his use of Heidegger until the 1930 publication of "The Historicity of Dasein and Faith" in response to Kuhlmann's 1929 "Towards the Theological Problem of Existence: Questions to Rudolf Bultmann."[38] Emil Brunner did not theologically tackle Heidegger until his 1931 "Theology and Ontology."[39] And, of course, Barth was largely silent on the matter. Again, Bonhoeffer's *Act and Being*, begun in 1929, was accepted in 1930. Despite this, and the general accuracy and uniqueness of Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger, it has not gained the attention it deserves. For example, in her otherwise excellent works, *Heidegger's Eschatology* and *Heidegger and Theology*, Judith Wolfe examines the above figures' relations to Heidegger; yet, Bonhoeffer is conspicuously absent. To understand exactly how Bonhoeffer offers a unique theological adaptation of Heidegger, it is necessary to place him in context with his contemporaries grappling with the same issue, particularly Bultmann.

---

[36] DBWE 12: 304 (DBW 12: 284-5).

[37] Rudolf Bultmann, "The Eschatology of the Gospel of John," in *Faith and Understanding*, ed. Robert W. Funk, trans. Louise Pettibone Smith (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), 165–83.

[38] Rudolf Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, trans. Schubert Ogden (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), 92–110; Gerhard Kuhlmann, "Zum theologischen Problem der Existenz: Fragen an Rudolf Bultmann," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 10 (1929): 28–57.

[39] Brunner, "Theologie und Ontologie, oder: Die Theologie am Scheidewege."

Based on the criteria of Heidegger's own philosophy, his understanding of its relation to theology, and the theological sources Bonhoeffer and Heidegger shared, Bonhoeffer, I will argue, offers a unique and viable theological engagement with Heidegger. Though Barth and Heidegger are ironically close to one another on a number of important and general points, such as the division of theology and philosophy, they rarely spoke about or reacted to one another. The usefulness of Barth's reaction to Heidegger is then quite limited. Bonhoeffer, compared to Brunner, has a much more accurate and detailed understanding of Heidegger's *Being and Time*. Brunner's brief and superficial analysis of Heidegger is, then, of little import as a viable theological reaction to Heidegger. Given Bultmann's lengthy and direct personal relation to Heidegger, his understanding of Heidegger is undoubtedly the most accurate. Despite or perhaps even because of Bultmann's close relationship with Heidegger, he does not adhere to the rather strict division of theology and philosophy as Heidegger understood it. It is here that Bonhoeffer has a distinctive advantage over Bultmann. For Heidegger, the division of theology and philosophy, with only a rather small window of interaction between the two, was integral to the success of both theology and philosophy. Bultmann's use of Heidegger breaches this division in a way that Bonhoeffer's use does not. From a Heideggerian point of view, this makes Bonhoeffer's use a credible theological alternative to Bultmann. Evaluating Bonhoeffer's theological use of Heidegger by Heidegger's own standards and comparing that use to Bultmann in order to validate Bonhoeffer as a viable alternative is then the goal of chapter six.

Before turning to the main tasks of my argument there is an unfortunate and delicate topic that must be addressed. On the 1st of May 1933, Heidegger joined the National Socialist party. By contrast, Bonhoeffer was executed on the 9th of April 1945, in part, because of his peripheral involvement in the failed coup attempt on the 20th of July 1944. This raises one

question that may take many different forms. Its most visceral formulation would be something like the following: How much use could a person martyred by Nazis find in the work of a Nazi?[40] Obviously my answer is "Much," which requires some defense. First, there are a few historical points to keep in mind. Bonhoeffer only knew and made use of *Being and Time*,[41] which was published in 1927 six years before Heidegger joined the National Socialists. Bonhoeffer's most explicit and direct use of Heidegger is from 1928 to 1932. Technically, there was no "Heidegger, the Nazi" at this time. There is, then, a sense in which the question is itself historically inappropriate. For some plausible reasons this answer might still be unsatisfactory. There might be some important connections between Heidegger's life and his philosophy such that his joining the National Socialists is a live issue that reverberates back to *Being and Time*.

There are various routes one might take to address this concern. I could try to mitigate, justify, or explain away Heidegger's involvement with the Nazis. One could say that Heidegger's involvement with the Nazis was neither intensive nor extensive enough to be concerned about; the contamination did not run so deep or for so long. By comparison to some or many during this time this is undoubtedly true. For those, however, that find the above question troubling, it may be that there is a qualitative difference between Heidegger and Bonhoeffer for which no quantitative quibbling could account.

Perhaps the most frequent and serious approach directly addresses the relation between Heidegger's life and his philosophy. This option contains perhaps the worst and best possible answers. First, one might say that there is a strict divorce between his philosophy and his life; in

[40] "Martyr" might be a loaded term, particularly when contrasted with "Heidegger the Nazi." First, I want to avoid side-stepping the issue by dealing with its perhaps most extreme possible manifestation. Also, this is at the very least the popular image of Bonhoeffer, evinced by a statue of Bonhoeffer at Westminster Abbey memorializing him alongside other "20th Century Martyrs" such as Martin Luther King, Jr.

[41] There is, however, a chance that Bonhoeffer read Heidegger's 1933 inaugural lecture "What is metaphysics?"; see DBWE 3: 33n[28].

other words, Heidegger's Nazism does not lead to his philosophy and, more importantly for our present concerns, that his philosophy does not lead to his Nazism. This simply cannot hold. Heidegger attests to some kind of relation between the two in both general theoretical and in particular practical terms. One of the premises on which Heidegger's philosophy is built is that a philosophy arises from a philosopher's life and this is explicitly Heidegger's method of philosophizing, which is in fact, as we will see in chapter three, one of Heidegger's key theoretical successes according to Bonhoeffer. As Heidegger states to Karl Löwith in 1921: "I work concretely and factically out of my 'I am'—out of my spiritual and thoroughly factic heritage, my milieu, my life contexts, and whatever is available to me from these, as the vital experience in which I live."[42] And according to Löwith, Heidegger specifically linked *Being and Time*, particularly his understanding of historicity, to his joining the National Socialist party.[43]

Though life and philosophy cannot be strictly divorced neither can they be directly, causally linked. To say that Heidegger's philosophy directly and necessarily leads to something like Nazism is as fallacious as strictly separating the two. In theology, for example, it seems to be impossible to make a definitive link between the theology of a particular theologian and their acceptance or rejection of Nazism.[44] Friedrich Gogarten and Barth were close personal and *theological* friends until Gogarten's outspoken support of Hitler and Barth's staunch rejection of the same. Similarly, Heidegger had too many philosophical kin and protégés that did not join the National Socialists to claim a direct link between his philosophy and Nazism.

The real answer must lie somewhere in the middle or in some more nuanced position. I believe this is, in its general contours, a Bonhoefferian, and perhaps a Heideggerian, response:

---

[42] Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan, eds., *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 99.
[43] Karl Löwith, *My Life in Germany before and after 1933: A Report*, trans. Elizabeth King (London: Continuum, 1993), 60.
[44] For example, see Robert P. Ericksen, *Theologians Under Hitler* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

There must be some links between the life that Heidegger led, the philosophy that such a life gave rise to, and his eventual involvement with the National Socialists, but this cannot *tout court* make him of no use to Bonhoeffer (or us). Once Heidegger's philosophy is appropriated into one's life, it is in some way altered by the new life it enters. At that point, Heidegger's philosophy is no longer strictly or only Heidegger's. How Heidegger interprets himself and his philosophy, and what use he puts it to is not then the sole, authoritative option. The philosophy or theology that arises from that life might then be importantly transformed by someone like Bonhoeffer without it inevitably leading to something like joining the Nazi party. Or to give it a more theological twist, which I believe Bonhoeffer might approve of: Philosophy is something that occurs under the Law. Though lacking important elements of the truth or being improperly oriented to the truth, good philosophy can get something right, and therefore cannot simply be discarded. A theologian, if doing theology properly, may take and transform that philosophy in light of a life in faith. Through such a transformation, theology may place philosophy in the truth and 'redeem' it.

Finally, as Plant notes, "Of course it matters that Heidegger was a Nazi because Heidegger's life was the 'sphere of the familiar' in which his ideas came to presence. But that is no reason to dismiss him […] one must weigh the texts."[45] With that, the best support I can give for my answer that Bonhoeffer gains much from Heidegger's early philosophy, despite Heidegger's involvement with the Nazis, is the detailed analysis that follows.

[45] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 327.

Chapter One: The Problem of Act and Being

As the title, *Act and Being*, suggests, Bonhoeffer's *Habilitationschrift* seeks to come to some understanding concerning the concepts of act and being, and the opening section, "The Problem," provides the reader with some "general and preliminary" characteristics of "act" and "being."[1] Temporally, act is discontinuous, discreet, and momentary; some forms of act-concepts are even atemporal. Being, on the other hand, is characterized by continuity and duration through time. Because act is discrete, that is discontinuous with previous and subsequent acts and not necessitated by the conditions of previous acts, it is modally contingent. Being, however, is understood as potentiality and possibility, and more specifically being exists out of its own possibility. Relationally, act must always relate to an other;[2] while being is confined to itself because it exists from its own possibility.[3] Concerning the actual concepts of "act" and "being," this is all Bonhoeffer provides the reader before moving on to evaluate particular philosophies. It is quite understandable, then, that a reader would be frustrated by the opaque and formal nature of Bonhoeffer's characterizations of these central, organizing concepts. It is therefore necessary to do what Bonhoeffer did not, i.e. slow down and parse out the details of the work's central concepts and organizing problem.

[1] DBWE 2: 29 (DBW 2: 24).
[2] Here Bonhoeffer actually uses the word "existentiality" (*Existentialität*) to designate the characteristic of act-concepts to affect existence. Because this might cause some confusion with some of Heidegger's central philosophical terms, I will avoid direct use of the term in favor of longhand descriptions such as simply "the ability to affect existence."
[3] DBWE 2: 29 (DBW 2: 24); DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 16.

First, it is important to keep in mind that "act" and "being" for Bonhoeffer do not primarily designate things, but different ways or orientations of thought; philosophies and theologies are generally either oriented more toward act or toward being. Bonhoeffer's concern is not merely to come to an understanding of what "act" and "being" are. As the above "general and preliminary" characteristics suggest, Bonhoeffer already has a general understanding of what he thinks constitutes "act" and "being." Though Bonhoeffer will concern himself with particular instances of "act" and "being," such as the knowing act of the subject and the being of the object of knowledge, this is also not his primary focus, save his ultimate concern with understanding revelation as both "act" and "being." Bonhoeffer's primary concern is to understand how philosophical and theological thought can manifest primarily act- or being-characteristics.

One of the primary uses to which Bonhoeffer puts the concepts of "act" and "being" is then to divide different theologies and philosophies into camps. In other words, there are philosophies and theologies that are primarily act-oriented, and those that are primarily being-oriented. By dividing philosophies and theologies in this way, Bonhoeffer is not stating that, for example, a being-philosophy has no "act" characteristics or is not concerned with act. Rather, Bonhoeffer is mapping general characteristics that a philosophy or theology may have. Scheler, for example, frequently uses both the words "act" and "being." Yet because Scheler privileges the being of phenomena over the act of the subject coming to know phenomena, Bonhoeffer classifies him as a being-philosopher. And this strategy of classification applies to all the other major philosophers and theologians with whom Bonhoeffer engages. Kant and Hegel are primarily act-oriented philosophers. Scheler and Heidegger are primarily being-oriented philosophers. Barth and Karl Holl are act- and being-oriented theologians respectively.

Act and Being is not simply about the general tendency for philosophies and theologies to be oriented either towards act- or being-concepts; *Act and Being* seeks to solve problems that arise when either act or being are overemphasized.[4] As the opening sentence of *Act and Being* states, "The most recent developments in theology appear to me to be an attempt to come to an agreement about *the problem of act and being*."[5] As might be apparent from the above general characterizations of the categories of act and being, they are oppositional in nature. The problem of act and being, however, is not a question of deciding whether to emphasize act- or being-concepts.[6] Again, all philosophies and theologies will contain some aspects of both act and being. As inherently oppositional, however, an overemphasis on either side tends to override or dominate the other. The general and formal problem of act and being is then the problem of coordinating act- and being-concepts.[7] The need to coordinate act and being, for Bonhoeffer, is manifested in and affects many particular philosophical and theological problems. Examples of such questions and problems include: How are the successive acts of seeing portions of a house made into the unified perception and understanding of the being of the house?[8] How can philosophy understand identity such that it is not composed of completely free and unrelated acts, yet such that acts arising from one's being or identity may themselves affect one's being?[9]

---

[4] Bonhoeffer's critiques of overly act-oriented theologies developed here in *Act and Being* lie behind many of those career-long points of disagreement with Barth. Similarly, his critiques of overly being-oriented theologies developed here are foundational for his later disagreements with fellow Lutherans. Prominent examples include his critiques of the then prevalent understanding of the "orders of creation" (DBWE 11: 364 [DBW 11: 337-8]) and his rejection of "cheap grace" in favor of "costly grace" (DBWE 4: 43 and 58-9 [DBW 4: 29 and 46-7]).

[5] DBWE 2: 25 (DBW 2: 21); emphasis added.

[6] Wayne Floyd, "Encounter with an Other: Immanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 107.

[7] Though speculative, this could be a hint at the influence of Heidegger's *Being and Time*, the goal of which was also to bring together the title concepts and which have often traditionally been understood as oppositional.

[8] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, ed. and trans. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), A190/B235–A192/B237.

[9] Here one might think of Alasdair MacIntyre's critiques of "the tendency to think atomistically about human actions" and Jean-Paul Sartre's characterization of unifying narratives that would make such actions intelligible as fabrications; Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 3rd edition (Notre Dame: University of

How can the continuity of the existence of the church in history be brought together with the discrete acts, both communal and individual, of revelation that create the church? How can the discrete acts of revelation themselves be made continuous such that they are not arbitrary? These are particular problems that have gripped modern philosophy and theology. Bonhoeffer's contention is that all these more particular problems share a general form; they are all trying to understand the respective phenomena according to what Bonhoeffer calls the categories of act and being. However, satisfactory solutions to these more localized problems have eluded philosophy and theology because they have not understood the general framework and problem that these particular problems manifest, i.e. the need to coordinate act and being.

The historical scope to which Bonhoeffer applies this problem of act and being is simultaneously extensive and yet localized. As Bonhoeffer tells the story, the inability to coordinate act and being is evident at least as far back as the birth of modern philosophy with Descartes and with intimations that some major Medieval Scholastic debates might also manifest this problem.[10] However, the earliest figures that Bonhoeffer focuses on are Kant and Hegel. Even these earlier figures, though, are read and evaluated, at least in part, through contemporaneous religious and theological appropriations of them. The opening line of *Act and Being* indicates that "the most recent developments in theology," that is early 20th century theologies and their philosophical presuppositions, are Bonhoeffer's real concern.[11]

This is, in fact, more than an actual reader of *Act and Being* gets in its opening pages before Bonhoeffer turns to evaluating instances of act- and being-philosophies, leaving the

---

Notre Dame Press, 2007), 205 and 214. In aesthetics, Gadamer's characterizations and critiques of "aesthetic differentiation" and the experience (*Erlebnis*) of art may also be good examples. Here the continuity of the work of art and one's experience (*Erfahrung*) is jeopardized insofar as the world in which the work of art is imbedded is abstracted out. In Bonhoeffer's terms, the experience (*Erlebnis*) of the work of art is an isolating act that threatens the continuity of the being of the work of art and one's experience of it. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, Second Revised edition (New York: Continuum, 2004), 74.

[10] DBWE 2: 73 and 82 (DBW 2: 67 and 76).

[11] DBWE 2: 25 (DBW 2: 21)

reader understandably frustrated. Bonhoeffer's initial characterizations of "act," "being," and the need to coordinate them is rather opaque and formal. It also apparently covers a large historical scope and various philosophical and theological schools of thought. A problem that can include and guide an interpretation of so many divergent theological and philosophical schools of thought could be seen as so formal as to risk vacuousness. However, a close reading of the work in its entirety does provide the reader with actual content to the problem. As Bonhoeffer understands the need to coordinate act and being, it must occur at three different, yet nested, conceptual levels, and there are four criteria any philosophy or theology must meet in order to count as an adequate solution at any of these three levels.

For our purposes, it is particularly important to understand these nuanced aspects of coordinating act and being in order to understand Bonhoeffer's evaluations of Heidegger. Heidegger works at a particular conceptual level of the problem and meets the four criteria in particular ways. In such a way, in fact, that Bonhoeffer will find Heidegger valuable for coordinating act and being for theology.

The Three Conceptual Levels of the Problem of Act and Being[12]

For Bonhoeffer, the problem is not simply a matter of coordinating act- and being-concepts in general; rather one must coordinate such concepts at three distinct, though importantly related, conceptual levels: the epistemological, anthropological, and theological. Bonhoeffer is not as explicit on this point as the reader might like, but in the opening section of *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer does say that

> the encounter with the *problem of knowledge* provides the first clarification of the problem of act and being […] Here, the question of knowledge is the understanding of Dasein trying its wings, seeking in reflection to adapt to a world, that is, to find itself in

[12] Much of the following is indebted, with some minor variations to the explication of the problem in DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 15–35; Michael DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time: Bonhoeffer's Theological Appropriation of Heidegger," *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Jahrbuch* 5 (2011/2012): 122–3.

> it. It is, in other words, *the question of human beings*. Though the latter does not follow from the former, it is their connection that is essential: *the meaning of epistemology is anthropology* […] But because the concept of knowledge comprises in itself the necessity of transcending the known through the process of knowing, and vice versa, the understanding of Dasein in reference to transcendence is, in one form or another, part of the question of knowledge. This suggests that the *question of God* is a part of it, too.[13]

The details of the above quotation might still be rather opaque, but what we do get is that there are these three conceptual levels of epistemology, anthropology, and theology.

It is not simply, however, that there are these three levels, but that these levels are related in a particular, nested way. The coordination of act and being at the epistemological level requires a coordination at the anthropological level that itself requires coordination at the theological level.

According to Bonhoeffer, most of modern philosophy and theology has given too much attention to the problem of act and being at the epistemological level and missed the fact that any solution for a theory of knowledge must first depend on a solution in anthropology.[14] According to Bonhoeffer this epistemological obsession has been prevalent since the birth of modern philosophy with Descartes.[15]

> It had been the basic mistake of Descartes and all his followers that, in explicating the *cogito sum*, they neglected to put the question of being to the *sum*. But this question cannot be raised unless there '*is* something like an understanding of being'.[16]

As the quotation shows, Bonhoeffer takes the position that to properly engage in epistemology and develop a theory of knowledge one must be grounded in a proper understanding of that kind

[13] DBWE 2: 30 (DBW 2: 25); emphasis added.
[14] The relation of this assumption to Heidegger will be dealt with in chapter three.
[15] DBWE 2: 30 and 70 (DBW 2: 25 and 64).
[16] DBWE 2: 70 (DBW 2: 64). Karttunen also suggests that this relation between epistemology and anthropology may have been inspired by Heidegger. Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit,* 74–5.

of existence that can know.[17] Modern philosophy's concern with coordinating the act of the knowing subject with the being of the known object has blinded modern philosophy to the fact that any solution here in epistemology depends on a correct anthropology. Act- and being-concepts must be coordinated in human existence. This is, in fact, where Heidegger makes his first and most obvious contribution to *Act and Being*. According to Bonhoeffer, Heidegger has solved the problem of act and being at the anthropological level.[18]

For Bonhoeffer the theologian, however, the true and complete solution to the problem of act and being must occur at the theological level. Just as a solution at the epistemological level depends on the anthropological level, so too does a solution at the anthropological level depend on the theological level. According to Bonhoeffer, all philosophies either begin with or slide into a conception of the self as an "autonomous I understanding itself only in terms of itself and subject only to itself."[19] A fuller explanation of what Bonhoeffer means here and why he believes he is justified in saying it will have to wait; suffice it to say, for Bonhoeffer, if one remains at the problem of act and being at the anthropological level, then one will only ever be concerned with an account of human existence isolated from others and God. Without a solution to this problem of isolation, it is impossible, according to Bonhoeffer, for the self to be properly open to the other, whether that other is the object of knowledge, fellow humans, or God. A proper anthropology that would solve this problem then depends on coordinating act and being at the theological level.

[17] This assumption that epistemology arises from anthropology, particularly as we concretely live in the world, continues to inform Bonhoeffer's later work. For example see DBWE 11: 434 (DBW 11: 416); DBWE 3: 92 (DBW 3: 86); and DBWE 4: 51 (DBW 4: 38).
[18] Or more properly, Heidegger has done the best that philosophy can do to solve the problem at the anthropological level. A true solution requires a theological anthropology for Bonhoeffer.
[19] DBWE 2: 31 (DBW 2: 25).

A solution at the theological level would involve coordinating act and being in the concept of revelation, specifically revelation as the person of Jesus Christ. Just as the problem of coordinating the act of knowing with the being of the object known is nested in the problem of human existence, so too is the problem of human existence as both act and being nested within the problem of coordinating act and being in the person of Jesus Christ.[20] This will become clearer when we move from Bonhoeffer's appraisals of Heidegger's anthropological solution in chapters three and four to Bonhoeffer's theological use of Heidegger in chapter five. But I might succinctly state it as follows: Just as the knowing subject and known object occur in and arise from Dasein for Heidegger, so too does Dasein occur in and arise from the person of Jesus Christ particularly as the church for Bonhoeffer.

One cannot, however, simply begin with a theological solution and work back up, as one might think given the nested relationship of the three levels. The theological level is not immediately accessible, and, despite modern philosophy's misguided obsession with epistemology, that obsession has garnered fruitful and convenient material for understanding the problem of coordinating act and being in general.[21] Bonhoeffer's procedure is to begin with the epistemological and work down to the anthropological before turning to the theological and working back up through theological anthropology and theological epistemology. It is true that each stage of this procedure is a testing ground for what will eventually be Bonhoeffer's theological solution. Bonhoeffer does say, for example, that "the problem of knowledge provides

[20] Though Green incorrectly locates the foundation of *Act and Being* in theological anthropology, he is correct to present Bonhoeffer's general systematic sequence as working from Christology to anthropology. The logic behind this sequence, which Green adeptly presents, is that the theological level, which is primarily Christological, concerns the person of Jesus Christ, who is both God and human. That the two are joined in the person of Christ means that the understanding of that particular person will then carry through to anthropology. Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 239 and 224–5. This logic also seems to lie behind Bonhoeffer's move to appropriate Heidegger's Dasein for Christology, as will be detailed in chapter five.

[21] According to Feil, and it seems right, recent theology has suffered from a similar epistemological obsession. Ernst Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, trans. Martin Rumscheidt (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 65.

the first clarification of the problem of act and being."[22] But it does not appear to be simply that. First, the problem at a higher level, such as anthropology, is a manifestation of the problem at a more fundamental level, such as theology. If we understand the problem at the higher level of epistemology, then we are better equipped to understand the problem at the more fundamental level of anthropology. Second, as a larger historical practice, "the question of knowledge is […] Dasein trying its wings, seeking in reflection to adapt to a world, that is, to find itself in it."[23] It is not only a preparatory stage in Bonhoeffer's systematic work, but a preparatory stage for Dasein's understanding. The epistemological level is in some sense the easiest level with, by Bonhoeffer's time, nearly three hundred years of trial and error.

Though developments at the anthropological level are rather recent, culminating in Heidegger's *Being and Time* with hints of antecedents in Kierkegaard and Dilthey, it is no less structurally necessary to pass through that level before coming to the theological level. The anthropological level tells us something about human existence as "person."[24] Since Bonhoeffer believes that a theological solution involves coordinating act and being in the concept of revelation understood as the *person* of Jesus Christ, the anthropological level has much to contribute to the theological level.

Once the problem is solved for theology only then may one move back through the anthropological and epistemological levels. This point is clear in Bonhoeffer's initial, formal suggestion at a solution presented in *Act and Being*'s opening section. A proper theological solution to the problem of act and being must, according to Bonhoeffer, use both "purely transcendental" and "purely ontological" solutions, represented by Kant and Heidegger respectively. Joining such solutions in order to provide an act-being coordinated account of

[22] DBWE 2: 30 (DBW 2: 24).
[23] DBWE 2: 30 (DBW 2: 25).
[24] Heidegger does have qualms concerning the concept of person with which I will deal later.

revelation then allows one to come to a theologically acceptable "concept of the person."[25] According to this theological concept of person "the theological concepts of object and knowledge […] must be recast."[26]

The conceptual and hermeneutic importance of the different levels of the problem of act and being cannot be overemphasized. Missing it risks misinterpretations of key aspects of *Act and Being* or even the work in its entirety. To my knowledge no one misses the point that *Act and Being* is theological. But what kind of theology? Theological epistemology, theological anthropology, ecclesiology, etc.? These are all important topics of *Act and Being*, yet none are the heart of the work; they are all secondary and tertiary concerns. Bonhoeffer's goal is to reach to the fundamental level of the problem of act and being. Only by addressing the problem at its deepest can the secondary and tertiary manifestations finally be solved. This fundamental level is theological ontology, or how revelation itself is a coordination of act and being.[27] Often secondary scholarship stops at some secondary or tertiary problem. Eberhard Bethge stops at the interrelation of theological epistemology and ecclesiology.[28] Heinrich Ott sees the sociological and ecclesiological as central, rather than secondary; he makes theological epistemology secondary rather than tertiary; and coming right to the central focus of *Act and Being*, a theological ontology of revelation, he makes it secondary, again, to the sociological.[29] Because of his not unjustified focus on sociality throughout Bonhoeffer's corpus, Green locates the central

[25] DBWE 2: 31 (DBW 2: 26).
[26] Ibid.
[27] Luca Bagetto correctly identifies the "primacy of revelation" for Bonhoeffer; however, it occurs as early as *Act and Being* and not "during his years at Union Theological Seminary in 1930-31." Since the primacy of revelation for Bonhoeffer is the focal point of *Act and Being*, he is not turning "away from the early impasse between Kant's transcendental philosophy and Heidegger's philosophy," but rather bringing the two together in revelation as Bonhoeffer states in *Act and Being*. Luca Bagetto, "The Exemplification of Decision in Dietrich Bonhoeffer," in *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, ed. Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 199.
[28] Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, 134.
[29] Heinrich Ott, *Reality and Faith: The Theological Legacy of Dietrich Bonhoeffer* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1972), 231.

focus of *Act and Being* in theological anthropology.[30] In a similar fashion and for related reasons, Ernst Feil sees *Act and Being* as an attempt to clarify theological epistemology by addressing the anthropology implied in that epistemology.[31] Larry Rasmussen straightforwardly calls *Act and Being* epistemological.[32] These interpretations all have some element of truth to them, but by misunderstanding the central goal—i.e. to work out an act-being coordinated ontology of revelation—and the overall conceptual structure—to work down and back up through the three conceptual levels—various particular and important interpretive issues arise, which will be dealt with as they become pertinent to the following argument.

Not recognizing that there are these three levels and that they are nested within one another may also lead to particular problems when transitioning from Bonhoeffer's work on one level to another. As stated above, the problem of act and being is quite general and formal; it penetrates all three levels. As such the way in which the problem occurs at all three levels will have some basic similarities, though there will also be some important differences. Navigating these similarities and differences can be difficult, particularly if one does not recognize that there are these different levels and that Bonhoeffer transitions between them. Because of the general similarity of the problem at all three levels, what one learns at one level will be informative for dealing with the problem at another level; hence, statements by Bonhoeffer such as "The encounter with the problem of knowledge provides the first clarification of the problem of act and being" and "[I]t must be highly instructive for theology to see worked out in philosophy a metaphysical definition of the interrelationship of act and being."[33] One cannot, however, expect *tout court* transfers of solutions at one level to another, again, because a true solution at a higher

[30] Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 70.
[31] Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 9–10.
[32] Larry Rasmussen, "Editor's Introduction to the English Edition" in DBWE 12: 17.
[33] DBWE 2: 30 and 72 (DBW 2: 24 and 66).

level requires a solution at a lower level. This can lead to some confusion as Bonhoeffer often jumps from praise to critique with little to no indication that such assessments are framed by criteria dependent on the particular level within which he is working. It is, therefore, important to be mindful of the general moves that Bonhoeffer makes and that are applicable at each level, while also noting the particular, important differences that occur between each level. If one simply asks oneself what level Bonhoeffer is working on at any particular time, then many confusions and apparent contradictions in *Act and Being* can be avoided.

The Four Sub-Criteria for a Solution to the Problem of Act and Being

As if these three nested levels of the problem of act and being did not complicate the problem enough, there are additionally four interrelated sub-criteria or sub-problems that any possible solution must meet in order to actually count as a solution at any given level, at least as far I have been able to identify. These are the problems of transcendence, boundary, continuity, and concreteness. Bonhoeffer does not explicitly and conveniently list these four sub-criteria, but all four are prevalent in Bonhoeffer's praises and critiques of various philosophies and theologies. They are also all identified in secondary scholarship; though to my knowledge no instance of secondary scholarship has included all four or disambiguated some of the more closely related ones.[34] But identifying and disambiguating these sub-criteria is necessary for appreciating the complex assessments Bonhoeffer makes of philosophical and theological attempts at a solution to the problem of act and being. And they are crucial in understanding and appreciating the fine line that Bonhoeffer's own attempt at a solution is trying to walk. As such these sub-criteria will help in the following chapters to structure the reconstruction and evaluation of Bonhoeffer's

[34] See, for example, DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 1–7; Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 87–9; Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 11, 16, and 30–9; Luca D'Isanto, "Bonhoeffer's Hermeneutical Model of Community," in *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, ed. Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 135–6; Charles Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer: The Promise of His Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), vi–viii.

presentation and appraisals of philosophical attempts to solve the problem of act and being. As all four criteria are operative at all three levels, I will also attempt to give some indication of how they function at each level. Though Bonhoeffer does not bring all four sub-criteria to bear on every philosophical attempt to solve the problem of act and being, they are his guiding standards and all four will have their role to play in Bonhoeffer's assessment of Heidegger. With some minor caveats to be disclosed later, of all the philosophical attempts Heidegger's comes closest to satisfying these criteria.

Of the four, transcendence is perhaps the most easily identifiable and the first with which Bonhoeffer deals in any detail.[35] It is first important to note that Bonhoeffer takes for granted the Kantian and post-Kantian assertion that the mind is not merely passive in coming to know the world, but is actively structuring and ordering the information it receives. The active mind, through its structuring faculties and the application of categories and concepts, is a constant threat to transcendence. For any solution to the problem of act and being to be viable it must allow for and maintain transcendence. That is, it must maintain otherness, particularly of God and other human beings. There must be something, such as the thing-in-itself or God, that reason and human existence is in relation to, yet cannot completely grasp. Here the danger is most pertinent for act-theologies and -philosophies. There is always the danger that act will not simply be in relation to the being of the other, but that act will determine or create the being of the other according to its own nature. Each level has its own particular other or transcendent that must be maintained. For epistemology, it is the being of the object of knowledge. As we will see in chapter two, for example, Kant does well with the criterion of transcendence in epistemology. While the being of the phenomenal object is a creation of the subject's rational activity, the being of the thing-in-itself is safeguarded against such activity. For anthropology, it

[35] See DBWE 2: 29-30, 34-5, 37, 39, and 43 (DBW 2: 24-5, 28-9, 30-1, and 36).

is both one's own Dasein and the Dasein of others; there must be a sense in which one's own existence cannot be merely at one's disposal nor can that of other Daseins.[36] Finally, the real motivation for Bonhoeffer's concern with the criterion of transcendence is the theological concern for maintaining God and revelation as transcendent. The general similarity across the three levels is that such transcendents must not merely be at thought's disposal such that the human act of knowing creates their being. Doing so leaves the person isolated because, rather than actually encountering these transcendents, the person is only encountering themselves through that which they have created. There are also particular ways in which the three levels relate concerning transcendence centering around Bonhoeffer's theological concerns. Maintaining transcendence in epistemology bolsters the ability of maintaining the transcendence of God and revelation at the theological level. If our own Dasein and the Dasein of others remains transcendent, then God and revelation become all the more necessary for accessing the truth of our existence.

Though the criterion of boundary (*Grenze*) is closely related to transcendence, it is important to distinguish them, at least for analytic purposes.[37] A boundary is what maintains transcendence through the bounding of human reason or existence; however, it is possible to correctly identify some transcendent, such as the being of the object of knowledge or God,

[36] This is a particular instance of Bonhoeffer's theological presuppositions. If Dasein were capable of coming to know itself by its own means, then God, revelation, and Christ would no longer be necessary.

[37] In Kant scholarship it seems customary to translate *Grenze* as "boundary" and *Geschranke* as "limit." Bonhoeffer rarely uses *Geschranke* or related words. English translations of Bonhoeffer generally, but not always, translate *Grenze* as "limit." I will translate it as "boundary" given the likely Kantian influence. This is one of many instances where it is not exactly clear how closely Bonhoeffer intends to follow Kant. By *Grenze* Bonhoeffer does presuppose the meaning that there must be something beyond the boundary, but he does not limit its use as Kant seems to. Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, ed. and trans. Gary Hatfield, Revised edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), §57. In relation to *Sanctorum Communio* Ernst Feil makes a similar, general connection concerning transcendence and boundary. Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 7.

without properly identifying the nature of the boundary that maintains it.[38] In fact, of the four criteria this seems to be the most difficult to satisfy, making it all the more important to disambiguate it from transcendence. Not one philosopher or theologian evaluated by Bonhoeffer correctly identifies and maintains a boundary suitable for safeguarding transcendence. For example, Kant correctly identifies the epistemological transcendent of the thing-in-itself. The boundary, however, is established by reason itself and, therefore, the idealist temptation to move beyond it is a constant threat. What is needed is an anthropological boundary, one which bounds human existence (Dasein), which Heidegger establishes through his philosophy of finitude.[39] Yet, this is established from within Dasein itself and therefore is not a true boundary either. The final answer, according to Bonhoeffer, is to locate the theological boundary in Christ and work back up to epistemology through anthropology based on this true boundary that cannot be self-established.[40]

Though the criterion of continuity does not appear much at the epistemological level, at the anthropological and theological levels it is equal in importance to the criterion of transcendence.[41] While transcendence is most closely linked to act-concepts, continuity is most

[38] DBWE 2: 34-6, 38, and 44-5 (DBW 2: 28-30, 32, and 37-8). The criterion of boundary is also present in Bonhoeffer's earlier academic work. For example, see DBWE 9: 453 (DBW 9: 487-8) and DBWE 1: 46, 84, and 93 (DBW 1: 26, 53, and 61).

[39] Here we see another continuity and discontinuity between *Sanctorum Communio* and *Act and Being*. In *Sanctorum Communio*, Bonhoeffer is already concerned with transcendence, boundary, and their relation; however, forms of transcendence and boundary can be categorically different depending on the sphere they occur in. Arriving at a socially, ethically, or anthropologically adequate boundary and concept of transcendence can tell us nothing concerning epistemological boundaries and transcendence; DBWE 1: 46 and 52 (DBW 1: 26-7 and 31).

[40] There seems to be an important shift between *Sanctorum Communio* and *Act and Being* here as well. Again, in *Act and Being* to truly meet one of these criteria at one level one must meet it at the most fundamental theological levels. For this reason, among others, in *Act and Being* Bonhoeffer rejects the possibility of locating the boundary in the I-You relation; DBWE 2: 88-9 and 105-6 (DBW 2: 82-3 and 102-3). In *Sanctorum Communio*, however, Bonhoeffer endorses the I-You relation as a boundary equally applicable to our relation to others and to God; DBWE 1: 51-2 (DBW 1: 30-2).

[41] For example, see DBWE 2: 29, 71, 97-102, and 113-4 (DBW 2: 24, 65-6, 93-9, and 109-11). Continuity, in its various forms, is also a concern that spans Bonhoeffer's corpus. It appears in his early academic work; see for example DBWE 9: 343 (DBW 9: 377-8). However, such early solutions are atemporal and act-oriented. The solutions that he will develop in *Act and Being*, rooted in his appropriation of Heidegger's temporality, will continue

closely linked with being-concepts. With act-concepts, and their general characteristics of discreteness and momentariness, continuity is threatened at the various conceptual levels of the problem of act and being. Again, Bonhoeffer does not discuss the criterion of continuity at the epistemological level much, but his concern does seem to be similar to Kant's in his "Analogies of Experience."[42] There must be something that joins the discrete acts of the knowing subject in constituting the being of the object of knowledge and maintains the continuity of experience. At the anthropological level an overly act-oriented philosophy risks making the self a mere succession of acts of knowing and decision. This makes it difficult to account for a unified and continuous self living a life. Rather than inaccurately portray concrete existence as discontinuous, theologies and philosophies must express the continuity of existence.[43] In theology, if act-concepts dominate, then revelation would also seem to be a mere succession of discreet acts of revelation on God's part. One would not be able to account for a continuity of God or of God's relation to the world. This would then work back up to theological anthropology and epistemology. Revelation is what imparts theological knowledge and the actual state of being a Christian. If revelation is then merely a succession of discreet acts, then one cannot account for any continuity of Christian knowledge or identity. Being-concepts must then be properly coordinated with act-concepts in order to account for continuity at all three levels.

Just as boundary was closely tied to transcendence, so too is concreteness related to continuity.[44] It is possible for a philosophy or theology to maintain continuity *in the abstract* and

---

into his later work; for example, see DBWE 12: 192 and 221 (DBW 12: 154 and 186), and DBWE 6: 73 and 151-2 (DBW 6: 60 and 143).

[42] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A176/B218–A182/B224.

[43] Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 107.

[44] On my reading, DeJonge, for example, includes the criteria of continuity and concreteness under the more general concept of "historical continuity" or "historical existence."

yet not fulfill the criterion of concreteness. The criterion of concreteness is concerned with whether a particular philosophy or theology both begins with and can return to life as it is actually lived.[45] For example, though Bonhoeffer admits that Hegel's idealism appears to have coordinated act and being, Hegel fails, among other reasons, for having written "a philosophy of angels, but not of human Dasein."[46] As Bonhoeffer reads Hegel and the idealist tradition, they fail at concreteness because they cannot adequately account for historical existence. History is abstractly approached and made to conform to a presupposed system.[47] A significant aspect of Bonhoeffer's positive appraisal of Heidegger is that, for Heidegger, "Dasein is neither a discontinuous succession of individual acts nor the continuity of a being that transcends time"; rather, "Dasein is the existence of human beings in their historicity."[48] An atemporal continuity or a continuity that does not take historical existence into account does not qualify as having satisfied the criterion. Continuity must affect existence for it to be at all viable.[49] At the epistemological level this would mean that knowledge of objects must be determined by the actual ways in which we live in relation to those objects; here one may think of Heidegger's distinction between the ready-to-hand and present-at-hand where the former is the practical and privileged, though traditionally neglected, knowledge we have of equipment in the world.[50] For anthropology, ourselves, others, and our relation to others must be understood as a dynamic

[45] DBWE 2: 31-2, 39, 54, 56, 108, 114-5, and 123 (DBW 2: 26, 32-3, 48, 50, 105, 111-2, and 120-1). Concreteness is important for Bonhoeffer well beyond *Act and Being*, as Feil correctly points out. Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 45. Bonhoeffer's concern with concreteness is also present prior to *Act and Being* ; see DBWE 9: 285 (DBW 9: 305-6) and DBWE 1: 48 (DBW 1: 28); however, his actual meeting of this criterion becomes quite different beginning with *Act and Being*, which is the point from which his later concerns with concreteness develop. For example, see DBWE 10: 377 (DBW 10: 344) and DBWE 6: 49, 73, 220, 379 (DBW 6: 33-4, 59-60, 219, and 382).
[46] DBWE 2: 42 (DBW 2: 35); translation altered.
[47] Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 36–7.
[48] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65-6); cf. SZ 374. All page references to *Being and Time* refer to the marginal German paginations.
[49] DBWE 2: 114 (DBW 2: 110-11).
[50] SZ 69-76.

rather than a static continuity;[51] it must account for our existence as temporal and historical, as individuals participating in actual traditions. At the theological level, one must account for how one can concretely encounter revelation as the person of Christ, how the church is a temporal and historical entity constituted by revelation, and how one's Christian identity is constituted by actually living in the church.

The above four sub-criteria necessary for a solution to the more general problem of act and being are intended to avoid the construction of a totalizing system.[52] For Bonhoeffer all thought is under the constant temptation, even need, to construct a system: "At the basis of all thinking lies the necessity of a system. Thinking is essentially systematic thinking, because it rests upon itself, it is the last ground and criterion of itself. System means interpretation of the whole through the one, which is its ground and its center, the thinking ego."[53] This need to think systematically or create a system is the constant threat looming behind all philosophies and theologies. It is the danger to which the movement from Kant to Hegel ultimately succumbs and which lies hidden in the phenomenologies of Husserl and Scheler.[54] Even Heidegger cannot completely escape this final problem given his atheistic philosophy of finitude.[55]

The historical and theological origin of this problem lies in one of Luther's definitions of sin as *cor curvum in se* (the heart turned in on itself) or *ratio in se ipsam incurve* (reason turned in on itself).[56] Luther's, and with him Bonhoeffer's, concern is that human reason and existence sees itself as the foundation of the world and is then only ever able to encounter itself and never

[51] DBWE 10: 389 (DBW 10: 358)
[52] Bonhoeffer's critiques of metaphysics are often equivalent to his critiques of totalizing systems. See DBWE 2: 72, 75-6, 80, and 94-5 (DBW 2: 66-7, 70-1,74, and 89-90) ; DBWE 10: 469 (DBW 10: 442); and Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 103.
[53] DBWE 10: 471 (DBW 10: 444).
[54] DBWE 2: 39-40 and 67 (DBW 2: 32-4 and 61-2).
[55] DBWE 2: 72 (DBW 2: 66).
[56] DBWE 2: 41 and 46 (DBW 2: 34 and 39); LW 11: 69, 289, and 386; LW 25: 291, 346, 426, and 513.

God. Bonhoeffer presents the logic of his theological concerns as follows: "Through the act of knowing, the known is put at the disposition of the I; it can be classified within the system of knowledge. As something known, it 'is' only in this system. The aim of cognition is to close this system. If this happens, the I has become lord of the world."[57] Essentially, then, Bonhoeffer's concern to avoid a closed, totalizing system is a concern to avoid an intellectual form of sin. In creating a system, reason or human existence places itself in a position properly held by God. Therefore, as Bonhoeffer says, "revelation stands against the system, for God is lord of the world, and the true system is but an eschatological possibility."[58]

Transcendence, boundary, continuity and concreteness are all intended to break the temptation to construct a totality or a system into which everything collapses.[59] Transcendence properly identifies that which cannot fall under the power of human reason and existence allowing humans to be actually encountered by that which is outside. Proper boundaries safe-guard transcendence by letting what is truly transcendent, rather than ourselves, set such boundaries. Continuity would seem to be an exception; the construction of a totalizing system would seem to be an easy means to assuring continuity. Here Bonhoeffer's concern is entirely theological. If a theology does not allow for continuity in revelation's relation to history, then one is thrown back on the question of continuity at the anthropological level. If continuity is merely reached at the anthropological level, then the continuity is achieved by human means and apart from God. The person is, then, trapped within themselves. Concreteness insures that a dynamic, changing historical existence is constantly thwarting attempts at constructing totalizing systems.

[57] DBWE 2: 94 (DBW 2: 89).
[58] DBWE 2: 94 (DBW 2: 89-90).
[59] Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 102; Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 55–9.

It is important to note that Bonhoeffer does make a distinction between a true system and untrue systems. The true system is an eschatological possibility into which we are placed by God. Bonhoeffer does not provide much clarity beyond that. What is important, however, is Bonhoeffer's assertion that until this eschatological possibility is met there is no escape from untrue systems. Rather we must continually meet the above criteria in order to continually disrupt untrue systems.[60]

The above account of Bonhoeffer's problem of act and being is intended to function as a road map for the chapters to follow. We now know that the general problem of act and being occurs when one of the two categories of concepts dictates the other. We also know that this general problem occurs at three nested conceptual levels, the epistemological, anthropological, and theological. And the solution at one level requires a solution to the problem at successively more fundamental levels. Yet it is important to understand the problem at each level before moving on to the next. At each level the construction of a totalizing system that traps the person within themselves must be avoided by fulfilling the requirements of transcendence, boundary, continuity, and concreteness. With this general road map in place, it is possible to move on, in the next chapter, to the various attempts at a solution to the problem of act and being at the level of philosophical epistemology.

[60] DBWE 2: 89 (DBW 2: 84).

Chapter Two: Epistemological-Philosophical Attempts at a Solution

Bonhoeffer on Philosophy and Its Lutheran Context

Act and Being is theological from beginning to end. This means that Part A, "The Problem of Act and Being, Portrayed in a Preparatory Manner as the Epistemological Problem of an Autonomous Understanding of Dasein in Philosophy," despite its focus on philosophy, is also theological. While explicating and evaluating the various epistemological-philosophical attempts at a solution to the problem of act and being, Bonhoeffer already has his final theological solution in mind, and therefore he also already has in mind how each philosophical attempt will contribute to that solution. This makes the structure of *Act and Being* a hermeneutic circle. Having some general sense of his presupposed theological framework is then necessary for appreciating Bonhoeffer's presentation and evaluation of philosophy in Part A. Otherwise, one might misunderstand Part A as Bonhoeffer merely flexing his philosophical muscles or as an evaluation of philosophy by *strictly* philosophical standards. While Bonhoeffer will use and endorse some philosophical arguments, it is always because such arguments serve his larger theological purpose, particularly when philosophical arguments are self-destructive.[1] Before moving to these philosophical attempts it is then necessary to understand the theological stance from which Bonhoeffer is judging them.

[1] Wayne Whitson Floyd and Walter Lowe are then in some sense correct to claim that the philosophical criticisms Bonhoeffer brings to bear in Part A are instances of "immanent criticism" or "internal critiques of reason"; however, Bonhoeffer endorses such criticism because they bear theological fruit and support the claim that philosophy succumbs to the *cor curvum in se*. Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr., *Theology and the Dialectics of Otherness: On Reading Bonhoeffer and Adorno* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988), 53; Walter Lowe, "Bonhoeffer and Deconstruction: Toward a Theology of the Crucified Logos," in *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, ed. Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 218. Also see DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 32n46.

As I pointed out in the introduction, Bonhoeffer takes up a nuanced position amid the surrounding debate concerning how theology could properly relate to philosophy. Bultmann, with his unabashed and near *in toto* appropriation of Heidegger, is an example of one extreme whereby theology operates *from* a particular philosophy. Barth, in contrast, clearly assumed the complete independence of theology from philosophy. Bonhoeffer's approach is more complex, with theology being the final arbiter of truth that may take over philosophy as long as it makes the appropriate theological transformations.[2] As the title of Part A of *Act and Being* indicates, Bonhoeffer sees philosophy as preparatory. That is, it functions as a preparation for his own theological solution. And throughout Part A Bonhoeffer makes statements such as the following: "In what follows, nevertheless, genuine transcendental philosophy and genuine ontology—as distinct from idealism and phenomenology—are said to make a contribution to the understanding of the problem of act and being within the concept of revelation."[3]

That Bonhoeffer has a generally more positive, yet still theologically determined and nuanced understanding of theology's relation to philosophy is clear throughout his corpus.[4] This is an approach that has precedent in *Sanctorum Communio*, where he uses sociological and social philosophical concepts to inform his ecclesiology. For example, in describing *Sanctorum Communio*'s method, Bonhoeffer says that "it will be carried out on the foundation of Christian theology and will make fruitful for theology the insights that derive purely from social

[2] Here I must agree both with Jürgen Boomgaarden and Tomi Karttunen's critiques of the same. Boomgaarden is right to say that Bonhoeffer works out, at least in part, his "systematic theological project" both "against and with the insights" of "Kant, Hegel and Heidegger." Though Karttunen is right to warn that such an interpretation, if not properly nuanced, risks blending philosophy and theology, of which Bonhoeffer would not approve. Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 584. Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, 26.

[3] DBWE 2: 79 (DBW 2: 72-3).

[4] As we turn to Bonhoeffer's assessments of particular philosophers, we will see that his understanding of any particular philosopher may not be nuanced. Yet, it still seems appropriate to say that his understanding of the general relation between theology and philosophy is more nuanced than some of his most prominent peers.

philosophy and sociology."[5] In his "The Theology of Crisis and Its Attitude toward Philosophy and Science" (1930/31), Bonhoeffer says, "it has to be confessed that Protestantism as yet lacks its proper philosophical terminology,"[6] implying that theology does need philosophy for conceptual and terminological clarity. Recounting Bonhoeffer's 1933 seminar on Hegel's philosophy of religion, Ferenc Lehel captures Bonhoeffer's general treatment of philosophy in Bonhoeffer's specific treatment of Hegel:

> Bonhoeffer read the philosophy of Hegel as a theologian, in fact as an ecclesiologically oriented theologian. He looked for theology in the philosophy. You feel the joy of discovery, in which even we had been involved. Just as the expert in monument restoration is delighted when he has scraped free and reached the oldest layers and most valuable structural components and caresses it affectionately, so Bonhoeffer delights in church, world, incarnation, creation, reality, and history. The lofty system that had been built thereupon did not fascinate him. The joy over what has been found speaks louder than the aggravation with the stylistically alien [i.e. to theology] edifice. In a certain sense, Bonhoeffer treats Hegel eclectically by examining Hegel's philosophy of religion and highlighting what, to him, the theologian, appeared valuable.[7]

This interest in a fruitful engagement with philosophy is still conceptually supported by the penultimate/ultimate distinction in his *Ethics*,[8] and Bonhoeffer continued to read philosophy while in prison.[9] Throughout his corpus, then, Bonhoeffer holds a complex understanding of philosophy as theology's useful and necessary handmaiden.[10]

This life-long engagement with philosophy, which is particularly strong in Bonhoeffer's early works, arises from and is oriented by an equally long confessional commitment to Martin Luther, particularly Luther's law/gospel distinction. As Wolf Krötke correctly states, without exaggeration, "Luther is present more than anyone else at every stage of [Bonhoeffer's] path and

[5] DBWE 1: 32 (DBW 1: 32).
[6] DBWE 10: 469 (DBW 10: 442).
[7] Ferenc Lehel, "Einleitung to Dietrich Bonhoeffers Hegel-Seminar 1933," ed. Ilse Tödt, *Internationales Bonhoeffer Forum: Forschung und Praxis* 8 (1988): 10; my translation. Bonhoeffer's understanding and appreciation of Hegel does become more nuanced than it is in *Act and Being*.
[8] DBWE 6: 146-70 (DBW 6: 137-62).
[9] DBWE 8: 116, 317, and 427 (DBW 8: 112, 349, and 478).
[10] Peter Frick, "Introduction," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 5.

in every dimension of his thought. This is obvious from even a cursory glance at both Bonhoeffer's life and his writings."[11] To understand Bonhoeffer on philosophy it is therefore also important to understand the Luther from which he is drawing in order to come to his basic position on philosophy.

Luther's law/gospel distinction is a basic, though complex, one that guides his entire theological enterprise. The law/gospel distinction guides his biblical hermeneutics, political and social theology, ecclesiology, and most centrally his soteriology. One's understanding of the law/gospel distinction is, therefore, Luther's litmus test for a true theologian: "Therefore whoever knows well how to distinguish the Gospel from the Law should give thanks to God and know that he is a real theologian."[12]

In general, the law has two uses or functions, its civic use and its theological use: "Here one must know that there is a double use of the Law. One is the civic use. God has ordained civic laws, indeed all laws, to restrain transgressions."[13] First, it is important to recognize that this first use of the law is not autonomous, standing apart from God. God in fact ordains this sense and use of the law. Also, this 'civic' use should be understood in the broadest sense possible. Anything that restrains acts of sin or immorality is included under this first use of the law. So not only 'ordinances' created by states or governments but also "parents" and "teachers" are included.[14] As we will see, philosophy has a perfectly acceptable role, according to Luther, to play in this first use.

---

[11] Wolf Krötke, "Bonhoeffer and Luther," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 54. For other works emphasizing Bonhoeffer's Lutheran position see, for example, DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, esp. chapters 5 and 7; Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, esp. 51–8; Klaus Grünwaldt, Christiane Tietz, and Udo Hahn, eds., *Bonhoeffer und Luther: Zentrale Themen ihrer Theologie* (Hannover: Amt der VELKD, 2007).

[12] LW 26: 115; see also 104 and 395.

[13] LW 26: 308.

[14] LW 26: 309.

The second use of the law, its theological use under the gospel broadly conceived, rather than restraining sin, shows the gravity and inescapability of sin.[15] The gospel's use of the law, as Luther often formulates it, convicts the conscience.[16]

> The other use of the Law is the theological or spiritual one, which serves to increase transgressions. This is the primary purpose of the Law of Moses, that through it sin might grow and be multiplied, especially in the conscience [….] Therefore the true function and the chief and proper use of the Law is to reveal to man his sin, blindness, misery, wickedness, ignorance, hate and contempt of God, death, hell, judgment, and the well-deserved wrath of God.[17]

This second, theological use of the law is where the law and gospel overlap. The gospel in its broadest conception is the preaching of both law, in its theological use, and gospel, in its narrower sense. The gospel, in the broad sense, uses the theological law to show that one completely and continually fails to live up to the perfect demands of God, then provides the gospel, in the narrower sense, to tell the listener that such sins are freely forgiven in faith by the grace of God: "After the Law has humbled, terrified, and completely crushed you, so that you are on the brink of despair, then see to it that you know how to use the Law correctly; for its function and use is not only to disclose the sin and wrath of God but also to drive us to Christ."[18] What is particularly important for our present purposes is that the second, theological use of the law must be under the gospel. Only the gospel can properly use the theological law. By extension this then means that only in faith can one recognize and understand this second use of the law.

[15] One useful way of considering this distinction is to think of the law, in its first use, as restraining sins; while the second use reveals our Sin, or that our very being just is Sin from which individual instances or acts of sin arise.
[16] This point will return in chapter five when we elucidate and evaluate Bonhoeffer on Heidegger's concept of conscience.
[17] LW 26: 309.
[18] LW 26: 315

Though Luther is often stereotyped as a despiser of philosophy, instances in his writings allow for the proper use of philosophy as captured under the category of law.[19] Philosophy most naturally operates, for Luther, under the first or 'civic' use of the law, the use by which immorality is restrained:

> God wants the Law to be taught, and He Himself reveals it; nay, He even writes it upon the hearts of all human beings, as Paul demonstrates in Rom. 2:15. From this natural knowledge have originated all the books of the more sensible philosophers, such as Aesop, Aristotle, Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, and Cato. It is a good idea to set these books before uneducated and unruly individuals, that their wicked impulses may in some measure be counteracted through this training.[20]

This quotation tells us three things: First, philosophy, like civil laws, may be used to restrain "wicked impulses." Second, there is a type of natural knowledge that one might know apart from faith or the gospel. Philosophy can know enough about the natural world and humans to be effective at restraining immorality; this opens a door through which Bonhoeffer is able to bring philosophy to bear on more than straightforward ethical matters. And third, there are distinctions between good and bad philosophy, depending on a particular philosophy's ability to properly access this natural knowledge; similarly this opens the way for Bonhoeffer to distinguish between good philosophy, e.g. Kant and Heidegger, and bad philosophy, e.g. Hegel and Husserl. While even good philosophy cannot access the truth of the gospel or truth only available in faith, it is not without some access to truth.

While philosophy cannot on its own access the gospel or faith and the truth contained therein, it can be *used* by theology in the service of faith or the gospel. The 'civic' and

[19] This is by no means to say that one could not find viable resources in Luther to support something like a Barthian rejection of philosophy. Rather my contention is that Bonhoeffer saw himself as adhering to Luther, that this is one Lutheran route one might take concerning the relation of philosophy and theology, that Bonhoeffer takes that route, and it is important to understand that route in order to understand Bonhoeffer.

[20] LW 2:159. For other representative instances of Luther's praise of philosophy, which he closely associated with Aristotle, see LW 1: 26 and 122; LW 2: 124, 207 and 340; LW 8: 171 and 174; LW 26: 262; LW 25: 434; and LW 27: 219.

theological uses of the law are not unrelated. 'Civic' law may tell us that murder is wrong. Incorporated under the broader concept of the gospel, one learns that anger is also a sin. The gospel may appropriate and transform the truth contained in the first use of the law such that it is useful under the second use of the law for the gospel and the theologian. Thus, Luther can say, for example,

> According to the theologians, the concept of law necessarily includes the counsel of a devout man who controls the law as cases develop; thus it does not become harmful, but the purpose of the law is maintained, namely, to be beneficial and to preserve the peace. If a law is in conflict with love, it is no law. Love is the mistress and teacher of the law, who commands a law to keep silence; for in certain cases the law teaches injustice, not justice. It does this if someone should want to follow it without moderation[….]
>
> Therefore you must learn that peace and love are the moderator and administrator of all virtues and laws, as Aristotle beautifully says about clemency in the fifth book of his *Ethics*.[28]

Admittedly, this theological use of philosophy by Luther still falls short of Bonhoeffer's theological use of philosophy as I am arguing here. I am arguing not only that, according to Bonhoeffer, philosophical epistemology, especially in Kant, and philosophical anthropology, especially in Heidegger, can get some things right; rather, I am also arguing that according to Bonhoeffer these can be theologically useful for getting the gospel in the narrower sense right as well. This does push the boundaries of Luther's views on the profitable use of philosophy by theology, but it is not without some precedent in Luther himself:

> And these five stages in some way are always in motion in man. And whatever is found in the nature of man—except for the first stage of nonbeing and the last form of existence, for between these two, nonbeing and being acted upon, there are the three stages which are always in movement, namely, becoming, being, and acting—through his new birth he moves from sin to righteousness, and thus from nonbeing through becoming to being. And when this has happened, he lives righteously. But from this new being, which is really a nonbeing, man proceeds and passes to another new being by being acted upon, that is, through becoming new, he proceeds to become better, and from this again into something new. Thus it is most correct to say that man is always in privation, always in becoming or in potentiality, in matter, and always in action. *Aristotle philosophizes*

[28] LW 2: 340

> *about such matters, and he does it well, but people do not understand him well.* Man is always in nonbeing, in becoming, in being, always in privation, in potentiality, in action, always in sin, in justification, in righteousness, that is, he is always a sinner, always a penitent, always righteous.[21]

This is an admittedly dense and opaque passage but deserved to be quoted in full because here Luther praises and draws on Aristotle to provide an ontological account of the movement from a state of unrighteousness to a righteous one and to *philosophically* justify one of Luther's more well-known accounts of individuals in faith as *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously justified and sinner). This is philosophy being used to account for a matter properly placed under the gospel in the narrow sense.[22]

One might summarize the positive strand of Luther's relation to philosophy as follows: Good philosophy may access natural truth apart from faith or the gospel. It can do so because, as a proper instance of the first use of the law, it too is ordained by God. Though even good philosophy cannot access faith, good theology, which works from faith, can turn such philosophy to the service of the gospel. The way in which Bonhoeffer relates to philosophy, particularly in *Act and Being*, is an updated instantiation of this general Lutheran approach to philosophy.

There are particular and general structural indications that demonstrate that Bonhoeffer is applying this general law/gospel rubric throughout *Act and Being* (and, again, beyond) and in his particular engagements with philosophy. First, Bonhoeffer believes that philosophy can be "preparatory" as the title of Part A indicates. "Preparatory," here, does not, however, mean that philosophy has full access to natural truths that need only be completed or capped off by truths gained from faith or theology. For Bonhoeffer, the complete truth and the full meaning of philosophy can still only be gained from the standpoint of proper theology. But good philosophy can prepare the way for theology because it has "thoroughly grasped and thought through the

[21]LW 25: 434; emphasis added.
[22] LW 26: 133 and 232; LW 27: 231; LW 34: 152.

philosophical problem of act and being."[23] That is, philosophy has done much of the work to show the general contours of the problem.

Second, proper philosophies can provide the conceptual tools that proper theology may appropriate. At the end of Part A, the philosophical section, Bonhoeffer says that an interpretation of revelation according to act and being can be put "in the sharpest possible manner" because philosophy has provided such tools. Because of this, such philosophies "are basically amenable to a theological interpretation and, therefore, of help in the understanding of the concept of revelation."[24]

In keeping with the law/gospel relation, however, proper theology cannot simply adopt *in toto* even good philosophy. The gospel in the broader sense can see the true meaning of the first use of the law and also that it is incomplete. Proper theology can see the true meaning and incompleteness of even good philosophy. Even good philosophy is trapped in the *cor curvum in se*, trapped in the autonomous 'I' understanding itself from itself.[25] Just as the gospel must reorient the first use of the law to be appropriately used for the gospel, so too must proper theology reorient good philosophy. Proper theology must replace the autonomous 'I' as the center with Christ as the center, as Bonhoeffer will do.

Third and most importantly, this general law/gospel rubric supports Bonhoeffer's understanding of the different conceptual levels of the problem of act and being, and the way in which Bonhoeffer works through the three levels is evidence of Bonhoeffer's acceptance of this general rubric. Bonhoeffer begins with philosophical epistemology. Good philosophy, having some admirable qualities and some access to truth, must contain something beneficial for theology at the level of epistemology. Kant is representative of good philosophical epistemology.

[23] DBWE 2: 79 (DBW 2: 73).
[24] DBWE 2: 79, see also 30, 72, and 76 (DBW 2: 73, see also 24-5, 66, and 70).
[25] DBWE 10: 390-1 (DBW 10: 359). Krötke,"Bonhoeffer and Luther," 70.

Because, however, the meaning of epistemology is anthropology, philosophy can and must do better. It must move down to the anthropological level. Again, good philosophy must be able to offer something of theological use here. Heidegger's existential analysis of Dasein does so. This is precisely where even good philosophy must stop according to Bonhoeffer. Here philosophy has met the limit of the first use of the law. The meaning of anthropology is theology and the only means to the theological level is through revelation. "Philosophy, *per se*," according to Bonhoeffer, "can leave no space for revelation unless it knows revelation."[26] Proper theology, which does know revelation, must then take over. From within a position of faith, theology may adapt the truths discovered by philosophical epistemology and anthropology. Having completed an ontology of revelation that coordinates act and being with partial help from philosophy, theology may disclose the full truth of the anthropological and epistemological levels as theological. This is the overall structure of *Act and Being*, which may be obscured by the fact that philosophy cannot access the theological level and that theology must alter philosophical epistemology and anthropology by placing Christ at the center to come to solutions even at those levels.

It is important to keep this general understanding of Bonhoeffer's relation to philosophy in mind in order to avoid misinterpretation. First, one cannot say without a good degree of nuance that in *Act and Being* Bonhoeffer "attacks all philosophy."[27] Since good philosophy can get something right at the epistemological and anthropological levels, one should not expect Bonhoeffer to completely reject philosophy. As such, there cannot be a disjunct between the philosophical Part A and the rest of *Act and Being*, as Green seems to imply when he says that

[26] DBWE 2: 76-7 (DBW 2: 71); translation altered.
[27] Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 80. To be fair, Green does allow for some nuance, particularly concerning the difference between Kant and Hegel; however, he represents Part A of *Act and Being* as a total rejection of philosophy on Bonhoeffer's part thereby making it difficult to see philosophy as preparatory as Bonhoeffer states numerous times.

"*Act and Being* begins with a critique of philosophical anthropology, proceeds to interpret revelation […] and concludes by building on this foundation a more concrete Christian anthropology."[28] It is, therefore, incumbent on the interpreter to discern how Part A's influence carries through the rest of the book. Second, since the truth of even good philosophy is incomplete and obscured and it is the job of theology to properly disclose and alter such truth, the interpreter must always have the larger theological framework of *Act and Being* in mind. Otherwise such an interpreter may unfairly find Bonhoeffer's appraisals of philosophy far less convincing than they otherwise might be. Third, for Bonhoeffer theological judgments of philosophy involve rejecting what is completely theologically unacceptable and *altering* what is theologically useful. Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler, for example, will be completely rejected as theologically inappropriate. Kant and Heidegger will be altered to suit theological needs. One should not misinterpret alteration for rejection. Admittedly, Bonhoeffer could have been of more help here by flagging instances of his adapting philosophical solutions in his theology. Still, to truly understand Bonhoeffer's theological solution one must see its philosophical sources, which involves tracing the alterations they undergo as Bonhoeffer alters them.

Turning now to Bonhoeffer's engagement with philosophical epistemology, we may focus on what Bonhoeffer sees as complete failures and partial successes at this level. The complete failures are those that Bonhoeffer finds both philosophically and theologically unacceptable. The partial successes are more complex. Sometimes a partial success will be a success in philosophical epistemology at one or more of the criteria of transcendence, boundary, concreteness, and continuity, but because of failures at other criteria such a success is jeopardized or moot. Scheler, for example, makes some gains in relation to concreteness with his focus on ethics and philosophy of religion; yet, those gains are lost given the way he

[28] Ibid., 74.

addresses the criterion of continuity. A partial success may even initially appear to be a direct theological success, but because the success arises from a philosophical position such a success is not immediately useful to theology. Kant, for example, identifies God as transcendent, an important position Bonhoeffer will maintain in his theology; yet, as we will see, his failure in relation to the criterion of boundary leads to Hegel and the complete reversal of the God's transcendence. It is important to catalogue these successes and failures both for understanding Bonhoeffer's theological solution as a whole and for understanding why Bonhoeffer found Heidegger to be a notable improvement for philosophy. While Bonhoeffer will find Heidegger theologically wanting, Heidegger improves on many of the failures of his predecessors while also maintaining many of their successes. Following Bonhoeffer's own presentation, we now turn to his presentation and evaluation of Kant as "genuine transcendentalism."

Kant and Pure Transcendentalism

For historical and theological reasons, Bonhoeffer's decision to begin with Kant is a natural choice. The entirety of *Act and Being* is predicated on the assumed truth of the basic Kantian position that the mind is not merely a passive recipient of information from the world, but actively imposes its own order on that information. From such a basic Kantian presupposition Bonhoeffer finds philosophical support for the intellectual correlate of Luther's *cor curvum in se*. If the mind is always active in constructing and understanding the world, then human thinking is under the constant threat of creating a totalizing system that leaves the subject in self-contained isolation unable to be truly affected by others. Without such a presupposition and its corresponding threat, then the general need to coordinate act and being in order to forestall such a danger would not be as pressing.

Also, in early twentieth century German theology, whether in the form of dialectical theology or neo-Kantian philosophy of religion, Kant was a vibrant resource. One might begin with the question, "Is it possible and desirable for theologians to recover from Kant?", finding that Kantian epistemology is an undue hindrance to theology and philosophy of religion. For Barth, Bonhoeffer's primary theological interlocutor, this was not the case. For Barth, Kant had done theology a great service with his philosophical 'proof' of the inaccessibility of God by human reason.[29] Kant is often, then, the philosophical shadow under which Barth and his cohort are working.

Despite Kant's general importance, for constructive and argumentative reasons, Bonhoeffer does not attempt to present Kant's epistemology in all its nuances. Rather Bonhoeffer describes his presentation of Kant and subsequent German idealism as "stylized."[30] Bonhoeffer intends to present Kant as a "pure transcendental philosopher, which he never was entirely."[31] For Bonhoeffer, then, Kant functions as a representative and ideal case for an extreme act-oriented philosophical attempt to solve the epistemological problem of act and being. There is also a Heideggerian imposition that Bonhoeffer places on Kant, which Bonhoeffer's constant use of "Dasein" even in the Kant section makes apparent and which he expressly attributes to Heidegger: "The concept of Dasein as the kind of being [*Seinsart*] of humans as distinct from other entities [*Seienden*] is taken over from the terminology of Heidegger."[32] Bonhoeffer is also reading and presenting Kant through contemporary theological

[29] DBWE 10: 471 (DBW 10: 444). Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns, 6th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1968), 4, 367, and 386.; Karl Barth, *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*, ed. Hannelotte Reiffen, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991), 10, 20, 41, 326, 345, and 350. Bruce L. McCormack, *Orthodox and Modern: Studies in the Theology of Karth Barth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 12. Marsh might be making the same point; Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 10.
[30] DBWE 2: 33n1 (DBW 2: 27n1).
[31] Ibid.
[32] DBWE 2: 35n4 (DBW 2: 29n4); translation altered.

applications of Kant, particularly that of Hinrich Knittermeyer.[33] There are, then, inevitably points at which one may challenge the accuracy of Bonhoeffer's presentation of Kant. Again, however, Bonhoeffer is more concerned with the role such a stylized Kant can play in coming to understand the problem and resolve it at the theological level. I will point out inaccuracies in Bonhoeffer's presentation when it is necessary for understanding Kant's role in Bonhoeffer's theology and *Act and Being*; though, this is not my main concern. Again, my concern is with what Bonhoeffer thinks philosophers leading up to Heidegger get right and wrong, and how this frames Bonhoeffer's reactions to Heidegger.

Bonhoeffer categorizes Kant as an act-philosopher dealing with the problem of act and being at the epistemological level. Bonhoeffer, in fact, opens his presentation of Kant with the question of whether or not Kant should be given "the title of epistemologist *par excellence* of Protestantism."[34] While Bonhoeffer never directly answers his own question in *Act and Being*, the implication of Bonhoeffer's subsequent evaluation of Kant would seem to suggest that the answer is "no" given the dire results, i.e. Hegelian idealism, that arise when Kant's system is pressed to its logical conclusion.[35] As Bonhoeffer bluntly puts it in his "Theology of Crisis": "Kant still believed, [sic] critical philosophy could make room for faith by means of limiting reason by reason. But he failed."[36] This, however, does not mean that Kant is useless for Bonhoeffer's project. Next to Heidegger, Kant seems to provide some of the most valuable

[33] For excellent presentations of Bonhoeffer's use of Knittermeyer to mediate his presentation of Kant see Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 24–5; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 88–9. Because of this reliance on then contemporaneous theological uses of Kant, one might suspect that Bonhoeffer did not really know Kant; however, at the age of seventeen or eighteen, Bonhoeffer took a course devoted to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (DBWE 9: 66 [DBW 9: 63]) and Kant is directly used fairly often in *Sanctorum Communio*. Also see Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 39n49.

[34] DBWE 2: 34 (DBW 2: 28).

[35] According to student notes from his 1932 seminar, "The Nature of the Church," Bonhoeffer says, "*Ecclesial epistemology*, not a transcendental philosophy"; DBWE 11: 290(DBW 11: 260). To be fair, here Bonhoeffer also rejects existential epistemology in favor of ecclesial epistemology, which is a subject of chapter five. See also DBWE 2: 122 (DBW 2: 119).

[36] DBWE 10: 473 (DBW 10: 446).

lessons concerning the problem of act and being. And Bonhoeffer does mine Kant for such benefits.

As an act-oriented philosopher Kant, as pure transcendentalist, is particularly suited for dealing with the criterion of transcendence. One of the characteristic features of "act" is that it is relationally open; it must always refer to an other that is outside of the act itself. Bonhoeffer understands this to be the defining characteristic of Kant: "It is integral to the concept of genuine transcendentalism that thinking refers to something transcendent which, however, is not at its disposal."[37] That Kant makes thought or the epistemic act always in reference to some transcendent is one of the first and most valuable elements he provides. By "in reference to" (*in Bezug auf*), Bonhoeffer means that for Kant thought must always be directed towards a transcendent that thought can never fully grasp or have access to. More specifically, the referential and transcendental nature of thought occurs in two directions, prospectively and retrospectively.[38]

The thinking act, when prospective, is directed outwardly and in reference to the thing-in-itself. In being so directed, thought creates, from the thing-in-itself, the *ob*ject (Gegen*stand*) of knowledge, which for Bonhoeffer, literally stands against the knowing act.[39] This has the consequence of making all being in reference to the act of the knowing 'I'. While Bonhoeffer does not go into any further detail, this does seem basically true of Kant's position. First, through the faculty of sensibility we receive impressions or data concerning the thing-in-itself,[40] which is immediately formed by the intuitions of space and time that originate in the subject and yet do

[37] DBWE 2: 34 (DBW 2: 28).
[38] DBWE 2: 34-5 (DBW 2: 28-9); see also DBWE 12: 215-16 (DBW 12: 180).
[39] DBWE 2: 34 (DBW 2: 28).
[40] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A19/B33.

not apply to the thing-in-itself.[41] Through intuition, then, we receive a manifold or multiplicity of sense data about what exists. Here what is important is that the multiplicity of sense data is not yet combined in such a way that thought may arise. The understanding, by means of synthesis, combines the multiplicity of sense data into a unity, into a true object of knowledge.[42] Then, through the concepts contained in the understanding, the object of knowledge presented by intuition is thought. For Bonhoeffer this means that truth is not, for Kant, "the correspondence of knowledge with the object of knowledge," but rather truth is contained in "the necessity of the a priori synthesis."[43] This synthesis is entirely an *act* of the subject. Truth is then not in the being of the object, but in the knowing act of the subject, which has created the being of the object; "Thus, the concept of being is resolved into the concept of act."[44]

When the thinking act is directed retrospectively, it is directed at the self, or more specifically for Bonhoeffer's reading of Kant, at transcendental apperception.[45] For Kant, transcendental apperception is the means by which we take what would be otherwise disparate and unrelated experiences and connect them according to laws to make a single, unified experience.[46] This itself requires an underlying, unified consciousness, what Kant refers to as the transcendental consciousness,[47] or, perhaps misleadingly, what Bonhoeffer refers to as the "ego."[48] Just as when thought is in reference to the thing-in-itself and thereby creates the object of knowledge from the manifold of sense data, so too do I receive a manifold of inner intuitions

[41] Cf. ibid., A42 and B62.
[42] Ibid., A77–9.
[43] DBWE 2: 37 (DBW 2: 31); translation altered.
[44] Ibid.
[45] This seems to be a slight misstep on Bonhoeffer's part. It is odd to say that transcendental apperception is a thing at which one may be directed. What Bonhoeffer seems to mean given the progression of his presentation of Kant is that we may be retrospectively directed at the transcendental consciousness.
[46] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A108.
[47] Ibid., A117n.
[48] DBWE 10: 471-2 (DBW 10: 444-5).

which I unite to construct an appearance of myself.[49] As a consequence and as it was for the thing-in-itself, the transcendental apperception or more technically correct, the transcendental consciousness, cannot be directly grasped by reason, rather one may only direct oneself in reference to it. For Kant, one does not have one's self at one's disposal: "[T]his [inner] sense represents to consciousness even our own selves only as we appear to ourselves, not as we are in ourselves."[50]

With this we have, by Bonhoeffer's estimation, Kant's most crucial successes, which, in general, arise from Kant's epistemic humility. Kant has tried to place reason within its boundaries by establishing the transcendent thing-in-itself and transcendental consciousness. Though Dasein is "the world's reference point" and truth is only in the thinking act,[51] Kant places important boundaries on thought. "The transcendence itself does not enter thinking."[52] The general problem of act and being occurs, again, when either act or being dominates the other. Kant, as an act-oriented philosopher, runs the risk of making all being succumb to the act of thinking. However, Kant has made the thing-in-itself and transcendental consciousness inaccessible to thought. Whatever being the thing-in-itself and transcendental consciousness have, it is not determined by the thinking act. One of Bonhoeffer's concerns is, again, allowing for some relational openness, for the ability of something not determined by ourselves to affect us. Bonhoeffer believes that the boundary created by the thing-in-itself and transcendental consciousness has the potential to do just that.

According to Bonhoeffer's account, the means by which Kant maintains the epistemic transcendence of the thing-in-itself also leads to the theologically significant transcendence of

[49] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B133–5.
[50] Ibid., B152–3, see also A278, B155, and B409.
[51] DBWE 2: 35 and 37 (DBW 2: 29 and 31).
[52] DBWE 10: 471 (DBW 10: 444).

God. First, because the thinking I is bounded by the thing-in-itself, it is not the total creator of the being of the world. As such "the Creator's integrity is honored in principle."[53] Second, God is also transcendent. For Kant, this follows from the fact that God cannot be an object of intuition.[54] As Bonhoeffer explains it, the objectivity of God is impossible because being (*Sein*) is always understood as an entity (*Seiende*), which only occurs in the a priori synthesis as a "there is" (*es gibt*).[55] Because God cannot be an object of knowledge, God does not become merely another object of the world that is essentially oriented toward the 'I' and exists only for the 'I'.[56]

Kant's third notable success, by Bonhoeffer's estimation, is that we are not completely graspable by our own means. The ability to do so is a particular theological concern for Bonhoeffer, as we will see when we turn to his critiques of Hegel. For now, however, Kant seems to have succeeded here. While we might be able to know our empirical selves through inner intuitions, there is still the core transcendental self that is inaccessible. In one respect, this avoids the meta-critique that applies to all philosophy according to Bonhoeffer: the *cor curvum in se*. Here, the 'heart' or reason is not entirely curved in on itself because it cannot fully grasp itself. This creates a theological window through which Bonhoeffer, with some important alterations, can advocate the need to be directed toward an other, in the form of objects, other humans, and God, in order to come to know one's self. With these three transcendents, the

[53] DBWE 2: 44 (DBW 2: 37).
[54] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Bxxx and B71.
[55] DBWE 2: 44 (DBW 2: 37).
[56] Ibid. This "for the I" in the form of the Lutheran "*pro me*" (for me) will make a positive return in Bonhoeffer's theological solution. The important difference, and the reason why Kant's success here is something of a genuine success, is that the *pro me* relates to the person of Jesus Christ and not to God directly. For a related interpretation see Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 173 and 232n150.

danger of the Lutheran *cor curvum in se* is potentially, though not completely, mitigated.[57] Here Dasein is understood as, and, more importantly, understands itself as, existing between or among these transcendents.

This being of Dasein as between two transcendents, the thing-in-itself and transcendental consciousness, is in fact the first scraping of the surface of the problem of act and being at the anthropological level. The being of humans, Dasein, is composed of acts relating to these transcendents. Act then creates not only the being of the object of knowledge, but the being of humans. What Bonhoeffer finds useful here, again, is the idea that humans can only come to know themselves by relating to or being directed at (*actus directus*) that which is not at their disposal: "To know oneself to be oriented towards transcendence and, consequently, to be the world's reference point is what, in transcendentalism, constitutes human Dasein."[58] Bonhoeffer's theological solution will involve making human acts of knowing and existing always in relation to Jesus Christ as transcendent.

There are, however, a number of problems that will require substantial modifications before Kant's anthropology can be theologically useful for Bonhoeffer. The first general problem is that this anthropology is epistemologically defined.[59] The being of humans is created in acts of knowing. As we saw in chapter one, however, Bonhoeffer presupposes the opposite to be true, namely that the meaning of epistemology is anthropology. The nature of human existence or Dasein precedes acts of knowing. The full negative import of reversing the conceptual levels of epistemology and anthropology will not be felt until we turn to Bonhoeffer's critiques of Hegel.

---

[57] Here, Bonhoeffer is drawing primarily on Knittermeyer's theological use of Kant. Hinrich Knittermeyer, "Transzendentalphilosophie und Theologie. Eine kritische Erinnerung zum 22. April 1924," *Christliche Welt* 38 (1924): 259. Also see Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 24.
[58] DBWE 2: 35 (DBW 2: 28-9).
[59] Bonhoeffer already makes this assertion in *Sanctorum Communio*; DBWE 1: 40 (DBW 1: 22).

This reversal of order, to be corrected in Heidegger, combined with Kant's overly act-oriented epistemology, creates problems for maintaining continuity. The inability to fully grasp one's self through one's own faculties, though a positive characteristic, has a concomitant failure. Kant's position cannot adequately account for the continuity of Dasein:

> The object of understanding here should be Dasein itself—that is, Dasein in its unity—for there is no 'understanding' save on the basis of unity. If Dasein is so structured that the will-to-understand-itself belongs to its essence, the problem arises of how the unity of Dasein can be gained by means of self-understanding from, or out of, the self [*Sich-aus-sich-selbst-verstehen*]. The eye does not see itself.[60]

Kant, himself, states Bonhoeffer's point more clearly: "The consciousness of oneself in accordance with the determinations of our state in internal perception is merely empirical, forever variable; it can provide no standing or abiding self in this stream of inner appearances."[61] The unity of experience, both in terms of objects of knowledge and of ourselves, is based on a more fundamental unity, the transcendental unity of apperception, that cannot be proven and guaranteed but only presupposed. The essence of the problem here is that if our being is constituted by referential acts in relation to a transcendent, then the discreteness of these acts makes our being also discrete and therefore discontinuous. One cannot account for how our being at one moment is necessarily related to our being the next moment. One cannot simply turn to Kant's transcendental unity of apperception for a satisfactory answer, at least not for Bonhoeffer.

This then causes the related problem of how to account for the unity in our knowledge of objects. Again, the transcendental unity of apperception is intended to account for the unity of our experience, but it must be assumed from the fact that there appears to be such a unity. It does not in itself account for the nature of the unity. What was once a laudable aspect of Kant's

[60] DBWE 2: 46 (DBW 2: 40).
[61] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A107.

philosophy, the inability to access the thing-in-itself and ourselves, becomes a hindrance. Without some access to that which gives our existence continuity, there is no way to give an adequate account of continuity.

The most pressing problem for Bonhoeffer, however, is Kant's inability to properly secure the boundaries of transcendence. This inability, however, only becomes apparent for Bonhoeffer with Hegel and idealism to which we now turn.

Hegel and Idealism

Over the course of Bonhoeffer's work, his relationship to Hegel represents probably one of the more complex and enduring of his interactions with a philosopher. Hegel and idealism figured prominently and not quite as negatively in *Sanctorum Communio*. In *Act and Being*, Hegel functions as a cautionary tale that tells us what in philosophy and theology should be avoided. In the summer semester of 1933, Bonhoeffer still found Hegel's relation to theology important enough to warrant a seminar entitled "Dogmatics: Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*," of which unfortunately only fragmentary student notes survive.[62] And the struggle with the threat of idealism seems to have lurked in the background of his *Creation and Fall*.[63]

There is some debate concerning how well Bonhoeffer actually knew Hegel at any particular time. "At the time of *Sanctorum Communio*," so says one source, "Bonhoeffer had absorbed the bourgeois Hegelian renaissance but hardly Hegel himself."[64] Yet in reaction to this comment, Bonhoeffer's cousin, von Hase, asserts that Bonhoeffer was quite familiar with *The Phenomenology of Spirit* and the *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*.[65] It is certainly true that Hegel makes frequent and not always negative appearances in *Sanctorum Communio*. Though

[62] DBWE 12: 521 (DBW 12: 511).
[63] Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 108.
[64] Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, 953n110.
[65] Cf. DBWE 9: 149n[5] (DBW 9: 157n[5]); Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 39n49.

wary even in *Sanctorum Communio* of the dangers of idealism, Bonhoeffer found, for example, Hegel's distinctions and relations between subjective, objective, and absolute spirit useful.[66]

In *Act and Being*, as with Kant so with Hegel, Bonhoeffer is more concerned with an idealized portrayal of the extremes of Hegel's philosophy read through theological adaptations, such as Friedrich Brunstäd's *Idee der Religion*. Just as with Bonhoeffer's presentation of Kant, one may find considerable room to critique Bonhoeffer's presentation of Hegel. Again, however, my concern is less with the presentation's accuracy and more with its overall function in *Act and Being*.

Hegel is a reoccurring interlocutor for Bonhoeffer because, by Bonhoeffer's estimation, Hegel represents the worst and most dangerous of philosophical options, i.e. idealism. Idealism, for Bonhoeffer, is essentially the philosophical equivalent of Luther's *cor curvum in se* where all of reality is collapsed into the subject, and the subject becomes the creator of itself and its world. Immediately after critiquing Hegel for writing a "philosophy of angels" Bonhoeffer, with noticeable vitriol, says, "In the experience of being totally turned-in-on-himself, -persisting, -resting, he who only needs to come to himself in order to be God must end up in the terrifying disappointment of the tormenting desolation and sterility of utter solitude."[67] As the representative of the worst that can happen in philosophy by Bonhoeffer's standards, it is important to take note of exactly where and how it can go so drastically wrong.

Not only does Hegel function as an important foil in many of Bonhoeffer's writings, but for present purposes understanding Bonhoeffer's appraisal of Hegel's idealism will be important for understanding Bonhoeffer's appraisals of Heidegger. Bonhoeffer nearly credits Hegel with solving the problem of act and being: "Idealism, especially Hegel, in fact appears to have

[66] For example, see DBWE 1: 74 (DBW 1: 46).
[67] DBWE 2: 42 (DBW 2: 35); translation altered.

reached a synopsis of act and being that would be capable of satisfying the demands of the problem, if only those doing the philosophizing themselves did not founder on the resistance of their own reality to this philosophy."[68] Later, when crediting Heidegger with solving the problem for philosophy, Bonhoeffer states, "This solution, though reminiscent of Hegel is fundamentally different from Hegel's theory, in that being is Dasein, 'being in the world', existing in temporality."[69] Essentially, as we will see later, Heidegger's solution is superior to Hegel's in that the former is able to simultaneously meet the criteria of continuity and concreteness.

The essence of Hegel's failure actually begins with an inherent weakness in Kant's concept of boundary. Concerning the boundary set by Kant's thing-in-itself, Bonhoeffer asks, and takes seriously, the idealist question: "If it can never be objectively knowable, how can reason fix its boundaries over against something unknown?"[70] That is, if the thing-in-itself is truly unknowable, how can reason know the simple fact that it cannot know the thing-in-itself? The only explanation, again according to Bonhoeffer, is that rather than being bounded by the nature of the thing-in-itself, reason has set this boundary itself. This is, according to Bonhoeffer, Hegel's fundamental insight.[71]

This may not be an immediately noticeable problem, but as Bonhoeffer understands it, this jeopardizes every success that Kantian epistemology can claim in relation to the problem of act and being. First, one of Kant's central successes was to make thinking and human existence in reference to the transcendent that could not be fully grasped. Being in reference to the

[68] DBWE 2: 42 (DBW 2: 35); translation altered.
[69] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65). In Bonhoeffer's 1932 publication, "Concerning the Christian Idea of God," he says, "In short, idealistic philosophy does not take seriously the ontological category in history"; DBWE 10: 457-8 (DBW 10: 429).
[70] DBWE 2: 45 (DBW 2: 38); translation altered.
[71] DBWE 10: 472 (DBW 10: 445). In terms of comparatively recent Hegel scholarship, Bonhoeffer's reading of Hegel is close to those who read Hegel as a traditional metaphysician; see, for example, Michael Rosen, *Hegel's Dialectic and Its Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 62–3; Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 36 and 117; Frederick Beiser, *Hegel* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 63 and 68.

transcendent also necessarily meant that thinking and Dasein were in reference to the boundaries that protected the transcendent. If, however, these boundaries are created by reason itself, then reason is only seeing its own reflection in those boundaries. Reason becomes in reference to itself. Rather than thought and human existence being relationally open to the other, it is now closed in on itself. It has succumb to the *cor curvum in se*.

With the collapse of Kant's boundaries the second and most crucial of Kant's successes, establishing transcendence, is also threatened. If reason has created these self-imposed boundaries, then there is a sense in which reason has already transgressed them in order to even know that there is something beyond them. If these boundaries are self-created and reason has already in some way moved beyond them, then there would seem to be no reason to maintain them. As Bonhoeffer states it, "The miscarriage of the endeavor to ascertain the boundaries of reason is due to the fact that there are for reason essentially no boundaries, for even the boundaries are thought away until they are no longer genuine boundaries."[72] If there are no boundaries between reason and the transcendent, then reason is free to grasp the transcendent. Though Bonhoeffer does not go into the details of Hegel's argument, this is essentially Hegel's point. According to Hegel, the thing-in-itself, which for Hegel also includes the mind and God, is simply reason abstracting all particular properties away. Reason *creates* the thing-in-itself by stripping away these properties. As Hegel straightforwardly concludes, "Hence one can only read with surprise the perpetual remark that we do not know the Thing-in-itself. On the contrary there is nothing we can know so easily."[73]

Here we arrive at Bonhoeffer's crucial distinction between Kant's "in reference to" and Hegel's "through." Again, for Bonhoeffer's Kant, reason and Dasein are always merely in

[72] DBWE 2: 45 (DBW 2: 38).
[73] G.W.F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline, Part I: Science of Logic*, ed. Klaus Brinkmann and Daniel Dahlstrom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), sec 44.

reference to transcendence. This makes the world as we can know it in reference to us, yet not entirely graspable by us, not entirely created by us. By removing the boundaries to reason and allowing reason access to transcendence, Hegel has allowed the world to be created *through* us. It is true that the world was created by the active ordering of reason, but for Kant this was always checked by the ungraspable nature of the transcendent thing-in-itself. The world was in reference to us, but not created by us. With Hegel, the breakdown of the boundary protecting the thing-in-itself, and the easy graspability of the thing-in-itself, makes the world created by us. Here all being is entirely reduced to act for according to Bonhoeffer's reading of Hegel, "where there is no knowing consciousness, there is also no being."[74] Wherever reason turns, it now only ever sees itself making it impossible to ever be truly affected by an other and thereby exacerbating the *cor curvum in se*.

This failure to maintain appropriate boundaries also has its concomitant effects at the anthropological level. Again, Bonhoeffer approves of the Kantian assertion that we are not able to grasp ourselves as we are in ourselves. Yet there seems to be an inherent problem here as well. As Bonhoeffer formulates the problem, it is a question of whether thinking precedes the I or the I precedes thinking.[75] The transcendental subject cannot be thought as it is in itself because it is the necessary condition of thought. "The I logically precedes thinking."[76] Yet insofar as the transcendental subject seems to simply be the act of thinking itself, then thinking is logically prior to the I or the transcendental subject. As Bonhoeffer understands Kant and Hegelian idealism, this apparent contradiction arises from Kant's splitting of the self into the transcendental and the empirical selves. This, again, however is a division created by reason or thought itself. As such it is vulnerable to the same maneuver Hegel applied to the thing-in-itself.

[74] DBWE 2: 48 (DBW 2: 41).
[75] DBWE 2: 38 (DBW 2: 31-2).
[76] Ibid.

Just as the thing-in-itself was a construction of reason via abstraction, so too is the transcendental subject an abstraction created by reason.[77] With Bonhoeffer's Hegel we are given easy access to ourselves eliminating yet another of Kant's successes.

Kant's anthropological position that Dasein is suspended between the two transcendent poles of the thing-in-itself and the transcendental subject has collapsed with Hegel. Through the knowing act of the subject both the being of the thing-in-self and the being of the transcendental subject collapses into the being of the subject. Yet the being of the subject is the knowing act, the act of consciousness coming to know itself. "[I]n original transcendentalism" as Bonhoeffer understands it, "the human spirit was suspended between transcendence and, consequently, irrevocably in reference to them, now the movement of the spirit is turned in upon itself."[78] This collapsing of being into act and act into being will form an important clue both for how to and how not to solve the problem of act and being.

Finally and most offensively for Bonhoeffer the theologian, there is, for Hegel, no boundary between us and God, thereby pulling God into thought.[79] Hegel, himself, seems to say as much:

> It [philosophy] presents the reconciliation of God with himself and with nature, showing that nature, otherness, is implicitly divine, and that the raising of itself to reconciliation is on the one hand what finite spirit implicitly is, while on the other hand it arrives at this reconciliation, or brings it forth, in world history. This reconciliation is the peace of God, which does not "surpass all reason," but is rather the peace that *through* reason is first known and thought and is recognized as what is true.[80]

---

[77] Cf. Hegel, *Encyclopedia*, sec. 24.
[78] DBWE 2: 41 (DBW 2: 34).
[79] Hegel, for example, does say, "In this respect it is a need of the present day to be cognizant of God through thinking reason." G.W.F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. R.F. Brown, Peter C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 128.
[80] G.W.F. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. R.F. Brown, Peter C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, vol. 3 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 347. Notice that this also breaches the important divisions between philosophy and theology that Bonhoeffer is working with. In his aesthetic lectures, Hegel says, "For, after all, philosophy has no other object but God and so is essentially rational theology." G.W.F. Hegel, *Hegel's Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, trans. T. M. Knox, vol. I (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 101.

"This means," for Bonhoeffer, "that God once again becomes 'objectified' in consciousness and is thereby taken into the unity of transcendental apperception, becoming the prisoner of the consciousness."[81] The danger of this position, however, does not stop there for Bonhoeffer. This position may not only make God another object and creation of human reason, thereby unraveling one of Kant's successes, but may devolve further into equating I and God.[82]

With the tendency for Kant's pure transcendentalism to devolve into Hegelian idealism and all its accompanying problems, transcendental philosophy, as Bonhoeffer sees it, is left with two options. First, "thinking can submit to this self-limitation, in the manner of genuine transcendental thinking."[83] The second option, upon realizing that these limits of reason are self-imposed, is to succumb to "the great temptation for all genuine philosophy" where thinking raises "itself to the position of lord over what is nonobjective [transcendent]."[84] Though Bonhoeffer does not state so directly, following his theological presuppositions, this is, in fact, not a genuine choice. First, this choosing is still an act of reason. It is nothing but a reiteration of the problem in Kantian epistemology that led to Hegelian idealism in the first place. The problem began with reason choosing its own boundaries. This new option really only amounts to reason choosing to choose its boundaries. Second, there is nothing internal or external to reason to impose the preferable choice of maintaining the boundaries of transcendence: "Nothing can oblige thinking, precisely as free thinking, not to draw the unconditional into itself and to take

[81] DBWE 2: 51 (DBW 2: 45).
[82] DBWE 2: 41 (DBW 2: 34). Insofar as Hegel's "Notion" might be equivalent to God, Hegel does seem to say as much; G.W.F. Hegel, *Science of Logic*, trans. A.V. Miller (New York: Humanities Press, 1996), 583. Barth has a very similar assessment of Hegel: "So Hegel's brand of self-confidence is also confidence in mind which for its own part is one with God and the same with God." Karl Barth, *Protestant Thought: From Rousseau to Ritschl*, trans. Brian Cozens (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959), 275.
[83] DBWE 2: 39 (DBW 2: 32).
[84] Ibid.

control of its I."[85] Third, this is tantamount to intellectually willing oneself out of the *cor curvum in se*. Given Bonhoeffer's Lutheran presuppositions, this is no different than willing or working oneself out of sin, which is impossible. If the weaknesses in Kantian transcendentalism are not shored up, then philosophy will always in one form or another succumb to the great temptation represented by Hegelian idealism.

All of this has allowed Hegel, in Bonhoeffer's terms, to combine act and being; however, obviously in the most inappropriate way. For Kant there was an important division between act and being. For Kant, the knowing act or reason did create the being of the object of knowledge and our empirical selves, yet being did not completely devolve into the knowing act. The being of the thing-in-itself, the transcendental subject, and God remained beyond the bounds of the knowing act. With Hegel, however, all being, in the form of the objects of knowledge and the world, others, one's self, and God completely collapse into the knowing act.[86] Here all being is contained within act. Yet Hegel's act also becomes being. In coming to know what for Kant was other and transcendent, the 'I' is really coming to know itself. For Bonhoeffer this really means that what was an apparent movement or act of the I is really, in fact, the 'I' coming to rest in itself. But this absolute rest is, for Bonhoeffer, absolute being.[87] Act has, then, also been resolved into being. However, the general problem, which Heidegger will solve for philosophy at the epistemological and anthropological levels, is that Hegel has *equated* act and being. A viable solution must coordinate, not equate, the two. The subtle difference here, which will become clearer in chapter three with Heidegger's solution, is that act and being must presuppose one another without devolving into one another.

[85] DBWE 2: 40 (DBW 2: 33).
[86] DBWE 2: 40-1 (DBW 2: 34).
[87] DBWE 2: 42 (DBW 2: 35)

Hegel's solution, which is in some respects a logical continuation of Kant, has come at too high a price. Hegel has met the criterion of continuity. Using Hegel one can account for the continuity of the self, objects of knowledge, God, and so forth. This continuity only arises, however, because Hegel has collapsed everything into the singularity of the 'I' or reason. This singularity arises because Hegel has failed at all of Bonhoeffer's other criteria. Hegel transgressed the boundaries set by Kant thereby collapsing transcendence into reason. With the loss of transcendence there is nothing that can break in from outside to disrupt the system. Whatever might do so from concrete historical existence is reincorporated into Hegel's system. This then means that human existence and knowledge cannot actually be affected by concrete historical existence. By Bonhoeffer's standards, then, Hegel has constructed a metaphysical system of the worst kind and represents the most dire intellectual form of the *cor curvum in se*.

"If the transcendental approach is not to end once again in the system of reason, it clearly requires a new formulation of the 'boundaries' of reason."[88] What is needed and will not come until Bonhoeffer's theological joining of Heidegger and Kant, is for the boundary of reason and Dasein to be actually imposed from outside. Such an alteration will be the centerpiece of Bonhoeffer's theological alteration of Kant and Heidegger, as Bonhoeffer foreshadows: "There is a boundary only for a concrete human being in its entirety, and this boundary is called *Christ*."[89] Yet the more philosophically pertinent issue behind the inability to correctly locate and maintain boundaries, and therefore also transcendence, has its origin in Kant and Hegel's overly act-oriented philosophies. Act was given too much dominance over being. Act, whether in the form of thought or existence cannot be bounded, if being is not guarded from them. Perhaps philosophies with a greater emphasis on being might succeed in ways that transcendentalism and

[88] DBWE 2: 54 (DBW 2: 48); translation altered.
[89] DBWE 2: 45 (DBW 2: 38).

idealism have not. With that we, following Bonhoeffer, turn to Husserl and idealist phenomenology.

Husserl and Idealist Phenomenology

Bonhoeffer's move to Husserl and phenomenology marks a shift from a focus on act-oriented philosophies to being-oriented philosophies. As we saw in the above accounts of Kant and Hegel an overly act-oriented approach to the problem of act and being is unsuccessful. An overly act-oriented approach culminates in an unacceptable collapsing of act and being into one another. Because being-oriented philosophies begin on the opposite pole of the problem, they may be more successful, or at the very least disclose different aspects of the problem useful in coming to a solution.

Bonhoeffer does not turn to Husserl, however, simply because he is next in chronological order or because he founded the school that would lead to Heidegger. Rather, Husserl, for Bonhoeffer, is being-philosophy's equivalent to Hegel, hence the appellation "idealist phenomenology." That is, Husserl, though he begins with a focus on being, results, much like Hegel, in the collapse of act and being into one another. A distinctive feature of the problem of act and being, as Bonhoeffer presents it, is that an overly zealous focus on either act or being results in making the two equivalent. If both result in act and being simply equaling one another, then failures on either side are roughly equivalent for Bonhoeffer's purposes.

As with Bonhoeffer's presentations of Kant and Hegel, Bonhoeffer might be charged with being overly simplistic, particularly by those concerned with the nuances of such philosophers. Even those more concerned with Bonhoeffer's broader theological moves disparage Bonhoeffer's general and reductionist collapse of obviously distinct philosophies into

idealism.[90] There is certainly a healthy degree of merit to these complaints; yet this misses Bonhoeffer's hermeneutic use of the problem of act and being. Bonhoeffer is certainly not saying that Husserl simply rehearses Hegel with new vocabulary. The problem of act and being allows for multifarious manifestations of failure. Bonhoeffer is simply more concerned with cataloging the general moves that lead to a complete failure at the problem of act and being.[91] Husserl is one means through which Bonhoeffer does so.

There is, in fact, good evidence that Bonhoeffer was familiar with the nuances of the phenomenological tradition. As presented in the introduction, Bonhoeffer consistently engaged the phenomenological tradition at least since 1924. Bonhoeffer explicitly describes his method of investigating the phenomena of the church in *Sanctorum Communio* as phenomenological.[92] While there were few explicit citations to Kant and Hegel, Bonhoeffer makes comparatively frequent and accurate citations to Husserl's *Ideas* and *Logical Investigations* in *Act and Being*. While Bonhoeffer might unfairly reduce Husserl to idealism, it is not because he did not know Husserl.

Husserl (and Scheler with him) also provide Bonhoeffer with an excuse to get to Heidegger. Bonhoeffer's goal in evaluating Husserl, Scheler, and Heidegger is to come to a genuine ontology. Pure or genuine transcendentalism, represented by Bonhoeffer's stylized Kant, was the most acceptable act-oriented philosophy, Bonhoeffer is now looking for a being-oriented counterpart, a genuine ontology. Before turning to Husserl, Bonhoeffer outlines what would characterize such a genuine ontology, and it is clear that he already has Heidegger in mind for the job. Most generally and switching his vocabulary slightly, genuine ontology would surrender the claim of the logos, or act, over *ὄν*, being, or, more specifically the movement of

[90] Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 80.
[91] Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 105.
[92] DBWE 1: 30-1 (DBW 1: 16-17).

thought would belong to being.[93] In this regard, genuine ontology, in its own way, would also respect transcendence. While pure transcendentalism makes thought always in reference to being, genuine ontology makes being independent of thought; being would have priority over thought.[94] An important element of success here is for ontology to avoid making being an existing object (*seiendes Objekt*).[95] And if being does become obscured by some entity (*Seiende*), then it is the task of ontology to clear the way (*freilegen*) to being.[96] Without much explanation yet still mindful of Heidegger, this means that "ontology must be the pursuit that ponders this fact of 'always already existing' [*immer schon Dasein*],"[97] which, as we will see, maintains continuity and concreteness, such that "thinking must again and again be 'suspended' ['*aufgehoben*'] in being."[98] That is, thinking, or in Heidegger's more technical terms presence-at-hand and assertive knowledge,[99] must always arise from actual concrete existing. Husserl will not be able to meet these requirements. As Bonhoeffer says explicitly "Here the step from Husserl-Scheler to Heidegger is foreshadowed."[100]

Husserl's goal, according to Bonhoeffer, is to get to the essence of phenomena as given to consciousness and thereby to get to the phenomenon of pure consciousness itself. The investigation of phenomena as given to consciousness is supposed to get us the structures of consciousness itself because, for Husserl, consciousness always refers to or intends some object or entity.[101] In more technical Husserlian language, which Bonhoeffer adopts here, *noesis*, the act

[93] DBWE 2: 60 (DBW 2: 53-4).
[94] DBWE 2: 60 (DBW 2: 54).
[95] Ibid.
[96] DBWE 2: 61 (DBW 2: 55).
[97] Cf. SZ 2 and 12.
[98] DBWE 2: 60 (DBW 2: 54).
[99] See SZ 71-76 and 153-160
[100] DBWE 2: 60 (DBW 2: 54).
[101] DBWE 2: 62 (DBW 2: 56); Edmund Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, trans. F. Kersten (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1982), par. 86.

of consciousness, always refers to *noema*, an intended object of knowledge.[102] What will be an important error on Husserl's part, according to Bonhoeffer, this noesis-noema structure is contained within consciousness itself. So investigating these phenomena and the structures according to which they are presented also gets one to the essential structures of consciousness itself.

The method by which one gets to these essential structures of consciousness involves the phenomenological-eidetic reduction. The phenomenological reduction involves bracketing the question of existence of the intended object. The eidetic reduction involves removing all contingent and accidental characteristics of the intended object to get to the essential and necessary characteristics. Both involve bracketing our everyday interpretation and engagement with such intended objects and will constitute an important failure on Husserl's part according to Bonhoeffer.[103]

As Bonhoeffer reads Husserl, reality or the question of existence must be bracketed because such assumptions and questions already contain interpretation on the part of the subject. Interpretation is tantamount, in Bonhoeffer's language, to the logos making a claim on *ὄν* (being). With the elimination of interpretation through the phenomenological-eidetic reduction one can have a direct and purely conceptual perception of essence, an instantiation of the category of being for Bonhoeffer.[104] In this way, these methods of reduction, at the very least, attempt to meet the criterion of transcendence.

There are, then according to Bonhoeffer, two general and opposed trends in Husserl's philosophy, one overriding the other and leading Husserl into idealism.[105] First, the

[102] DBWE 2: 62 (DBW 2: 56); Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 97.
[103] DBWE 2: 62 (DBW 2: 56); Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 31.
[104] Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 3.
[105] DBWE 2: 63 (DBW 2: 57).

phenomenological reduction, whereby the question of existence is bracketed, means, at least for methodological purposes, one neither affirms nor denies the existence of something external to the knowing act. Here, and not unlike Kant, there is a degree of epistemic humility. In Bonhoeffer's terms, there is then a degree of respect for transcendence. Second, with the proper methodological tools, we can have an unencumbered conceptual perception of essences. This would seem to mean that there is something that stands independent of the act of the subject. Numbers, for example, according to Husserl, are what they are independent of any conceptual construction we might perform in relation to them.[106] Here, being, in this example of numbers, would seem to take precedence over or be prior to our epistemic acts of knowing them.

Yet the small gains that follow from the first trend are negated by the second whereby all being is resolved into the act of consciousness. Bonhoeffer is here thinking, in part, of the noema-noesis structure. This structure, again, is immanent to consciousness. That with which phenomenology is concerned and has access to given its methodological presuppositions is entirely contained within consciousness or more precisely for Bonhoeffer within conscious acts. All being that can be known can be known only within such acts of consciousness. This radical emphasis on consciousness then entails that that which is transcendent functions as "only a rule that consciousness projects beyond itself so as to order reality within it."[107] Husserl, for example, says, "The existence of what is natural *cannot* condition the existence of consciousness since it arises as the correlate of consciousness; it *is* only in so far as it constitutes itself within ordered organizations of consciousness."[108] For Bonhoeffer, though the nuances of how and why might be different, Husserl has, like Hegel, collapsed all being into act despite Husserl's intentions.

[106] Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 22.
[107] DBWE 2: 63 (DBW 2: 57).
[108] Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 51.

As with Kant and Hegel, an essential test of a philosophical approach to the problem of act and being is how it accounts for God. Here Husserl does not fare well either, according to Bonhoeffer.[109] First, according to Husserl, God must also be bracketed out.[110] This is not in itself a problem, there is a sense in which this shares general similarities to Kant's leaving God out of epistemology. The way in which Husserl intimates how God might be brought make into phenomenology is a problem, however. Husserl asserts that there must be some special intuitive manifestations of God given to consciousness.[111] If this is so, then it should be possible to use phenomenology to intellectually grasp God through pure consciousness.[112] Without explanation Bonhoeffer then concludes that here "the I, or consciousness, is once again restored to the place of God."[113] The general problem here is that if God is grasped, itself a sign that a mistake has been made, by the methods of phenomenology and the structures of pure consciousness, then God, or more particularly revelation, must conform to the possibilities inherent in human existence. Bonhoeffer, following some of his Barthian tendencies, assumes this to be unacceptable because it would curtail God's sovereignty and freedom.

Husserl's greatest failure, at least vis-à-vis Heidegger according to Bonhoeffer, are the phenomenological and eidetic reductions themselves.[114] Again, with the phenomenological reduction the question of existence is bracketed out. With the eidetic reduction all contingent and accidental characteristics of the way in which phenomena present themselves is removed in order to get to the necessary and essential features of phenomena and consciousness. Here Husserl fails at the criterion of concreteness, and what is perhaps worse, he does so by choice. The

[109] DBWE 2: 64 (DBW 2: 58).
[110] Husserl, *Ideas*, par. 58.
[111] Ibid., par. 51.
[112] Ibid.
[113] DBWE 2: 64 (DBW 2: 58).
[114] DBWE 2: 60 and 68 (DBW 2: 53-4 and 62).

actual living that constitutes human existence and, as we will see with Heidegger, dictates the parameters with which one encounters objects, others, and God are removed from philosophical consideration to get at the atemporal structures of pure consciousness.

As Bonhoeffer reads Husserl, he was supposed to begin with and support the priority of *ὄν* over logos, or being over act, yet the boundaries that maintain the transcendence and safety of being over act are again rationally imposed thereby pulling being into the act of consciousness. Husserl is then another instance of philosophy succumbing to the general problem of idealism and the *cor curvum in se*. Husserl is also ill-equipped, even choosing to be so, to deal with concrete human existence. Scheler makes some small gains on these two fronts.

Scheler and Phenomenological Epistemology[115]

Though Scheler does not appear to hold a significant position in *Act and Being* or in any of Bonhoeffer's later works, he was nevertheless an important early influence. Bonhoeffer's 'person', a central concept in *Sanctorum Communio* is highly indebted to Scheler.[116] And although Bonhoeffer is not above critiquing Scheler in *Sanctorum Communio,* particularly for his overly humanistic approach,[117] Scheler represents one of the better philosophical options for understanding the phenomenological nature of community. In *Act and Being*, Scheler is also understood as a notable improvement on past philosophical approaches, particularly Husserl's; however, the honorable position he held in *Sanctorum Communio* is now supplanted by Heidegger.

[115] DBWE 10: 392 (DBW 10: 360-1)
[116] For example, see DBWE 1: 53n[68]
[117] DBWE 1: 49-50 (DBW 1: 29-30).

According to Bonhoeffer, Scheler conscientiously attempts to improve on the failures of Husserl's phenomenology.[118] One of the general improvements that Scheler makes over Husserl merely concerns Scheler's topical focus. Bonhoeffer notes that Scheler is not content to just improve on Husserl in the field of phenomenology, but develops such improvements "consistently in the fields of ethics and philosophy of religion."[119] This will be important when we turn to Scheler's improvements with regard to the criterion of transcendence, but for now this is a marked improvement on the criterion of concreteness. Speaking of Kant, Scheler's primary interlocutor and opponent in his *Formalism in Ethics*, Scheler says for example, "I am of the opinion that this Kantian colossus of steel and bronze obstructs the way of philosophy toward a concrete and evidential *theory of moral values* […], toward the *order of ranks of these values* and the *norms* based on them. Kant's work therefore bars us from any true insight into the place of moral values in man's life."[120] Though Scheler does not always in fact apply phenomenology to every aspect of the "totality of life," Scheler recognizes both the possibility and the need to do so.[121]

Part of Scheler's success, both with regard to concreteness and transcendence, is his repudiation of the dominance of reason or thought. On Bonhoeffer's reading of Kant, Hegel, and Husserl, reason was the dominant faculty through which we came to knowledge and which, through its acts of knowing, ultimately created being. Scheler, however, explicitly critiques the dominance of reason: "For it is our *whole* spiritual life—and not simply objective thinking in the

[118] DBWE 2: 64 (DBW 2: 58). Max Scheler, *On the Eternal in Man* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009), 80–3. Manfred S. Frings and Roger L. Funk, "Forward," in *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values: A New Attempt toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), xiv.
[119] DBWE 2: 64 (DBW 2: 64).
[120] Max Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values: A New Attempt Toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism*, trans. Manfred S. Frings and Roger L. Funk (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), 6.
[121] DBWE 2: 64 (DBW 2: 58).

sense of cognition of being […] The *emotive* elements of spirit […] also possess original a priori contents which are not borrowed from 'thinking', and which ethics must show to be independent of logic."[122] Breaking the hold of reason on philosophical thought is important at least insofar as it opens the possibility that we may come to know the world through faculties that are exposed to being, rather than creative of being.[123] Specifically in relation to the being of values, we are given access to them through, variously put, "passionate beholding," "the feeling of values," or "love."[124]

According to Bonhoeffer, Scheler's conscientious attempt to improve on Husserl's phenomenology also makes gains with respect to the criterion of transcendence. As representative of the phenomenological option for a solution to the problem of act and being, Husserl was supposed to give priority to being, or *ὄν*, over act, or logos. Prioritizing being over act could have potentially maintained the transcendence of being and kept human reason in check. Husserl's emphasis on the structures of consciousness dictating the presentation of phenomena made this impossible. Scheler, according to Bonhoeffer, noticed the idealist conclusion to which this would lead and attempted to forestall it by reorienting the guiding question of phenomenology.[125] According to Scheler, the guiding question of phenomenology should not concern the conditions for the possibility in consciousness for the givenness of phenomena. Rather, the question should quite simply concern what *is* given, or the being of the given rather than the conscious act that gives being.[126] The general answer to this question is that being, or essence in Husserl's and Scheler's terms, contains within itself the conditions for our

[122] Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 63.
[123] DBWE 2: 65 (DBW 2: 59).
[124] DBWE 10: 392 (DBW 10: 361); Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 89, 109, and 257.
[125] DBWE 2: 64-5 (DBW 2: 58-9).
[126] DBWE 2: 65 (DBW 2: 59); Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 55.

knowing it. Our ability to grasp being is not located in the formal structures of consciousness, reason, the ego, or the knowing act: "The ego is neither the *point of departure* for the apprehension nor the producer of essences. It is not an essence which unilaterally 'founds' all other essences or even all essences of acts. In the lived pursuance of outer perception, nature 'itself' is *immediately* given, not a 'representation' or 'sensations' that belongs to an ego."[127] Focusing particularly on ethics and value, we notice, according to Scheler, that there exists an independent domain of being, particularly a domain of values.[128] And it is this domain of values that creates the conditions for the presentation of ethical phenomena independent of the consciousness of the subject. This then means, according to Bonhoeffer, that for Scheler there is "being transcending consciousness."[129]

Despite Scheler's notable advances regarding the problem of act and being, there are still some notable failures, many of which forecast Bonhoeffer's turn to Heidegger. First, as we might expect, Scheler is also ultimately unable to maintain transcendence. Though Scheler was able "to construct a world of the being of values transcending consciousness" and therefore give definitive priority to being over act, there is no boundary concerning what consciousness can know about being.[130] It is true that the knowing act of consciousness does not create the being of objects of knowledge, values, God, and so forth. It is also true that our knowledge of being does not merely or exclusively come through thought or reason, but also through other, particularly so-called "irrational," faculties. Though both are notable improvements, they do not go nearly as far as Bonhoeffer would like. Bonhoeffer is wary not merely of giving acts of reason or thought dominance over being, but of allowing any faculty or potentiality within human existence

[127] Scheler *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 77.
[128] DBWE 2: 64-5 (DBW 2: 58-9); Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 17–19.
[129] DBWE 2: 65 (DBW 59).
[130] DBWE 10: 392 (DBW 10: 361).

unfettered access to being. Bonhoeffer presupposes that the world cannot be entirely at a person's disposal by any means. Yet through this "passionate beholding" Scheler has done just that. On Bonhoeffer's reading of Scheler, "the person grasps the All within himself and can even grasp God in passionate beholding."[131] That reason is replaced by feeling ultimately makes little difference to Bonhoeffer. Both options work under the premise that there is something in human existence, some possibility, which of itself grants humans unimpeded access to being.

This unimpeded access to being is particularly problematic, for Bonhoeffer, when related to God. According to Scheler, through our own feeling and intentionality of love for God we gain pre-conceptual access to God's being.[132] For Scheler, God is the highest value. Having immediate access to the being of God, for Bonhoeffer, also means delivering over the value of the world and oneself.[133] Through one's own means, then, one is given immediate access to all being. Again, given Bonhoeffer's Lutheran presuppositions, this is untenable. While previous philosophers with which Bonhoeffer was concerned were trapped primarily by the *ratio in se ipsam incurva*, reason curved in on itself, Scheler is trapped in the more general formulation of the *cor curvum in se*, the heart curved in on itself.

It also appeared, simply in virtue of Scheler's focus on ethics and philosophy of religion, that he had made advances concerning the criterion of concreteness. For Bonhoeffer, it is indeed progress vis-à-vis Scheler's predecessors. However, given the way in which Scheler maintains continuity the progress is fairly hollow. On Bonhoeffer's reading of Scheler, the being of values belong to a static and atemporal realm. Human *being* also more properly belongs to the realm of static and atemporal being. As such, human existence is also atemporal and static.[134] As a static

[131] Ibid.
[132] Scheler, *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values*, 294–5.
[133] DBWE 2: 66 (DBW 2: 60-1).
[134] DBWE 10: 392-3 (DBW 10: 361).

and atemporal unity Scheler is able to maintain the continuity of human existence, but as we saw in Bonhoeffer's assessment of Hegel this is unsatisfactory.[135] Scheler cannot account, then, for historical existence. His human being is untouched by historical contingency.

This all culminates in Scheler's failure to truly ask the anthropological question, to truly ask about human existence. Bonhoeffer presupposes, again, that to answer the question of knowledge first requires asking about human existence. In one respect, Scheler does make an advance here by trying to inquire about the totality of human life. Yet that advance is hindered by the way in which Scheler treats human existence. Perhaps as the result of the combined influence of Heidegger and the Christian presupposition of the uniqueness of human existence, Bonhoeffer presupposes that the human being cannot be treated as merely one entity (*Seiende*) among other entities.[136] Yet, according Bonhoeffer, by making human existence static and atemporal Scheler has done just that.[137] Additionally, Scheler removes the impetus for even properly raising the question of human existence. The question can only be raised and taken seriously if one properly recognizes the inherent insecurity in human existence. The person has unfettered access to values, to God, and to itself. There is then "not even the slightest notion that the person […] finds himself in a truly questionable situation."[138] Human existence conceived of as such an entity is then "basically untouched by the fact that it must first inquire regarding itself."[139]

***

Though from Kant to Scheler philosophy has gleaned some elements necessary, according to Bonhoeffer, to arrive at a solution to the problem of act and being, they have ultimately failed.

[135] DBWE 10: 394 (DBW 10: 362-3).
[136] DBWE 10: 393 (DBW 10: 361).
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid.
[139] DBWE 10: 393 (DBW 10: 362).

Aside from particular elements of any individual failure there are two general *philosophical* reasons for this succession of failures. First, the attempts at a solution that Bonhoeffer has evaluated have all overemphasized either act or being rather than coordinating them. Act- and being-concepts must mutually entail one another. The act-orientation of the transcendental and idealist attempts at a solution made it such that there was no being without act. The phenomenological attempt, particularly Scheler's, made it such that there was no act without being. A proper solution must appropriately combine these two assumptions.

Even in those instances where there did appear to be a coordination of act and being, such coordination was accomplished at the expense of one or more of Bonhoeffer's four criteria for a proper solution. Hegel, for example, collapsed all being into act and the way in which he did so also made all act into being. Yet Hegel, on Bonhoeffer's reading, could only do so my ignoring historical contingency and actual human life. A solution must, then, not only make act and being mutually entail one another, but meet the criteria of transcendence, boundary, continuity, and concreteness.

The second general philosophical problem that has hindered the above attempts concerns the way in which they understood the relation between epistemology and anthropology. In general they all, according to Bonhoeffer, begin with the question: "How can I know?" Their answers to this question unduly emphasize "know." For Bonhoeffer, the nature of the "I" or human existence is the more fundamental question. And to ask about the nature of human existence is to ask about far more than the nature of human knowledge. Once one settles on a proper account of human existence, then one can ask the more limited question about how such an existence can know.

Though Heidegger will be found theologically wanting, he has surpassed his philosophical progenitors on philosophical grounds. The Heidegger of *Being and Time* begins with the anthropological question; he begins by asking about human existence or Dasein, only then providing elements for a theory of knowledge. And Heidegger coordinates act and being in a way that is particularly adept at meeting the criteria of concreteness and continuity. With the past philosophical inadequacies in mind, we now turn in the next chapter to the details of Heidegger's philosophical and anthropological solutions that will later inform Bonhoeffer's own theological solution.

Chapter Three: Heidegger's Anthropological Success

In this chapter I now turn to Heidegger's coordination of act and being for philosophical anthropology as understood by Bonhoeffer. In the previous chapter we saw how, according to Bonhoeffer, there has been a succession of failed attempts on the part of notable philosophers to develop an act-being coordinated theory of knowledge. Heidegger, on Bonhoeffer's reading, breaks this pattern. In the course of evaluating Heidegger's *Being and Time*, Bonhoeffer says, "Seen from the problem of act and being, it is as it seems that a genuine coordination of the two has been reached," and "Heidegger has succeeded in forcing together act and being in the concept of Dasein."[1] The goal of this chapter is, then, to explain the details of this success.

In evaluating previous philosophers, Bonhoeffer has already anticipated many of Heidegger's successes. It may, therefore, be useful to review these premonitions in order to keep them in mind as we go through the details of Heidegger's success in philosophical anthropology. Again, Bonhoeffer describes the goal of *Act and Being* in the final sentence of its opening section as follows: "This entire study is an attempt to unify the concern of true transcendentalism and the concern of true ontology in an 'ecclesiological form of thinking'," [2] which essentially means conjoining the best of Kant and Heidegger. As we saw in the lead up to Bonhoeffer's evaluation of Husserl and Scheler, genuine ontology must prioritize being over thought or consciousness such that thinking is continually suspended (*aufgehoben*) in being.[3] This continual suspension of thought in being involves, in some yet unclarified way, pondering the fact of

[1] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65)
[2] DBWE 2: 32 (DBW 2: 26).
[3] DBWE 2: 59-60 (DBW 2: 53-4)

"always already existing" (*immer schon Dasein*) in its everydayness (*Alltäglichkeit*) that avoids the positing of "timeless essences" in favor of historicity and temporality.[4] What follows is a presentation of these successes and why they are successes for Bonhoeffer.

The ultimate and related rewards of the following exposition of Heidegger's analysis of Dasein are thrown-projection and temporality. Regarding the former, Boomgaarden is, to my knowledge, the only one to notice the importance of Heidegger's thrown-projection to Bonhoeffer's positive appraisals of Heidegger and to Bonhoeffer's own theological coordination of act and being.[5] However, a clearer exposition of exactly what thrown-projection is for Heidegger is needed, which will subsequently allow us in chapter five to give a fuller account of how thrown-projection works for Bonhoeffer at the levels of theological ontology, anthropology, and epistemology.

Heidegger's temporality has gained more attention. Boomgaarden, DeJonge, and Tietz all note that temporality plays a vital and positive role in Bonhoeffer's evaluations and uses of Heidegger.[6] This is by no means, however, a settled matter. Plant, as a notable example, reads Bonhoeffer as rejecting the use of Heidegger's temporality in favor of God's eternitiy.[7] This and other positions on Heidegger's place in Bonhoeffer's theology, miss Bonhoeffer's distinction between the three levels at which one must coordinate act and being, the complex relation Bonhoeffer has with philosophy presented at the beginning of chapter two, and, most relevant to the following chapter, Heidegger's distinction between time and temporality. Even those, such as Boomgaarden, who note the difference between time and temporality, miss the intricacies of

[4] DBWE 2: 60 and 67-9 (DBW 2: 54 and 62-3) and DBWE 10: 393 (DBW 10: 362)
[5] Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 271 and 287–8. Boomgaarden does argue that Bonhoeffer misses projection, which is not right.
[6] Ibid., 288, 290–1, 296, 344, 354, 367; Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 76; DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 132–4.
[7] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 320.

the distinction because they miss the importance of and Heidegger's continual use of the method of formal indication, an important component in Heidegger's ability to meet the criterion of concreteness.

What is required, then, is a careful reading and comprehensible presentation of Heidegger, in part framed by what Bonhoeffer finds best in Heidegger,[8] that elucidates how Heidegger begins with *concrete* existence and uses formal indication to move down to the fundamental structures of thrown-projection and temporality. Bonhoeffer will positively appropriate Heidegger on concrete existence, thrown-projection, and temporality for his theology, which is the subject of chapter five.

Before continuing to such details, however, there is a preliminary matter that requires attention, namely the argument made by Zimmermann that Heidegger does not constitute a genuine influence because *Act and Being* does not contain any substantive changes from Bonhoeffer's dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*.

From *Sanctorum Communio* to *Act and Being*: What Required Fixing

Given the thematic continuities of Bonhoeffer's corpus as a whole,[9] and the fact that Bonhoeffer's explicit engagement with Heidegger is isolated to *Act and Being* and its surrounding minor works, it is not uncommon to overlook or explicitly reject the importance of Heidegger's influence on Bonhoeffer. In his *Humanism & Religion*, Zimmermann says for example,

> We have little evidence that Heidegger's influence extended beyond serving as a useful philosophical justification to conjoin human reflection to action and to confirm

[8] This clause is important. *Being and Time*'s presentation of Dasein is long, complex, and detailed. While Bonhoeffer utilizes and addresses some of *Being and Time*'s most central concepts, Bonhoeffer's presentation and use is not exhaustive. Because I am concerned with how *Bonhoeffer* understood and used Heidegger, I am only concerned with presenting and explaining what is essential for that.

[9] Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 1; Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 4; DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 129–42.

> Bonhoeffer's own incarnational instinct that Christian theology must ever be historically conscious. Both of these tendencies, moreover, are already in Bonhoeffer's first dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*.[10]

This is an important and reasonable objection to the general claim of my argument that Heidegger is an important philosophical resource for Bonhoeffer. The objection seems to be two-fold. First, even where Heidegger does seem to have an obvious influence, it is merely as a useful tool to get to a conclusion that Bonhoeffer already had in mind. Second, what seems to be a unique influence is not in fact unique because the main points in *Act and Being* are already present in *Sanctorum Communio* prior to Bonhoeffer encountering Heidegger.

Addressing the first objection, there are notable elements to Bonhoeffer's treatment of Heidegger that makes that treatment unique vis-à-vis other philosophical attempts at a solution to the problem of act and being, which lends at least circumstantial support to the position that Heidegger was an essential source of insights into the problem of act and being for Bonhoeffer. First, as already noted in the introduction, after Luther, Heidegger is the second most cited source in *Act and Being*. Second, Bonhoeffer's presentations of other philosophical systems, particularly Kant's and Hegel's, were, by Bonhoeffer's own admission, stylized; that is, not immediately concerned with the particularities of these philosophies themselves, but their possible extreme forms. And this stylized presentation was often read and presented through contemporary religious and theological appropriations of them. Neither is primarily the case with Bonhoeffer's presentation of Heidegger. Bonhoeffer does deal with Pryzwara and Bultmann, both of whom make theological use of Heidegger, but Bonhoeffer's initial presentation of Heidegger is dominated by Heidegger himself. Bonhoeffer begins his presentation and evaluation of Heidegger with a two-page summary of *Being and Time*. *Prima*

[10] Jens Zimmermann, *Humanism and Religion: A Call for the Renewal of Western Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 292.

facie, perhaps not noteworthy, but this summary demonstrates that Bonhoeffer read the entirety of *Being and Time*. The summary is also accurate, and, by my estimation, masterful. Bonhoeffer took the effort to write it and write it well; an exercise he did not perform with Kant, Hegel, Husserl, or Scheler. Heidegger then seems to be more than a "useful philosophical justification" for Bonhoeffer's intended solution, which, as this and chapter five will demonstrate, is not isolated to the conjoining of human action and reflection, and making Christian theology historically conscious. As we will see, Bonhoeffer integrated particularities of Heidegger's temporal presentation of Dasein into his theology in a sufficiently complex way to make Heidegger important beyond merely instrumental value.

Finally and still addressing the first objection, Heidegger's function and relation to past philosophical attempts at a solution to the problem is analogous to Bonhoeffer's relation to previous theological attempts. Bonhoeffer begins with a survey and evaluation of past philosophical attempts at a solution made by Kant, Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler. They all fail to solve the problem. Heidegger, however, does solve the problem, at least for philosophy. Bonhoeffer explains the purpose of this section as follows: "The critical idea that governs the discussion of Section A [the philosophical section] must be the possibility of applying the suggested solutions of the act-being-problem to Christian conceptions of God and revelation, from which everything else proceeds."[11] In Part B, he then moves on to theological attempts to solve the problem in relation to revelation. Again, he critiques a number of theologians, such as Barth and Holl, before offering his own solution. In terms of the overall structure of *Act and*

[11] DBWE 2: 30 (DBW 2: 25)

Being, Bonhoeffer holds the same position in relation to previously critiqued theologies as Heidegger does to the previously critiqued philosophical systems.[12]

That Heidegger is uniquely treated and holds a similar structural position to philosophy that Bonhoeffer does to theology indicates that Heidegger is more than an excuse for Bonhoeffer to deal with issues he is already interested in, which brings us to the second objection.

Regarding Zimmermann's second objection, he is quite right to say that central tendencies in *Act and Being* are already present in *Sanctorum Communio*. First, it is important to keep the chronological developments of *Sanctorum Communio* and *Act and Being* in mind. The initial form of *Sanctorum Communio* was written between late 1925 to mid-1927.[13] The final, extensively edited form was given to the publisher in March, 1930.[14] *Act and Being* was written in the summer and winter of 1929,[15] and much of the research obviously occurred prior to that. It is then probable that some of what Bonhoeffer learned in preparing for *Act and Being* was edited back into *Sanctorum Communio*.

More importantly, tendencies are not solutions, and by *Act and Being*'s standards *Sanctorum Communio* fails according to two general criteria. The first of these general criteria is the need to coordinate act and being. By *Act and Being*'s standards, *Sanctorum Communio* is overly act-oriented.[16] A central goal of *Sanctorum Communio* is to formulate a theologically acceptable concept of person, both as individual and as community. Bonhoeffer's concern with

---

[12] There is another similar conceptual and argumentative parallel. Just as Barth's understanding of God as subject is the theological analogue of Kant's transcendental subject, Bonhoeffer's understanding of the person of Jesus Christ is the theological analogue of Heidegger's Dasein, which is the guiding position of chapter five. See Clifford J. Green, "Forward," in *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation: Berlin, Barth, & Protestant Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), xii–xiii; DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 75.

[13] Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, 81.

[14] Ibid., 130.

[15] Ibid., 131.

[16] Both Green, DeJonge, and Bagetto make this same point; Green, *Bonhoeffer*, 33; DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 73–4; Bagetto, "The Exemplification of Decision in Dietrich Bonhoeffer," 199. According to Feil, Bonhoeffer also fails in *Sanctorum Communio* to escape idealism and make the church sufficiently historical; Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 63 and 65.

the concept of 'person' in *Sanctorum Communio* is primarily ethical. One of the conclusions that Bonhoeffer arrives at is that the person is only created in the moment (*Augenblick*) in which the person is ethically addressed.[17] Translated into *Act and Being* terminology, the *being* of a person only arises in the *act* of being ethically addressed. The discontinuous and discreet nature of act then translates into a discontinuous and discreet being of the person, which is quite apparent when Bonhoeffer says that "*the person ever and again arises and passes away in time* […] the person is re-created again and again in the perpetual flux of life."[18] By *Act and Being* standards *Sanctorum Communio* has failed at the criterion of continuity. By contrast, Heidegger is most successful in addressing the criterion of continuity.

The second general shift that occurs between *Sanctorum Communio* and *Act and Being* concerns the relation of epistemology and anthropology. According to *Act and Being*, modern philosophy's obsession with epistemology, which begins with René Descartes, is one, important reason philosophy has been unsuccessful at the problem of act and being.[19] This assertion is, in general, comparable to Heidegger's own position as presented in *Being and Time*. Heidegger says, for example,

> Historiologically, the aim of the existential analytic can be made plainer by considering Descartes, who is credited with providing the point of departure for modern philosophical inquiry by his discovery of the "*cogito sum.*" He investigates the "*cogitare*" of the "*ego,*" at least within certain limits. On the other hand, he leaves the "*sum*" completely undiscussed, even though it is regarded as no less primordial than the *cogito.* Our analytic raises the ontological question of the being of the "*sum.*" Not until the nature of this being has been determined can we grasp the kind of being which belongs to *cogitations.*[20]

[17] DBWE 1: 48 (DBW 1: 28).
[18] Ibid.; emphasis in the original.
[19] DBWE 2: 30 (DBW 2: 25). Heidegger forcefully makes this claim of neo-Kantianism; however, he does believe Kant himself is generally an exception to the modern obsession with epistemology; Peter E. Gordon, *Continental Divide: Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 33 and 138–9.
[20] SZ 24.

The last sentence is of particular note. In Bonhoeffer's terms, here Heidegger is essentially saying that we cannot undertake a theory of knowledge until the being of that which knows, Dasein, is understood; epistemology comes from anthropology. This may have been one aspect of *Being and Time* that predisposed Bonhoeffer to find it useful. This basic position, however, cannot have its origin in Heidegger; in *Sanctorum Communio* Bonhoeffer is already critical of modern philosophy's obsession with epistemology and locates the origin of that obsession with Descartes.[21]

There is an important shift, however, in that for *Act and Being* a theory of knowledge must be founded on a concrete anthropology. For the *Sanctorum Communio* Bonhoeffer, the fact that "the epistemological and the social spheres can differ so greatly in principle […] demonstrates that neither sphere can be reduced to the other."[22] By *Act and Being*, however, there is not this strict categorical division between the epistemological and the social or anthropological. "The theological concepts of object and knowledge are shown to be *determined*," so *Act and Being* Bonhoeffer states, "by the sociological concept of the person and must be recast accordingly."[23] Again, the origin of a mistaken or correct relation of act and being at the epistemological *level* (as opposed to *sphere*) is at the anthropological level. In the course of explaining and evaluating *Being and Time*, Bonhoeffer, borrowing from Heidegger, states that

> what is important for our inquiry here is the unconditional priority given to the question of being over that of thought. It had been the basic mistake of Descartes and all his followers that, in explicating the *cogito sum*, they neglected to put the question of being to the *sum*. But this question cannot be raised unless there '*is* something like an understanding of being'.[24]

[21] DBWE 1: 40 (DBW 1: 22).
[22] DBWE 1: 45 (DBW 1: 26).
[23] DBWE 2: 31 (DBW 2: 26).
[24] DBWE 2: 70 (DBW 2: 64) Karttunen also suggests that this relation between epistemology and anthropology may have been inspired by Heidegger. Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, 74–5.

Now, like Heidegger and citing him specifically, Bonhoeffer takes the position that to arrive at a proper theory of knowledge one must begin with an investigation into the kind of existence that can know and more particularly into the concrete way such an existence lives that gives rise to knowledge.

Sanctorum Communio, then, was overly act-oriented and improperly understood the relation of epistemology to anthropology. As I noted at the conclusion of chapter two, these are the same general flaws that previous philosophical systems suffered. In general, then, *Sanctorum Communio* needed correction much like other past attempts at solutions to the problem of act and being require correction. For philosophy, Heidegger provides that correction. Bonhoeffer, learning from the details of Heidegger's solution, will provide the same function for theology. With that we turn to exactly how and why anthropology comes first for Heidegger in *Being and Time.*

Anthropology and the Priority of Dasein

The priority that Heidegger gives to Dasein in *Being and Time* is dependent on the intended purpose of *Being and Time*. Because Heidegger's goal is somewhat different than the use to which Bonhoeffer puts *Being and Time*, it is important to understand Heidegger's goal. As Heidegger clearly states in the opening page of *Being and Time*: "Our aim in the following treatise is to work out the question of the meaning of *being* and to do so concretely."[25] What

[25] SZ 1; emphasis in the original. See also SZ 22 and 24-6.Tietz critiques Bonhoeffer for missing this central goal of *Being and Time*. Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 74 and 76. This is not quite right. Bonhoeffer does recognize that the central goal of *Being and Time* is to come to an understanding of the meaning of being; DBWE 2: 68 and 71 (DBW 2: 62 and 65). However, Bonhoeffer's goal is to mine Heidegger for an understanding of Dasein. This is one instance in which it is quite important to understand that Bonhoeffer is here operating at the anthropological level. Though the goal of *Being and Time* is to get to the meaning of being, it never does so. Rather, almost the entirety of *Being and Time* is devoted to an understanding of Dasein. It seems reasonable, therefore, for Bonhoeffer to focus on that which occupies the majority of the work. Concerning the capitalization of being, while I generally follow the MacQuarrie & Robinson translation, I have opted to not capitalize being. As Heidegger states, being is not itself an entity (SZ 4). Capitalizing "being" in English does seem

exactly Heidegger means by "being" and "the meaning of being" is itself contentious and complicated.[26] Looking ahead to §32 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger defines meaning as "*the 'upon-which' of a projection in terms of which something becomes intelligible as something*."[27] Leaving aside for now the technical component of "the 'upon-which' of a projection," we can say that meaning is what allows us to understand something as something. So Heidegger looking for the meaning of being is Heidegger asking how we can have an understanding of being at all. What Heidegger means by "being" is also contentious.[28] The central cause of this issue is that Heidegger never himself arrives at an answer to this question. In a generic sense I think it is safe to say that Heidegger is asking how we can understand, not simply a particular entity or category of entities, but how it is that we can understand the entity, Dasein, that has any understanding of what it is to be.[29] What allows me to understand all the various ways in which something may be, whether it is an everyday object such as a pencil, an abstract object such as a number, a 'non-existent' unicorn, past events, and myself?

This question of the meaning of being has what Heidegger calls an "ontological priority."[30] According to Heidegger, all sciences (*Wissenschaften*) are systematic attempts to come to know a particular region of being, such as biology's investigation of life, sociology's investigation of society, theology's investigation of the divine-human relationship, and so forth.

---

to give it the feel of being an entity. More particularly, it seems to give it the feel that it is the ultimate, sacred, or divine Being, which in *Being and Time* it is not.

[26] For an excellent analysis of Heidegger's "meaning of being" see Taylor Carmen, "The Question of Being," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time*, ed. Mark A. Wrathall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 84–99.

[27] SZ 151; emphasis in the original.

[28] For example, some argue that being is equivalent to intelligibility, meaning, or what allows us to understand entities as entities; Thomas Sheehan, "What If Heidegger Were a Phenomenologist?," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time*, ed. Mark A. Wrathall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 382–3. While others argue for a broader understanding of being; Richard Capobianco, "Reaffirming 'The Truth of Being,'" *Continental Philosophy Review* 47 (2014): 275–92.

[29] Richard Polt, *Heidegger: An Introduction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 24–5; William Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide* (New York: Continuum, 2006), 18–9.

[30] SZ 8-11.

They are most often enterprises examining the grounds for truth claims within their respective regions: What can we know about this particular animal? What can we know about God? And so forth. These epistemic methods and goals are based, however, on an often hidden, concealed, or assumed regional ontology arising from pre-scientific ways of experiencing and interpreting the world.[31] The sciences are based on assumed positions concerning the nature of 'what is' or entities (*Seiende*).[32] Biology, for example, assumes a position on what constitutes 'life' and therefore delimits its domain of inquiry. The academic study of religion assumes a particular pre-ontological understanding of what constitutes 'religion', 'ritual', and so forth. It is only based on these assumptions that a science can then ask epistemological questions concerning its subject (*Sache*) of inquiry. But because the sciences already assume much about the nature of what they study, there is a degree to which their epistemology is predetermined. It is then, at times, necessary for a science to question the nature of their fundamental concepts: What actually *is* life? What actually *is* religion? What *is* the sacred?[33]

According to Heidegger, for such regional ontologies to be truly clarified, it is not enough to ask about the being of particular entities or domains of entities; rather, one must ask about the meaning of being in general, or what he sometimes calls "fundamental ontology."[34] For Heidegger, this means not simply asking about the nature of this particular entity or region of

[31] SZ 9. Martin Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeil, trans. James G. Hart and John C. Maraldo (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 50.
[32] Charles Guignon, *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983), 58 and 64. It is important, here, to keep in mind that Heidegger uses the term entity (*Seiend*) in its broadest possible meaning. It refers to anything that we might say exists in any way. The most obvious concrete examples would be everyday objects, such as a chair. But it also includes abstract entities, such as religion or things that we would not customarily attribute existence to, such as Sherlock Holmes or unicorns.
[33] SZ 9-10.
[34] What exactly Heidegger means by "fundamental ontology" is unclear and therefore, within certain parameters, contentious. At times it seems to mean asking about the meaning of being in general (SZ 19, 26, 183, 196, 213, 403, 406, and 436). Sometimes it appears to mean the more specific existential analysis of Dasein (SZ 13, 14, 55, 131, 232, and 268). And at other times it seems to mean getting to the meaning of being in general through the existential analysis of Dasein (SZ 13, 182, 194, 200, 213, 314, and 316).

entities, such that we can then know something about those entities; rather, one asks how any entity whatsoever can appear and therefore how any understanding of such entities is at all possible. The question is then "What is the meaning of being in general?" The relational dependence of these kinds or levels of inquiry can then be encapsulated as follows: The epistemology of a particular science is dependent on its particular pre-ontological assumptions. These regional ontologies are in turn dependent on fundamental ontology.

How does one get to a fundamental ontology or the meaning of being in general? As Heidegger says, "Being is always the being of an entity,"[35] yet being is not itself an entity.[36] This means, first, that one cannot investigate being as if it were a chair, a number, or even God. One cannot get directly to being. But one does have to go *through* a particular entity to get to being. Presumably, one could go through just about any entity, but Heidegger has in mind a particular entity with characteristics already well-suited to the task; that entity is Dasein.

When asking about the meaning of being, Dasein has particular, salient features that give it priority over other entities.[37] First, according to Heidegger, Dasein has an ontic priority.[38] Dasein is unique among all other entities for the fact that "being is an *issue* for it."[39] In other words, Dasein cares about being. Because Dasein cares about being, it has always already, even if only implicitly, asked and answered the question of the meaning of being. Acting in the world, understanding and interpreting phenomena in the world, and so forth, are predicated on Dasein already understanding being in general.

---

[35] SZ 9.
[36] SZ 4.
[37] SZ 13-14; DBWE 2: 68 (DBW 2: 62).
[38] By "ontic" or "ontical" Heidegger means anything having to do with particular entities. Sciences, for example, are ontic because they are concerned with particular entities, as opposed to true or fundamental ontology which is concerned with being in general.
[39] SZ 13-14; DBWE 2: 68 (DBW 2: 62).

This leads to the second aspect of Dasein's priority, the ontological priority. Because Dasein always takes a stance on being, it is already (pre-)ontological. There is a real sense in which for Heidegger we already know what being is. The answer is already hidden 'within' Dasein; we need only expose and clarify it.

Particularly important for Bonhoeffer's reading of Heidegger, is that the ontic and ontological priorities of Dasein combine to form the third priority that Heidegger calls Dasein's "ontico-ontological" priority.[40] Here, Dasein is the "condition for the possibility of any ontologies."[41] The particular regional ontologies of the various sciences arise from Dasein's pre-scientific engagement in the world. To clarify those ontologies one must first clarify Dasein itself and its fundamental ontology. If a theory of knowledge is based on ontology and ontology is based on Dasein, then epistemology is based on Dasein. Or, in Bonhoeffer's words, the meaning of epistemology is anthropology.[42] Therefore, we must first ask about Dasein.

There are two general questions one may ask of Dasein. One may inappropriately ask "*What* is Dasein?" or one may ask the true question, "*Who* or *how* is Dasein?"[43] The former question presupposes that Dasein is something that is, in Heidegger's terms, present-at-hand (v*orhanden*).[44] Essentially this means that Dasein is seen as one entity or thing among other entities or things. As Heidegger says in the *History of the Concept of Time*, a testing ground for many of *Being and Time*'s concepts,

---

[40] SZ 14.
[41] SZ 13.
[42] At this point it seems important to address the problem of saying that Heidegger is working at the *anthropological* level. Heidegger does distinguish his analytic of Dasein from anthropological, psychological, and biological understandings of "what man is" (SZ 45-6). Here Heidegger is rejecting the use of a particular science with its presupposed ontology of what constitutes human existence. By 'anthropology' Bonhoeffer does not mean the particular science, but merely the asking of the question of human existence or Dasein. Of course, he is working from theology, an ontic science by Heidegger's definition, and therefore this problem may return in another guise. This will be dealt with in chapter six.
[43] This distinction will become particularly important in Bonhoeffer's "Lectures on Christology" where he will reject "what" questions in relation to Christ in favor of "who" questions.
[44] SZ 114-15.

> This designation 'Dasein' for the distinctive entity so named does not signify a *what.* This entity is not distinguished by its what, like a chair in contrast to a house. Rather, this designation in its own way expresses *the way to be.* It is a very specific expression of being which is here chosen for an entity, whereas at first we [normally] always name an entity in terms of its what-content and leave its specific being undetermined, because we hold it to be self-evident.[45]

The most common way to see Dasein as a 'what' is to, as Descartes does, treat Dasein as a subject.[46] Heidegger prefers to investigate Dasein as a "way to be." Heidegger wants to know how Dasein exists by investigating it as a process.

There are a number of problems with the assumption that Dasein is essentially just a subject. First and foremost, such an assumption does not address the more fundamental question of how a subject may *be* at all, or as the above quotation states, it "leaves its specific being undetermined." Second, by unreflectively assuming a subject amidst objects we run into the epistemological problems that, according to Bonhoeffer, previous philosophers have tackled yet failed to resolve. This subject/object division creates an assumed internal/external division. There is a subject 'in here' and there are objects 'out there'. A host of chimerical questions then arise: "For only then can the problem arise of how this knowing subject comes out of its inner 'sphere' into one which is 'other and external', of how knowing can have any object at all, and of how one must think of the object itself so that eventually the subject knows it without needing to venture a leap into another sphere."[47] Essentially, this assumption gives rise to the epistemological problem of act and being; how can we understand and account for the relation of the knowing act of the subject and the being of the object of knowledge when they seem to belong to two distinct spheres? Third, assuming Dasein to be a subject assumes Dasein to be a

[45] Martin Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, trans. Theodore Kisiel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 153 emphasis in the original; see also Guignon, *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge*, 44.
[46] SZ 46, 60, and 114-15. Bonhoeffer says much the same thing; DBWE 10: 390: (DBW 10: 358).
[47] SZ 60.

static substance. This is a failure many, such as Scheler,[48] made and is contrary to both Heidegger's and Bonhoeffer's assumption that human existence be related in some important way to historicity and temporality. Finally, there is nothing, for lack of a better word, 'personal' about assuming Dasein to be a subject. Dasein as subject is contrary to or cannot account for the seemingly obvious fact that there is me and there are others. It would seem that one subject is just like another subject. But as Heidegger defines an essential aspect of Dasein, it is in each case mine; I have existence; I have a life to live.

The more appropriate question to pose is "How is Dasein?" or "What is the way or manner of Dasein's existence?" With a new orientation in the investigation of Dasein and a new route to get to the 'how' of Dasein we arrive at Heidegger's success at the criterion of concreteness.

Average Everydayness and Concreteness

As we saw with previous philosophical attempts to solve the problem of act and being, particularly in Hegel, Husserl, and Scheler, they failed to account for human existence or Dasein as it is actually lived. Hegel could only bring act and being together my creating "a philosophy of angels."[49] Though by focusing on ethics and philosophy of religion Scheler was concerned with concrete questions, his 'Dasein' was not concrete and neither were his answers. And Husserl intentionally foreclosed or bracketed questions about actual concrete human existence through his method of phenomenological reduction. Bonhoeffer diagnoses pre-Heideggerian phenomenology as follows:

> Phenomenology since Husserl has itself done violence to a problem, the clarification of which would have been indispensable for its very presuppositions: the problem of being itself. Not until the arbitrarily bracketed existence, or 'reality', is put on a new

[48] DBWE 10: 392-3 (DBW 10: 361-2).
[49] DBWE 2: 42 (DBW 2: 35).

> ontological foundation can we expect a clarification of the problem of act and being, which neither Husserl nor Scheler offers.[50]

Fortunately, "precisely where Husserl 'brackets', Heidegger discloses being itself."[51]

In "securing the kind of access which will lead to Dasein" Dasein must, as Heidegger puts it, "be shown as it is *proximally and for the most part*—in its average *everydayness* [*durchschnittlichen* Alltäglichkeit]."[52] Nearly four hundred pages later Heidegger is kind enough to explain what he means by the expressions "proximally and for the most part" and "everydayness." For example: "[W]hat we have primarily in mind in the expression 'everydayness' is a definite '*how*' of existence by which Dasein is dominated through and through 'for life'."[53] Essentially, these expressions mean the way in which most of us go about living most of our lives. We must examine Dasein, at least initially, not at those exceptional moments, but at those times that are most common. Reflection is one of these exceptional moments. Those moments when we reflect on ourselves, others, and the things around us are not, according to Heidegger, our usual way of living in the world. Most of our time is not spent reflecting on what it means to be a parent, what it means to be responsible to others, or on how we actually us a pencil. Most of our time is spent simply doing such things. This dominant manner, 'doing', or 'how' of existence should be the initial starting point of getting to the essential existential structures of Dasein.

This method itself has something like two 'moments' relating to two levels of inquiry into the being of Dasein, the existentiell and the existential.[54] Existentiell relates to actual ways

[50] DBWE 2: 67 (DBW 2: 61).
[51] DBWE 2: 67 (DBW 2: 62).
[52] SZ 16; emphasis in the original.
[53] SZ 370-1.
[54] Though the English translation of *Akt und Sein* does not consistently distinguish between "existentiell" and "existential," this is an important distinction that Bonhoeffer appropriates in his own theology and therefore will recur in chapter five.

in which a particular Dasein lives. If a particular Dasein is a parent or a nurse, those are existentiell characteristics of a particular Dasein. Examples of investigations at this level would include anthropological, sociological, psychological, and so forth, examinations of particular religious practices, particular social roles, and so forth. The existential level relates to the general structures of Dasein that make any existentiell way of existing possible. The existential structure of understanding (*Verstehen*), for example, allows for the particular possibility of understanding one's future goals as a parent or nurse. Heidegger's intermediate goal, on the way to finding the meaning of being, is to elucidate such general existential structures of Dasein that make meaning or intelligibility and any particular existentiell way of existing possible.

What is particularly important at this point is Heidegger's assertion that to get to the existential structures of Dasein one must first go through particular, existentiell ways of existing.[55] These two levels never, in fact, exist separately. Particular existential structures are always enacted in a particular existentiell way. And particular existentiell ways of existing are always formed by existential structures. So we only ever encounter existential structures as they manifest in particular existentiell ways.

The means of going through the existentiell to get to the existential involves two related approaches: the hermeneutics of facticity and the method of formal indication. The hermeneutics of facticity is essentially human existence interpreting itself or the ways in which it actually lives. Heidegger uses "facticity" (*Faktizität*) as a designation to mean the ways in which we actually live or, more technically, Dasein's "*temporally particular 'there'*, its being *'there' for a while*."[56] This is in contrast to "factuality" (*Tätsachlichkeit*) that is concerned with the

[55] SZ 313.
[56] Martin Heidegger, *Ontology-The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, trans. John van Buren (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 24; emphasis in the original.

"properties" of a human being such as height and weight.[57] Factuality is concerned with what Dasein is, and facticity is concerned with how Dasein is.

Both 'hermeneutics' and 'facticity' highlight, again, that the study of human existence or Dasein is not concerned with the objective or scientific investigation into objects with properties. Dasein is not like such entities. First, interpretation is an essential possibility of Dasein itself. Second, coming to understand Dasein is itself an activity of Dasein that, therefore, also involves interpretation. The hermeneutics of facticity is facticity interpreting itself.[58] Even the practice Heidegger is engaged in, i.e. the attempt to get to the existential structures of Dasein, is existentiell.

> But the roots of the existential analytic [of Dasein], on its part, are ultimately *existentiell*, that is, *ontical*. Only if the inquiry of philosophical research is itself seized upon in an existentiell manner as a possibility of the being of each existing Dasein, does it become at all possible to disclose the existentiality of existence and to undertake an adequately founded ontological problematic.[59]

This only makes the interdependence of the existentiell and existential that much more complicated. This and the fact that facticity, or the ways in which we actually live, is not itself the object of study, but only a first stage requires Heidegger to find a special method to disentangle them, clear away particular existentiell ways of existing, and get down to the fundamental existential structures of Dasein.[60]

---

[57] SZ 55-6 and 135; Martin Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, trans. Matthias Fritsch and Jennifer Anna Gosetti-Ferencei (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 7; Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*, 45–6; István Fehér, "Phenomenology, Hermeneutics, Lebensphilosophie: Heidegger's Confrontation with Husserl, Dilthey, and Jaspers," in *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in His Earliest Thought*, ed. John van Buren and Theodore Kisiel (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994), 83–4.
[58] GA 63: 14.
[59] SZ 13-14.
[60] Heidegger, *Ontology-The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, 12 and 15.

The method by which Heidegger clears away the particular existentiell ways of existing in order to get to the existential structures is the method of formal indication (*formale Anzeige*).[61] Some of the details of the method are not important for our concerns, and perhaps best explained through the examples to follow. For now it is important to note that Heidegger's method of formal indication is an attempt to get below what Bonhoeffer understands as the epistemological understanding of act and being and the problems that arise from some of the common assumptions presented in the previous chapter, particularly in their Husserlian form.

Formal indication is predicated on transforming Husserl's *noesis-noema* structure. In order to do justice to the importance of facticity, which Husserl intentionally bracketed, Heidegger adds a third aspect to intentionality. Heidegger identifies three moments of intentionality: the 'what' or content-sense (*Gehaltssinn*), which corresponds to Husserl's *noema*; the 'how' or relational-sense (*Bezugssinn*), which corresponds to *noesis*; and the enactment-sense (*Volzugssinn*), the additional, third aspect of intentionality.[62] The content-sense or 'what' is determined by the relational-sense or 'how' of the intentional act. In Bonhoeffer's terms, the intentional act is determinative of the being of the object intended. However, the enactment-sense is determinative of both the content- and relational-senses. The enactment-sense is the

[61] "Formal indication," in various grammatical forms, appears fairly often in *Being and Time* (for example see, SZ 114, 116-17, 313, and 315); though the standard translations sometimes obscure this. In fact, in *Being and Time* Heidegger never explicates the concept; though in hindsight he assures us that it is important for *Being and Time*; Theodore Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 19. The sheer number of times Kisiel uses "formal indication" in his *Genesis of Heidegger's* Being and Time is an indication of how important he believes the method to be. The only place where Heidegger does attempt to provide an explicit account of this method is in his 1919-20 Winter semester course "An Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion." Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 42–5. For interpretations of this method see Brian Gregor, "Formal Indication, Philosophy, and Theology: Bonhoeffer's Critique of Heidegger," *Faith and Philosophy* 24, no. 2 (April 2007): 185–202; SJ McGrath, "Formal Indication, Irony, and the Risk of Saying Nothing," in *A Companion to Heidegger's Phenomenology of Religious Life*, ed. SJ McGrath and Andrzej Wiercinski (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), 179–205.

[62] Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 43; McGrath, "Formal Indication, Irony, and the Risk of Saying Nothing," 181.

historical existence of Dasein. That is, Dasein's historical existence is prior and gives rise to the act of the subject and the being of the object.[63]

Though I will use the fundamental structures of attunement (*Befindlichkeit*) and understanding (*Verstehen*) as extended examples below, a brief example may help at this point. If I am Husserl attempting to uncover the structures of consciousness, I may be sitting and staring at a coffee mug. The coffee mug would be the content of the intention. In staring at the coffee mug in such a way, I would be taking a theoretical stance in relation to the mug. This would be the relational sense of the intention. What Husserl misses, according to Heidegger (and Bonhoeffer), is that these are imbedded and enacted in an actual context. Change the context or enactment and the content and relation change as well. So far the situation is a scientific or objective one. If my situation changes to writing this particular work, then my relation to the coffee mug changes. I am no longer relating to it in some theoretical way; I am relating to it as a piece of paraphernalia in my practice of writing. Then the content changes as well. It is no longer an object with determinate properties; it is a thing used for drinking.[64] The enactment makes all the difference, and it is to the enactment that we should get.

Here Heidegger has undercut the Husserlian form of the act-being divide by advocating, with his hermeneutics of facticity, that we turn to the way life is actually lived, which Husserl explicitly brackets, and by arguing for a deeper structure of intentionality that is prior to Husserl's and is importantly based on actual historical existence.

[63] Heidegger later adds the "temporalizing-sense" (GA 58: 260-1; GA 61: 52-3); though it is already present in a nascent form in his lectures on the phenomenology of religion; Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 44.

[64] This, in fact, corresponds to and grounds Heidegger's distinction between the present-at-hand (*vorhanden*) and ready-to-hand (*zuhanden*).

Furthering the Husserlian scandal, Heidegger proposes his own form of bracketing, which involves bracketing or "holding in abeyance" precisely what Husserl was seeking.[65] If the historical existence of Dasein is prior to the way in which the subject understands the object, then we should seek to understand that existence. Focusing on either content or relation misses the deeper structures that give rise to both. We should try to get past the content- and relational-senses to the enactment sense. Formal indication then requires that we suspend the content-sense and the relational-sense in order to allow the enactment sense to come to the fore.

Here, from Bonhoeffer's perspective, Heidegger has satisfied, for philosophy,[66] the elusive criterion of concreteness.[67] Heidegger's method focuses neither on the object nor on the subject extracted from the historical and situational context, but rather precisely focuses on the historical as the context within which the object, subject, and their interaction occur. According to Bonhoeffer, neither Kant, Hegel, Husserl, nor Scheler worked out of the actual living of historical life as Heidegger does.

It is also important to note that this method is pervasive throughout *Being and Time*. Heidegger will often begin with everyday understandings of concepts, activities, and so forth, then dig deeper to the existential structures using formal indication. It is important to present and explain each relevant instance of Heidegger's use of formal indication. Most interpretive problems arise when one does not understand the particular instance of Heidegger's use of this method.

---

[65] Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 43–4.

[66] The phrase "for philosophy" is important. As I have tried to stress throughout this work, Bonhoeffer sets different standards for philosophy and theology. As we will see in the next chapter Heidegger is still not concrete enough by the standards of proper theology; yet Heidegger has gone as far as one can legitimately expect philosophy to go in satisfying the criterion of concreteness from Bonhoeffer's perspective. This is no small victory; for Bonhoeffer will, as chapter five will demonstrate, transmute this philosophical success into a theological one.

[67] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 301.

To help illustrate how Heidegger's method works and to further substantiate its meeting the criterion of concreteness I will provide two examples: (1) How Heidegger moves from tuning (*Stimmung*) to the deeper existential structure of attunement (*Befindlichkeit*),[68] and (2) how Heidegger works from particular possibilities down to the existential structure of understanding (*Verstehen*). Both of these examples will reappear in the next section when these structures are joined in such a way that they fulfill the criterion of continuity.

Tunings, for Heidegger, are particular existentiell ways of being-in-the-world. And we always find ourselves in some tuning or other, whether it is "undisturbed equanimity," "inhibited ill-humour," "a pallid […] lack of [tuning]," "elation," "fear" and so forth.[69] Heidegger warns us, however, not to think of tunings as we ordinarily would: "Having a [tuning] is not related to the psychical in the first instance, and is not itself an inner condition which then reaches forth in an enigmatical way and puts its mark on Things and persons."[70] That is, to translate back into Bonhoeffer's terms, tunings are not simply acts of a subject that impose themselves on the being of an independent object. Rather tunings open up a world such that a subject can direct itself in some particular way towards an object. Tunings reveal, simultaneously, the subject, objects, and the relations between them in a particular way.[71]

Heidegger uses the particular tuning of fear to illustrate three important elements of tunings in general. There are (1) that in the face of which we fear, (2) fearing, and (3) that about

---

[68] MacQuarrie and Robinson translate *Befindlichkeit* as "state-of-mind"; however, Heidegger intentionally avoids using words like "mind" since they often carry presuppositions that would overly determine a particular understanding of human existence. I find Polt's alternative translation "attunement" to be the more accurate and economic choice; Polt, *Heidegger*, 64–5. Though *Stimmung* is generally translated as mood, and this is the everyday German meaning of the word, I have also chosen to translate it as "tuning." First, mood has an overly subjective connotation that Heidegger explicitly wishes to avoid. Second, its linguistic relation to the word "attunement" in English more closely parallels the relation Heidegger intends between *Stimmung* and *Befindlichkeit*.

[69] SZ 134.

[70] SZ 136.

[71] Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, trans. William McNeil and Nicholas Walker (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 66–7.

which we fear.[72] "That in the face of which we fear" corresponds to some entity in the world.[73] "That about which we fear" is Dasein itself. We find our existence threatened in some way, whether in the form of loss of life, property, respect, and so forth. And we can fear about our existence because our existence is an issue for us.[74] The relational "fearing as such" allows us to see our existence, in some way or another, to be feared for in the face of some fearsome, threatening entity.

It is important that all three of these elements are mutually determinative and simultaneous. The tuning lies in the context, not in any definite property a subject or object might have. A tiger may or may not be that in the face of which we fear. The situation of a zoo or a jungle conditions the possibility of fearing a tiger differently. It would be a mistake to locate fear in the tiger or object itself. This also means that fear does not merely arise in a subjective vacuum. It is just as problematic to understand tuning as a merely subjective condition. Fear arises in a complex arrangement of relations in which, because of the situation, another entity may appear threatening to us. Both ourselves and phenomena around us simultaneously appear in certain ways because of tunings.[75]

To stop here, however, would be to mistakenly stop at the content- and relational-senses. As Heidegger warns, "Phenomenally, we would wholly fail to recognize both *what* tuning discloses and *how* it discloses, if that which is disclosed were to be compared with what Dasein

[72] SZ 140
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid, 140-1.
[75] Heidegger's analysis of fear is, in fact, much more complicated and nuanced than I have presented it here. Fear itself can be modified in various ways; SZ 142. And Heidegger distinguishes between fear (*Furcht*), which is perhaps closer to our understanding of the emotion of fear, and being fearful (*furchtsam*), which is something like the tuning that allows the emotion of fear to arise; SZ 141. A detailed analysis of this is beyond the purview of the present discussion, but for an excellent analysis of this point see Matthew Ratcliffe, "Why Mood Matters," in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time*, ed. Mark A. Wrathall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 163–4.

is acquainted with, knows, and believes 'at the same time' when it has such a tuning."[76] If we stopped here the risk would be two-fold. There is the risk of overly identifying a particular tuning with one of its constituent and interdependent elements, and we cannot truly understand tuning as such and its elements if we do not ask "How is tuning in general even possible?" We must find that existential structure, attunement, that lies beneath any particular existentiell tuning.

If we remove the particular content and relation of the tuning of fear we get many of the characteristics of the existential structure of attunement. Attunement is that general existential structure that allows for any particular tuning. As noted earlier, in actually living, existential structures are always actualized by particular existentiell ways of living. Fear, love, indifference, and so forth are particular ways of being attuned. They are, therefore, particular iterations of what attunement in general does or allows for. Fear allows us to see entities in the world as fearsome. Those particular entities then matter to us as threatening. The first characteristic of attunement is that it allows phenomena to appear to us as mattering at all.[77]

As we saw, fear allows entities to matter as threatening, but being threatening is not a property held by an isolated object; it is dependent on the situation in which the subject and object relate to one another. The fear reveals the entire situation as threatening. Attunement, as that which allows for any particular mattering, then also allows for *situations in general* to matter. As allowing me to be attuned in general to myself, surrounding phenomena, and my relations to them, attunement therefore discloses or opens up "being-in-the-world as a whole,"[78] which constitutes attunement's second characteristic. As the translators note, *Befindlichkeit* is related to the everyday German question "*Wie befinden Sie sich*?" meaning "How do you find

[76] SZ 135-6; emphasis in the original.
[77] This is also a role played by the structure of understanding to be elucidated shortly.
[78] SZ 137

yourself?" or "How is it going?"[79] The structure of attunement is what allows you to answer this question at all.

This then leads to the third characteristic of attunement. How do you find yourself? You find yourself thrown into a world. Attunement reveals one's "thrownness" (*Geworfenheit*).[80] That is, attunement reveals that you are always faced with what you have already been. You always carry your past with you in the present in such a way that it determines the way in which the world appears to you. Thrownness will become particularly important in the next section as one element that maintains the continuity of Dasein. For now we may say that thrownness corresponds to the past; though, as we will see with Heidegger's understanding of temporality later in the chapter, past is not understood in its the usual everyday sense.

Parallel to the tunings/attunement structure is the possibility/understanding structure. Unfortunately, Heidegger is not as 'concrete' here. It is not difficult, however, to see the concrete behind the theory and fill it in for him. It is not simply our tunings arising from attunement that reveal entities as mattering in certain ways, possibilities do so as well. In any situation Dasein is always presented with a range of possibilities, or abilities for Dasein to be something (*Seinkönnen*).[81] Given a particular Dasein's thrownness, it may have various open and salient possibilities. Dasein could be a mother, instructor, meditation-enthusiast, and so forth.[82] Based on which particular existentiell possibility we understand ourselves according to at any particular time, different entities and other Daseins in the world will meaningfully appear in different ways.

---

[79] BT 172n2

[80] SZ 136

[81] SZ 143-4. It is important to note, as Heidegger does, that "possibility, as an *existentiale*, does not signify a free-floating potentiality-for-being in the sense of the 'liberty of indifference'. In every case Dasein, as essentially having an attunement, has already got itself into definite possibilities" (SZ 144). That is, as I will discuss shortly, possibility does not mean "anything goes."

[82] It does not seem necessary to restrict possibilities to social roles. Just as one example, it would seem that virtues and vices could also be possibilities. Dasein, I would think, could also understand itself and its interactions with entities around itself according to its ability to be loyal, honest, obsequious, and so forth. Social roles happen to be one of the more often provided and easily understood instantiations of possibilities; Polt, *Heidegger*, 69.

Students in a classroom, understanding themselves according to the possibility of being students, also understand other entities in the classroom in a particular way. A fire marshal, existing from the possibility of being a fire marshal, will see this same 'objective' environment differently. Students may see the white board as a designated space meant for conveying important information. The fire marshal may see the same white board as an object required to be a certain distance from the ceiling. The students may see one another as similar Daseins engaged in realizing a common possibility. A fire marshal may see the students as things to be counted and compared to the maximum seating capacity of a room. How particular entities appear depends on the particular existentiell possibility one is engaged in. Particular existentiell possibilities are dependent on Dasein's existential structure of possibility in general.

Particular possibilities and the existential structure of possibility are then dependent on understanding (*Verstehen*). Understanding is the fundamental existential structure, equiprimordial with attunement, that allows Dasein to pick up or choose a possibility and incorporate entities into the chosen possibility. Again, however, we must work down past the content and relation of any particular possibility to the general structure of understanding. Possibilities, like tunings, reveal entities as mattering in certain ways. Here, however, the mattering is oriented in relation to a futural ability to be something as opposed to a situation into which one is thrown. Understanding is the general existential structure that allows Dasein to be futurally oriented toward any possibility whatsoever. Its first characteristic, like attunement's, is to allow Dasein to grasp anything as mattering because it matters to a particular possibility.[83]

Understanding's second characteristic is to also reveal being-in-the-world. Particular possibilities reveal situations in determinate ways as in the above contrasting examples of the students and the fire marshal. Understanding is that which allows for a particular possibility and

[83] SZ 144-5.

is therefore that which allows for all situations and, hence, being-in-the-world to appear at all. At this point it is also important to note that entities that appear within a situation according to a possibility also determine that possibility. This is structurally similar to the way in which the relations within a situation were as determinative of a tuning as the tuning was of the way in which particular entities appeared. We require desks, chairs, pens, and so forth to make up the particular possibility of being a student as we understand it. As the equipment associated with the possibility change, so too does the possibility.[84]

Finally, just as attunement was essentially thrownness, understanding is essentially projection. Understanding reveals that, not only do we find ourselves always in a world in a particular way, but we are always already projecting ourselves into the future.[85] We understand ourselves, others, and the entities around us because we are pressing, extending, or projecting ourselves into the possibilities we have taken up. We understand a dry erase marker because it is "in-order-to" (*um-zu*) write on a whiteboard.[86] This then refers to or is "towards-which" (*Wozu*) the work of lecturing.[87] And all of this is for the sake of (*Worumwillen*) the possibility of being an instructor or student. We understand the intermediate steps because we are constantly projecting ourselves into various, particular possibilities.

These examples of attunement and understanding have hopefully clarified the concrete method with which Heidegger is working.[88] Heidegger wants to draw on particular everyday ways we live in the world and from there delve deeper into the structures of human existence that

[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid., 145.
[86] Ibid., 68.
[87] Ibid., 70.
[88] Readers familiar with *Being and Time* will have noticed that some important existentiale have been left out, discourse (*Rede*) being the most prominent. Here again, the content of my presentation of Heidegger is framed primarily by what is needed to understand Bonhoeffer's own presentation and use of Heidegger. Bonhoeffer has nothing to say concerning discourse; therefore, it is not immediately necessary for understanding Bonhoeffer on Heidegger.

make those possibilities possible. Concreteness is also maintained at this apparently abstract level if one always bears in mind that Heidegger's separating of the existentiell and existential is an analytic enterprise. He divides them primarily for conceptual clarity and analysis. In actual life they never exist apart.

The structures of attunement and understanding will also guide us in the next section when we turn to how Heidegger fulfills, again for philosophy, the criterion of continuity. Though a number of elements of Heidegger's existential analytic of Dasein, such as his *Vorhanden*/*Zuhanden* distinction, could have been chosen to illustrate Heidegger's concern with concreteness, attunement and understanding will be joined into the unitary structure of thrown-projection, the most salient feature of Dasein that maintains its continuity, to which we now turn.

Thrown-Projection and Continuity

According to Bonhoeffer, Heidegger is successful at meeting the criterion of continuity, and though Heidegger is not alone in meeting this criterion, the way in which he does so is unique among the philosophical options Bonhoeffer has evaluated. As we saw in the last chapter, both Hegel and Scheler were able to meet the criterion of continuity. They were only able to do so, however, at the expense of concreteness. Heidegger, in contrast, has met the criterion of concreteness. We should, therefore, expect Heidegger's solution for continuity to be importantly different from Hegel's and Scheler's. Kant was also concerned with the problem of continuity. It seemed empirically obvious that there just was epistemic and anthropological continuity; yet when we attempt to find and disclose the source of the continuity we cannot find it. Rather it must simply be assumed as the transcendental ego. Kant's inability to find the source of continuity arises from his overly act-oriented philosophy. For Heidegger to meet the criterion of

continuity, he must maintain the concreteness already established, be able to actually find the source of continuity, and coordinate act and being.

Before elucidating the existential structure Bonhoeffer identifies as Heidegger's solution to the problem of continuity,[89] i.e. the structure of thrown-projection, we must first take a step back and summarize the important points concerning the being of Dasein that Heidegger provides prior to the structure of thrown-projection. This is necessary in order to better understand thrown-projection because much of what Heidegger covers prior to thrown-projection will return later; and much of what precedes thrown-projection also helps Heidegger to fulfill the criterion of continuity, though Bonhoeffer does not explicitly appeal to them.

To the basic question "'What' is Dasein?", so important to Bonhoeffer, Heidegger initially answers "being-in-the-world."[90] Being-in-the-world is a unitary phenomenon that, for the sake of exposition and explanation, may be divided into three component structures. In order of Heidegger's exposition, these component structures are 'in-the-world', the entity or 'who' of being-in-the-world, and 'being-in'.

The goal of Heidegger's investigation into the structure of 'in-the-world' is to get to worldhood as such, or what makes it possible for us to have a world at all.[91] To elucidate this goal, Heidegger distinguishes between four meanings of "world." First, there is the perhaps common definition of world as the total collection of stuff or entities. Working with this definition, if one asked "What is the world?" one could presumably answer with an exhaustive

[89] Later Bonhoeffer does say, "The question of continuity makes it clear that Heidegger's concept of existence is of no use for the elucidation of being in faith"; DBWE 2: 98 (DBW 2: 93). It is important, however, to understand the context of this statement. It occurs in the context of Bonhoeffer grappling with the problem of previous attempts to bring the new existence or creation into continuity with the old or sinful existence. Heidegger is not immediately useful to this *theological* question because Heidegger locates the source of continuity within Dasein. For Bonhoeffer, an answer to this theological question will have to locate the source of continuity in Christ and the church.
[90] SZ 53.
[91] SZ 64.

inventory of all the particular entities that exist. This understanding of world is furthest from Heidegger's interest. Second, 'world' may be a regional ontological term. It may mean the 'space' that makes it possible to identify particular entities as belonging to particular categories. A scholar of religion may have a 'religious' world by this definition. To have such a world means that the scholar participates in a 'space' of meaning that allows certain entities to show up as 'religious'. Third, 'world' may mean that 'space' in which we live. Here the world is not a collection of things, nor is it a regional, ontological 'space' of meaning that allows certain entities to show up as those entities. Rather this world is the everyday ontic 'space' of meaning in which we engage in actual everyday activities. When Heidegger uses this definition of world, he generally talks about one's "environment" (*Umwelt*), various immediate and surrounding contexts of meanings and entities with which we most often deal. Fourth and finally, is 'world' understood as worldhood (*Weltlichkeit*), the explication of which is Heidegger's true goal in analyzing the structure of 'in-the-world'. It is the existential structure of Dasein that makes possible all the previous meanings of world.

To get to worldhood, Heidegger goes through the types of environments with which we are most concerned, i.e. Heidegger goes through the third understanding of 'world' to get to worldhood. This involves the average everyday ways we interact with equipment (*Zeug*). I will take a classroom and its equipment as a particular example. If we wanted to talk about and examine the entities within a classroom, one approach would be to look at each entity separately and examine its objective properties. We might look at a dry erase marker and examine its mass, volume, color, and so forth. This would entail seeing the dry erase marker as, what Heidegger calls, a present-at-hand (*vorhanden*) entity. According to Heidegger, this is not how we generally understand equipment within an environment. Nor would such an approach help us to

understand the meaning of the environment of the classroom. Generally, in our average everyday dealings with entities, we encounter them as ready-to-hand (*zuhanden*). That is, we generally encounter and understand entities in using them. I understand the dry erase marker as something I can use.[92] Further, I understand it as useful to some purpose, as 'something in-order-to' (*etwas zu-um*).[93] I find it useful for writing on a whiteboard. The dry erase marker is now tied to another ready-to-hand entity, the whiteboard. This in turn is tied to the desks, which should be appropriately positioned facing the whiteboard. And we can continue to expand these relations to include the doors, clock, overhead projector, and so forth. We see, then, that the classroom is a totality of equipment in which all the ready-to-hand entities refer to one another. The equipment is joined together into a totality by a "towards-which."[94] That is, the ready-to-hand entities in the classroom environment have a shared master purpose to which they contribute. In the case of a classroom, the equipment collectively aims towards learning and teaching. The environment and that which is 'in' it, is then organized according to a common purpose. This common purpose organizes the environment into a relational totality of significance. The reason I can use and understand a dry erase marker is because I understand its particular 'place' in this relational

[92] Here, it is perhaps important to note and remember Heidegger's earlier warning: "If our purpose is to make such an anthropology possible, or to lay its ontological foundations, our Interpretation will provide only some of the 'pieces', even though they are by no means inessential ones. Our analysis of Dasein, however, is not only incomplete; it is also, in the first instance, *provisional*" (SZ 17). Heidegger's purpose is to get to the meaning of being by way of an existential analysis of Dasein. He will only disclose those existential structures that he believes are necessary for getting an answer to his question. This is an instance of an incomplete analysis of Dasein. Heidegger does not mean to say that Dasein always only encounters average objects and only deals with them according to some use. This is just a convenient route to get to worldhood. Looking back at *Being and Time* in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (1929-30) Heidegger says, "It never occurred to me, however, to try and claim or prove with this interpretation that the essence of man consists in the fact that he knows how to handle knives and forks or use the tram"; Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, 177.
[93] SZ 68.
[94] SZ 70.

totality. This is essentially what an environment is for Heidegger. It is a particular, ontic collection of relations that are organized and guided by shared purposes.[95]

Worldhood is essentially, then, the existential structure of Dasein that allows for any particular environment whatsoever. The relation between worldhood and environment is essentially the same as the relationship between understanding and possibility and between attunement and tuning. So worldhood is not any particular relational totality of significance, such as a classroom or workshop. Rather worldhood is the possibility of any relational totality as such according to which we and the entities we encounter can make sense at all. Worldhood is what allows for particular "in-order-to's" and "towards-which's" presented in the preceding paragraph.

The 'who' of Dasein, the next major structure of being-in-the-world, is one of the more difficult and complex aspects of Heidegger's analysis. If one takes *Being and Time* as a whole, then a complete answer to this question must involve authenticity or ownednesss (*Eigentlichkeit*), and would carry us deep into Division Two of *Being and Time*.[96] Authenticity is, however, subject to particularly strong theological critiques by Bonhoeffer and will therefore be a central subject of the next chapter. For now, then, we will focus on Heidegger's initial answer that the 'who' of Dasein is primarily the Anyone (*das Man*).[97]

For Heidegger, who Dasein is in its average everyday dealings in the world, in its concrete existence, is not itself, but rather the Anyone. With entities in the world, Dasein does

[95] This understanding of environment and its subsequent foundation in worldhood forms a central contribution to Heidegger's sought-after understanding of *logos* and the various, apparently disparate meanings it has come to have; see especially SZ 32 and 34.
[96] Though I will follow the more common practice of translating *Eigentlichkeit* as authenticity, it is important to keep the alternative, "ownedness," in mind as we move forward, particularly in chapter four. If one keeps this alternative in mind, Bonhoeffer's theological critiques of authenticity and its attendant phenomena will be clearer.
[97] Here I am following Guignon and Blattner's translation rather than MacQuarrie and Robinson's translation, "the they," primarily because the third-person plural makes *das Man* seem separate from Dasein, which Heidegger is explicitly attempting to avoid.

not usually stand there starring at them investigating their objective properties. Similarly with Dasein itself and others, Dasein does not usually understand itself as an isolated 'I' or subject and then adds on others that are outside of Dasein. As Heidegger says, "By 'Others' we do not mean everyone else but me—those over against whom the 'I' stands out. They are rather those from whom, for the most part, one does *not* distinguish oneself—those among whom one is too."[98]

This then also means that being-in-the-world is always already a shared world or "with-world [*Mitwelt*]."[99] Dasein's world is not an invention or construction of a subject, but is always tied up in a shared network of meanings, significances, and involvements. There are shared meanings for what it means for Dasein to participate in or manifest roles such as being a mother or instructor. We have a sense of what to do and not to do in fulfilling these roles. We have a sense of the significance of these roles. The meaning of particular environments is determined by others and shared. We know what a classroom is, and what to do and not do there; we know what a movie theater is, and what to do and not do there. In participating in roles and the environments they entail, we share in the meaning of equipment associated with those roles and environments. In being in this shared world, then, Dasein generally acts and thinks as anyone would act and think.

The next major structure of being-in-the-world, Being-in, has, in fact, already been explained in some detail above. Two of the primary structures involved in Being-in are attunement and understanding.[100] We find ourselves 'in' the world according to ways in which

[98] SZ 118.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Again, discourse is the third. Falling (*Verfallen*) is another important aspect of our being-in-the-world; however, because of its intimate relation to authenticity, it will be dealt with in chapter four when we present and evaluate Bonhoeffer's theological critiques of authenticity.

we are attuned to our surroundings and the understanding of our possible ways of being 'in' that world.[101]

That the above analyzed structures belong to the unitary structure of being-in-the-world cannot be overemphasized. Each component presupposes, mutually entails, and influences the others. As Heidegger states towards the end of Division I, "Being-in-the-world is a structure which is primordially and constantly whole."[102] And Heidegger densely formulates being-in-the-world as that "*which is falling and disclosed, thrown and projecting, and for which its own most potentiality-for-Being is an issue, both in its Being alongside the 'world' and in its Being-with Others*."[103]

Being-in-the-world as a unitary structure is a valuable resource for addressing the criterion of continuity; however, it is not the element of Heidegger's analysis that Bonhoeffer primarily identifies as meeting this criterion. Bonhoeffer's concern is primarily with temporal continuity rather than structural unity. In fact, as we will see in the following chapter stringent structural unity is a possible failing of Heidegger's from Bonhoeffer's theological perspective. We have also already seen this failing in Hegel and Scheler. As Bonhoeffer understands Hegel and Scheler, for example, they in a sense meet the criterion of continuity, but only by collapsing human existence into a static unity. If Heidegger had stopped at being-in-the-world, there is a chance that he too would have merely met with a similar critique from Bonhoeffer. Heidegger does not stop at being-in-the-world, however. In fact, what gives being-in-the-world its unity is

[101] It is important to note that by 'in' Heidegger does not primarily mean the "in" of spatial location. In fact, the diverting of our common understanding of "in" according to spatial location is an important instance of Heidegger's method of formal indication. For an excellent account of this see McGrath, "Formal Indication, Irony, and the Risk of Saying Nothing," esp. 186–7.
[102] SZ 180.
[103] Ibid., 181; emphasis in the original.

a temporal continuity that lies at the heart of Bonhoeffer's positive adaptation of Heidegger's analysis of Dasein.

According to Heidegger, it is not simply that each component of being-in-the-world is tied up with the others that makes it a unitary structure, but that being-in-the-world is based on the deeper unitary structure of "care" (*Sorge*), which Heidegger defines as "ahead-of-itself-Being-already-in-(the-world) as Being-alongside (entities encountered within-the-world) [*Sich-vorweg-schon-sein-in-(der-Welt-) als Sein-bei (innerweltlich begegnenden Seienden)*]."[104] Though this formulation of care may not at first seem to be an improvement on the unitary structure of being-in-the-world, it is what Bonhoeffer identifies as Heidegger's meeting the criterion of continuity.[105] The way in which Bonhoeffer talks about this is more often in terms of thrown-projection, however. Therefore, I will speak of Heidegger's meeting this criterion primarily in those terms.

The general structure that allows Heidegger to maintain Dasein's continuity is, according to Bonhoeffer, thrown-projection.[106] In Bonhoeffer's words, Heidegger can bring together act and being in Dasein and maintain Dasein's continuity because "Dasein is constant decision-making and, in every instance, already being determined."[107] Why Bonhoeffer chooses to focus on this particular aspect of Dasein will become clearer in chapter five when we elucidate

[104] SZ 192.
[105] DBWE 2: 69 and 71-2 (DBW 2: 63 and 66).
[106] For Heidegger, ultimately what allows for this "connectedness of life" (*Lebenszusammenhangs*) is temporality and historicizing or happening (*Geschehen*), the subject of the next section. It also seems that, for Heidegger, connectedness of life is deficient when Dasein is inauthentic. In authenticity, Dasein has self-subsistence or self-constancy (*Selbstständigkeit*) in a way that inauthentic Dasein, as an Anyone-self, does not (SZ 322-3). Heidegger is not entirely clear on this point. While it is clear that for Heidegger only authentic Dasein has *Selbstständigkeit*, it seems that inauthentic Dasein, in virtue of still being essentially thrown-projection, temporal, and historical, still has this connectedness of life; it has only been hidden or forgotten in inauthenticity (SZ 390-1). Though Heidegger's *Selbstständigkeit* may have helped Bonhoeffer in formulating some differences between existence in sin and in faith, he does not appear to appropriate it, most likely due to his overall rejection of Heidegger's authenticity, the subject of chapter four.
[107] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 66)

Bonhoeffer's theological adaption of Heidegger; suffice it to say, for now, it will allow Bonhoeffer to maintain the continuity between the apparently disparate understandings of human existence as "being in Adam" and "being in Christ."[108]

In the above accounts of attunement and understanding, an initial venture into thrown-projection has been made. As we saw, attunement is one of the important ways in which our thrownness is revealed to us. Essentially thrownness means that Dasein always already finds itself as having been something, having chosen certain possibilities, and having found itself in a world in a certain way. Dasein has a past. The past is not, however, a succession of bygone, completed moments; rather we always carry the past with us. The fact that I am sitting here and writing this particular work is predicated on being-already-in-the-world. I find myself already in a world with a certain range of socio-cultural possibilities. I could not be a chivalrous knight, though I can be an academic and a husband. I have chosen such possibilities, at every moment find myself as having chosen them, and I must therefore live up to those choices according to the range of possibilities into which I am thrown. I also find myself always with others and 'things' that themselves have a range meanings and relations with which I must deal. The meanings of and the ways in which I may relate to other Daseins and entities is already determined by my thrownness, by where I find myself in the world, and vice versa.

In finding myself in a world in a particular way, i.e. in being thrown, I find myself with a range of possible ways of being that have been laid out by the Anyone over history; I find myself with a future. However, just as with my past, the future is not a succession of moments waiting to be met or fulfilled. I am also always carrying my future with me. What I do now, what I think now, what meaning other Daseins and entities have for me now are also determined by the way

[108] In traditional Lutheran terms, this will also help Bonhoeffer combine the paradoxical understanding of humans in faith as both "simultaneously sinner and justified" and as "new creation."

in which I understand their involvement in the possibilities I am constantly projecting before myself.

The most important point is the mutual influence thrownness and projection have on one another. As the hyphenated thrown-projection suggests, it too is a unitary structure. To take an existentiell example, if I find myself with a broken-down car, a particular tuning of anger, frustration, and so forth may arise because I see the situation as threatening the projected possibility of teaching class. Though, I could also have an overriding projection of understanding myself as stoic in my resolve to not allow situations to disrupt my emotional equanimity. The projected possibility influences what a particular situation and the entities involved in it mean to me. Simultaneously, the fact that I have a car, have chosen an academic profession and so forth influence what projections I can act on and understand myself and the world according to. Put in more general terms, myself, others, and entities only appear to me now because I have a past and a future. My past or particular determinations of it appear as significant to me at a particular time and given the future projections that are salient at that time. And particular projections become noticeable given the particular circumstances of the present and the particular determinations of my thrownness that are now salient. These structures are not disparate, but mutually entail and determine one another.[109]

To shift back to Bonhoeffer's language, the being of Dasein lies in its acts and its acts lie in its being. "Heidegger has succeeded in forcing together act and being in the concept of Dasein; both what Dasein itself decides, and the fact that it is itself determined, are brought into one here."[110] This avoids the Kantian problem of making Dasein "a discontinuous succession of individual acts" because such acts both arise from and are taken back into the continuity of

[109] SZ 350.
[110] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65). This is why I have to disagree with Boomgaarden when he says that Bonhoeffer missed projection; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 271.

Dasein's being.[111] It also avoids Scheler's static understanding of human existence because Dasein's being is made dynamic by the ever-arising acts. Avoiding Hegel is somewhat more problematic.

One might reasonably ask how this differs from Hegel's solution of collapsing act and being into one another thereby erasing the differences between them, rather than coordinating them. Bonhoeffer admits that "this solution" is "reminiscent of Hegel"; however, it "is fundamentally different from Hegel's theory in that being is Dasein, 'being in the world', existing in temporality."[112] Unfortunately, Bonhoeffer does not provide a detailed explanation of his own evaluation of the difference, perhaps deferring to Heidegger's own evaluation of the distinction between himself and Hegel at the end of *Being and Time*. As Bonhoeffer indicates, and as Heidegger explains in *Being and Time*, there are two key differences, i.e. concreteness and temporality.

According to Heidegger, an essential difference between himself and Hegel lies in their starting points.[113] "Our existential analytic of Dasein, [in contrast to Hegel], starts with the 'concretion' of factically thrown existence itself in order to unveil temporality as that which primordially makes such existence possible."[114] By contrast, according to Heidegger, Hegel begins by abstracting all meaningful content away from both spirit and time such that spirit "falls into time."[115] Essentially, Heidegger seems to be saying that because his method begins with concrete existence, he is able to demonstrate that spirit does not fall into time, but that

[111] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65-6).
[112] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65). Here we see that temporality is a feature that distinguishes Heidegger from Hegel according to Bonhoeffer; Floyd incorrectly associates Bonhoeffer's theological use of temporality with Hegel. Floyd, "Encounter with an Other," 115.
[113] SZ 405.
[114] SZ 435-6.
[115] SZ 435.

temporality is the common source of both spirit and our ordinary sense of time as sequential. So the ultimate difference, according to both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer, lies in temporality.

Temporality and Historicity

The most important concept of *Being and Time*, both for distinguishing Heidegger from Hegel and for Bonhoeffer's adaptive theological use of Heidegger, is the concept of temporality. As Heidegger continues his distinction from Hegel: "'Spirit' does not fall into time, but it *exists as* the primordial *temporalizing* of temporality."[116] We may begin to clarify this distinction by looking forward to Heidegger's 1930/31 Winter semester course entitled "Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit" where Heidegger explicitly expands on *Being and Time*'s treatment of Hegel.

> To summarize in the form of theses, we can say: For *Hegel*, being (infinity) is also the essence of time. For *us*, time is the original essence of being. These are not theses which can be simply played against each other antithetically. Rather, the term *essence* [*Wesen*] says something fundamentally different each time, precisely because being is understood differently.[117]

Hegel's 'reversal' of Heidegger's proposed relation of time and being, where for Hegel "being is the essence of time" leads to Bonhoeffer's critique that Hegel only solves the problem of act and being by equating the two. Time, according to Heidegger's reading of Hegel, is an appearance of being. More particularly, time is a mode of differentiation that arises *within* the unity of absolute being: "Or to speak in terms of time, we can say that [for Hegel] time is *one* appearance of the *simple* essence of being qua infinity." [118] Or , "Conceived logically and thus really onto-*logically*, the essence of being is being-identical-with-itself in being-other. The egologically conceived essence of being is the 'inner difference' as I = I, *the relation to something* which at

[116] SZ 436; emphasis in the original.
[117] Martin Heidegger, *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana Univerisity Press, 1988), 146; emphasis in the original.
[118] Ibid., 145; emphasis in the original

the same time is not a relation."[119] Here Heidegger, in different words, seems to be pointing to Bonhoeffer's problem, i.e. that with Hegel act and being simply become equivalent. Hegel's historical dynamism is, for both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer, chimerical. What appear to be dynamic acts in history are occurring within the static universal being.

One cannot, however according to Heidegger, simply reverse the Hegelian relation of time and being and arrive at the correct position; rather, one must reformulate the concept of essence (*Wesen*). According to Heidegger's famous formulation, the essence of Dasein is existence.[120] The essence of Dasein is its 'to be'. Or using the above elucidated unitary structure of thrown-projection, the essence of Dasein is to pick up possibilities given to it in its thrownness and project itself forward according to those possibilities. The condition for the possibility of thrown-projection is temporality. 'Time', or, more properly, temporality, is the essence of being.

It is important to pause and explain Heidegger's concept of temporality. As others have pointed out, temporality is the key to Bonhoeffer's evaluation that Heidegger has solved the problem of act and being.[121] It is that concept that allows Heidegger to succeed where others have failed. And it will return in force in Bonhoeffer's own positive theological account of revelation or the person of Jesus Christ.[122]

To understand Heidegger's temporality, it is best to start with what temporality is not, namely time or time as we normally understand it. According to Heidegger, when we normally reflect on time, particularly from a theoretical stance, we understand it as 'now-time'.[123] We understand time to be a linear series of 'now's that can be identified by a clock. There are future

[119] Ibid; emphasis in the original.
[120] SZ 12 and 42; cf. DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63).
[121] DBWE 2: 71-2 (DBW 2: 66); Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 76; DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 132–4; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 257.
[122] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 256; DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time."
[123] SZ 421.

'now's waiting to be actualized; there are present 'now's that are actual; and there are past 'now's that are no longer.

Heidegger identifies a number of problems with this conception of time, or more properly with simply assuming this conception of time. First, this reflective, theoretical conception of time simply assumes, yet cannot account for, the continuity of time.[124] What is it that unifies these different 'now's? According to Heidegger, we must go deeper in order to identify the structure that can unify what might otherwise seem to be discrete moments.

A first step in seeing a solution to this problem is to see the second problem: We do not in average everyday existence think of time in this reflective, theoretical way. This way of viewing time is present-at-hand;[125] that is, to see time as an entity with objective properties not unlike seeing the dry erase marker according to its weight, color, and so forth. A more fundamental understanding of time is "world-time" (*Weltzeit*), or the time with which we are concerned.[126] When we are going about our average everyday business we do not understand time as a contentless succession of 'now's. Time is meaningful.[127] "Now is time to prepare a lecture." "Now is time to eat." "Half an hour is not enough time to cover the material." "Half an hour is just enough time to eat." Here we understand time according to the way we use it and the entities and activities that fall within it. Here we move closer to temporality, though we are not yet there. We still do not know what makes such concern for and understanding of such entities and activities possible, and we do not have an account of the continuity of world-time.

The answer to these problems comes with seeing the temporal core of thrown-projection. The temporal foundation of thrown-projection also answers the Hegelian worry that the unitary

[124] SZ 423.
[125] SZ 423-4.
[126] SZ 411-12.
[127] See SZ 416.

structure just equates act and being. The key to solving both problems lies in Heidegger's above quoted phrase "the *temporalizing* of temporality" (Zeitigung *der Zeitlichkeit*), which for Heidegger is historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*).[128] Here, act and being, as thrown-projection, are not coordinated merely because they mutually entail one another, but because they have a deeper unity in temporality. Yet temporality is not a static unity. It is a process. By saying "Zeitigung der Zeitlichkeit" or "Zeitlichkeit zeitigt" (temporality temporalizes) Heidegger means that temporality produces, brings about, or brings to fulfillment its unified temporal structure. The elements of this unified temporal structure, which we have encountered briefly before, are the future (*Zukunft*), present (*Gegenwart*), and past, having been or beenness (*Gewesenheit*).[129] Heidegger calls these temporal elements "ecstases" (*Ekstasen*).[130] By calling these unified elements of temporality ecstases, Heidegger is emphasizing the fact that temporality is extended or stretched.[131] "*Temporality is the primordial 'outside-of-itself' in and for itself.*"[132] One might say that temporality is the pressing forward into the future while, simultaneously and based on that pressing forward, the pulling up of the past. This process just is temporality and historicity; not a singular entity that might risk Heidegger falling back to a static collapsing of act and being. As Heidegger states, "Temporality is not […] an entity which first emerges from *itself*; its essence is a process of temporalizing in the unity of the ecstasies."[133]

[128] The MacQuarrie and Robinson translation of *Geschichtlichkeit* is "historicality," but it has become common practice to translate it as historicity.
[129] SZ 328.
[130] SZ 329.
[131] These claims are made much more explicitly and straightforwardly in Heidegger's 1923/24 seminar on "Phenomenological Interpretations of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*." Martin Heidegger, *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 268.
[132] SZ 329; emphasis in the original.
[133] Ibid; emphasis in the original.

This temporalizing temporality is the condition for the possibility of thrown-projection.[134] Thrown-projection is the central existential structure of Dasein that allows for all the above elucidated structures. Temporality is then the being of Dasein. This also then means that, because temporality is the being of Dasein, Dasein is also stretched or extended into these unified elements of temporality,[135] and, returning again to Bonhoeffer's vocabulary, this coordination of act and being as thrown-projection is also stretched or extended.

Dasein is the pulling of its past or beenness (*Gewesenheit*) with it while simultaneously pushing itself into future (*Zukunft*) possibilities as it presently finds itself being-amongst entities in the world. With Heidegger's concept of historicity and the previous account of thrown-projection, we can fill in and further explain this formal temporal structure: The temporal structure unfolds as Dasein presses forward into possibilities, both proximal and distant. In terms of historicity, this constitutes one's fate.[136] As I see the possibility for being a husband, a hopefully long-term possibility, before me, various intermediate possibilities appear such as anticipated anniversaries, having a job for the sake of meeting expectations of being a husband, and so forth. I also pull up a past, one which has particular meaning based on my chosen projections, such as having been married. I take over the inherited socio-cultural context of what it means to be married and so forth from my heritage or tradition.[137] I simultaneous disclose surrounding entities and other Dasein according to this future and past; so, for example, I see my wife as my wife because of my projected possibility of being a husband and the pulled up past of

[134] It is more technically correct to say that temporality is the condition for the possibility of care, of which thrown-projection is a central element. However, Bonhoeffer's concern is primarily with thrown-projection.
[135] SZ 371.
[136] Heidegger does, however, generally reserve fate (*Schicksal*) to authentic Dasein's relation to history, where Dasein has resolved itself to one central possibility. The communal correlate to fate is destiny (*Geschick*) (SZ 384). Neither fate nor destiny are intended by Heidegger to mean some form of determinism.
[137] Heidegger generally reserves heritage (*Erbe*) for authentic Dasein's relation to historicity (SZ 383-4).

having been married. So I *am* not only or primarily what I am *now*; my being is extended in particular, ontic ways into these ecstases.

This concept of temporality gives Bonhoeffer the key to solving the problem of act and being both in theological ontology (i.e. theology proper or an ontology of revelation) and theological anthropology. That it does so will not become clear until chapter five, but Bonhoeffer does provide an early, somewhat enigmatic hint in one of his praises of Heidegger's success. In each of the previous philosophical cases Bonhoeffer briefly tested them according to how their systems could handle the concept of God. Bonhoeffer does the same with Heidegger. In asking what has allowed Heidegger to come to a solution to the problem of act and being Bonhoeffer answers "the *first* is that he [Heidegger] interprets being so much in terms of time that even God's eternity, if it could be at all philosophically conceived, would, in principle, have to be thought of as having been drawn into time."[138] The exact nature of this apparent praise is not immediately clear. Perhaps looking to Heidegger will help. In making this statement Bonhoeffer cites and draws on the following footnote from *Being and Time*:

> The fact that the traditional conception of "eternity" as signifying the "standing now," *(nunc stans)*, has been drawn from the ordinary way of understanding time and has been defined with an orientation towards the idea of 'constant' presence-at-hand, does not need to be discussed in detail. If God's eternity can be 'construed' philosophically, then it may be understood only as a more primordial temporality which is 'infinite'. Whether the way afforded by the *via negationis et eminentiae* is a possible one, remains to be seen.[139]

This seems to be a remnant of the opening pages of Heidegger's *The Concept of Time*, initially a lecture presented to the Marburg Theological Society in July, 1924.[140] In these opening pages Heidegger concedes that the proper route for understanding time may be to move from (God's) eternity to time. However, there must be an initial access to this eternity. This access is faith. A

[138] DBWE 2: 71-2 (DBW 2: 66); emphasis in the original.
[139] SZ 427n1
[140] Martin Heidegger, *The Concept of Time*, trans. William McNeil (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 1–2.

philosopher, acting as philosopher, cannot have this access, only a theologian in faith can. "[T]he theologian, then, is the legitimate expert on time."[141] As for the philosopher, "If the philosopher asks about time, then he has resolved *to understand time in terms of time* or in terms of the δεί [ever, always, or perpetual], which looks like eternity but proves to be a mere derivative of being temporal."[142] Heidegger's point seems to be that if philosophy tried to understand eternity, it could only ever mistakenly understand it as the δεί, which is secondary to or arises from Dasein's temporal being.[143] Here Heidegger is asserting, specifically in relation to time and temporality, the division between theology and philosophy.[144] Only theology through faith can access eternity. If philosophy speaks of eternity, it is making a fundamental mistake. It is not, in fact, speaking about eternity but rather of the δεί. It would seem that God's eternity cannot be properly philosophically construed.

Bonhoeffer's understanding of Heidegger on this issue seems somewhat different. Bonhoeffer seems to be taking Heidegger's statement at face value; that philosophy can construe God's eternity by drawing that eternity into time. Bonhoeffer's likely misreading, which seems understandable since he only had the above footnote to work with, points to a more complex relation to Heidegger on issues of time, temporality, and God's eternity.

We can gain some clarity on the complex similarities and differences on Heidegger and Bonhoeffer here, if we ask if Bonhoeffer is genuinely complimenting Heidegger. After all, Bonhoeffer lists this as an important element in Heidegger's ability to coordinate act and being in Dasein. That, according to Bonhoeffer, Heidegger's temporal interpretation of Dasein is so extreme as to draw God's eternity into time is not obviously a compliment. According to Plant,

[141] Ibid., 1.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Gordon, *Continental Divide*, 170–2.
[144] This division becomes an important theme and more fully worked out in Heidegger's later "Phenomenology and Theology." Bonhoeffer's relation to this work is the subject of chapter six.

this is not only not a compliment, but the heart of Bonhoeffer's theological critiques of Heidegger.[145] According to DeJonge and explicitly in contrast to Plant, this is a compliment and at the heart of Heidegger's and Bonhoeffer's respective successes at the problem of act and being.[146] I will have much more to say about this, particularly in chapter five, but for now we can say that neither Plant nor DeJonge are wholly right or wrong. The nature of Bonhoeffer's position on God being drawn into time is a particularly dense instance of many of the distinctions so far elucidated. One must keep in mind the distinction between the conceptual levels of the problem of act and being, particularly the levels of anthropology and theology; the important distinction between philosophy and theology; and the newly acquired Heideggerian distinction between time and temporality. Plant is certainly right to say that Bonhoeffer must reject the drawing of God's being into time, or, to be more accurate, the drawing of God's being into Dasein's temporality.[147] However, this does not mean, as DeJonge points out, that Bonhoeffer would have to or actually does reinforce God's eternity.[148] In his *Lectures on Christology*, for example, Bonhoeffer says, "It is just as impossible to ask how God can enter into time—as if such an isolated God could exist!"[149] That is, God must have some positive relation to time; otherwise there is the risk of isolating God from the world. The problem is that drawing God's being into Dasein's temporality risks making God one entity among others at the disposal of Dasein's autonomous understanding. From Bonhoeffer's theological perspective, this is a consequence of Heidegger working as a philosopher at the anthropological level. According to the larger structure of *Act and Being*, this is best understood then as simultaneously a theological critique and philosophical praise. As Bonhoeffer assumes and Heidegger admits, philosophy

[145] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 320.
[146] DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 133–4.
[147] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 320.
[148] DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 133–4.
[149] DBWE 12: 313 (DBW 12: 294).

cannot access the solely theological domain of faith. Yet Heidegger has coordinated act and being in human existence, particularly by understanding such existence as fundamentally temporal. This is instructive for theology; theology can adapt this temporal understanding of human existence to an understanding of revelation. Here Heidegger's distinction between time and temporality is important and lacking in both Plant's and DeJonge's assessments of this issue.[150] From Heidegger, Bonhoeffer gets the conceptual tools with which to formulate God's relation to time. Though an important element to Bonhoeffer's theological solution to the problem of act and being, it cannot simply be that God enters time, however. Rather God must be temporal in some way. With an eye to a fuller explanation in chapter five, Bonhoeffer's position may briefly be stated as follows: The being of the person of Jesus Christ is temporal. For Bonhoeffer, then, human Dasein is not the font of temporality; rather, Jesus Christ, as something like the Ur-Dasein, is.[151] As we will see in chapter five, this allows Bonhoeffer to make many of the same moves Heidegger does for human existence in order to coordinate act and being for revelation.

***

We have now seen Heidegger's central successes at solving the problem of act and being for philosophy at the anthropological level. In contrast to his philosophical predecessors, at least according to Bonhoeffer, Heidegger realized that epistemological problems could only be addressed after elucidating the being of that entity that can know, i.e. Dasein. However, it was not simply enough to look at Dasein in the abstract; rather, one must investigate Dasein as it goes about living in the world. One must look at Dasein concretely. Through this concrete investigation, which moves from particular ontic content to the formal ontological make-up of

[150] To be fair, this lack is understandable. Heidegger's distinction between time and temporality is by no means obvious, and Bonhoeffer himself does not consistently draw the distinction either.
[151] See "Christ as the Center of History" in DBWE 12: 325-7 (DBW 12: 307-10).

Dasein, Heidegger arrives at Dasein as the unitary phenomenon of thrown-projection, or, in Bonhoeffer's encapsulation, the fact that Dasein is always already and simultaneously deciding and being determined. According to Bonhoeffer's assessment, this both satisfies the criterion of continuity and the coordination of act and being in Dasein. Moving to temporality, we see that this unity is not static. Rather the coordination is stretched along the elements or ecstases of temporality. As Bonhoeffer clearly states a number of times, this ontological solution to the problem of act and being must be in some way useful for theology as a means to explain Christ and the church as temporally extended.[152]

Despite this usefulness there is still a general problem that hinders an unaltered adoption of Heidegger. The existential analysis of Dasein is philosophy. As such, according to Bonhoeffer, it must still be trapped in the *cor curvum in se*, in the autonomous 'I' understanding itself from itself. Bonhoeffer finds Heidegger's concept of authenticity and its attendant phenomena of *Angst*, death, and conscience, to be particularly egregious cases of this. In the next chapter, we will see that while these might count as philosophical successes in relation to the criteria of transcendence and boundary, they are particularly theologically offensive to Bonhoeffer.

[152] DBWE 2: 27, 31, and 79 (DBW 2: 22, 25, and 72-3).

Chapter Four: Heidegger's Theological Failure

In the previous chapter we saw from Bonhoeffer's perspective the various successes of Heidegger's philosophy as presented in *Being and Time* in relation to the problem of act and being, particularly as it occurs at the anthropological level. Such successes should then reappear in some guise in Bonhoeffer's own theological solution to the problem. However, Bonhoeffer does not find Heidegger's solution to be immediately applicable to the final theological level of the problem of act and being. Heidegger's *Being and Time* is, for Bonhoeffer, a theological failure.

For those familiar with the development of Heidegger's self-understood relation to theology, a subject dealt with in chapter six, it may seem odd, even erroneous, to attribute anything like a theological failure to Heidegger's project in *Being and Time*. Heidegger did not understand himself to be doing theology, and Bonhoeffer recognized this.[1] It is important to remember that Bonhoeffer's theological reaction to Heidegger develops amidst growing contemporaneous theological reactions to Heidegger, some of which, particularly evident in Bultmann's work, view Heidegger's philosophy as a fecund starting point for theological work. For Bonhoeffer to view Heidegger's philosophy as a theological failure is to say that Heidegger's philosophy cannot itself form the basis of theology, and that for it to be useful for theology it must be adapted according to theology's own standards.

[1] DBWE 2: 72 (DBW 2: 66). For relevant instances where Heidegger distinguishes his project from theology see GA 61: 197-8; SZ 272n1 and 306n1; Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 39–54; Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, 4, 85, and 283; Heidegger, *The Concept of Time*, 1–2.

The previous chapter explained and evaluated Heidegger's philosophical successes deemed appropriate for theological adaptation by Bonhoeffer; this chapter explains and evaluates those elements of Heidegger's *Being and Time* that Bonhoeffer finds not only unusable by theology, but which pose direct threats to Bonhoeffer's understanding of proper theology. Heidegger's concept of authenticity (*Eigentlichkeit*) is at the center of Bonhoeffer's theological critiques of Heidegger.[2] Bonhoeffer sees in Heidegger's authenticity an argument for the *possibility* of Dasein putting itself in a privileged form of existence. Bonhoeffer will reject authenticity as a particularly strong form of the *cor curvum in se*. Authenticity will then be replaced with an act-being coordinated account of revelation. Detailing Bonhoeffer's rejection of authenticity will allow for an account, in chapter five, of how revelation fulfills many of the same roles for Bonhoeffer's theology that authenticity does for Heidegger's philosophy.

Bonhoeffer's Theological Critique of Possibility

In his "Inaugural Lecture" based on *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer says, "*the concept of possibility has no place in theology and thus no place in theological anthropology*."[3] In the last chapter I pointed to Heidegger's concept of possibility as a component in his philosophical success at the problem of act and being, particularly in anthropology and with the criterion of continuity. Here it would seem that the concept of possibility must be rejected in theology and, therefore, is not a genuine philosophical success that can be translated into theology. This is yet another point at which the distinction between Bonhoeffer's assessments of philosophy and theology must be disambiguated.

[2] I prefer Blattner's suggested translation of *Eigentlichkeit* as "ownedness." Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*, 15. It highlights the etymological roots of the concept, certain aspects of Dasein such as "mineness," and Bonhoeffer's concern that it is a heighten form of the *cor curvum in se*. However, it can be grammatically unwieldy, and it is not as well known as the translation "authenticity." I will, therefore, maintain the more common translation of "authenticity"; however, the alternative should also be kept in mind.

[3] DBWE 10: 403 (DBW 10: 373); emphasis in the original.

To do so we must understand what Bonhoeffer means here by possibility and to do that we must return to his fundamental theological concern. His fundamental concern, which we have seen numerous times, is to overcome the *cor curvum in se* (the heart curved in on itself), which is the ever present state of sin that results in humans always being self-directed and unable to genuinely encounter others. Overcoming the *cor curvum in se* requires a proper understanding of human existence.

In his "Inaugural Lecture" Bonhoeffer asserts that humans can either understand themselves from their works or from their boundaries.[4] That is, we can either understand the human from what it does or can do, or we can understand it from the boundaries of its existence. This mirrors the distinction between being-oriented philosophies and act-oriented philosophies, respectively. For example, Kant understands the human, according to Bonhoeffer, as oriented towards the boundaries of the thing-in-itself and the transcendental ego. As Bonhoeffer reads Kant, human existence is suspended between these two boundaries and must therefore be understood according to them. Heidegger, by contrast, understands human existence primarily in relation to our ability to be (*Seinkönnen*) and what we most characteristically do.[5] Heidegger, for instance, singles out Dasein's constant activities of understanding its world and interpreting being as distinctive of Dasein.

Though these options for understanding human existence appear to be different, both, if improperly oriented, rely on the same foundation, i.e. possibility. It may be fairly clear that understanding human existence according to its work, or what it can and does do, is to understand human existence according to possibility. Work or activity is, for Bonhoeffer, just

[4] DBWE 10: 389 (DBW 10: 358).
[5] SZ 143.

the concretization or actualization of possibility.[6] Understanding the human from its boundaries is also reliant on understanding the human based on possibility, both in philosophy and improper theology, i.e. theology that does not have an act-being coordinated ontology of revelation. As we saw with Bonhoeffer's critiques of Kant, the human understanding itself from its own boundaries means that such boundaries are drawn by human understanding itself. Such boundaries become a *work* of the human being itself. The boundaries themselves are then only instantiations of human possibility.[7] This then means, according to Bonhoeffer, that both available options for humans to come to understand themselves are based on possibility.

Human self-understanding that works from possibility necessarily, for Bonhoeffer, leads to the *cor curvum in se*.[8] For human existence to understand itself according to its possibilities means for it to understand itself based on self-reflection. Human existence both asks and answers the question concerning its meaning. In theology, understanding human existence means understanding existence in sin and faith. With the ability to understand sinful and faithful existence, there is the risk that human existence may be able to work itself from sin to faith, a position that Lutheran Bonhoeffer rejects. If humans could work from sin to faith, revelation or the person of Jesus Christ would be superfluous. In terms of the criteria for solving the problem of act and being, theological transcendence would be closed off. Bonheoffer presses his rejection of any role for possibility further. Not only is there no active possibility of moving from sin to faith, there is no passive ability to receive revelation to move from sin to faith, which will be important for Bonhoeffer's criticisms of Heidegger's concept of conscience. For Bonhoeffer (and Barth) this would risk the conclusion that revelation must conform in some way to human

[6] DBWE 10: 391 (DBW 10: 359).
[7] DBWE 10: 399 (DBW 10: 368).
[8] DBWE 10: 399 and 403-5 (DBW 10: 369 and 373-5); DBWE 2: 136-7 (DBW 2: 135-6). This attack on possibility is present throughout Bonhoeffer's corpus; see DBWE 1: 129 (DBW 1: 83); DBWE 3: 86 (DBW 3: 80); and DBWE 6: 300 (DBW 6: 302).

existence that would thereby challenge the sovereignty and complete transcendence of revelation.

It is clear that Bonhoeffer's critique of possibility is explicitly theological. Turning to actual examples of understanding human existence from possibility or boundaries, Bonhoeffer opens with the following: "If *as theologians* we turn to hear what contemporary philosophy has to say about the human […]"[9]And concluding his survey of contemporary philosophy and as a transition to contemporary theology, Bonhoeffer says, "*Although theology accepts these results of philosophical inquiry*, it interprets them in its own fashion as the thinking of the *cor curvum in se.*"[10] It is important to note the specifically theological framework of Bonhoeffer's critiques. Here Bonhoeffer's concern is primarily soteriological. Bonhoeffer's concern is not with possibility as such, but rather with the possibility of humans coming to understand themselves from themselves. Or put another way, Bonhoeffer wants to reject the ability for humans to place themselves in the truth.[11]

Bonhoeffer's rejection of possibility in Heidegger's philosophy does not then concern the ability of humans to understand themselves according to average everyday possibilities. Bonhoeffer does not reject Dasein's ability to understand equipment such as hammers, social roles such as mothers or instructors, character traits such a patience or punctuality, and so forth. Bonhoeffer rejects the ultimate possibility attributed to Dasein according to *Being and Time*, i.e. authenticity or ownedness. More particularly, Bonhoeffer rejects the central feature of authenticity as a possibility that Dasein itself takes up or in which it places itself. Bonhoeffer sees in Heidegger's concept of authenticity, and its attendant concepts of death and conscience, a particularly virulent form of the *cor curvum in se*. Though, as we will see in chapter five,

[9] DBWE 10: 392 (DBW 10: 360); emphasis added.
[10] DBWE 10: 399 (DBW 10: 369); initial emphasis added.
[11] Cf. DBWE 2: 81 (DBW 2: 75)

Bonhoeffer does re-theologize these concepts using them to explicate human existence in sin or in Adam.

Authenticity and the *Cor Curvum in se*

As we will see Heidegger's authenticity fails at the criterion of transcendence; though in a very particular way that secondary literature mistakes for a failure at transcendence in general.[12] The general contours of the problem are as follows: Authenticity is a distinctive possibility of Dasein. Achieving authenticity gives Dasein unique access to the fundamental truths of its existence.[13] That is, authenticity entails a privileged or normatively superior relation to one's existence. For Bonhoeffer the theologian, however, revelation is the only event capable of granting Dasein that privileged position.[14] As Bonhoeffer reads Heidegger, and there are good reasons to have this reading, this means that Heidegger, whether intentionally or not, has made revelation a possibility of Dasein. But this removes the transcendent nature of revelation that Bonhoeffer wishes to maintain. It also means that Dasein need only look to its own possibilities, its own self, to come to the truth. Dasein need only turn in on itself (*cor curvum in se*).

Authenticity fulfills various and central functions in *Being and Time*.[15] Again, Heidegger's primary intended goal is to get to the meaning of being. He does this by going through Dasein, that entity that already cares about its own existence and being, and that already has an understanding of being. Though Heidegger warns that he does not intend to give a complete picture of Dasein,[16] he does need to get to the most salient and structurally fundamental features of Dasein. Division I covered Dasein in its average everyday existence and

[12] See, for example, Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 129–31.
[13] SZ 297.
[14] DBWE 2: 73 (DBW 2: 67)
[15] For a fuller explanation of authenticity's structural and methodological importance to *Being and Time* see Charles Guignon, "Authenticity and the Question of Being," in *Heidegger, Authenticity and the Self: Themes from Division Two of Being and Time*, ed. Denis McManus (New York: Routledge, 2014), 8–20.
[16] SZ 17.

inauthenticity. Heidegger still needs to disclose the possibility of Dasein as authentic.[17] In authenticity, Dasein becomes a whole self.[18] In becoming authentic and whole, Dasein gains a superior continuity of self by taking a stand and being constant (*Selbstständigkeit*) that is only realized on the other side of anxiety, death, and conscience after which Dasein sees its fallenness and guilt and becomes free for death in forward-running resoluteness.[19] Authentic Dasein then has a privileged and complete, even if not a theoretically explicit, view of its existence. Central to this understanding of existence, and Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger, is existence as fundamentally temporal.[20] Getting to temporality is central to getting to the meaning of being,[21] the intended goal of *Being and Time*. Authenticity is then not ancillary to *Being and Time*'s overall project and its central concepts, some of which Bonhoeffer sees as profitable to his own theological project.

Despite the obvious importance of authenticity, Bonhoeffer is unambiguously critical of it. For example, Bonhoeffer says, "Every concept of existence that is not formed by being encountered or not being encountered by Christ is 'inauthentic' (including Heidegger's 'authentic' existence)."[22] Bonhoeffer's rejection of authenticity is not an insignificant matter given its centrality for Heidegger's method and philosophy as presented in *Being and Time*. It is, therefore, important to detail and evaluate Bonhoeffer's rejection of authenticity in order to evaluate the ways in which Bonhoeffer will positively use Heidegger in his theology. By rejecting authenticity, Bonhoeffer may be gutting Heidegger's philosophy. As we will see in the next chapter, however, Bonhoeffer retains many of the elements involved in authenticity

[17] SZ 232-3.
[18] SZ 236-8 and 285; DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63).
[19] DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63).
[20] SZ 304.
[21] SZ 17.
[22] DBWE 2: 116 (DBW 2: 113).

attributing some to Christ as something like the Ur-Dasein and some to Dasein as Being in Adam.

That Heidegger's concept of authenticity is a focal point of Bonhoeffer's theological criticisms of Heidegger is not a controversial point. Most secondary literature that even touches on Bonhoeffer's relation to Heidegger say something to the effect that Bonhoeffer is critical of Heidegger on this point.[23] And to my knowledge there is no instance in the secondary literature of anyone contravening this assertion. However, the importance of Bonhoeffer's critique of authenticity, the importance of the concept in *Being and Time*, and the complexity of the concept itself requires a more devoted analysis than has been given thus far.

To understand and appreciate Heidegger's authenticity we must first explain another important existential structure that coming to authenticity is meant to alter, i.e. fallenness (*Verfall*). At its simplest fallenness is Dasein's tendency to evade its self.[24] This tendency to evade or not be its self is the way in which Dasein, according to Heidegger, generally exists in its average everyday being-in-the-world: "The Self, however, is proximally and for the most part inauthentic, the Anyone-self. Being-in-the-world is always fallen."[25]

If we return to a question from the previous chapter, "who is Dasein?" and the answer, "Dasein is generally the Anyone" we get a clearer understanding of what it means for Dasein to fall. In Dasein's average everyday dealings in the world, Dasein generally does what anyone does. That is, Dasein generally unreflectively accepts meanings that make up the world from others around it. Dasein does not generally reflect on the fact that it is the one that is taking up these meanings, and understanding and acting in the world according to them. So, for example,

[23] See Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 64–9; Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, 95–6; Zimmermann, *Humanism and Religion*, 297–8.
[24] SZ 139.
[25] SZ 181; translation altered.

in taking up the role of instructor or parent, fallen Dasein may simply do, without reflection, what one's previous instructors or parents have done, or cobble together the latest trends in parenting or teaching without a clear conception of making it one's own. Such a Dasein may not actually know why a certain teaching method is being used or why certain rules are enforced. When asked, such a Dasein might simply respond with "Because that is how it is done" or the like. The problem also runs deeper.

It is not simply that such a Dasein unreflectively does what anyone does in such roles, such a Dasein probably does not even know why or even that it chose to take up such roles. Because of this, such a fallen Dasein does not have a whole or coherent self. In falling, Dasein becomes absorbed and dispersed in the world.

> This "absorption in ..." has mostly the character of being-lost in the publicness of the "Anyone." Dasein has, in the first instance, fallen away [*abgefallen*] from itself as an authentic potentiality for being its Self, and has fallen into the 'world'. "Fallenness" into the 'world' means an absorption in being-with-one-another, in so far as the latter is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity.[26]

The details of idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity are not immediately pertinent.[27] What is important is that fallenness involves scattering oneself superficially among the various entities, meanings, and possibilities one is given in the world. So it is not simply that fallen Dasein takes up possibilities and meanings without knowing why or how, fallen Dasein scatters itself among these various possibilities. It takes up the possibilities of being a parent, spouse, instructor, punctual person, and so forth with no understanding of how they work together or whether there

[26] SZ 175; translation altered.

[27] Idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity are intended by Heidegger to be fallen modes of the existential structures of discourse, attunement, and understanding. There are, however, a number of problems with this. For an excellent account of the problems see Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*, 130–1.

is a meta-possibility that structures them together to form a whole or coherent self. In falling Dasein has become fragmentary.[28]

These characteristics of fallenness mean that there is a real sense in which fallen Dasein is not a self. Fallen Dasein is doing what anyone can or does do. The Anyone is acting and thinking for Dasein. Here Dasein is not a genuine, authentic, or owned self. As fallen, Dasein is then a disowned or inauthentic self. This is the condition that authenticity is meant to correct.

In his inaugural lecture Bonhoeffer provides the following, dense summary of his understanding of authenticity and how it is achieved:

> Where the person is summoned by conscience, he is able to extract himself from his captivity to the world, albeit not in such a way that he might escape the forces of temporality without responsibility, but such that he takes his guilt, [the nullity of his life] upon himself and orients himself toward the most unconquerable of all forces—death. He draws death into his life and lives a being toward death […] The person gains command of the world by elevating himself into a tragically isolated individual. [The person remains alone, understanding himself from himself; being in the world has no meaning for one's authentic self-understanding].[29]

There are some notable accuracies and inaccuracies in this summation of Heidegger's authenticity, which will become apparent as it and Bonhoeffer's criticism are unpacked.[30] Bonhoeffer reads Heidegger's authenticity as the condition for the possibility of becoming an actual self, which necessarily involves making Dasein a coherent whole.[31] According to Bonhoeffer, "In its [Dasein's] captivity to the world, to the Anyone, to talk […] Dasein

[28] Cf. Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 135, 151–2, 169, 187, 195, and 241.
[29] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 365); the insertions are Bonhoeffer's own later handwritten insertions.
[30] The most glaring mistake is the assertion that "being in the world has no meaning for one's authentic self-understanding." Bonhoeffer is most likely conflating the individualizing aspects of death and anxiety with authenticity itself, a common mistake. It seems that Bonhoeffer, in *Act and Being*, avoids this mistake when he says, "It [Dasein] does so [i.e. becomes authentic] not by withdrawing from this world but by accepting its fallenness in the world as its guilt"; DBWE 2: 70 (DBW 2: 64). Boomgaarden also notices this possible mistake, yet tries to justify Bonhoeffer's reading by claiming that Bonhoeffer has the transitional state of anxiety in mind, which does have this extreme individualizing quality; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 278. This would only work, however, if in anxiety Dasein was cut off from its world, which is not the case for Heidegger.
[31] Bonhoeffer's reading of authenticity is then a combination of the transcendental/emancipatory and existentialist/narrativist interpretations. For excellent typologies of various readings of authenticity see Benjamin Crowe, *Heidegger's Religious Origins: Destruction and Authenticity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 164–8; Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*, 321–2.

disintegrates."[32] Reading Heidegger through the concept of possibility, to overcome this state Dasein must realize its most characteristic or essential possibility, i.e. the possibility to own itself. And this necessarily entails Dasein becoming whole: "Insofar as Dasein lays hold of the possibility, the existence, most authentic to it, Dasein grasps its own wholeness."[33] And though one may have alternative emphases in interpreting Heidegger's authenticity, there is no doubt that Bonhoeffer's reading highlights central characteristics of authenticity. In contrasting Dasein as authentic or inauthentic,[34] Heidegger, for instance, characterizes the latter as dispersed or disintegrated: "The Self of everyday Dasein is the *Anyone-self* [the inauthentic self that is captive to the Anyone], which we distinguish from the *authentic Self*—that is, from the Self which has been taken hold of in its own way [*eigens ergriffenen*]. As an Anyone-self, the particular Dasein has been *dispersed* into the 'Anyone', and must first find itself."[35] Pulling its self out of this fallenness or captivity to the Anyone is an essential possibility of Dasein: "And because Dasein is in each case essentially its own possibility, it *can*, in its very Being, 'choose' itself and win itself; it can also lose itself and never win itself; or only 'seem' to do so. But only in so far as it is essentially something which can be *authentic*—that is, something of its own—can it have lost

[32] DBWE 10: 395 (DBW 10: 363); translation altered.
[33] DBWE 2: 70 (DBW 2: 64).
[34] It is perhaps important to note that there is another viable nuance to reading Heidegger on authenticity. There seems to be not simply the opposition between authentic existence and inauthentic existence; rather, there seems to be an initial condition that Dasein is generally in prior to the opportunity to become either. Blattner usefully terms this initial condition unowned; Blattner, *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*, 130. Heidegger, for example, says "But this *potentiality-for-Being*, as one which is in each case *mine*, is free either for authenticity or for inauthenticity or for a mode in which neither of these has been differentiated" (SZ 232). Elsewhere Heidegger calls this third option "non-authentic" (SZ 176) and undifferentiated (SZ 43, 53, and 231). This is by no means an unambiguous reading; at times Heidegger does seem to only have authenticity and inauthenticity as options: "Understanding is either authentic, arising out of one's own Self as such, or inauthentic" (SZ 146). Bonhoeffer only sees the binary options of authenticity and inauthenticity, and he is in good company here.
[35] SZ 129.

itself and not yet won itself."[36] And in winning its self, Dasein essentially becomes a unified whole; Heidegger describes one of the tasks of Division II of *Being and Time* as follows[37]:

> One thing has become unmistakable: *our existential analysis of Dasein up till now cannot lay claim to primordiality.* Its fore-having never included more than the *inauthentic* being of Dasein, and of Dasein as *less* than a *whole.* If the Interpretation of Dasein's being is to become primordial, as a foundation for working out the basic question of ontology, then it must first have brought to light existentially the being of Dasein in its possibilities of *authenticity* and *totality*.[38]

That is, methodologically we can only properly understand, ontologically, the wholeness of Dasein through an investigation into authentic Dasein because only authentic Dasein has a grasp on its wholeness and unity.

Achieving authenticity, for Heidegger, entails the existential encounters of anxiety, death, and conscience, the latter two of which are important for Bonhoeffer's theological criticisms of Heidegger. Before presenting the basic picture of this movement from inauthenticity to authenticity, it is important to keep two points in mind. First, as is usually the case with Heidegger, he does not intend these terms in their usual everyday meanings. Heidegger's unique understanding of these terms will be explained in further detail in the following two sections; for now I am concerned with merely presenting the basic picture of their role in moving Dasein from inauthenticity to authenticity. Second, anxiety, death, and conscience are modifications of the structures of thrownness or attunement, projection or understanding, and discourse respectively. As we saw in the last chapter, these structures mutually entail one another; they are not sequentially or chronologically related.[39] I, for example, project based on my thrownness and simultaneously take up my thrownness in a particular way based on particular projections.

---

[36] SZ 42-3.
[37] Charles B. Guignon, "Becoming a Self: The Role of Authenticity in Being and Time," in *The Existentialists: Critical Essays on Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Sartre,* ed. Charles B. Guignon (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 123 and 126–30.
[38] SZ 233.
[39] SZ 328 and 350.

Because they are particular manifestations of these structures, anxiety, death, and conscience are similarly related. Though they are not sequential, Heidegger does prioritize projection or the future. He says, for example, "In enumerating the ecstases, we have always mentioned the future first. We have done this to indicate that the future has a priority in the ecstatical unity of primordial and authentic temporality. This is so, even though temporality does not first arise through a cumulative sequence of the ecstases, but in each case temporalizes itself in their equiprimordiality."[40] Death, as futural, then has some priority over anxiety, and anxiety is defined as "anxiety in the face of death."[41] Though they are not sequential, they must be presented in some order. Because death has some priority over anxiety and Bonhoeffer is unconcerned with Heidegger's presentation of anxiety, death is presented first with anxiety incorporated into the presentation when necessary for understanding death.

Keeping the above caveats in mind, the overall movement from inauthenticity to authenticity looks something like the following: In coming to authenticity, Dasein projects itself forward towards its death. Assuming that Dasein does not cover over or flee from this realization, this reveals to Dasein the radical contingency of all its possibilities.[42] The possibilities it has chosen to be a spouse, instructor, punctual person, and so forth must come to an end. Even its ability to choose possibilities must come to an end.[43] This challenges the usual or taken-for-granted meaning one has found in the world. The inability to find meaning in one's possibilities or one's world as a whole is the attunement of anxiety.[44] Dasein becomes anxious concerning its being-in-the-world. Its usual involvements with entities and others seem to lack

[40] SZ 329, see also 20 and 326.
[41] SZ 251 and 254.
[42] SZ 263.
[43] SZ 250.
[44] SZ 265-6.

significance.[45] Then Dasein encounters conscience, which reveals to Dasein its usual state of not having a self, having fallen into the world, its guilt at having done so, and the need to take responsibility for its self.[46]

If these encounters go well, endure, and Dasein does indeed take responsibility for its self, its being-in-the-world is further modified as forward-running resoluteness (anticipatory resoluteness; *vorlaufende Entschlossenheit*).[47] Here resoluteness is a modification of thrownness and forward-running is a modification of projection. When projection is modified as running forward towards death, Dasein "is forced by that very running forward into the possibility of taking over from itself its ownmost being, and doing so of its own accord."[48] This then causes a fundamental shift in Dasein's understanding of the intermediate possibilities that lie prior to death, such as being a spouse or punctual person:

> When, by forward running, one becomes free *for* one's own death, one is liberated from one's lostness in those possibilities which may accidentally thrust themselves upon one; and one is liberated in such a way that for the first time one can authentically understand and choose among the factical possibilities lying prior to [*vorgelagert*] that possibility which is not to be outstripped [i.e. death].[49]

"Forward-running to death is" also, however, "essentially anxiety."[50] Again, with the attunement of anxiety, Dasein is anxious about its self and its being-in-the-world. In such an attunement "the totality of involvements […] is, as such, of no consequence; it collapses into itself; the world has the character of completely lacking significance."[51] Authentic Dasein's reaction to this is resoluteness. Resoluteness reveals to authentic Dasein its actual thrownness; it unlocks the possibilities available to a particular Dasein in actual circumstances that arise from

[45] SZ 186-7.
[46] SZ 296.
[47] SZ 305-10.
[48] SZ 263-4.
[49] SZ 264; translation altered.
[50] SZ 266.
[51] SZ 186.

the Anyone and from its historical and cultural heritage.[52] And this forward-running resoluteness places Dasein in the "truth of existence."[53]

Although Bonhoeffer will have more specific theological critiques of death and conscience, we already have a strong critique of authenticity. In owning its self, Dasein comes to a privileged or genuine understanding of its self, others, the world (and presumably God). This in itself would not be a problem. Bonhoeffer himself, as we will see, formulates a privileged condition in which humans may exist that grants such an existence genuine understandings of the same. However, authenticity is a distinctive possibility that arises from Dasein itself. Anxiety, conscience, and death are Dasein's. Forward-running resoluteness is a modification of Dasein that arises from Dasein. They are, therefore, not transcendent in the theological sense that Bonhoeffer wants. At the close of Part A of *Act and Being*, the philosophical section, Bonhoeffer has the following encompassing assessment of all philosophy, including Heidegger's: "The offense against Christian thinking in any autonomous self-understanding is that it believes human beings to be capable of giving truth to themselves, of transporting themselves into the truth by themselves, since the 'ground' of existence must somehow surely be in the truth, in the likeness to God."[54] Heidegger, as Bonhoeffer reads him, succumbs, like all philosophy, to the intellectual form of the *cor curvum in se*, one which does not allow for theological transcendence and one which Bonhoeffer often encapsulates in the critical phrase, "the autonomous thinking I understanding itself from itself within a closed system."

Heidegger has failed by not meeting the criterion of transcendence in a very particular (theological) way. To get at the particular way in which Heidegger does fail here according to

[52] SZ 298.
[53] SZ 221, 297, and 307.
[54] DBWE 2: 79 (DBW 2: 73).

Bonhoeffer, we must first address how he does not.[55] Though Heidegger's concept of Dasein does succumb to the general critique of the *cor curvum in se*, it is not because Heidegger understands Dasein to be an autonomous thinking I.[56] Heidegger is explicit that Dasein is not equivalent to a subject or I.[57] Heidegger is concerned with the ontological or existential analysis of Dasein. Concepts such as "subject" or "thinking I" carry ontic baggage and can only occur based on a particular ontic understanding of Dasein. For instance, depending on the science in which the concept occurs, anthropology or biology for example, there are ontic predeterminations of what constitutes instances of "human being" that Heidegger intends to get under. This is not to say that there is not or could not be a "thinking I" for Heidegger. He is simply primarily concerned with what is more fundamental than the "thinking I" and what would allow for the "thinking I" to arise.[58]

To clarify how Heidegger does not succumb to the criticism that reason, the thinking I, or the subject collapses everything into itself, we may dissect the critique's central point: "the autonomous thinking I understanding itself from itself within a closed system."[59] Dasein is clearly not autonomous. It is dependent on the Anyone, thrownness, the context into which it is thrown, its totality of involvements, and so forth. It can neither be nor act without these. This, then, makes it impossible for it to understand itself from itself. When I think of myself as an instructor, I am not simply encountering my self. I am explicitly encountering myself engaging

[55] Plant also notices the essentials of what follows when he says, "Moreover, Heidegger, unlike earlier transcendentalist, idealist and phenomenological philosophies, is awake to the limitations of Dasein: *being is limited not only by the 'other'* but by its being-toward-death"; Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 320.This is an important point missed in other treatments of Bonhoeffer and Heidegger and deserving the following expanded treatment.

[56] Portions of this chapter have been previously published in Nik Byle, "Heidegger's Adam and Bonhoeffer's Christ: Evaluating Bonhoeffer's Appraisals of Heidegger," *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Jahrbuch* 5 (2011/ 2012): 99–119 and are reprinted with permission from the publisher.

[57] SZ 46, 114-17, 303, and 317-23.

[58] SZ 98.

[59] DBWE 2: 76 (DBW 2: 71).

in activities and drawing upon meanings given to me by my historico-cultural context. When I encounter an entity, I am not encountering something I have created, and therefore only myself. Neither am I encountering an object whose being has independently existing predicates. I am encountering a particular confluence or nexus of involvements that are neither wholly dependent on me nor wholly independent of me because I in part contribute to them. Nor is the potentiality for such encounters simply within me as a subject or "thinking I."

A particular instantiation of this problem involves the "who" of Dasein and Dasein's relations to others. If Dasein were autonomous, collapsing the world into itself, we should expect to see this in Dasein's relations to others. Marsh, for example, argues that the important difference between Heidegger and Bonhoeffer concerns their appraisals of proper relations of Dasein with others. After having elucidated Heidegger's fundamental structures of Being-with and Dasein-with, Marsh thinks that "despite whatever intentions [Heidegger] might have to depict togetherness as aboriginal to Dasein, his description has the consequent effect of consolidating the other with the I. Although Heidegger argues that Dasein-with is a characteristic of Dasein's other through the being-with of Dasein's being-in-the-world, nonetheless, the world is always a referential totality *for the sake of the I that is Dasein*."[60] At least at one point this is also Bonhoeffer's assessment of Heidegger: "Because human beings are alone, the world is 'their' world, and other human beings have sunk into the world of things (cf. Heidegger's '*Mitsein*', 'being-with')."[61] Ultimately Heidegger must fail for Bonhoeffer because such relations are not mediated through Christ. But it is incorrect to assert that Dasein possesses the world and others within it precisely because Heidegger has coordinated act and being. It would be much

[60] Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 129.
[61] DBWE 2: 137 (DBW 2: 136).

more accurate to say that, for the most part, the world, the Anyone, and others possess Dasein.[62] Not only do entities in the world get their involvements and meanings from the Anyone and others, such that they are not passive recipients of my intentional acts; I too get the being from which I understand myself and my possibilities from the Anyone and others.[63] And this is particularly true when Dasein exists as an inauthentic Anyone-self.[64] So Dasein as an inauthentic Anyone-self cannot be the focus of this critique.

The heart of the criticism is authenticity; however, many of the characteristics of inauthentic Dasein effective at preventing the criticism are still operative for authentic Dasein. According to Marsh, "what it means to be authentic is this winnowing down of the self that dwells alongside and with others to its innermost individuality" resulting in "the disconnection of any genuine bond between I and other."[65] This is not correct, but understandably so. The mistake is equating the *process* of coming to authenticity with authenticity itself. On the other side of the process, there is no free-floating self that has been released from the common understandings and possibilities of the Anyone as if authentic Dasein can now create itself *ex nihilo*.[66] Authentic Dasein returns to the Anyone, to its thrownness, and takes up or chooses the possibilities and understandings that it inherits, though in a qualitatively different manner: "The resoluteness in which Dasein comes back to itself, dis-closes current factical possibilities of authentic existing, and discloses them *from the heritage* which that resoluteness, as thrown, *takes over*."[67] Even in authentic existence, Dasein is not an "I" mastering and possessing the world and others.

---

[62] For example, see SZ 163.
[63] Marsh understands this as well; though his otherwise accurate account falters on the other side of the process of Dasein coming to authenticity; Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 265.
[64] For example, SZ 267-8.
[65] Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 131.
[66] SZ 298; Boomgaarden notes this as well, particularly in relation to death. Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 278.
[67] SZ 383.

Authentic Dasein is still dependent on these communal structures. And there is some indication that Bonhoeffer saw this: Dasein "enters into its most authentic possibility […] not by withdrawing from this world but by accepting its fallenness in the world as its guilt."[68] Additionally, authenticity creates the conditions for proper relations to other: "Resoluteness brings the Self right into its current concernful Being-amongst what is ready-to-hand, and pushes it into solicitous Being with Others."[69] So, it is neither the "before" of inauthentic existence nor the "after" of authentic existence with which Bonhoeffer should have a problem.

From Bonhoeffer's theological perspective and given an accurate reading of Heidegger, there are two legitimate critiques. The first concerns the means by which Dasein transitions from inauthenticity to authenticity. The second concerns the closed nature of Dasein's existential structures. Together these both make Heidegger unsuitable for Bonhoeffer's conception of proper theology. The first critique, concerning the process of coming to authenticity, involves encountering death, anxiety, and conscience, which will be the detailed focus of the following two sections; I will therefore present the second critique first. This critique is essentially that the closed nature of Dasein's existential structures means, for Bonhoeffer, that "no room has been left for the concept of revelation."[70]

While Heidegger is able to account for 'this-worldly' transcendence, or being encountered and affected by others, Heidegger cannot account for the transcendence of revelation.[71] There, in fact, seems to be a few options concerning how Heidegger's analysis of Dasein might relate to revelation. First, Heidegger could be understood to practice a basic methodological atheism where theological matters are more or less bracketed. There are many

[68] DBWE 2: 70 (DBW 2: 64).
[69] SZ 298; translation altered.
[70] DBWE 2: 72-3 (DBW 2: 67).
[71] Ibid.

points where Heidegger explicitly separates phenomenology or philosophy from theology, with particular concern that confusing the two is detrimental to both.[72] Second, it could be that Heidegger's analysis goes beyond this methodological atheism to a straightforward atheism. Heidegger's own biography up to the writing of *Being and Time* and his philosophical reliance on theological sources make this option implausible. Bonhoeffer does describe Heidegger's philosophy as "a consciously atheistic philosophy of finitude."[73] However, Bonhoeffer seems less explicitly concerned with Heidegger's own stance on revelation and more concerned with how Heidegger's philosophy might form the basis of an inappropriate ontology of revelation.

There is some cause for thinking that Heidegger has at least implicitly left room for revelation. He does leave room for other major theological concepts. Heidegger is quite explicit on this point in his "Phenomenology and Theology" (1927), particularly concerning sin as an existentiell modification of Being-guilty (*Schuldigsein*):

> Hence we can say that precisely because all basic theological concepts, considered in their full regional context, include a content that is indeed existentially powerless, i. e., *ontically* sublated, they are *ontologically* determined by a content that is pre-Christian and that can thus be grasped purely rationally […] then the *content* of the concept [of sin] *itself*, and not just any philosophical preference of the theologian, calls for a return to the concept of guilt. But guilt is an original ontological determination of the existence of Dasein.[74]

[72] SZ 34, 229, and 272n1. The actual methodological atheistic nature of Heidegger's early work is, however, threatened by his heavy personal and philosophical reliance on theological sources. For excellent sources detailing Heidegger's reliance on religious sources, see Benjamin Crowe, *Heidegger's Phenomenology of Religion: Realism and Cultural Criticism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007); Crowe, *Heidegger's Religious Origins*; John van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*; Judith Wolfe, *Heidegger's Eschatology: Theological Horizons in Martin Heidegger's Early Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Judith Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014). And both in Heidegger's development leading up to *Being and Time* and in *Being and Time* itself there are frequent nods to theology that make the division difficult to maintain (See, for example, SZ 190n1, 245n1, and 306n1.)

[73] DBWE 2: 72 (DBW 2: 66).

[74] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 51. Bonhoeffer would have been familiar with this basic position from SZ 190n1.

Nearly everything that Bonhoeffer must reject is compressed in this statement. Consider the 'causal' chain of the particular example of guilt here: Dasein has a particular ontological nature. Part of this nature is the structure of guilt. As ontological, guilt may happen to be given the ontic content of sin, a philosophical *preference* of the theologian. Most importantly, this content is existentially *powerless*. Heidegger has constructed comfortable homes in the being of Dasein for some of the most important theological concepts.

The worry here is that Heidegger *has made* an existential home for revelation in the transition to authenticity. If so, revelation has been swallowed, not by act, but by being, making it one *possible* existentiell modification among others and leaving it impotent vis-à-vis the existential structures *within* Dasein from which it arises and according to which it must conform. It is here that Bonhoeffer must draw the line, particularly given his Barthian sensibilities.

> The reason for this is that the essence of revelation lies in its event-character. For the existential-ontological analysis, revelation can be thought within the static possibilities of Dasein; but then it no longer has the essential character of an event, one that comes from God's freedom […] But if revelation is essentially an event of God's free activity, then it supersedes and challenges also the existential-ontological possibilities of Dasein […] In the existentiell event of revelation, the existential structure of Dasein is touched and changed.[75]

By making room for revelation in the being of Dasein, Heidegger is essentially not talking about revelation. For Bonhoeffer, revelation must be understood as God's free event that supersedes any human possibility.

More generally, making room for revelation in Dasein also means that, again, Dasein has the possibility of placing itself in the truth. Revelation is importantly, for Bonhoeffer, that transcendent event, the only event, that places Dasein in the truth. Now that revelation is a possibility of Dasein, Dasein yet again commandeers the ability to place itself in the truth.

[75] DBWE 2: 78n89 (DBW 2: 72n89).

Dasein needs only turn 'inward' (*cor curvum in se*) to its own possibilities in order to come to the truth of its existence.

In *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer says that Heidegger has successfully coordinated act and being. Also, in his "Inaugural Lecture" Bonhoeffer says, "Scheler conceives the possibilities of the human being statically, hence in continuity but not in existentiality [i.e. openness to transcendence]. Heidegger succeeds in combining the two."[76] Bonhoeffer can say both this and also that Heidegger has theologically failed at the criterion of transcendence without contradiction if we again keep in mind the different standards to which Bonhoeffer holds philosophy and theology. Heidegger has not collapsed the world into the I or subject as idealism does according to Bonhoeffer. With this Heidegger has accounted for transcendence as best as can be expect of philosophy by theology. Yet, because Heidegger's philosophy is philosophy, it is incapable of leaving Dasein open to transcendent revelation.

The Boundary of Death

Bonhoeffer's more general critique of Heidegger's authenticity is that in coming to this privileged position Dasein need only turn to itself thereby removing or incorporating, depending on one's theological use of Heidegger, transcendent revelation. Much of the content of this critique is contained in the more localized critiques of how Dasein comes to authenticity, particularly through death and conscience.

As we have seen from the last two chapters, designating a proper boundary is essential to a true solution to the problem of act and being. Kant's boundaries of the thing-in-itself and the transcendental subject, for example, are epistemologically ideal if only they could be maintained. In keeping with the general nature of the problem of act and being, we should also expect some form of boundary at the anthropological level. As a champion of a solution to the problem of act

[76] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 364).

and being at the anthropological level, we should expect Heidegger to provide such a boundary. And so he does with his concept of 'death', which Heidegger explicitly calls Dasein's boundary-situation (*Grenzsituation*).[77]

Bonhoeffer unequivocally rejects Heidegger's concept of 'death' on strictly theological grounds. "On this point, cf. Heidegger's analysis of 'being towards death' as the 'ownmost potentiality for being' that makes possible 'the whole of Dasein'. Heidegger's concept of death is metaphysical and utterly insincere, for he includes death in the dialectical process of the spirit ('Dasein') finding itself."[78] Unfortunately, it is not clear whether Bonhoeffer properly understands Heidegger on death; though, in light of Bonhoeffer's other theological commitments he would still have to reject Heidegger's 'death' even if accurately understood.

Yet, it is important to accurately understand and appreciate Heidegger's 'death' because it is essential to *Being and Time*'s overall structure both in itself and as understood as a philosophically adequate solution to the anthropological problem of act and being, and we cannot otherwise accurately understand and correct Bonhoeffer's evaluation of 'death'.

For Heidegger's existential analytic of Dasein, death is methodologically important. The goal, again, is to get a fundamental grasp of Dasein's being. This entails coming to understand Dasein as a whole. A central existential structure of Dasein is possibility. Dasein is essentially possibility. This entails that Dasein is always "not-yet"; something is always "still outstanding."[79] But if Dasein is always and essentially incomplete possibilities, then how can we understand Dasein as a whole?[80] Heidegger's answer is that if we come to understand the

[77] SZ 349.
[78] DBWE 2: 148n15 (DBW 2: 147n15).
[79] SZ 242.
[80] SZ 236.

existential structure of death, we can understand Dasein as something that is whole. This will entail death being a certain way or manner of having incomplete possibilities.[81]

To understand, however, how death is an answer to the problem of Dasein's completeness, we have to understand what is not an answer or what Heidegger does not mean by 'death'. Heidegger explicitly distinguishes 'death' from "perishing" (*Verenden*) and "demise" (*Ableben*). Perishing is biological death.[82] Perishing is then an event at the end of a biological life. Demise is a way of perishing specific to Dasein. Where perishing and 'death' meet there is demise, which is strictly reserved for Dasein. This is what Heidegger means when he says that demise is intermediate between perishing and 'death' and that "Dasein […] can demise only as long as it is dying."[83] A bacteria may physically or biologically perish. A bacteria, however, does not have a world.[84] Dasein does have a world. It seeks to understand its being: how it is as thrown into a world, with the necessary requirement to project itself and understand itself according to its possibilities. 'Death' is the ontological possibility of no longer being able to do this. When Dasein physically dies it experiences demise as the end of its world and the end of its being-there.[85] So 'death' is not unrelated to ordinary understandings that Heidegger would call 'demise' or 'perishing', but it is not strictly equivalent to them either. 'Death', rather than being an actual event, which would make it ontical or existentiell, is an ontological or existential

[81] For an excellent summation of the methodological importance of death see Polt, *Heidegger*, 86. For an argument for death as a way for Dasein to exist see William Blattner, "The Concept of Death in Being and Time," *Man and World* 27 (1994): 49–70.
[82] SZ 241 and 247.
[83] SZ 247.
[84] In using the example of a bacteria, I am consciously trying to avoid Heidegger's contentious claims concerning whether animals have worlds; Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, 176–8.
[85] SZ 259.

possibility of Dasein. As Heidegger says, "when Dasein dies […] it does not have to do so with an experience of its factical demising, or in such an experience."[86]

Bonhoeffer's critiques of Heidegger's death seem to involve conflating death with demise. Given the complexity of Heidegger's analysis of death, the ambiguity of Bonhoeffer's language in evaluating death, and the fact that Bonhoeffer does not explicitly acknowledge the distinction of death from demise, we cannot say with certainty if Bonhoeffer has an adequate understanding of Heidegger's death. In *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer first describes Heidegger's death as follows: "As temporal Dasein within historicity, it must order itself upon its own end so as to attain its original wholeness. And this end is death. In the most proper sense, Dasein is 'being toward death'."[87] First, when Bonhoeffer says that "this end is death," it is not clear what meaning of end he has in mind. Heidegger, in another instance of his method of formal indication, goes through a few common meanings of "end," such as "stopping" or being "finished," and rejects them as possible meanings of death-as-end.[88] Elsewhere Bonhoeffer seems to equate wholeness with completion.[89] This would seem to suggest that by "end" Bonhoeffer has one of the rejected meanings in mind. And if by death-as-end he has something like "stopping" or "finishing" in mind, then it seems that he may be conflating death with demise. As a final piece of evidence, Bonhoeffer locates Heidegger's analysis of both authentic and inauthentic existence firmly in existence in sin or Adam. In describing what sounds like an allusion to Heidegger's process of coming to authenticity, Bonhoeffer says, "In conscience death steps within the horizon of the I, but only as an entity, as an event that conscience can

[86] SZ 247. This seems to be what Bonhoeffer misses in Heidegger's concept of 'death'. Bonhoeffer misses the fact that death is an existential structure that may be filled in with other existentiell 'content', including theological content; though, again as we will see, even if Bonhoeffer had seen this, he would still have found it necessary to reject Heidegger's notion of death.
[87] DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63); SZ 252, 266, 348, and 373.
[88] SZ 244-5.
[89] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 365).

conquer."[90] It seems quite likely then that Bonhoeffer reads Heidegger's death as an event, i.e. as demise rather than death.[91] This likely misunderstanding of death will lead Bonhoeffer to a few misplaced critiques. First, we must properly understand Heidegger's death.

Death is not an event like demise, but is rather a way of being. Death is a possibility and uniquely so. "Death is the possibility of no-longer-being-able-to-be-there."[92] As Polt aptly points out, Heidegger's choice of "death" (*Tod*) is misleading, offering "mortality" as a viable substitute.[93] "Mortality" correctly highlights death, as Heidegger means it, as a continual condition. It is not an event that will happen. Rather it is a way in which Dasein is finite and therefore that conditions its existence. To highlight this Heidegger also uses the term "dying" at one point saying, and echoing Luther, "As soon as man comes to life, he is at once old enough to die."[94] In this sense, death then means the constant condition under which all of Dasein's projects are undertaken. Whether Dasein truly knows it in an existential sense, it is mortal and finite; all its projects, and more fundamentally even the ability to undertake projects, are constantly under threat.

As a possibility and a way for Dasein to be, death has a few distinctive characteristics that make it unique among Dasein's possibilities. It is Dasein's *ownmost* possibility. It is *non-relational*. It is *certain* and *indefinite*. And it is *unsurpassable* (not to be outstripped; *unüberholbare*).[95]

---

[90] DBWE 2: 148 (DBW 2: 147).
[91] It is important to note the "but only as…" phrase, however. Bonhoeffer himself does not want to understand death as an event. As we will see, Bonhoeffer's and Heidegger's understandings of death are likely more similar than Bonhoeffer seems to have realized.
[92] SZ 250.
[93] Polt, *Heidegger*, 86.
[94] SZ 245; cf. a similar statement by Luther: "Right from our mother's womb we begin to die"; LW 1: 196. This statement is specifically given by Heidegger as a motto for his 1921 course, "Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle: Initiation into Phenomenological Research"; van Buren, *The Young Heidegger*, 166.
[95] SZ 258-9.

By death as Dasein's ownmost possibility, Heidegger essentially means that death always belongs to a particular Dasein. No one can die for another Dasein. Here understanding the difference between death and demise is important. Someone else can demise for me. Forms of heroism and sacrifice are predicated on this possibility. But no one can take over my mortality, the fundamental condition that I am finite, for me. This also makes death distinct from other possible ways of being. Being a spouse or instructor are also ways for Dasein to be; however, they are ways that may be taken over by others.

Death as uniquely mine or ownmost distinguishes it from other possibilities of Dasein in another important respect, which makes it certain. This is not empirical or epistemic certainty.[96] Again this would be to mistake demise, the event, with death, the possibility. No other possibility is a possibility in which Dasein *must* exist. It is not necessary that any particular Dasein be a spouse or instructor. It is, however, necessary that Dasein be mortal.[97]

Though death is certain it is also indefinite. Here the "when" of death is indeterminate.[98] Here it is difficult to elucidate what Heidegger means without making it sound like a future event like demise. By contrast, Heidegger asserts that death is often covered up by demise. Death, being confused with demise, is then seen as a future event. As a future event that will happen, "but not right away," the "when" of death is then made definite.[99] Rather death, according to Heidegger, "is possible at any [every/each] moment" (*er jeden Augenblick möglich ist*) and

[96] SZ 257.
[97] Heidegger does leave open the possibility, in a nontechnical sense, that there is an afterlife. He rules it out as a subject of his investigation, one, because it would involve investigation at the ontic level, and two, because it would not involve being-in-the-world, it would also not involve an investigation into Dasein (SZ 247-8).
[98] Death as certain and yet indefinite seems to have some origin in Heidegger's analysis of Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. As Heidegger reads Paul, Christian existence is always conditioned by the impending *parousia*, which, though impending, one can never know its definite "when." Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 67–74.
[99] SZ 258.

because of this is indefinite.[100] What Heidegger seems to be saying, particularly if "*jeden*" is meant as "each" or "every," is that death is a possibility in which Dasein always is, and therefore it does not occur at or in any particular moment of sequential or chronological time.

As a possibility that is ownmost and certain, death is also unsurpassable or not to be outstripped. All other possibilities are susceptible to breakdown in the face of Dasein's finitude. The conditions that allow different possibilities to be taken up, such as being an instructor, may fail. Dasein, as we will see with anxiety, may no longer be able to identify itself with a possibility. There are a number of conditions in which any particular possibility may no longer be a possible way for Dasein to be. This is not the case for death. No other way of being can remove death or mortality as an essential way for Dasein to exist.

Finally, death is non-relational.[101] When facing up to death, Dasein's relations with others are cut off. "When it [Dasein] stands before itself in this way [i.e. facing up to death], all its relations to any other Dasein have been undone."[102] Death (and anxiety), when experienced, are extreme individualizing moments when relations to others seem to have no significance.

Anxiety attends Dasein's understanding of death. When Dasein encounters death, feels the full weight of the above characteristics, yet does not flee in the face of it,[103] Dasein

[100] Ibid.
[101] Much of Heidegger's analysis of death is reminiscent of some of Luther's statements concerning death. For example, "The summons of death comes to us all, and no one can die for another. Every one must fight his own battle with death by himself, alone. We can shout into another's ears, but every one must himself be prepared for the time of death, for I will not be with you then, nor you with me." "The First Sermon, March 9, 1522, Invocavit Sunday" in LW 51: 392. In all candor, this is one of many points where Luther is not always consistent. For example, in his "Sermon on Preparing to Die," he states that "in the hour of death no Christian should doubt that he is not alone." For the eyes of God, Christ, the angels, the saints, and all Christians are on him; Martin Luther, "Sermon on Preparing to Die," in *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, ed. Timothy E. Lull (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 643.
[102] SZ 250.
[103] It seem that the most common way of fleeing death, for Heidegger, is to misunderstand death as demise and understand demise, following the Anyone, as an event that will happen "but not right away."

simultaneously encounters "anxiety in the face of death."[104] As death was a unique possibility of Dasein, anxiety is a unique attunement of Dasein. Death reveals the radical contingency of all of Dasein's possibilities. Dasein is then thrown back on the way it is in the world. And given the radical contingency of Dasein's possibilities, Dasein cannot identify with such possibilities: "Anxiety thus takes away from Dasein the possibility of understanding itself […] in terms of the 'world' and the way things have been publicly interpreted."[105] If Dasein cannot identify with possibilities such as being a spouse or instructor, then the involvements such possibilities were mutually dependent on collapse. Dasein's world then collapses and "has the character of completely lacking significance."[106] As the collapsing of the world, "anxiety," like death, "individualizes Dasein for its ownmost being-in-the-world."[107]

Though they seem dire, these encounters are in fact, liberating for Heidegger. They potentially free Dasein of its fallenness and lostness in the Anyone-self, and they thereby potentially lead to authentic existence.

> We may now summarize our characterization of authentic being-towards-death as we have projected it existentially: *Running forward reveals to Dasein its lostness in the Anyone-self, and brings it face to face with the possibility of being itself, primarily unsupported by concernful solicitude, but of being itself, rather, in an impassioned* freedom towards death-a *freedom which has been released from the Illusions of the "Anyone," and which is factical, certain of itself, and anxious.*[108]

But as Heidegger quickly notes following the above quotation, the job is not complete. He must still account for how Dasein can move forward in an authentic *and existentiell* way. To do so he gives an account of conscience, the subject of the next section. First, we must account for Bonhoeffer's critiques of death and, by extension, anxiety.

---

[104] SZ 252 and 254.
[105] SZ 187.
[106] SZ 186.
[107] SZ 187.
[108] SZ 266; translation altered and emphasis in the original.

Bonhoeffer appears to have four critical comments concerning death. First, death (along with anxiety) individualizes Dasein and therefore isolates it.[109] Second and like the failure of Kant's boundaries, death cannot be a true boundary because in authentic existence death is incorporated into Dasein's self-understanding.[110] Third, Bonhoeffer accepts Heidegger's observation of Dasein's radical finitude, but believes that Heidegger has conflated finitude with completion.[111] Fourth, that death leads to completion makes it systematic and metaphysical.[112]

Concerning the first criticism, Bonhoeffer is right. Heidegger unambiguously asserts that death and anxiety are extreme individualizing moments. Unfortunately as we saw earlier, Bonhoeffer carries this through to authentic existence. This is patently false at least in so far as Heidegger throughout *Being and Time* asserts that authentic existence is what allows for genuine relations with others and the world. The only viable means of saving Bonhoeffer here is to adopt his theological position.[113] For Bonhoeffer, both Heidegger's inauthentic and authentic existences are existences in sin. For Bonhoeffer, the only difference between the two is that authentic existence involves a higher level of self-justification in the face of sin. A prominent theme throughout Bonhoeffer's corpus is that existence in sin is incapable of having proper relations with others. It is possible to theoretically account for our ontological dependence on and therefore openness to others; however, existence in sin cannot in reality or, as Heidegger would put it, existentielly, have proper relations with others. This then means that even in

[109] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 365); Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 278.
[110] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 365); DBWE 2: 148n15 (DBW 2: 147n15); Karttunen, *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit*, 96; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 276.
[111] DBWE 10: 396 (DBW 10: 365); Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 273.
[112] DBWE 2: 148n15 (DBW 2: 147n15).
[113] Boomgaarden, also noticing this problem, attempts to save Bonhoeffer by claiming that what Bonhoeffer really has in mind is anxiety and not authenticity. Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 278. Bonhoeffer is quite clear, however, in making this claim for authenticity in addition to anxiety and death.

authentic existence one cannot have proper relations with others and is therefore in some sense isolated, for Bonhoeffer.

The second critique, that death is not a true boundary because it is incorporated into Dasein, is true by Bonhoeffer's definition of boundary. It is a boundary imposed by Dasein's very being. It is a condition that must be faced up to and according to which other possibilities must be undertaken in order for Dasein to be authentic.

The third critique, again, is that death, as that which reveals Dasein's radical finitude, leads to Dasein's completion. But this seems to be predicated on death understood as merely a futural event, as demise; when, in fact, Heidegger means that constant condition of being limited or finite. There are only so many possibilities available to Dasein. There are fewer that Dasein may take up. And even fewer still may be authentically taken up: "Freedom, however, *is*, in the choice of one possibility—that is, in tolerating one's not having chosen the others and one's not being able to choose them."[114] Dasein just is limited, bounded, or finite. So Bonhoeffer's second critique still holds, but seems to be predicated on an inaccurate understanding of completion and the conflation of finitude with completion. Dasein can never be complete, for Heidegger, in any straightforward meaning of the word. As long as Dasein is, it is "not-yet."[115]

Fourth, Bonhoeffer critiques Heidegger's death for being metaphysical. Though Bonhoeffer does not explicitly define what he means by "metaphysical" he seems to mean the construction of any closed system that does not allow for an encounter with the transcendent.[116] So we essentially return to the above critique that authenticity is predicated on the closed existential structures of Dasein. Death, as a possibility 'internal' to Dasein, and as a necessary means to attaining authenticity, means that Dasein does not turn to or is affected by anything

[114] SZ 285.
[115] SZ 244-6.
[116] DBWE 2: 75-6 and 80 (DBW 2: 70 and 74).

outside of itself in achieving genuine authenticity or selfhood. From Bonhoeffer's theological position this is certainly a legitimate critique.

Bonhoeffer has made some fundamental mistakes in his understanding of Heidegger's concept of death, most arising from the common mistake even among Heidegger interpreters of mistaking demise for death; however, even with a proper understanding of death, Bonhoeffer would have to reject being-towards-death as a means to achieving authentic existence given his theological commitments. This means that Heidegger's concept of death cannot aid in Bonhoeffer's understanding of Dasein in faith or, in Bonhoeffer's terms, being in Christ. This does not, however, mean that Heidegger's death could not and does not play some role in Bonhoeffer's theology overall.

When we turn in the next chapter to Bonhoeffer's constructive theological solution to the problem of act and being we may find that Bonhoeffer's Christian understanding of death has more in common with Heidegger's than Bonhoeffer realized, the likely cause of which was their shared reliance on the Christian tradition and Luther in particular. Plant, for example, says, "He [Heidegger] plays an important cameo role in a contrast Bonhoeffer draws between being-towards-death and being in Christ as being towards the future. Being-towards-death is still to exist in sin. Being in Christ alone opens up the future since 'the human being "is" in the future of Christ—that is, never in being without act and never in act without being."[117] Here too Plant is complexly right and wrong concerning Bonhoeffer's critique and alteration of Heidegger's concept of death. Again, the fuller picture of Bonhoeffer's theological adaptation of Heidegger will be further developed in the next chapter. For now we can agree with Plant that Bonhoeffer firmly places Heidegger's being-towards-death in the authentic Christian's 'past' existence as being in Adam or sin. However, like Heidegger's 'past', this past being in Adam is not done and

[117] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 321.

gone; rather, it is constantly made present in light of the future. Christian Dasein must be constantly in the process of dying to sin or being in Adam.[118] So, Heidegger will be important for understanding being in Adam, which is an important theological task in its own right. And we have here a taste of how Heidegger's temporality helps in understanding being in Christ, an essential theological task.

Conscience, Guilt, and Self-Justification

In Heidegger's concept of conscience, Bonhoeffer finds the justification for his overall critique of authentic existence, i.e. that it is still caught in the *cor curvum in se* or sin. As Bonhoeffer reads Heidegger, conscience is the "last gasp" of the self trying to justify itself in the face of sin.[119]

Conscience plays a crucial methodological function in *Being and Time*. While Heidegger believes he has shown the ontological or *existential* possibility of coming to authenticity with being-towards-death, he does not believe he has demonstrated the *existentiell* possibility of coming to authenticity.[120] That is, Heidegger must show how it is possible for authentic existence to have existentiell or 'real world' content. Conscience is that existential possibility that reveals to Dasein that it is inauthentic and guilty, what its existentiell possibilities are, and allows Dasein to authentically choose a particular existentiell way to exist.

Conscience, for Heidegger, manifests or is a call or appeal (*Ruf*). As fallen, Dasein is an Anyone-self. It is caught up in the Anyone and the way in which the Anyone publicly understands the world and Dasein. Dasein must be called out of its fallenness and away from its Anyone-self in order to become authentic.[121] The call of conscience is then an appeal to Dasein

[118] See DBWE 10: 406 (DBW 10: 376-7).
[119] DBWE 10: 406 (DBW 10: 376).
[120] SZ 266.
[121] SZ 273; DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63); DBWE 10: 395-6 (DBW 10: 364-5).

as an Anyone-self.[122] Dasein is what is called in conscience.[123] More importantly, Dasein is also the caller.[124] The call of conscience comes from Dasein as it has been *individualized* by anxiety.[125] As individualized by death and anxiety, Dasein is able to call to itself concerning its fallenness in the Anyone.

As a call, conscience must tell Dasein something. This something is not straightforward, however. The call of conscience is characterized by silence or reticence (*Verschwiegenheit*).[126] There is a sense in which the call of conscience does not tell Dasein anything. It does not manifest as specific language directing Dasein to do or not to do a specific action or engage in a specific possibility. This, for Heidegger, would be to fall back into the idle talk of the Anyone because it would treat Dasein's existence as a manipulable, calculable thing.[127]

Yet Dasein as an Anyone-self must be shown something, and this something is its guilt. Exercising his method of formal indication, Heidegger runs through various common understandings of 'guilt' in order to come to an ontological understanding that forms the basis of these common understandings. Such common, ontic understandings include "owing something," "being responsible for," and "making oneself responsible."[128] These are not ontological understandings, however. They concern specific things, actions, or requirements that are or are not lacking. There must be an ontological basis in Dasein's being for these. Ontological guilt

[122] SZ 272.
[123] SZ 275; DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63); DBWE 10: 395-6 (DBW 10: 364-5).
[124] SZ 276; DBWE 2: 69 (DBW 2: 63); DBWE 10: 395-6 (DBW 10: 364-5).
[125] SZ 276-7.
[126] SZ 273-4.
[127] SZ 274 and 293-4.
[128] SZ 282.

relates to "not."[129] Dasein's being in being-guilty is then being-the-basis of a nullity or notness (*Grundsein einer Nichtigkeit*).[130]

This "notness" is easiest to understand according to the way it determines the various structures of Dasein, for ontological guilt pervades its being. Dasein is guilty, or the basis of notness, both in its thrownness and its projection. As thrown, Dasein always already finds itself in a world in a particular way with certain possibilities open and closed to it. This thrownness is not under Dasein's control. "Thus 'being-a-basis' means *never* to have power over one's ownmost being from the ground up. This '*not*' belongs to the existential meaning of 'thrownness'."[131] Polt usefully calls this aspect of guilt "indebtedness."[132] Dasein cannot change what it has been. It is indebted to its beenness, which it must take over. It is important to note how extreme this position is. It is not simply a matter of being born into a world with its particularities that I did not choose. Dasein is always making this indebtedness present. In more ontic terms, I am always and constantly creating a past that I cannot change and must live with. Guilt also infuses the structure of projection. Dasein "always stands in one possibility or another: it constantly is *not* other possibilities, and it has waived these in its existentiell projection."[133] Polt calls this "responsibility."[134] In choosing possibilities I am always also not choosing others. I am responsible for such choices, and the ones not chosen may still make a claim on me.

Here we see how radical Heidegger's conception of Dasein's finitude is. There is an extreme curtailing of Dasein's "power."[135] And this lack of power is at the very heart of Dasein's being. It cannot be remedied. One might think that Bonhoeffer would appreciate this extreme

[129] SZ 283.
[130] SZ 283; DBWE 2: 69-70 (DBW 2: 63-4); DBWE 10: 395-6 (DBW 10: 364-5).
[131] SZ 284.
[132] Polt, *Heidegger*, 89.
[133] SZ 285.
[134] Polt, *Heidegger*, 89.
[135] SZ 284.

limiting of Dasein. Yet, as we will see, in Dasein's reaction to this in coming to authenticity, Bonhoeffer sees self-justification and merely a different form of sin.

Though Dasein cannot remedy guilt, it can take it on in a particular way. Dasein's authentic reaction is resoluteness (*Entschlossenheit*). As a fallen, inauthentic Anyone-self, Dasein has chosen possibilities, but not explicitly.[136] Authentic Dasein must change this somehow. "This must be accomplished by *making up for not choosing*. But 'making up' for not choosing signifies *choosing to make a choice*—deciding for a potentiality-for-being, and making this decision from one's own Self. In choosing to make a choice, Dasein *makes possible*, first and foremost, its authentic potentiality-for-Being."[137] This choosing to choose is resoluteness. Dasein is confronted with its guilt and its not having authentically chosen itself. Dasein also realizes that it must choose in spite of its guilt.

Dasein as resolute, then, chooses from the possibilities available to it from, what Heidegger calls, its Situation. Resoluteness reveals, in a new way, where Dasein is and the possibilities that are factically available to it. "Resoluteness, by its ontological essence, is always the resoluteness of some factical Dasein at a particular time […] *The resolution is precisely the disclosive projection and determination of what is factically possible at the time*."[138] Previously, as an inauthentic Anyone-self, Dasein was only open to general possibilities as publically interpreted by the Anyone. Dasein did not explicitly choose possibilities based on the actual factical situation in which the particular Dasein exists. With the Situation revealed by resoluteness and conscience, Dasein is now able to do so.

Heidegger completes his account of coming to authenticity by joining forward-running to death with resoluteness. For Dasein to be resolute, it must see that it is guilt and that this guilt is

[136] SZ 268.
[137] SZ 268.
[138] SZ 298; emphasis in the original.

constant. To see that it is constant requires that Dasein see that it is guilty to the end. In projecting its guilt to the end, Dasein is simultaneously projecting or running forward to its death (which is still understood not as an event but as something like facing up to mortality).[139] As such, "the phenomenon of resoluteness has [according to Heidegger] brought us before the primordial *truth* of existence. As resolute, Dasein is revealed to itself in its current factical potentiality-for-being, and in such a way that Dasein itself *is* this revealing and Being-revealed."[140]

With the last quotation and what has preceded concerning Bonhoeffer's theological requirements, one might already anticipate Bonhoeffer's critiques, but to properly understand Bonhoeffer's critiques of Heidegger's conscience, we must first understand the theological commitments concerning conscience that Bonhoeffer brings to his reading of Heidegger. For Bonhoeffer, following his reading of Luther, there are two types of conscience.[141] As we will get to in further detail in the next chapter, for Bonhoeffer there are two different existences for Dasein. Dasein can be in Adam (sin) or in Christ (faith). Dasein in Adam has one form of conscience, and Dasein in Christ has two forms of conscience.[142] Bonhoeffer clearly understands Heidegger's conception of conscience to be a sinful or in-Adam conscience. Here is how Bonhoeffer describes conscience in Adam:

---

[139] SZ 305.

[140] SZ 307; emphasis in the original.

[141] It seems likely that Heidegger would retort that Bonhoeffer's consciences are ontic or existentiell, with the sinful, self-justifying conscience being roughly equivalent to the 'good' conscience and the pre-revelation conscience being roughly equivalent to the 'bad' conscience (SZ 290-2). According to Heidegger, the 'bad' conscience is at its best based on his existential conscience; while the 'good' conscience is not a conscience at all. Though speculative, Heidegger could have Luther in mind here. Luther dealt with the concept of conscience most extensively in his commentary on Galatians. Heidegger had at least some familiarity with these lectures as early as 1920. Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 47. And he felt confident enough about Luther's Galatian commentary to do a guest lecture on them in Bultmann's seminar in 1927. Heinrich Schlier, "Denken im Nachdenken," in *Erinnerungen an Martin Heidegger*, ed. Günther Neske (Pfullingen: Neske, 1977), 219. Unfortunately, all we know about this guest lecture is that they occurred, they were on Luther's commentary on Galatians, and that the students were surprised and impressed by Heidegger's knowledge of Luther.

[142] DBWE 2: 148 and 155-6 (DBW 2: 146-7 and 154-5); DBWE 12: 230 (DBW 12: 196); DBWE 6: 276-9 (DBW 6: 276-80).

> *Conscience*, in which desperation and solitude become-conscious-of-themselves, seeks thereby to overcome them. Solitude is not grasped in its authentic sense. There arises merely a general consciousness of being-left-alone, and this is what conscience is to eliminate by restoring human beings once again to themselves. In conscience, the powers of this world, law and death, fall upon human beings and make them anxious; here, anxiety in the face of oneself erupts from life, because it neither knows the future nor holds it in its power. Yet there is in this anxiety an inability to break free of oneself, a final perseverance of the I in itself. In conscience death steps within the horizon of the I, but only as an entity, as an event that conscience can conquer. Human beings think themselves immortal and remain alone.[143]

There are, of course, some inaccuracies here, some of which I have pointed out. Death is not intended as an event for Heidegger, and it is crucial that Dasein does not see itself as immortal. Yet, it seems rather clear that Bonhoeffer has Heidegger in mind.

Bonhoeffer's problem is twofold. First, his general problem, and one that he has with many contemporary theologies such as Karl Holl's, is, as a technical term, the problem of the point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*).[144] The point of contact is the theological position that there must be a capacity or faculty within the human being pre-formed to receive revelation.[145] To hold such a position would, for Bonhoeffer (and Barth),[146] threaten God's sovereignty and freedom. It would mean that God would have to conform to that capacity or possibility in human existence when granting revelation. Additionally, it would threaten to make Christ and the church as the

[143] DBWE 2: 148 (DBW 2: 146-7).
[144] DBWE 2: 141-3 (DBW 2: 140-2); DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 118–28.
[145] It is perhaps important to note that Heidegger explicitly rejects understanding conscience as a faculty with specific reference to theological examples such as Albrecht Ritchl's "Über das Gewissen"; SZ 272n1. However, seeing Heidegger's conscience as such a point of contact is still understandable. Bultmann, for instance, also rejects any point of contact; yet, only two paragraphs later, with Heidegger in mind, says: "Conscience, for example, would be interpreted as such a phenomenon (which could call into question unbelieving existence); and that interpretation corresponds to the fact that the Christian kerygma is addressed to the conscience (II Cor. 4.2). That is why it is possible for the kerygma to be a call to decision and for faith to be a decision." Rudolf Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," in *Faith and Understanding*, ed. Robert W. Funk, trans. Louise Pettibone Smith, 6th ed., vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), 316–17.
[146] Barth, "No!," 79 and 89.

proper mediators of revelation irrelevant.[147] Bonhoeffer sees this risk in most contemporary discussions of conscience.[148]

Second and more specific to Heidegger, is the problem that the conscience and what it discloses is not caused by God or Christ. Conscience makes Dasein "accuser, accused, and judge," or in Heidegger's terms Dasein is both the caller and the called.[149] Here Dasein needs only look to its own possibilities to come to a privileged existential position. Dasein justifies itself from 'within' its own existence. It is *cor curvum in se*.

For Bonhoeffer, then, the authentic existence that results from these encounters with anxiety, death, and conscience is only a higher level of sinful existence, a more nuanced form of self-justification. Authentic Dasein has come to realize that many aspects of its existence are 'sinful' or fallen; however, rather than these aspects being modified or altered from outside, authentic Dasein takes it upon itself to come to a new mode of existence. What is needed, for Bonhoeffer, is for Christ to intercede from outside at the moment of self-justification to destroy this conscience and Dasein's last attempt at self-justification.

There are two characteristics of conscience, which are unfortunately underdeveloped, that one might point to as rejoinders to Bonhoeffer's criticisms. First, while describing the way in which the conscience is a call from Dasein itself, Heidegger adds, "Indeed the call is precisely something which *we ourselves* have neither planned nor prepared for nor voluntarily performed, nor have we ever done so."[150] To this Heidegger adds, second, that "The call comes *from* me and yet from *beyond* [*über*] me."[151] Though Heidegger rejects interpreting the lack of voluntarism in

[147] DBWE 2: 141 (DBW 2: 140).
[148] DBWE 10: 400-1 (DBW 10: 369-70).
[149] DBWE 10: 406 (DBW 10: 376); SZ 275-6.
[150] SZ 275.
[151] Ibid.

the conscience and its 'transcendent' qualities as relating to God,[152] these qualities might appear to counter or mitigate Bonhoeffer's criticisms, the central point of which is that Dasein is still trapped in itself. Though Heidegger does not explicitly expand on or clarify these two points, it seems that conscience is 'outside of' and not voluntarily chosen by Dasein as it is modified as an Anyone-self.[153] That is, Dasein actually existing in the world as an Anyone-self does not choose to have a conscience, and it appears to come from outside of Dasein because the conscience does not operate in a way that is recognizable by Dasein as an Anyone-self. For example, a key characteristic of the Anyone and Dasein as an Anyone-self is idle talk. By contrast, the authenticity revealing conscience operates with a very different from of discourse, i.e. silence and reticence, which the Anyone-self does not recognize as a form of discourse. By "beyond" and "involuntary" Heidegger likely does not intend conscience to come from outside of Dasein's being.

Though Heidegger is able to maintain a this-worldly transcendence in which the world, entities, and others are not collapsed into the subject, he does fail at Bonhoeffer's desired theological transcendence. Authenticity is a privileged mode of existence that Dasein brings itself to through anxiety, death, and conscience. This, for Bonhoeffer, is merely another form of an intellectual *cor curvum in se* and self-justification that threatens the necessity of revelation.

Pryzwara: An Excursus?

There is one last critique that must be dealt with. Bonhoeffer concludes his explicit account of Heidegger in Part A of *Act and Being* with: "It follows that Heidegger's concept of being, despite its enormous expansion through the discovery of the existential sphere, remains

[152] Ibid. Heidegger does later say that theological, along with psychological and anthropological, accounts of conscience cannot be immediately dismissed (SZ 290). Also, even if Heidegger was open to the claim that the conscience was a call from God, it would merely make Heidegger vulnerable to the same theological critiques that Bonhoeffer levels against Holl.
[153] SZ 272-3.

unsuitable for theology."[154] This is a seemingly straightforward rejection of Heidegger often referenced in secondary scholarship. Ernst Feil says, "Thus Heidegger's concept of existence, derived from the human and not from revelation, was, for Bonhoeffer, theologically unusable."[155] Boomgaarden also quotes Bonhoeffer's above statement interpreting it as another instance of Bonhoeffer's critique that Heidegger fails to maintain openness to transcendence.[156] This is, of course, Bonhoeffer's strongest critique of Heidegger, but, as I will argue, I do not think that is what is happening here. Finally, Zimmerman, possibly with this quotation in mind, says "Bonhoeffer deems Heidegger's ontology ultimately unsuitable for a genuinely theological conception of knowledge."[157] When we turn to Bonhoeffer's theological epistemology in the next chapter we will see that this is true only based on a very narrow conception of suitability. What is needed to properly interpret Bonhoeffer's above statement is to reconcile it with his many statements that Heidegger is useful for theology.

I believe a more reasonable interpretation of this critique, one that does not make Bonhoeffer disingenuous or forgetful, comes from noting the difference between Dasein and the "concept of being" (*Seinsbegriff*) and seeing this statement in light of its immediate context.

It is important that Bonhoeffer does not say that Heidegger's concept of Dasein is unsuitable for theology. Dasein and being are not equivalent. The following would be the general consequence if Bonhoeffer considered Heidegger's concept of being suitable for theology, and why, therefore, he must reject being but not necessarily Dasein. Again, the overall goal of *Being*

[154] DBWE 2: 73 (DBW 2: 67).
[155] Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 32. Marsh's judgment, which I agree with, is that this is too quick a gloss on Heidegger's importance to Bonhoeffer and Marsh does better recognize that importance; however, Marsh soon states "that Bonhoeffer does finally reject [Heidegger's] fundamental ontology […]" Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 117. Depending on what Marsh means by "fundamental ontology," this too might be incorrect. That is, if by "fundamental ontology" Marsh means getting to the meaning of being, then he is correct. If he means the existential analytic of Dasein, he is wrong in so far as it is not a final or complete rejection.
[156] Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 295.
[157] Zimmermann, *Humanism and Religion*, 297.

and Time is to understand the meaning of being. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger does not actually achieve this goal. By the end of *Being and Time* the reader is frustratingly told that so far we are only "on the way" to getting an answer to the meaning of being.[158] We, therefore, know very little about being after reading *Being and Time* (though we know much about Dasein). What we do know is that Heidegger believes that the way to get to the meaning of being is through that entity that already has a pre-ontological or unthematic understanding of being, i.e. Dasein. What is suitable to theology, for Bonhoeffer in *Act and Being*, is what can help theology come to an act-being coordinated ontology of revelation. This would mean that if Heidegger's concept of being were suitable for theology, it would in some way be able to account for revelation, perhaps even be equivalent to it.[159] But this would mean that Dasein already has an understanding of revelation prior to revelation, grace, or entering faith.[160] This is a position that Bonhoeffer rejects. What is particularly important is that Bonhoeffer can say this while still accepting Heidegger's concept of Dasein as useful for theology, which is the target of all of Bonhoeffer's praises.

If we look closely at where the above statement occurs in *Act and Being* we see that it occurs just prior to Bonhoeffer's critique of a position much like the one just outlined. This critique comes immediately before Bonhoeffer's rejection of Erich Pryzwara, an early 20th century Catholic theologian. According to the general purpose of and what has preceded in Part A, Pryzwara should not be in this section. To this point, Part A has been devoted to philosophical

---

[158] SZ 436-7.

[159] There is an important area of agreement here between Bonhoeffer and Heidegger concerning the rejection of equating Heidegger's being and God. In 1951 during a seminar in Zurich, a student asked Heidegger, "Are being and God identical?" Heidegger's answer: "Being and God are not identical, and I would never try to think of God's essence through being. Some may know that I come from theology and it is still an old love […] If I were to write a theology, to which I am sometimes stimulated, then the word 'being' would not occur in it.

Faith has no need of the thought of being. If it used it, then it would no longer be faith. Luther understood this" (GA 15: 437; my translation).

[160] This is in fact a position that Bultmann, at least for a time, held, and which I will deal with in more detail in the concluding chapter.

attempts to solve the problem of act and being. Pryzwara would be a better fit for Part B, which deals with theological attempts to solve the problem. So why is Pryzwara here? Most secondary literature treats Bonhoeffer on Pryzwara as just another rejection of a relatively isolated attempt to solve the problem of act and being.

It makes more sense to see Bonhoeffer's rejection of Pryzwara as an extension of Bonhoeffer's treatment of Heidegger and as an instantiation of how Heidegger's concept of being can go theologically amiss if inappropriately applied to theology. Pryzwara had also entered the theological fray of reactions to Heidegger.[161] Like Bonhoeffer, Pryzwara was also concerned with the apparent closed and immanent nature of existence described in *Being and Time*.[162] However, and also like Bonhoeffer, he saw possible positive theological uses for Heidegger's philosophy. He saw the possibility of returning to Scholasticism and reinvigorating the doctrine of the *analogia entis* (analogy of being) using Heidegger's concept of being and Dasein's relation to it.[163] There is in Dasein, as Pryzwara interprets Heidegger, a difference between existence and essence. By contrast, God's being is characterized by the strict identity of existence and essence. The relation of Dasein's existence and essence is in the likeness of the relation of God's existence and essence.[164] Through this likeness Dasein has the *possibility* of accessing God's being. That is, Dasein has, even if fallen or imperfect, a pre-understanding of God's being. But as we have seen working to God or revelation from a human possibility is strictly rejected by Bonhoeffer. As Bonhoeffer says in his rejection of Przywara,

---

[161] Przywara, "Drei Richtungen der Phänomenologie." For a brief, but good, account of various Catholic reactions to Heidegger, including Pryzwara's, see Wolfe, *Heidegger's Eschatology*, 149–58; Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, 174–8 and 186–93.

[162] Przywara, "Drei Richtungen der Phänomenologie," 252.

[163] For a excellent and extended account of Przywara's relation to Aquinas, the *analogia entis*, and Bonhoeffer see Barry Harvey, "Augustine and Thomas Aquinas in the Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 18–28.

[164] Przywara, "Drei Richtungen der Phänomenologie," 262.

> The eternal 'is' remains a speculative notion which is continuously 'in-over' [*in-über*] becoming, and which even admits of being broadened into an a priori system of the natural insight of reason, but which is inadequate for a theological ontology. God is not primarily the sheer 'is'. Rather God 'is' the righteous one; God 'is' the holy one; God 'is' love.[165]

Here, I believe, we see Bonhoeffer rejecting *one* possible theological use of Heidegger's philosophy, one in which Heidegger's *Seinsbegriff* is likened to God's being.

Immediately following his critique of Pryzwara, Bonhoeffer asks, "Does this prove that every ontological approach is of no use for theology?" to which he answers, "It proves this with regard to an ontological approach just as little as it does with relation to a transcendental approach."[166] And shortly thereafter in concluding Part A, Bonhoeffer says, "In what follows, nevertheless, genuine transcendental philosophy [Kant] and genuine ontology [Heidegger] […] are said to make a contribution to the understanding of the problem of act and being within the concept of revelation."[167] And it is to this contribution that we turn in the next chapter.

***

With these previous two chapters, we should now have an understanding of Bonhoeffer's view of Heidegger's successes and failures in relation to the problem of act and being. This provides us with a road map for the way in which Bonhoeffer creatively appropriates Heidegger to solve the problem of act and being for theology. A summation of such successes and failures will help anticipate the moves Bonhoeffer makes in his theological solution, to be explained in the following chapter.

Heidegger's greatest successes occur at the anthropological level with his analysis of Dasein. His method of analysis begins by looking at the way Dasein actually lives or exists.

---

[165] DBWE 2: 75 (DBW 2: 69). See also DBWE 3: 65 (DBW 3: 58-9) and Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 39.
[166] DBWE 2: 76 (DBW 2: 70).
[167] DBWE 2: 79 (DBW 2: 72-3).

Heidegger begins with how we pre-theoretically interact with each other and things in the world. He begins with usual everyday understandings of words and concepts. This is a distinctive success in relation to Bonhoeffer's criterion of concreteness. Though it is not as immediately obvious at this stage of Bonhoeffer's development, he will turn to the concrete way in which Christians exist in the church.

Much of the rationale for Heidegger's turn to the concrete is predicated on overcoming modern philosophy's epistemological prejudices. To understand how we know, we must first understand how we exist. With Bonhoeffer's turn to concrete existence in the church, he will develop what he calls "ecclesial knowing" that arises from this concrete existence.

Concerning Dasein itself, Heidegger has successfully maintained the continuity of its existence, particularly by understanding it as thrown-projection and as fundamentally temporal. Both are at the heart of Heidegger's coordination of act and being. Bonhoeffer will therefore apply both to an ontology of revelation. This is made easier by Bonhoeffer's commitment to see revelation, as he understands Luther to have, as the *person* of Jesus Christ. The person of Jesus Christ, particularly as understood as the church, becomes something of an Ur-Dasein. Jesus Christ and the church are, like Heidegger's Dasein, explained by Bonhoeffer in fundamentally temporal terms.

In virtue of participating or not participating in this Ur-Dasein, human Dasein exists, for Bonhoeffer, as either in Christ or in Adam, respectively. This is Bonhoeffer's answer to theological anthropology. Given Bonhoeffer's understanding of philosophy, Heidegger will also play a positive, if complex, role here as well. We have already seen hints of how Bonhoeffer understands Heidegger to have explicated being in Adam. Yet, given Dasein-in-Christ's

dependence on its existence in the church, and Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger to explain the church, Heidegger also has his influence here as well.

Of course, Heidegger's philosophy, as it is, cannot be the foundation of theology. Heidegger fails at theological transcendence. Here Kant is much more important. Kant's intentions were right. He wanted to maintain the boundary between reason and the transcendent thing-in-itself, for example. Only the direction of this intention was misplaced for Bonhoeffer. Rather than our existence being directed at transcendence, at least initially, it is necessary for transcendence to be directed at us. Here Bonhoeffer understands the transcendent person of Jesus Christ to be *pro me* (for me) or directed towards me.

Chapter Five: Bonhoeffer's Theological Solution: Christ as Ur-Dasein

We now turn to the primary goal that the preceding chapters have been leading to, the explication of Bonhoeffer's theological solutions to the problem of act and being with an emphasis on those elements informed by Bonhoeffer's understanding of Heidegger's solution. The most difficult task of the present chapter is disambiguating where Heidegger is and is not an influential source. There are times when this influence is clear. There are points when Bonhoeffer the theologian explicitly wishes to distance himself from Heidegger the philosopher. Most difficult of all are those points where Heidegger may be only an apparent, but not an actual, influence. This seems to most often occur when the two have a shared source, Luther being the most prominent. Heidegger's relevance to Bonhoeffer's theology, in the aforementioned ways, is what will guide the following presentation of Bonhoeffer's theology. It is, therefore, not an exhaustive account of Bonhoeffer's theology as presented in *Act and Being*.

Though not exhaustive, it does get to the heart of both Heidegger's influence and Bonhoeffer's theological development. As we will see, Heidegger's *Daseinanalytik* is instrumental in Bonhoeffer's formulation of Jesus Christ as person. This forms the heart of Heidegger's influence, and as Larry Rasmussen correctly observes, "the heart of [Bonhoeffer's] theology was Christology."[1] Therefore, Heidegger's influence is not inconsequential.

Bonhoeffer's act-being coordinated theological ontology of revelation comes at the end of Part B, "The Problem of Act and Being in the Interpretation of Revelation and the Church as the Solution to the Problem." The first two sections of Part B, "The Interpretation of Revelation

[1] Larry Rasmussen, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Reality and Resistance* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 15; see also DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, esp chapter 8.

in Terms of the Concept of Act" and "The Interpretation of Revelation in Terms of Being," replay the same basic critiques Bonhoeffer had in Part A of act-oriented and being-oriented philosophies. Because the basic form of the critiques are the same and other excellent works have been devoted to analyzing such theological critiques, I will only briefly summarize them here.[2]

Though Bonhoeffer deals with a number of theological attempts at a solution that he categorizes as either act- or being-oriented, Barth and Holl are his most prominent and representative cases. Barth's primary concern is to maintain God's freedom in relation to human reason by avoiding any attempt to make God and revelation accessible to reason. He does so by understanding revelation as a pure act of God understood as a subject, much like Kant's transcendental subject. This makes revelation a free, contingent, and atemporal act of God. The most prominent problem Barth has is with maintaining continuity at the various levels of the problem of act and being. For theological ontology, revelation as contingent and atemporal, only occurs in discrete, atemporal 'moments'; there is no necessary connection between one event of revelation and the next. The continuity of Christian existence is then threatened. Barth and Bonhoeffer assume that one is only a Christian in revelation. If this is so, then for Barth, one is a Christian only during these atemporal moments of revelation. At best, then, one may simply flicker in and out of Christian existence. If revelation and Christian existences are atemporal, and being temporal is a fundamental way in which we understand the world, then there is also no real or substantive Christian knowledge. At best, again, a Christian only has knowledge in those moments of revelation, not before or after.

While Holl is the most prominent representative figure of an overly being-oriented theology, he, in fact, represents one of three general options for an overly being-oriented

[2] See DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, esp. chapters 3–5.

understanding of revelation. One might understand revelation as doctrine,[3] psychic experience such as Holl's conscience, or institution.[4] All three options make revelation into something that exists (*Seiend*). As something that exists, revelation would be available to human understanding. As such, revelation is unable to truly and radically affect human existence. Revelation would not be transcendent.

In order to avoid the problems of act-oriented and being-oriented accounts of revelation, Bonhoeffer argues that revelation should be understood as person rather than as subject or entity (*Seiend)*: "The being of revelation must, therefore, have a kind of being that satisfies the two indicated claims [transcendence and continuity]. We understand the person and the community to be such a kind of being."[5] To understand Bonhoeffer's concept of person, however, we must understand Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger's concept of Dasein, to which we now turn.

Theological Ontology: Christ as Ur-Dasein

A proper theological ontology should coordinate act and being in revelation. Revelation, for Bonhoeffer, is equivalent to the person of Jesus Christ. And "Christ is the corporate person [*Gesamtperson*] of the Christian community of faith [i.e. the church]."[6] I will explain these steps in more detail shortly, but what is important to note here is that Bonhoeffer understands, "the church as the unity of act and being."[7] Understanding how a Christian is in the church then leads to an act-being coordinated theological anthropology. And understanding the knowledge that arises from the church provides an act-being coordinated theological epistemology. The church

[3] A notable example would be the (pseudo-)Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone that Bonhoeffer calls "cheap grace" in *Discipleship*: "Cheap grace means grace as doctrine, as principle, as system. It means forgiveness of sins as a general truth"; DBWE 4: 43 (DBW 4: 29).
[4] DBWE 2: 103 (DBW 2: 100). Here Bonhoeffer provides the examples of the Catholic church and the orthodox Protestant idea of the verbal inspiration of the Bible; DBWE 2: 104 (DBW 2: 101).
[5] DBWE 2: 114 (DBW 2: 111).
[6] DBWE 2: 111 (DBW 2: 108).
[7] DBWE 2: 109 (DBW 2: 105).

as the present body of Christ is then Bonhoeffer's concrete source and solution for the problem of act and being at all three levels.

To understand how the church is the concrete solution to the problem of act and being for Bonhoeffer, it is important to understand his more formal solution in the person of Jesus Christ and Heidegger's role in it. For that we turn to Bonhoeffer's 1933 course "Lectures on Christology."

That Heidegger influences Bonhoeffer's "Lectures on Christology" is not as certain as his influence on *Act and Being*, primarily because Heidegger's name never occurs in the lectures. In addition to the methodological and conceptual resonances the lectures have with Heidegger and *Act and Being* to be elucidated shortly, there are other circumstantial reasons to believe Heidegger is still influential here. Some of this evidence leads Plant to cautiously assert that here Heidegger is still influential;[8] though I hope to show that one need not be quite as cautious. First, that Heidegger's name is not used in the lectures is not an immediate refutation of his influence. As Plant notes, Bonhoeffer was not always fastidious in his citing of secondary sources that may or at times obviously have had an impact on his thought.[9] Second, there does not seem to have been any appreciable change in Bonhoeffer's thinking between *Act and Being* and the lectures that would lead to significant changes in his relation to Heidegger. Third, there are many explicit references to and uses of Heidegger in Bonhoeffer's work between *Act and Being* and the lectures.[10]

---

[8] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 323; see also DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 134n20.

[9] Plant, "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer," 316 and 323.

[10] For explicit references to Heidegger in the interim see DBWE 10: 472 (DBW 10: 445); DBWE 11: 81 (DBW 17: 102) and 244-5 (DBW 11: 214-15); and DBWE 12: 193 and 245 (DBW 12: 155 and 215). The most significant of these is the "Thesis Fragment about M. Heidegger and E. Grisebach" which may have been connected to his 1931-2 Winter semester course "The Idea of Philosophy and Protestant Theology in the Twentieth Century"; DBWE 11: 244-5 (DBW 11: 214-15). And DBWE 12: 193 (DBW 12: 155) shows that Bonhoeffer still sees Heidegger as representing a contemporary, dominant philosophical movement. There are also interim instances where Heidegger

Bonhoeffer's methodological consideration about how one properly goes about doing Christology is the lecture's first notable step, and one which seems to have notable resonances with, if not a direct result of, Heidegger. Christology is, for Bonhoeffer, fundamentally about a person, the person of Jesus Christ. This leads Bonhoeffer to reject "how" and "that" questions in relation to Christology in favor of "who" questions. It is inappropriate to ask "how" questions: For example, how is Christ fully divine and human without the two mixing? For Bonhoeffer, such "how" questions attempt to understand Christ according to an already understood classification of relationships. This would be to treat the subject matter not as a person but as a thing (*Seiend*), and to place it at the disposal of human reason, i.e. it would violate the criterion of transcendence.[11] This means that neither the natural nor the human sciences are capable of guiding Christology since they presuppose classifications. This is in keeping with Bonhoeffer's adaption of Heidegger's analysis of Dasein. As we saw in chapter three, Heidegger also rejected analyzing Dasein as just another entity and the use of various positive sciences in doing so.[12]

Along with rejecting "how" questions, Bonhoeffer also rejects "that" questions. Once the Christian is provided the appropriate answers to Christological questions, it is not appropriate,

---

is not explicitly mentioned, but where he still seems to be informing Bonhoeffer's various assertions. For instances where Heidegger's notion of history seems to inform Bonhoeffer's, see DBWE 10: 458 (DBW 10: 43); and DBWE 11: 201, 211-12, and 233 (DBW 11: 166, 178, and 202). For an instance where Bonhoeffer makes theological use of Heidegger's position that theoretical knowledge arises from praxis, see DBWE 11: 283n[104] (DBW 11: 253n104). For instances where Bonhoeffer theologically adapts Heidegger's emphasis and unique understanding of the future, particularly for the purposes of preaching, see DBWE 11: 240n[322] and 410-15 (DBW 11: 387-94). For an instance where Bonhoeffer makes use of Heidegger's thrown-projection, though Bonhoeffer does not use those words, see DBWE 11: 253 (DBW 11: 222). For an instance of Bonhoeffer's use of the concept of "always already" in relation to the church, see DBWE 11: 310 (DBW 11: 280). And for the relation of creatureliness to ontological structures, see DBWE 12: 219 (DBW 12: 184).

[11] DBWE 12: 301 (DBW 12: 281).

[12] SZ 45-50. See also Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 39–42, where Heidegger rejects the methods of generalization and formalization in favor of his formal indication, which anticipates this methodological starting point in *Being and Time*. It is also important to note the confessional and theological background that is likely predisposing Bonhoeffer to appropriate this methodology. Christ as person is a Lutheran assumption, one which Bonhoeffer accepts as the essential starting point of theology (see DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 68–82.) This leads Luther, as Bonhoeffer reads him, to reject what Bonhoeffer understands to be "how" questions, which is perhaps best illustrated in Luther's conflict with Ulrich Zwingli over the "is" (See, for example, "That These Words of Christ, 'This is my Body,' etc., Still Stand Firm Against the Fanatics" in LW 37.)

from Bonhoeffer's faithful stance, to ask "that" questions, i.e. whether such answers are true.[13] For Bonhoeffer, this is to assume that human reason can get behind or before the person of Jesus Christ, which is again to violate the criterion of transcendence. Here Heidegger seems to have little if any influence. This seems rather to be a comparatively straightforward theological assumption.[14]

With the rejection of "how" and "that" questions, "what we have is the question of *who*, the question of *being* [*Sein*], of the essence and nature of Christ. So the Christological question is in its essence an ontological question. Its purpose is to bring out the ontological structure of the *who.*"[15] Here the resonances with Heidegger are quite apparent, nor can I think of any other influence that would guide Bonhoeffer to conclude that asking "who" means to ask about the *ontological structures* of the person of Jesus Christ.[16] This is after all the guiding methodology of *Being and Time*. And as we will see the structures that form the answers to the "who" question are explicitly distinguished, by Bonhoeffer, from "historical [*historische*], factual, and ontic" answers.[17] So Bonhoeffer asks about Christ in much the same way as Heidegger asks about Dasein.

---

[13] DBWE 12: 304 (DBW 12: 284).

[14] However, this would seem to be a position that Heidegger would appreciate. To ask whether "that" is true, particularly in relation to theological and faithful matters, would assume that a stance outside the factical or existentiell existence in which they occur could be taken to judge their truth value. This seems, in part, to be his point when in "Phenomenology and Theology" he says, "For the 'Christian' faith, that being which is primarily revealed to faith, and only to it, and which, as revelation, first gives rise to faith, is Christ, the crucified God. The relationship of faith to the cross, determined in this way by Christ, is a Christian one. The crucifixion, however, and all that belongs to it is a historical event, and indeed this event gives testimony to itself as such in its specifically historical character only for faith in the scriptures. One 'knows' about this fact only in believing." Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44.

[15] DBWE 12: 304 (DBW 12: 285); emphasis in the original.

[16] Ernst-Albert Scharffenorth points to Emil Brunner's *The Mediator* as the source of Bonhoeffer's distinction between "who" and "how" questions. There are undoubtedly strong resonances with Brunner's *The Mediator* particularly concerning critiques of objective historical questions concerning Jesus; however, the details of Bonhoeffer's "who" question are closer to Heidegger. See Ernst-Albert Scharffenorth, "Editor's Afterword to the German Edition" in DBWE 12: 489; cf. Emil Brunner, *The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947), 232–3.

[17] DBWE 12: 314 (DBW 12: 295).

There is, however, an important shift in orientation without which Bonhoeffer's theology would succumb to the same problems to which philosophy and inappropriate theologies have succumb, i.e. the reduction of revelation to human understanding. If Bonhoeffer were solely focused on the human ability to ask "who" and receive an answer, then this again would raise the specter of human possibility or potentiality according to which humans can understand revelation or the person of Jesus Christ apart from a prior intervention by revelation. To avoid this, Bonhoeffer flips the order of questioning. So the first question is not the human asking Christ "who are you?" Rather, the first question is Christ asking the human, "Who are you, you who can only ask about me because you have been justified and received grace through me?"[18] Only having been addressed by Christ can one properly ask and receive the answer to basic Christological questions.[19]

Two important points come from this basic reorientation of the question. First, for Heidegger, the preeminent being that understands, asks, and answers, is Dasein, the human logos; for Bonhoeffer, the preeminent being is Christ, the Logos. Here, we see the first and most important reorientation of some of Heidegger's basic insights away from human Dasein to Christ as the Ur-Dasein. Second, Bonhoeffer is then after the ontological structures of the person of Jesus Christ that lie behind Christ asking, answering, and understanding human Dasein.[20]

The general ontological structure that composes the person of Jesus Christ, for Bonhoeffer, is his being-there-for-you (*Dir-Dasein*). Here Bonhoeffer is combining the genuine transcendental and ontological approaches to the problem of act and being. Bonhoeffer finds in Kant and Heidegger the conceptual means of explaining, as Bonhoeffer sees it, two core

[18] DBWE 12: 305 (DBW 12: 286).
[19] Feil makes a similar point; Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 19. Again, this is a position Heidegger would seem to agree with; see note 14 above.
[20] That Christ as Ur-Dasein is what first and fundamentally understands human Dasein will form the basis of an important alteration of Heidegger in service of Bonhoeffer's theological anthropology in the next section.

elements of Luther's Christology: (1) Christ's presence in and as the church-community, and (2) Christ as *pro-me*.[21] In keeping with his interpretation of the history of theology in *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer sees the history of Christology as various schools emphasizing either Christ's substance, being, or Dasein, or emphasizing Christ's works, effects, or acts.[22] Christ should rather be understood as the coordination of both, of act and being as *Dir-Dasein*: "And yet what is decisive about the *pro-me* structure is that, with it, both the being and act of Christ are maintained. Being-there-*for-you* [Dir-*Da-sein*] comes together with being-*there*-for-you [*Dir*-da-*sein*]. The presence of Christ as the *pro-me* is his real being-for-me."[23]

Christ *is* simultaneously the corporate person of the church-community and the acts that arise from the church-community. The church-community itself forms the being of Christ; while Word and sacrament form his most important acts. Acts of the true Word and sacrament can only occur within the church-community. Act requires being. But the church-community *is* only in so far as it is the place where Word and sacrament occur. Being requires act.[24]

Christ's ontological structure of *Dir-Dasein* also means, for Bonhoeffer, that he mediates and forms the center of reality.[25] There are three important domains of reality with Christ as center and mediator: Christ is (1) being-there for humankind (*Dasein für den Menschen*); (2) being-there for history (*Geschichte*); and (3) being-there for nature. This means that Christ is the center of our existence, history, and nature respectively.[26] The first will be important later for theological anthropology, and the third is not extensively dealt with or of immediate concern. The second, Christ as Dasein for history, is immediately relevant. But to understand this

[21] DBWE 12: 314 (DBW 12: 295-6).
[22] DBWE 12: 314-15 (DBW 12: 296).
[23] DBWE 12: 315 (DBW 12: 296); translation altered and emphasis in the original.
[24] DBWE 12: 323 (DBW 12: 305-6).
[25] As Marsh nicely puts it, "Bonhoeffer wants to interpret all reality as part of the rich tapestry of God's promeity"; Marsh, *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, viii.
[26] DBWE 12: 324 (DBW 12: 307).

proposition and how Heidegger does and does not aid in its development, we need to take a step back and look at Bonhoeffer's development on this point.

Much of Bonhoeffer's theological development was guided by a concern to coordinate the then dominant, yet oppositional, theological movements of liberal theology and Barthian dialectical theology. One can see this concern as early as 1925 in Bonhoeffer's "Paper on the Historical and Pneumatological Interpretation of Scripture."[27] A primary theme in the conflict between these movements concerned revelation's and Christ's relation to history and time. Liberal theology saw Jesus as an historical person, an occurrence in time and history, and therefore open to critical-historical study.[28] In the attempt to maintain revelation's uniqueness and sovereignty, Barthian dialectical theology begins by asserting a strict division between Christ and history.[29]

Here we return to the disagreement between Plant and DeJonge presented in chapter three. As early as 1925, Bonhoeffer wants to have God in time and history.[30] Ubiquitous statements in the lectures make this clear. For example, "It is just as impossible to ask how God can enter into time—as if such an isolated God could exist!"[31] Yet, it cannot be that Christ is *drawn* into time. This would obviously make Christ one entity among others whose being is determined by human Dasein's temporal nature. Having Christ drawn into time would violate Bonhoeffer's criterion of transcendence. Bonhoeffer prefers to say that God or Jesus Christ enters or exists in time and history.

---

[27] DBWE 9: 285-98 (DBW 9: 305-23).
[28] Adolf von Harnack, "Open Letter to Professor Karl Barth," in *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, ed. Martin Rumscheidt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 94.
[29] Barth, "An Answer to Professor Adolf von Harnack's Open Letter," 103.
[30] See DBWE 9: 296 (DBW 9: 319); DBWE 1: 55n[77] and 58-9n[1] (DBW 1: 219n80 and 220-1n1)
[31] DBWE 12: 313, also see 310, 317, 323, 324, and 326 (DBW 12: 294, also see 291-2, 298, 305, 307, and 309).

Yet, there are still potential problems even when one understands God's entrance into time and history as a free act. God's entering time risks either it being a disruptive entrance or making Christ objectively available not unlike the consequences of Christ being drawn into time. His pre-*Act and Being* solution, which is more act-oriented, favors the first option. For example, in *Sanctorum Communio*, Bonhoeffer says that "Revelation enters time not just apparently but actually, and precisely by so doing it bursts the form of time."[32] And a few pages later, "Since death as the wages of sin (Rom. 6:23) first constitutes *history*, so *life that abides in love* breaks the continuity of the historical process."[33] This is certainly not the pure actualism of Barthian theology where revelation is completely atemporal. Yet, here Bonhoeffer still has difficulty maintaining historical and temporal continuity. By *Act and Being* and "Lectures on Christology" this disruptive language is dropped.

Though Christ's entrance into time and history cannot simply be a disruptive event, it also cannot be a by-gone objective historical event, as many liberal theologians have it. That is, one cannot have an overly being-oriented understanding of Christ that might make him merely a doctrine, psychic experience such as the conscience, or institution.[34] This would make Christ an object rather than a person. As an object in history, it either continues to have an influence *in* history and therefore can be understood according to human categories such as causality, or Christ becomes an inspiring image, presumably among others, that one can recall.[35] Again, this violates the criterion of transcendence and revelation's ability to radically affect human existence.

[32] DBWE 1: 143 (DBW 1: 89).
[33] DBWE 1: 146 (DBW 1: 92); emphasis in the original.
[34] DBWE 2: 103 (DBW 2: 100).
[35] DBWE 12: 310-11 (DBW 12: 292).

So again, Bonhoeffer's solution must maintain continuity and transcendence, which is predicated on understanding the being of revelation "neither as what exists [*Seiendes*], as something objective, nor as nonexisting [*Nichtseiendes*], as something nonobjective."[36] The third alternative is to understand Christ as person,[37] and person for Bonhoeffer has many of the basic structures of Heidegger's Dasein, at this point the most important of which is Dasein's temporality and historicity translated into Luther-inspired language of Christ as Dasein for history. This is then parsed out according to the concepts of the Humiliated One, the Exalted or Risen One, the *historisch* Jesus Christ that is accessible by objective historical analysis, and the *geschichtlich* Jesus Christ that is only accessible by faith.[38]

If Bonhoeffer intends "Dasein" in some Heideggerian sense, then we should see Christ as the foundation of the meaning and being of history, as human Dasein is for Heidegger.[39] This is obviously the case, for example, when Bonhoeffer says, "History finds its meaning in the humiliation of Christ," and "Christ is here seen to be the limit and the center of history's being."[40] Here the Risen or Exalted Christ is that from which history and time arise.[41]

If Bonhoeffer is adapting Heidegger's Dasein to theological purposes, we should see further details of that appropriation. After all, that Christ is the origin of all reality including history is a basic position easily available to Christian theology from its own sources, such as the

[36] DBWE 2: 113 (DBW 2: 110).
[37] DBWE 2: 115 (DBW 2: 112).
[38] It is important to note that here Bonhoeffer is making analytic distinctions. Humiliated, Risen, *historisch*, and *geschichtlich* all refer to the same person and are, therefore, in an important respect equivalent. They highlight different views or aspects of the same person. For their equivalence see, for example, DBWE 12: 313, 328, and 331 (DBW 12: 294-5, 311-12, and 315).
[39] SZ 377.
[40] DBWE 12: 325-6 (DBW 12: 308-9).
[41] Rasmussen also points this out, calling this aspect of Christ "Cosmic Christ," and shows its continued influence through Bonhoeffer's corpus to *Ethics*, where Bonhoeffer makes statements such as the following: "He [Christ] alone did not lapse into any ideology but is *the* Real One as such, who in himself has borne and fulfilled the essence of history, and in whom the inner law of history itself is embodied"; DBWE 6: 263 (DBW 6: 263); Rasmussen, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 16–22.

opening to the Gospel of John. For Heidegger, the being and meaning of an entity are importantly determined by the entity's position in Dasein's temporality. I understand a dry erase marker according to its place in the past I also carry along with me and the future projections I press forward into, which would be different for an economist or an instructor. If Bonhoeffer is adapting Dasein's temporality and historicity to the person of Christ, then we should see something at least roughly equivalent. Though this is much more evident in Bonhoeffer's theological anthropology and epistemology, there are signs of it here as well. History and time live between the promise and fulfillment.[42] The promise (of the Messiah and of becoming God's people) is past, but not in an objective, by-gone sense; rather, "this has become a living promise everywhere."[43] The promise is always made present. And "history lives toward the fulfillment of this promise alone."[44] History is always pressing forward into the projected possibility of the fulfillment of the promise.

This is particularly evident in Bonhoeffer's understanding of how we gain historical access to the person of Jesus Christ. The relation a particular entity has to this history determines its meaning and being. This is importantly true of the historical person of Jesus Christ. The objective historical (*historisch*) person of Jesus is the God-human, the Humiliated and Exalted One.[45] However, we cannot know this based on objective history; this "*historisch* access" cannot "oblige us to believe."[46] If one could, then the person of Jesus Christ would be one objective entity among others available to human Dasein's understanding. Access can only be gained through the *geschichtlich* Jesus. That is, we can only access this truth by participating in the existential history (*Geschichte*) of Jesus. But "access through the *geschichtlich* Jesus is only

[42] DBWE 12: 325 (DBW 12: 308).
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] DBWE 12: 328 (DBW 12: 311-12).
[46] DBWE 12: 330 (DBW 12: 314).

possible through the Risen One, through the Word by which Christ resurrected bears witness to himself."[47] So the person of Christ or revelation is there in time and history, but his meaning and being is determined by his own, and not human Dasein's, temporal and historical nature.

As we will see in more detail as we move through the church to theological anthropology, humans can access his meaning and being only based on how Christ already understands humans and the kind of participation one has in that history. Bonhoeffer's statement in *Act and Being* that Heidegger "interprets being so much in terms of time that even God's eternity, if it could be at all *philosophically* conceived, would, in principle, have to be thought of as having been drawn into time" is a partial or philosophical compliment.[48] In keeping with Bonhoeffer's reorientation of the best philosophy for theological purposes, he applies the best understandings of human Dasein, applies them to Christ, and makes Christ the origin of those elements. Christ's *being* already is temporal. It is, therefore, more accurate to say that Christ *acts* to place human Dasein into Christ's temporality, associated with Dasein in Christ, or to leave human Dasein in the sinful temporality, associated with Dasein in Adam. If human Dasein participates in Christ's temporality, then the Christian sees the *geschichtlich* Jesus in the *historisch* Jesus and the union of the Humiliated and Exalted One. If human Dasein participates in 'Adam's' temporality, then human Dasein only sees the *historisch* Jesus.[49]

The church has this same temporal and historical structure.[50] It should. The person of Jesus Christ, for Bonhoeffer, exists concretely as the church-community, which is a corporate person (*Gesamtperson*). This will also form the necessary step for Bonhoeffer to answer the

[47] Ibid.
[48] DBWE 2: 71-2 (DBW 2: 66); emphasis added.
[49] DBWE 12: 331 (DBW 12: 315).
[50] The use of temporality to account for the church, therefore, begins in *Act and Being*, and not in "The Nature of the Church" as Bagetto asserts; Bagetto, "The Exemplification of Decision in Dietrich Bonhoeffer," 200.

problem of act and being at the anthropological level since the Christian concretely participates in the church and the Christian's being is determined by such participation.

The church is defined as the place where the proclamation of Christ, as preaching or the Word and sacrament, are 'present' (*Gegenwart*). As with Heidegger, however, this present is not something that arrived from the future and will soon become past. In the section "The Kind of Being of Revelation in the Church," Bonhoeffer immediately defines the church using the structure of thrown-projection and the language of temporality explained in chapter three. Because this temporal explanation of the proclamation has not had much impact in secondary literature it deserves to be quoted in full:

> What is past, as 'having happened', is essentially caught up 'in its context', unless the proclamation 'coming to' us ('in the future') raises it up into the present. In the concept of contingency, as the occurrence that comes to us from outside, the present is determined by the future […] It may be said of Christian revelation that the proclamation of cross and resurrection, determined by eschatology and predestination, and the occurrence effective within that proclamation, lift even the past into the present, or paradoxically, into something 'in the future'. It follows from this that the Christian revelation must not be interpreted as 'having happened', but that for those human beings living in the church, in each present, this once-and-for-all occurrence is qualified as future.[51]

Bonhoeffer, in a footnote, says, "This might be a starting-point for a distinctively Christian philosophy of time in contrast to the concept of time as something reckoned by motion."[52]

The opening lines of the above quotation are particularly important for locating Bonhoeffer between or beyond liberal and dialectical theology, for his coordination of act and being in the church, and for demonstrating his reliance on temporality. Apart from participation in the church, the past appears as "having happened" and determined by "its context." The past appears to be something objectively available. But, contrary to this liberal theological position, it "must not be interpreted as 'having happened'." For a Christian in the church, the only place

[51] DBWE 2: 111 (DBW 2: 107).
[52] DBWE 2: 111n37 (DBW 2: 108n37). Heidegger also rejects understanding time in terms of motion; SZ 374-5, 389, and 418.

where theology may be properly practiced, the act of the proclamation comes to the Christian from the future.[53] It is a contingent act, as Barth would have it, but it is temporal; it is made present from the future. This futural proclamation simultaneously lifts the past into the present, "or paradoxically, into something 'in the future'." The proclamation is temporally extended. Because the church just is the place where Christ performs this temporally extended proclamation, the church too is temporal.

Again, one might be tempted to simply assert that Bonhoeffer is strictly appealing to the Christian tradition, particularly its eschatological themes. If so, one might expect it in *Santorum Communio* prior to encountering Heidegger; however, this temporal understanding is not present there. Nor is this temporal understanding of the church and revelation an option in any of Bonhoeffer's other influential sources such as Barth or Holl. Bonhoeffer's language does, however, bear a striking resemblance to Heidegger's: "Just as the Present arises in the unity of the temporalizing of temporality out of the future and having been, the horizon of a Present temporalizes itself equiprimordially with those of the future and of having been."[54] Or, emphasizing the future as Bonhoeffer does, "Primordial and authentic temporality temporalizes itself in terms of the authentic future and in such a way that in having been futurally, it first of all awakens the Present."[55]

Bonhoeffer closes this section, "The Kind of Being of Revelation in the Church," with a summation of the successes at the problem of act and being for an ontology of revelation, or

[53] For similar statements by Heidegger, see Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 49, 90, and 109.
[54] SZ 356.
[55] SZ 329. This is likely one of those instances where Bonhoeffer is unknowingly picking up on Heidegger's philosophical use of his Christian roots and sources. It seems fairly clear that much of Heidegger's understanding of temporality arises out of his interpretation of Christian sources. Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 73; Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, 48–50; John van Buren, "Martin Heidegger, Martin Luther," in *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in His Earliest Thought*, ed. Theodore Kisiel and John van Buren (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994), 160–8. There is, then, a sense in which Bonhoeffer is re-Christianizing or theologizing *Being and Time*'s a-theistic temporality.

theology proper.[56] Transcendence is maintained by making Christ and the church-community neither a being or entity (*Seiend*) nor a pure acting subject, but rather a person who initiates the act (the Kantian, Lutheran *Dir* of the *Dir-Dasein* in the "Lectures on Christology), drawing human Dasein into its being, understood as the church-community (the Heideggerian, Lutheran *Dasein* of the *Dir-Dasein*).[57] Making the appropriate Lutheran alteration to Kant, the boundary that maintains the transcendence of Christ is established by the being of revelation or Christ itself, and can only be crossed by Christ's free act. As we will see in the next section, for Bonhoeffer, one cannot even know that such a boundary exists between human Dasein and Christ until Christ has crossed the boundary for you. Following Heidegger, the continuity of revelation is maintained by making it temporally extended; the temporal extension that maintains continuity is then not simply a matter of eternity or being in time, but being the very basis for (Christian) time. And this revelation exists concretely as the church, which is, as will be developed further in subsequent sections, the world 'in' which Christians exist and from which theological knowledge arises, much like Heidegger's initial appeal to first turn to actual lived experience.

Theological Anthropology: Human Dasein in Christ as the Church

Bonhoeffer's solution to the problem of act and being for theological anthropology is particularly complicated, comprising a portion of Part B, "The Kind of Being of Human Beings in the Church," and all of Part C, "The Problem of Act and Being in the Concrete Teaching concerning Human Beings 'in Adam' and 'in Christ.'" Bonhoeffer's anthropology is so complicated because he must distinguish between sinful (in Adam) and faithful (in Christ) existences. His distinction, however, is not merely between different modes or modifications of human Dasein; that is, being

[56] DBWE 2: 114-15 (DBW 2: 111-12).
[57] For evidence that Bonhoeffer understands *Dir-Dasein* to be a Lutheran formulation see DBWE 12: 320 (DBW 12: 302).

in Adam and in Christ are not, for Bonhoeffer, founded on shared existential structures. They are different kinds of being (*Seinsarten*).[58] This makes maintaining continuity at the anthropological level that much more difficult. Not only must Bonhoeffer maintain the 'internal' continuity of Christian existence, but he must maintain that existence's continuity with sinful existence while at the same time maintaining a strong distinction between the two. Though much of the details of Bonhoeffer's anthropology, particularly for 'in Christ', are developed in opposition to Heidegger, Heidegger is important for existence in Adam and for maintaining continuity across these two kinds of existences.

In keeping with the nested layers of the problem of act and being, human Dasein's being (the anthropological level) is determined by its relation to revelation, the person of Jesus Christ, or the church (theology proper). Existence (*Existenz*) is defined according to whether or not it is encountered by Christ.[59] *Pati*, being acted upon, is what determines human Dasein. This then begins Bonhoeffer's general coordination of act and being at the anthropological level based on his theological ontology of revelation. Adapting his understanding of Heidegger from Part A,[60] Bonhoeffer, in part, understands the person of Jesus Christ as a decision to act or not act upon human Dasein in order to place it in the being of the church, particularly through the Word (preaching) and sacrament.[61] This act presupposes already *being* determined as being in the church. One must already be in the church to be acted upon.[62]

---

[58] The English translation of *Akt und Sein* often translates both *Seinsart* and *Seinsweise* as "mode of being," which might be misleading. As we will see, one way in which Bonhoeffer wants to explicitly distinguish his anthropology from Heidegger's is by not reducing the distinction between sinful and faithful existences to different existentiell modifications of the same existential structures. When using *Seinsart* Bonhoeffer seems to mean more than simply different modes of being. When Bonhoeffer uses *Seinsweise*, which is sometimes also translated as "manners of being," he does seem to mean something closer to Heidegger's modes or modifications. But Bonhoeffer associates these manners of being with the particular *Seinsarten* of in Adam or in Christ.
[59] DBWE 2: 116 (DBW 2: 113).
[60] DBWE 2: 71 (DBW 2: 65-6).
[61] DBWE 2: 116-17 (DBW 2: 113); DBWE 12: 316-17 and 318 (DBW 12: 297-8 and 300).
[62] DBWE 2: 117 (DBW 2: 113-14).

From this determination by Christ, human Dasein then has its corresponding and coordinated act and being. The Christian already *is* in the church. From this arises the Christian's act of faith; "Faith invariably discovers itself already in the church."[63] Yet, being in the church already presupposes the act of faith.[64] Bonhoeffer summarizes this coordination of act and being between the theological and anthropological levels as follows: "I am borne (*pati*), therefore I am (*esse*), therefore I believe (*agere*). Here the circle closes. Here even the *agere* is *pati*."[65]

It is important to bear in mind that this coordination is equally true of non-Christian existence. Not being acted upon means not being a Christian and therefore not believing. This, in part, informs Bonhoeffer's position that sinful, in-Adam existence and faithful, in-Christ existence are distinct kinds of being rather than merely different modifications of existential structures common to both.

> Since here the transcendental and ontological approaches come together in the sociological category, the existence of human beings is understood to be by nature as much in decision as 'already in Christ (or in Adam)'. Even though faith is act, as an expression of being in the church of Christ it encompasses the totality of Dasein in Christ, just as unfaith, as an expression of being in Adam, encompasses the totality of the old Dasein. Faith knows that it comes upon its decision as one already made. Just as unfaith is no individual psychic act, but rather a mode of being [*Seinsweise*] in the old humanity, so on the same basis faith is to be seen as a mode of being [*Seinsweise*] in the church of Christ, as it is seen as an act.[66]

Here we see unfaith as a mode of being related to the kind of being of in-Adam existence. This is separate from the faith as a mode of being equally intimately tied to in-Christ existence.

Bonhoeffer must make a comparatively (vis-à-vis Heidegger and Bultmann) strong distinction between these two kinds of existences given some of his other presuppositions. If there were not this strong distinction, then it would mean, as it does for Bultmann and

[63] DBWE 2: 117 (DBW 2: 114).
[64] Ibid.
[65] DBWE 2: 121 (DBW 2: 118).
[66] DBWE 2: 122 (DBW 2:119).

Heidegger, that the existential structures of Dasein are unaffected by revelation.[67] This would make such existential structures the mediators of revelation, much like Holl's conscience. This would, among other things, challenge the necessary, for Bonhoeffer, understanding of revelation as a transcendent event. Rather, for Bonhoeffer, "in the existentiell event of revelation, the existential structure of Dasein is touched and changed. There is no second mediator, not even the existential structure of Dasein. For revelation, the ontic-existentiell and ontological-existential structures coincide."[68] There are then important, basic ontological differences between being in Adam and being in Christ, to which we now turn.

For Bonhoeffer, being in Adam is the more ontologically pointed and biblically based term for being a sinner (*esse peccator*).[69] Bonhoeffer's intent is to locate sin at both the existential and existentiell levels. To do so he creates the technical distinction between Dasein and *Wiesein* (how-being). Though Wiesein is not directly taken from Heidegger, it is structurally similar to Heidegger's ontic/existentiell level. "In theological terms, it would mean that the sinner remains creature, that 'Da'-sein as creature lies at the foundation of how ['*Wie*'] one ontically is as a sinner."[70] Exactly why Bonhoeffer develops this new term, Wiesein, is unclear. It may be that Bonhoeffer wants to maintain Heidegger's distinction between ontic/existentiell

[67] Heidegger, for example, says, "Hence we can say that precisely because all basic theological concepts […] include a content that is indeed existentielly powerless, i.e. *ontically* sublated, they are *ontologically* determined by a content that is pre-Christian and that can thus be grasped purely rationally." Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 51; emphasis in the original. See also SZ 306n1. Bultmann makes nearly verbatim statements in Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 94 and 96.
[68] DBWE 2: 78n89 (DBW 2: 72n89).
[69] DBWE 2: 136 (DBW 2: 135). It is also worth noting that one can only know what being in Adam is in contrast to being in Christ. One can only know being in Christ from within that kind of existence. Therefore, one can only know being in Adam *as* being in Adam from being in Christ. This is Bonhoeffer's ontological correlate to Luther's position that one can only know sin as sin from faith. This also means that Bonhoeffer is presenting being in Adam strictly from a theological position. Heidegger, as we will see in the concluding chapter, agrees with this general assertion.
[70] DBWE 2: 136 (DBW 2: 135); translation altered.

and ontological/existential, but provide himself a terminological route for presenting these two levels as reciprocally influential.

What we do get from the above quotation is Bonhoeffer's position that sin involves the entire human being as both Dasein and Wiesein. This begins his coordination of act and being in being in Adam. First, Bonhoeffer must reject understanding sin as merely free, contingent acts. "If sin were no more than a free act of the particular moment, a retreat to sinless being would in principle be possible."[71] Thinking of sin as an act that one may or may not freely commit would not be consistent with Bonhoeffer's Lutheran concern to understand sin as something inescapable by human means. It would also threaten the continuity of sinful existence. One would only be a sinner once in awhile in committing such acts.

Sin also cannot be understood as an entity. Seeing sin as a pretemporal act of rebellion, psychologizing it, or naturalizing original sin all count, for Bonhoeffer, as seeing sin as an entity. Understanding sin as strictly located in one, more, or even in the entirety of the existential structures would also seem to be an instance of this limited view of sin. As an entity, it is possible to take an objective, disinterested view of it. Sin can be in the power of human understanding, and therefore does not affect human existence.[72]

Sin must be located both in the human's being (Dasein) and the human's acts (Wiesein). More particularly, and following Bonhoeffer's common maneuvers, sin as an act must simultaneously arise from a sinful being and be that which places one in that sinful being. For in-Adam existence, then, sin is determinative of its Dasein, Wiesein, and the relation between the two. Sin is the violation of one's Dasein by one's Wiesein.[73] Human Dasein is and should be understood as a creature *coram Deo* (before God). However, sinful acts (Wiesein), which repeat

[71] DBWE 2: 145 (DBW 2: 143).
[72] DBWE 2: 145 (DBW 2: 144).
[73] DBWE 2: 137-8 (DBW 2: 136).

Adam's original sin, violate Dasein; Dasein in Adam becomes both creature and creator.[74] It sees itself as determinative of reality. But this particular Wiesein already arises from sinful Dasein in Adam. Here both the continuity and transcendence, i.e. that one is actually affected by sin, is maintained. One is always already in a condition of sin; yet one is also always culpable for that condition because one's own acts have created that condition.

This may work well for the individual, but Bonhoeffer's goals are more ambitious; his concern is not merely to coordinated sinful act and sinful being for the individual, but for humanity as a whole as well. Bonhoeffer's answer is to, yet again, turn to his concept of person; more particularly to see Adam as both individual and community, as 'I' and humanity. Every individual is both an individual and "the one person of humanity, Adam."[75] When an individual commits an act of sin, it is Adam's first free and contingent act of sin occurring again and again. Yet, because it is always humanity as Adam committing this act, there is a continuous being underlying the act. Bonhoeffer seems to be equating Adam as humanity with Dasein, those structures universally constitutive of human existence; while Wiesein is equated with how the individual as Adam concretely acts from those universal structures: "In the knowledge of my being-a-sinner as an individual, I see my Dasein is in the power of my Wiesein; I cannot know it in its creaturely being [i.e. as a being dependent on God]. In the knowledge of my being-a-sinner as humanity, I see my sinful Dasein as the basis of my Wiesein."[76] Each act is always Adam's first act of sin creating the being of Adam, placing the individual in the being in Adam. Yet, the being of Adam is constantly there underlying each act.

Bonhoeffer then outlines the basic features of being in Adam. Such features are guilt, death, conscience, anxiety, and temptation (*Anfechtung*). Here, Bonhoeffer seems, in part, to be

[74] DBWE 2: 151 (DBW 2: 149-50).
[75] DBWE 2: 146 (DBW 2: 145).
[76] DBWE 2: 147 (DBW 2: 145).

providing a Lutheran re-reading of Heidegger's analysis of Dasein, which firmly places both authentic and inauthentic existences in being in Adam.[77] In what seems like an obvious reference to Heidegger, Bonhoeffer begins, "The *everydayness* of human beings in Adam is guilt."[78] This is not Heidegger's notion of guilt, but rather the constant decision for solitude, a flight both from Christ and the proper social relations that arise from a relation to Christ. When Dasein in Adam becomes aware of this solitude and guilt, the conscience arises.[79]

The conscience is that final phenomena that results in either explicit self-justification, a higher order of the *cor curvum in se*, or in the transition to being in Christ. In conscience, guilt and death are revealed causing anxiety, when the world presses in on human beings and becomes too 'narrow'.[80] Here sinful self-justifying conscience reincorporates such phenomena into itself.[81] It makes death a future event rather than a constant condition. Here, again, Bonhoeffer inaccurately ascribes the former view of death to Heidegger,[82] when, in fact, an accurate understanding of Heidegger may have helped Bonhoeffer explain his view of death. [83] Such a conscience may also take its guilt upon itself leading to self-condemnation and active repentance; the intention, according to Bonhoeffer, is to exonerate oneself apart from Christ.[84]

---

[77] As the last chapter showed, some of what follows is predicated on some misreadings of Heidegger and not recognizing the already Christian, particularly *lutherisch*, origins of many of these concepts.
[78] DBWE 2: 147 (DBW 2: 146); emphasis in the original.
[79] DBWE 2: 148 (DBW 2: 146-7).
[80] DBWE 2: 148-9 (DBW 2: 147). This is a point at which both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer share Luther, and perhaps Kierkegaard, as important sources. Heidegger lists Augustine, Luther, and especially Kierekegaard as influential in his understanding of anxiety; SZ 190n1. Kierkegaard's influence on Bonhoeffer is less clear; though the editor of DBWE 2 attributes this to Kierkegaard (DBWE 2: 148n[33]), Kierkegaard is not a prominent figure for Bonhoeffer at this time. Kierkegaard is only mentioned once in *Act and Being* and without any supporting citation; DBWE 2: 39 (DBW 2: 33).
[81] DBWE 2: 148 (DBW 2: 147).
[82] DBWE 2: 148n15 (DBW 2: 147n15).
[83] Here Bonhoeffer and Heidegger are closer than Bonhoeffer realizes, most likely because of their mutual reliance on Luther.
[84] DBWE 2: 138-9 (DBW 2: 137-8).

This form of conscience is still then a fleeing from Christ into the self. It is the final attempt of the *cor curvum in se* to maintain itself.

In contrast, at this point when the conscience arises, Christ may *choose* to assail the person through *Anfechtungen* (trials, temptations, or assaults). This reveals to Dasein in Adam its guilt, but from outside. It also reveals death, not as an event, but that one is already dead. Because this process is initiated by Christ from outside, one is freed from the *cor curvum in se* and able to be directed at Christ (*actus directus*).[85] In being so directed, human Dasein finds that it is already being in Christ, in the church; here act and being presuppose one another again and are coordinated.

With the transition from being in Adam to being in Christ, the old human being has died and a new one arisen.[86] How this occurs involves a change in the human being as both Dasein and Wiesein. How one concretely is (Wiesein) no longer involves the act of turning inwards (*cor curvum in se*), of seeing oneself as both creature and creator; now one's being (Dasein) is determined by the act of contemplating Christ (Wiesein).[87] How one actually is (Wiesein), then, does not involve a violation of one's Dasein.

In keeping with Bonhoeffer's reorientation of Heidegger and Kant, it is important, however, that the Christian is not the initiator of this transition. The Christian is only able to be directed at Christ because of Christ's initial act placing the Christian in Christ's being; the Christian becomes an 'object' of Christ's contemplation in the church.[88] That the Christian becomes an 'object' of Christ's contemplation is important. Human beings do not lose their sinful existence in entering the church and Christ. They are always *simul justus et peccator*

[85] DBWE 2: 150 (DBW 2: 149).
[86] DBWE 2: 151 (DBW 2: 150).
[87] Ibid.
[88] DBWE 2: 150 (DBW 2: 149).

(simultaneously justified and sinner); however, the Christian is seen *as* justified by Christ. This is not dissimilar from, and could have some roots in, Heidegger's explication of the relationship between Dasein and entities such as equipment. The being of a hammer or dry erase marker is seen in a particular way in part according to its place in Dasein's projects and temporality. The being of human beings is either in Adam or in Christ depending on how Christ sees the human as participating in his, especially the church's, temporality.

With this new kind of being, being in Christ, comes a new temporality, a "temporality of faith," which one must avoid freezing.[89] (The implication, I think, is that one should favor Heideggerian temporality over Scheler's static account.[90]) Referencing the temporality of the church explained above, Bonhoeffer says that "being in Christ, as historical, is also defined by past and future."[91] Since theological anthropology is dependent on theological ontology, this naturally follows. Bonhoeffer provides two sections to account for the temporality of theological anthropology's being in Christ: "The Definition of Being in Christ through the Past: The Conscience" and "The Definition of Being in Christ through the Future: The Child."

Here in his temporal account of theological anthropology, Bonhoeffer is, as always, guided by his concern to coordinated act and being. Additionally and in particular, he is guided by his concern to explain and bring together two Lutheran concepts: The Christian as a new creation and as *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously justified and sinner). Earlier in Part B, Bonhoeffer criticized both Barth and Bultmann for their inability to combine the two.[92] Barth can maintain the new creation or the "new existence," but at the expense of continuity of the "total I"; Barth cannot account for the Christian as *simul justus et peccator*. Bultmann can maintain the

[89] DBWE 2: 153 (DBW 2: 153).
[90] For evidence that Heidegger also saw a unique temporality for faith, see Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 73.
[91] DBWE 2: 155 (DBW 2: 154).
[92] DBWE 2: 98-101 (DBW 2: 94-7).

continuity of the "total I," but only at the expense of the new existence. How can Bonhoeffer describe the Christian both as *simul justus et peccator* and as a new creation? The Christian must be a new creation in so far as Bonhoeffer sharply distinguishes between being in Adam and being in Christ. Yet, the Christian must also be *simul justus et peccator* in so far as there is continuity between being in Adam and being in Christ.

The answer is a complex culmination of much of Bonhoeffer's work. A brief summation of what has preceded might then be in order. First, these questions and answers are a matter of theological anthropology, but as we have seen anthropology depends on theology proper or theological ontology. That is, human existence, for Bonhoeffer, must be understood concretely as existence in Adam or existence in Christ, both of which are determined by one's relation to Christ or revelation. So the answers that follow presuppose that the Christian already finds herself the recipient of Christ's act and simultaneously participating in Christ's being. Second, this point is also important because all other attempts to understand human beings, both philosophical (Kant and Heidegger) and theological (Barth and Bultmann) have begun from the human, which traps such attempts into assuming, whether explicitly or implicitly, that it is a human act or possibility that maintains continuity. For Bonhoeffer, it is not the human being that maintains continuity; Christ does. The more appropriate question would then be: How does Christ maintain the continuity of the new creation and the *simul*?

The best way to understand how Bonhoeffer maintains the continuity of being in Adam and being in Christ is to see the way in which Heidegger and Kant function in Bonhoeffer's Lutheran understanding of confession or penance. Confession is that concrete *act*, which must occur in the church (being), where the Christian conscience looks at and repents for the

Christian's "past in Adam."[93] In this act of confession, the human being in Adam dies to the new existence in faith.[94] This is not a human act, however; "they do not give themselves death but, in faith, see themselves given into death by Christ."[95] If it were the case that humans were the primary actors in confession, then it would be just an instance of the self-justifying conscience of being in Adam. Here, Bonhoeffer utilizes the theological alteration of Kantian transcendentalism where Christ, rather than human reason or understanding, is the primary actor.

For Bonhoeffer, confession is also the daily making present and dying to one's past in Adam. Here Bonhoeffer is utilizing the theological appropriation of Heidegger's temporality and thrown-projection. This is how Bonhoeffer is able to maintain the continuity of being in Adam and being in Christ, or the *simul*. Conscience, which is operative in confession, is that which reveals sin. Technically, however, "the human being in Christ is no longer governed by sin, [therefore] conscience is something defined by the past in Adam."[96] So, confession is concerned with one's past sin, one's past being in Adam. Here the Christian, as being in Christ, is participating in the temporality of the church explained above. As such, 'past' does not mean done with or by-gone, but that which is constantly made present. In the act of confession, which again must occur in the being of the church, the Christian's past in Adam is made present in light of a future directed at Christ: "Those over whom the future of Christ has triumphed in faith must daily die the death of that past anew with open eyes […] Thus being in Christ—which when defined by the past is the reflection, taking place in faith, of repenting and dying—is taken up

[93] DBWE 2: 155 (DBW 2: 154-5). Later, as Nicola Wilkes makes clear, Bonhoeffer will explicitly understand confession as an act correcting Adam's fall. Nicola J. Wilkes, "Confession of Sin as the Mirror Image of the Fall," in *God Speaks to Us: Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Jens Zimmermann and Ralf K. Wüstenberg (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2013), 217–27.
[94] DBWE 2: 157 (DBW 2: 156-7).
[95] DBWE 2: 157 (DBW 2: 157). It is important to bear this in mind. Any human being can engage in the act of confession to another human being; however, as it was with the conscience, confession may take the path of self-justification, which reinforces being in Adam, or a genuine crushing of the confessor's self, which moves the person to being in Christ.
[96] DBWE 2: 155 (DBW 2: 154).

and determined by the future; and this future is holiness and life."[97] Because the Christian is presently seeing the past in Adam in light of the future in Christ, sin is not seen as sin by either Christ or the Christian; the Christian sees "sin within the forgiveness through Christ."[98]

While the *simul* is provided by the past made present, the new creation is provided by the future made present. "In faith the future is present; but inasmuch as faith suspends itself before the future […], the human being 'is' in the future of Christ."[99] While confession was the operative 'sacrament' of being in Christ from the perspective of the past, baptism is, for Bonhoeffer, the relevant sacrament of being in Christ from the perspective of the future.[100] "Baptism is the call [act of the church] to the human being into childhood, a call that can be understood only eschatologically," that is from the future.[101] This admittedly seems an odd choice; baptism seems to lie in the Christian's objective past. Part of the answer to this comes with its connection to confession, which addresses another problem below, but for now it is important to baptism's relation to the church. Baptism is the sacrament that places one in the church. It is the church's, and therefore Christ's, act that places the Christian into Christ's temporality. That temporality is primarily futural: "Home is the community of Christ [the church], always 'future', present 'in faith' because we are children of the future."[102] The true meaning of baptism then lies in the future. Again, this future is not something one can mark off on a calendar. It is projection forward, directing oneself, to Christ; it is a future in the present:

[97] DBWE 2: 157 (DBW 2: 157).
[98] DBWE 2: 156 (DBW 2: 156).
[99] DBWE 2: 159 (DBW 2: 158-9).
[100] Communion is, for Bonhoeffer, intimately linked with preaching, which lies, as we will see in the next section, at the junction of past and future. DBWE 12: 318 and 322 (DBW 12: 299-300 and 304-5).
[101] DBWE 2: 159 (DBW 2: 159).
[102] DBWE 2: 161 (DBW 2: 161).

"This is the new creation of the new human being of the future, which is an event already occurring in faith, and there perfected for view."[103]

There still seems to be a lingering problem. How is the continuity of the new creation with the *simul justus et peccator* maintained? The temporal coordination of past, present, and future seems to occur in both, but by different means particularly in so far as one is associated with confession and the other baptism. Bonhoeffer does not seem to directly address this. Perhaps because of his confessional commitments he thought the explanation I will offer was more or less obvious. The key, I believe, is recognizing the relationship that confession and baptism have to one another according to Luther. For Luther, confession is not an independent sacrament in itself, but the renewal of baptism; it is the continual, daily reliving of baptism.[104] With this 'one' sacrament these two central concepts of theological anthropology are joined.

As I understand it, the general temporal picture looks something like the following for Bonhoeffer. First and foremost, Christ and the church are oriented towards the future. They press forward, understand the present and past, according to the promised, complete correction of the corrupted creation caused by Adam. The Christian, as necessarily determined by and participating in Christ's temporality, does so as well. This future is anticipated in the present.[105]

---

[103] DBWE 2: 161 (DBW 2: 161).

[104] Luther is not always clear on whether or not confession is a full sacrament. Early in "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," for example, it is: "*To begin with,* I *must deny that there are seven sacraments, and for the present maintain that there are but three: baptism, penance, and the bread.*" Martin Luther, *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, ed. Timothy E. Lull (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 274; emphasis in the original. By contrast, in "Confession concerning Christ's Supper," Luther says, "So, too, penance is nothing else than the practice and the power of baptism. Thus two sacraments remain, baptism and the Lord's Supper" (LW 37: 37). The exact sacramental nature of confession is not immediately important; what is important is its particular connection to baptism. On this Luther is consistent; as another example in "The Holy and Blessed Sacrament of Baptism," Luther says, "For the sacrament of penance […] also has its foundation in this sacrament [baptism], inasmuch as sins are forgiven only to those who are baptized, to those whose sins God has promised to forgive. The sacrament of penance thus renews and points out again the sacrament of baptism" (LW 35: 38). Though in *Act and Being*, Bonhoeffer does not make this direct connection of confession to baptism he does in *Life Together*: "Confession is the renewal of the joy of baptism"; DBWE 5: 112 (DBW 5: 97).

[105] This is an admittedly conceptually tricky point. One cannot say that this future is being progressively worked towards in the future. This is, for Bonhoeffer, an incorrect 'Anabaptist' position, where humans, rather than Christ,

And this future is predicated on the past corruption of Adam. Because the future is anticipated in the present and predicated on the past, the past in Adam is pulled to up to the present. Every sin 'now' is Adam's original sin. For theological anthropology, because the Christian lives at the temporal juncture of these ecstases, they are determined by both. The Christian always already finds itself thrown into an in-Adam past. Insofar as a Christian actually is a Christian, they have undergone baptism where Christ has placed the individual into his corporate person, the church, such that the individual shares in the corporate future. The individual and the community have died to their past being in Adam through Christ's future granted by baptism. Yet this is not fully consummated. It is necessary to continually kill the in-Adam past, to reaffirm, through confession, what occurred through baptism.

Theological Epistemology: Ecclesial Knowing

Again, given the nested nature of the conceptual levels of theological ontology, anthropology, and epistemology, we should expect Bonhoeffer to deal with the problem of act and being at the epistemological level and that Heidegger should play some positive role there as well. Both expectations are met, and as one might expect by now, Bonhoeffer creates some rather complex conceptual divisions to address the problem for theological epistemology.

For Bonhoeffer, there are three forms of knowing, the last of which is further split into two additional divisions: There are unbelieving, existentiell, and ecclesial forms of knowing.[106] The German editors make an important mistake here that is compounded by the English translation and that requires explicit correction.[107] In the German edition, Bonhoeffer says "Dieses Wissen hat theologisch eine dreifache Gestalt, als ungläubiges, als existentielles und als

---

are again made the primary actors; for example, see DBWE 1: 222 (DBW 1: 151); DBWE 15: 302 (DBW 15: 299); and DBWE 6: 57 (DBW 6: 42-3). This also risks mistaking temporality and objective time. One could potentially objectively measure time according to a human estimation of the progress made towards a future state of perfection.

[106] DBWE 2: 124-5 (DBW 2: 122).

[107] I thank Michael DeJonge for pointing out to me much of what follows concerning the four types of knowing.

kirchliches Wissen, deren Explikation erst später vorgenommen werden kann."[108] The German edition notes that "*ungläubig*" should be "*gläubig*."[109] Following this suggestion, the English edition translates this as "Theologically this knowing has three forms: as believing, as existentiell, and as ecclesial."[110] Part of the justification for this 'correction' is Bonhoeffer's relisting of these forms a page later. In the English edition, "We must first distinguish among three distinct ways of knowing and the concepts that correspond to three sociologically different functions of the church: the *believing* [*glaubende*], the *preaching* [*predigende*], and the *theological* [*theologische*] ways of knowing, of which the first may be called the *existential* [sic] [*existentielle*] and the other two '*ecclesial* [*kirchliche*] *knowing*'."[111] If one pays close attention to Bonhoeffer's distinctions, one sees that there are four, not three, forms of knowing, and that there is indeed a "parallelism" between the two lists.[112] First, there is "unbelieving" knowledge. This makes sense because being in Adam must have some epistemic relation to theological matters. Being in Adam does not believe. Second, there is "believing" knowledge, which "may be called *existentiell*" (not existential as the translation has it).[113] Then there is "ecclesial" knowing, which is then further divided into preaching and theology.

The primary 'object' of knowledge Bonhoeffer is concerned with is fairly specific: "The object of faith is the person of Christ preached in the community of faith."[114] From this primary

[108] DBW 2: 122.
[109] DBW 2: 122n58.
[110] DBWE 2: 124-5 (DBW 2: 122).
[111] DBWE 2: 126 (DBW 2: 123); emphasis in the original.
[112] DBWE 2: 124-5n[67]. Tietz gets the four part division of Bonhoeffer's types of knowing correct, and her account of Bonhoeffer's theological epistemology is, in general and by my estimation, the best; Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 273.
[113] In fact, the English edition often mistranslates *existentiell* as existential.
[114] DBWE 2: 126 (DBW 2: 123). Heidegger makes a comparable statement in Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44: "For the 'Christian' faith, that being which is primarily revealed to faith, and only to it, and which, as revelation, first gives rise to faith, is Christ, the crucified God. The relationship of faith to the cross, determined in this way by Christ, is a Christian one. The crucifixion, however, and all that belongs to it is a historical event, and

object of knowledge then arise other objects unique to faith: "Thus in faith is disclosed a new sphere of knowledge and objects."[115] Again, Bonhoeffer positions himself between or beyond two alternative epistemologies that do not, as he sees it, appropriately understand the unique nature of the person of Christ as the central object of faith. If revelation, as Barth has it, is non-objective, a non-entity (*Nichtseiend*), then it is impossible for faith to be directed towards revelation. With nothing else to be directed at, one can only reflect on one's own faith.[116] With this, one is again trapped in the *cor curvum in se*. Yet, revelation also cannot be an entity, an object in the usual sense. It cannot simply be a doctrine, an institution, or the objective historical human Jesus of Nazareth. Again, human reason and understanding could then understand revelation on its own terms. Potentially, one would not even need faith to access revelation.

Again, revelation must be understood as person. The person is "the point of unity of the transcendental and the ontological approaches to knowledge."[117] The person, particularly as Christ for Bonhoeffer, is knowable or haveable, but not in the usual sense of an object that is simply there to be known.[118] The person *is* knowable only in the person's self-giving act.[119] This maintains the epistemological transcendence of the person because the person acts from outside. Because it is a free act from outside, it is the person that sets the epistemological limit from outside. This self-giving act creates a corresponding alteration in the being of human Dasein. Dasein is in faith or Christ, from which the act of believing arises.[120]

---

indeed this event gives testimony to itself as such in its specifically historical character only for faith in the scriptures. One 'knows' about this fact only *in believing*."

[115] DBWE 2: 127 (DBW 2: 125). Heidegger makes similar statements in "Phenomenology and Theology," 44–5.

[116] DBWE 2: 125 (DBW 2: 122).

[117] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 125).

[118] DBWE 2: 127 (DBW 2: 124-5).

[119] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 125).

[120] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).

As one may already guess simply from Bonhoeffer's terminology, Heidegger plays an important role here as well, one which follows the important insight Bonhoeffer appropriates from Heidegger that epistemology is dependent on anthropology. This means that being in Adam and being in Christ must have distinct ways of knowing arising from their distinct existences. From being in sin or Adam arises the existentiell way of knowing as unbelieving in relation to Christian matters. From being in faith or Christ arises the existentiell way of knowing as believing in relation to Christian matters.[121] Here we see Bonhoeffer both using and altering Heidegger for his own theological purposes. For Heidegger, what Bonhoeffer labels being in Adam and being in Christ would be existentiell modifications of more fundamental existential structures; however, these are separate kinds of existences and are, therefore, better understood, for Bonhoeffer, as existential. All knowing that arises from these distinct kinds of existence are then existentiell, as Bonhoeffer consistently makes this distinction in this section.[122]

In Christian believing, one "know[s] oneself overcome and pardoned by the person of Christ in the preached word."[123] From this comes knowledge of other faithful matters, such as the beliefs that Christ is present in the sacrament or that confession is efficacious in justifying the Christian. Here, believing or faith as the act of knowing is the simple *actus directus* (direct act).[124] The Christian simply believes.[125] There is no reflection on one's faith, no reflection on the

[121] This is an important position underlying *Discipleship* as well; for example see DBWE 4: 51 (DBW 4: 38); see also Feil, *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 20–1.
[122] That the English translation often translates "existentiell" as "existential" in this and other sections makes this distinction more difficult to detect. This also means that when DeJonge labels faith, for Bonhoeffer, as "implicit, existential knowledge" he is half right. All knowledge, for Heidegger and Bonhoeffer, is existentiell. All knowledge is predicated on the particular way human Dasein *is* in the world. Believing is an "implicit" or pre-theoretical way of knowing, while theology is an "explicit" or theoretical way of knowing. See DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer's Theological Formation*, 79–81; DeJonge, "God's Being Is in Time," 130.
[123] DBWE 2: 126 (DBW 2: 123).
[124] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).
[125] Though there are some detailed points of disagreement between Heidegger and Bonhoeffer on this point, there is notable agreement. For example, when Heidegger says, "Thus faith understands itself only in believing. In any case, the believer does not come to know anything about his specific existence, for instance, by way of a theoretical

entities of faith, such as baptism or communion. Here the Kantian "in reference to the transcendent" and the Heideggerian ready-to-hand (*zuhanden*) knowledge are joined. In the faithful act of knowing in reference to Christ, Christ becomes Christ.[126] Or, according to the terminology of the "Lectures on Christology," the *historisch* Jesus becomes the *geschichtlich* Jesus by which the Christian can know Christ as both the Humiliated and Exalted One.[127] The Christian then knows implicitly, unreflectively the meaning of Christ and the ecclesial accoutrements that come along with such knowledge.[128] As Tietz correctly notes, though without explicitly referencing Heidegger, the implicit "everydayness" of this type of knowledge allows the Christian to be directed to Christ without having to be always consciously focused on Christ.[129]

Understanding believing-knowledge in this way helps to maintain the transcendental uniqueness of revelation, as that which cannot be fully grasped by human understanding. The intentionality of believing is, according to Bonhoeffer, by definition directed solely at Christ or revelation; as soon as it reflects on itself it is no longer faith.[130] Faith and its 'object', Christ as that which stands against (*Gegen*-stand) the 'I' , cannot be pulled into human reason and understanding.[131]

At this point, it is important to deal with a criticism Tietz has of Bonhoeffer's position on theological epistemology. As she notes, Bonhoeffer rejects the theological proposition that "like

---

confirmation of his inner experiences. Rather, he can only 'believe' this possibility of existence as one which the Dasein concerned does not independently master." Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44.

[126] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).

[127] DBWE 12: 330-1 (DBW 12: 314).

[128] This is, of course, all predicated on being placed in a new 'world', the church, by Christ. Though Bonhoeffer does not explicate or analyze Heidegger's concept of "world" in any detail, the relation of the church to being in Christ to believing is structurally similar to Heidegger's relation of world to the being of Dasein to knowledge and follows Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger to explain epistemology's dependence on anthropology.

[129] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 281.

[130] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).

[131] DBWE 2: 126 (DBW 2: 123-4).

can only by known by like."[132] There are two general options for understanding this proposition. The first option is that there remains some post-lapsarian likeness between human beings and God's being sufficient for allowing humans to know God. The second option is that an essential component of God's granting a Christian grace or faith is God's imparting Christ or the Holy Spirit to the Christian and that it is really Christ or the Holy Spirit within the Christian that knows God for the Christian.[133] The former is clearly rejected by Bonhoeffer.[134] It is not immediately clear whether Bonhoeffer is successful in rejecting the latter. His preferred position is that "unlike is known by unlike": "Because it is 'in Christ', Dasein is 'in reference to' Christ. But because here untruth is placed into truth, unlike is known by unlike […] unlike gives itself to be known by unlike: Christ, the crucified and risen one, gives Christ's own self to be known by human beings, who live to themselves. It is in being known by God that human beings know God."[135] As Tietz points out, however, there are times when Bonhoeffer falls back on Barthian language that seems to presuppose that "like is only known by like." For example, Bonhoeffer says that "God gives the divine self in Christ to the community of faith and to every individual as member of this community of faith. This happens in such a way that the acting subject in the community of faith, proclaiming and believing, is Christ."[136] It is difficult to reconcile such statements with Bonhoeffer's rejection of the Barthian position, but it is worth taking a closer look at what Bonhoeffer seems to intend in his alternative position and that position's Heideggerian elements.

[132] DBWE 2: 53 and 134 (DBW 2: 47 and 133); Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 276.
[133] Bonhoeffer links this position specifically to Barth; DBWE 2: 83 (DBW 2: 77).
[134] DBWE 2: 53 (DBW 2: 47).
[135] DBWE 2: 134 (DBW 2: 133).
[136] DBWE 2: 112 (DBW 2: 109); see also DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).

As Bonhoeffer understands the Barthian position, it is predicated on a strict division between unlike subjects.[137] Through his adaptation of Heideggerian Dasein, Bonhoeffer, however, wants to undercut the question of how unlike subjects can know each other.[138] Rather, the point for Bonhoeffer is that the person of Christ encounters the Christian in the church thereby placing the Christian in a world, in the Heideggerian sense, in which the Christian does know the person of Christ. It may still be that Bonhoeffer must rely on Barthian language. Bonhoeffer does want to avoid the other extreme alternative Barth is countering, i.e. that there is some possibility in human existence that allows for human knowledge of God apart from God's intervention. So it is likely that Barth's formulation must remain in some guise; however, Bonhoeffer's deeper point is that, as Tietz references,[139] that God first intervenes in human existence—unlike humans are known first by unlike God—which thereby affects the human's total existence. This creates human existence anew within the church. Within this new ecclesial world, the human 'subject' is given the ability to know God.

One presupposition that leads to Barth's failure here, according to Bonhoeffer, is the presupposition that the act of faith must be atemporal.[140] Yet, faith is "a temporal act" for Bonhoeffer, and as such must have some relation to the continuity of faithful existence.[141] Faith is primarily futurally directed, specifically at the futural fulfillment of the Christian promise; however, as we have seen at the other conceptual levels, there must be an intimate connection of futural projection to the present.[142]

---

[137] See DBWE 2: 85-6 (DBW 2: 79-80).
[138] As we saw in chapter three this is a similar concern for Heidegger. SZ 60.
[139] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 278.
[140] DBWE 2: 84-5 (DBW 2: 78).
[141] DBWE 2: 129 (DBW 2: 126).
[142] That Bonhoeffer is using temporal distinctions in his theological epistemology is not as clear and well-developed as compared to the other conceptual levels. But there do seem to be strong indications that believing corresponds to the future, preaching to the present, and theology to the past. As examples, Bonhoeffer says, "It is as certain that such faith carries itself forward in 'direct consciousness'"; DBWE 2:133 (DBW 2: 132); "The object of the way of

Here preaching, as the first form of ecclesial knowing, enters. The 'object' of faith is, again, "Christ preached in the community of faith."[143] Faith is created by Christ acting through the sermon or word (and sacrament).[144] As a way of knowing, preaching's object is "the word of proclamation to the community of faith" made "*hic et nunc*" (here and now).[145] The purpose of preaching is then to create future-oriented believing now, in the present, and here in the church.

The direction or intentionality of preaching-knowledge is reflexive (*actus reflexus*). Because preaching requires reflection on the content of the proclamation made to the church, it risks making revelation into an object or entity under the control of human understanding; in other words, it is under the constant threat of succumbing to the *cor curvum in se*. What saves preaching for Bonhoeffer is its communal nature, its dependence on the being of the church. The preacher acts from the office of preaching, an office arising from the church that is the present body of Christ.[146] Therefore, the preacher, for Bonhoeffer, is not acting as an individual, but rather Christ and the community are acting through the preacher.[147] In act-being terms, the being of the individual *as* preacher is created by, lies within, Christ as the church. All acts arising from that being are then similarly created from Christ as the church.

Preachers must obviously reflect on the content of that which they preach. The preacher must guide the present message of the sermon according to the "memory of the church."[148] Theology is the church's memory. From this memory, theology forms dogmas with the aim of

---

knowing of preaching is no longer the already spoken [past] word but the one to be spoken just now [present] to this community of faith" (DBWE 2: 133); and "Its [theology's] object is all the happenings held in remembrance in the Christian community of faith" (DBWE 2: 130).

[143] DBWE 2: 126 (DBW 2: 123).
[144] DBWE 2: 129 (DBW 2: 127).
[145] DBWE 2: 131 and 133 (DBW 2: 129 and 132).
[146] DBWE 2: 134 (DBW 2: 132).
[147] DBWE 2: 133 (DBW 2: 131).
[148] DBWE 2: 130 (DBW 2: 128).

guiding preaching.[149] Preaching, therefore, presupposes theology and its dogmas. In fact, "For preaching it follows that preachers must be theologians."[150] "Theology is, therefore, the science [*Wissenschaft*] that has its own presuppositions as its subject matter, that is to say, it stands between past preaching and future preaching."[151] That is, theology makes present, in the form of dogmas, the past happenings of the church, which present preaching may then take up and believers may use as a guide with an eye to the future.

As opposed to the previous forms of knowledge, theology is an explicit, reflexive, and propositional or assertive way of knowing. Theology arises from the life lived in the church. It has a particular object or *positum* of study, "the *spoken* word of Christ in the church."[152] From this spoken word, which is the origin and continuation of the church, arises other entities for theological reflection. Such entities include "all the happenings held in remembrance in the Christian community of faith; in the Bible; in preaching and sacrament, prayer, confession; in the word of the person of Christ, which is preserved as an entity in the historical [*geschichtlichen*] church."[153] These entities are already pre-theoretically understood in the existentiell believing way of knowing. Theology's task is then to reflect on such already known entities, systematize them, and present it to preaching. This is possible because, as Tietz correctly observes, God has

[149] Ibid.
[150] DBWE 2: 133 (DBW 2: 131). Heidegger understands there to be a similarly strong connection between theology and preaching: "*[T]heology in its essence has the character of a practical science.* As the science of the action of God on human beings who act in faith it is already 'innately' homiletical. And for this reason alone is it practical theology, as homiletics and catechetics, and not on account of contingent requirements that demand, say, that it apply its theoretical propositions to a practical sphere." Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 48 emphasis in the original.
[151] DBWE 2: 130 (DBW 2: 128); translation altered.
[152] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 129); emphasis in the original.
[153] DBWE 2: 130 (DBW 2: 128); translation altered.

freely bound God's self to such ecclesial entities upon which theology reflects, even if God is not strictly equivalent to such entities.[154]

Bonhoeffer and Heidegger are in some substantial agreement here. Existentiell believing, the pre-theoretical or implicit way of knowing, is predicated on the existential being in faith.[155] Theology systematizes and makes explicit that knowledge already known by believing.[156] They agree on the importance of theology's relation to faith and Luther as an (the) important figure in the correct understanding of that relation. With perhaps a nod to dialectical theology, most likely Bultmann in particular, and its mounting critiques of liberal theology, Heidegger says, "[Theology] is slowly beginning to understand once more Luther's insight that the 'foundation' on which its system of dogma rests has not arisen from an inquiry in which faith is primary."[157]

They do differ, however, on the nature of that relationship. Just prior to the above quotation, Heidegger says, "*Theology* is seeking a more primordial interpretation of man's being towards God, prescribed by the meaning of faith itself and remaining within it."[158] For Bonhoeffer, however and somewhat paradoxically, theology does not remain within faith. The being of faith only *is* in the direct act of looking at Christ. "Whether faith *is* faith can neither be ascertained nor believed; but the faith that believes *is* faith."[159] Though "theology is a function of the church,"[160] it is an instance of *actus reflexus*. Theology is then not faith, and when theology

[154] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 289. Cf. DBWE 2: 90-1 and 132 (DBW 2: 85 and 130.)
[155] Of course, that Bonhoeffer makes a more or less strict division between being in faith and being in sin, and therefore between unbelieving and believing forms of knowing will be, in the next chapter, an important point of disagreement.
[156] Cf. SZ 9-10 and 158.
[157] SZ 10. That Heidegger is critical of liberal theology is obvious in his early critiques of Ernst Troeltsch and Harnack, see Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 14–21, 117–18, and 121–2. Though as we will see in the next chapter, Heidegger becomes equally unimpressed by dialectical theology.
[158] This is made stronger in "Phenomenology and Theology" where faith itself is the object of theological study, Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 46.
[159] DBWE 2: 133 (DBW 2: 131); emphasis in the original.
[160] DBWE 2: 130 (DBW 2: 128).

looks at faith, it does not see faith as such: "The question about the possibility of faith can only be answered through its reality. But since this reality is not amenable to the manner of exhibition of what exists [*Seiend*], any reflection proves to be destructive."[161] The same is true of revelation itself; theology turns it into an entity.[162]

What saves theology, for Bonhoeffer, and separates it from all other positive sciences is its humility and obedience.[163] Proper, obedient theology can "be practiced only where the living person of Christ is itself present and can destroy this entity [created by theology] or acknowledge it."[164] The living person of Christ is the church or community of faith. More particularly, preaching, which takes up theology, judges theology's dogma in the community of faith.[165] Theology must always be practiced with an eye to the fact that its true meaning is given in the church, which may accept or reject it.[166]

The general epistemological picture looks something like the following: The church as a collective person is in faith. From faith arises various, newly available entities that both the church and the individual participating in the church may faithfully know. This includes the church's heritage, its past. Theology's primary task is to care for and order this heritage.[167] Importantly, theology and its product, dogma, do not create faith.[168] However, this systematized

[161] DBWE 2: 133 (DBW 2: 131).
[162] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 129).
[163] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 128-9). Again, as we will see in the next chapter, Heidegger agrees with this as well; though more often than not, this leads to Heidegger's strongest critiques of theology, and the strictest formulations of the absolute difference between theology and philosophy.
[164] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 129); translation altered.
[165] DBWE 2: 131 and 133 (DBW 2: 129 and 131).
[166] DBWE 2: 132 (DBW 2: 130-1).
[167] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 129).
[168] DBWE 2: 132 (DBW 2: 130). Here Heidegger agrees: "Likewise, the theological transparency and conceptual interpretation of faith cannot found and secure faith in its legitimacy, nor can it in any way make it easier to accept faith and remain constant in faith. Theology can only render faith more difficult, that is, render it more certain that faithfulness cannot be gained through the science of theology, but solely through faith. Hence theology can permit the serious character of faithfulness as a 'graciously bestowed' mode of existence to become a matter of conscience." Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 46.

remembrance is a necessary aid in preaching, when Christ as word is presented here and now to the church community, which does create faith.[169] Christ and the church then carry the word given in preaching forward in believing.[170] As Tietz nicely encapsulates these types of theological epistemology, "Theology thus says, 'God forgives sins'; preaching says, 'you are forgiven'; belief says, 'I am forgiven'."[171]

***

Though the preceding was by no means exhaustive of Bonhoeffer's theology, even as presented in *Act and Being*, it should be clear that Heidegger plays a pivotal role it its development. That there are nested levels of investigation is structurally and conceptually central for both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer. For Heidegger, the proper founding of knowledge and the sciences is predicated on a proper understanding of Dasein. Taking this a theological step further, for Bonhoeffer, while understanding ecclesial knowledge in its various forms is predicated on knowing faithful existence, understanding that existence is further predicated on understanding Christ or revelation.

Temporality, as that element that maintains continuity, is particularly vital to Bonhoeffer's project. Without it, Bonhoeffer might be a more or less orthodox Barthian. Temporality has a fundamental role to play for theological ontology, anthropology, and epistemology. It is certainly true that what use Bonhoeffer makes of Heidegger is first theologically tested. That is, had Heidegger's basic temporal framework not arisen, at least in part, from Heidegger's own theological background and had Bonhoeffer not at least implicitly

[169] If Bonhoeffer takes this position seriously, then we should expect to see the theology presented in *Act and Being* evident in his pastoral work at that time. It seems to me that many of the prominent Heideggerian themes used in *Act and Being* are also present in his sermons around this time. See, for example, DBWE 10: 517-19 and 528-30 (DBW 10: 499-502 and 512-16).
[170] DBWE 2: 131 (DBW 2: 129).
[171] Tietz-Steiding, *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*, 296.

recognized it as worth re-theologizing, then Heidegger's temporality would likely not have had the impact it did on Bonhoeffer's own work. Yet, temporality did have this impact and to the degree that understanding Heidegger's temporality is necessary for understanding the development of Bonhoeffer's early theology.

A next logical question would be to ask, "Is it right for Bonhoeffer to use Heidegger in this way?" Nearly all that has preceded has been predicated on how Bonhoeffer understands the way in which theology may profitably use philosophy. It is equally legitimate to ask whether Heidegger would approve. Asking this question would place Bonhoeffer's appropriation of Heidegger in relation to Heidegger's own understanding of the relation of theology to philosophy and the history of theological reactions to Heidegger. This is the topic of the next and concluding chapter.

Chapter Six: Bonhoeffer and Heideggerian Theology

The primary goal of the preceding chapters was to illuminate the pivotal role Heidegger played in Bonhoeffer's early theological development. Secondarily, though still importantly, my goal has been to demonstrate that Bonhoeffer is a good theological interpreter of the early Heidegger. As a conclusion, I would like to bring this secondary concern to the fore and explicitly ask whether such use of Heidegger is appropriate by Heidegger's own standards. In general, I argue that Bonhoeffer's theological adaptation of Heidegger is appropriate by Heidegger's own standards.

When one thinks of an early Heideggerian theologian, Bultmann is most likely seen as the paradigm example. Bonhoeffer, however, is quite critical of Bultmann in *Act and Being*.[1] If Bultmann is the paradigm case of a theological appropriation of Heidegger's early philosophy and Bonhoeffer is critical of Bultmann, then it may seem likely that Bonhoeffer's own use of Heidegger misses the mark in some way. This is predicated, however, on the position that Bultmann is more or less the only or best way in which to make theological use of Heidegger. Challenging this position is then an intermediary goal on the way to demonstrating that Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger is appropriate.

In order to assess both Bultmann and Bonhoeffer on their use of Heidegger, we need standards by which to evaluate them. Because we are dealing with early Heidegger around the time of his writing and publishing *Being and Time*, the primary source for these standards will be

[1] For a good summation of Bultmann's place in Bonhoeffer's corpus see Peter Frick, "Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich and Dietrich Bonhoeffer," in *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, ed. Peter Frick (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 223–37.

Heidegger's "Phenomenology and Theology," which is, at the time, the most sustained and systematic account of how his phenomenology may relate to theology. Though this is his most sustained and systematic account of the relation between phenomenology and theology, it contains an inherent ambiguity. Heidegger asserts that theology is guided *both* by phenomenology and faith. As we will see, it is difficult to maintain an equitable guiding relationship between phenomenology and faith. This then leads to theology being primarily guided either by phenomenology or faith. This then leads to two viable routes for theology to take vis-à-vis philosophy. One may either take a *positive-appropriative route* whereby phenomenology is the primary guide for theology. Or one may take a *positive-adaptive route* whereby faith is primary and requires theology to alter philosophical positions in light of faith.[2]

In the second section we will see how Bultmann legitimately takes the first positive-appropriative route. That is, Bultmann finds in Heidegger's phenomenology an accurate formal account of human existence from which theology must work. However, Bultmann pushes beyond the boundaries that Heidegger sets even for this more optimistic approach to theology's use of phenomenology. Heidegger strictly forbids phenomenology any access to revelation severely curtailing phenomenology's applicability to faithful existence. Bultmann, seeking to make phenomenology generally applicable to theology in all its domains, argues that phenomenology does have formal access to revelation.

Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger, as we will see in the third section, is a viable and legitimate alternative to Bultmann. Bonhoeffer shares many of the same general assumptions concerning the disciplinary and scientific nature of theology as it relates to philosophy. But rather than take the first positive-appropriative route, Bonhoeffer takes the positive-adaptive

[2] There is a more straightforwardly negative route whereby philosophy and theology are more or less strictly isolated from one another. In the context of the current discussion, this is exemplified by Barth's espoused view.

route left open by Heidegger, and Bonhoeffer does so with the intention of avoiding Bultmann's mistakes.

Phenomenology and Theology: Two Routes

The most extended and detailed account by early Heidegger of theology's possible relationship to his brand of phenomenology is given in his "Phenomenology and Theology."[3] A number of excellent interpretations and elucidations of this work exist.[4] One problem with interpreting this work is its apparent internal conflict. Interpretations, when they explicitly tackle this internal conflict, tend to favor one side or the other.

There are comments by Heidegger, difficult to interpret away, that there is a strict division and opposition between phenomenology and faith, from which theology arises. Heidegger, for example, describes philosophy, equivalent to phenomenology here, and faith as "mortal enemies," such that "philosophy does not even begin to want in any way to do battle with [faith]."[5] This leads Judith Wolfe, for instance, to argue that in writing and presenting this work, Heidegger in fact already thought that there could be no real profitable relationship between phenomenology and theology.[6] The implication seems to be that one should ignore the points where Heidegger does present ways in which theology may profit from phenomenology.

[3] "Phenomenology and Theology" made its first appearance as a lecture given to the Tübingen theological faculty on July 9, 1927 and again at Marburg on February 14, 1928. Its first publication was in 1969 in *Archives de Philosophie*. Then the dedication to Bultmann was added when published as a booklet in 1970. Finally, it was included in *Wegmarken*.

[4] Ben Vedder, *Heidegger's Philosophy of Religion: From God to the Gods* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007), chapter 3; Wolfe, *Heidegger's Eschatology*, 111–13; Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, chapter 3; Jeff Owen Prudhomme, *God and Being: Heidegger's Relation to Theology* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1997), chapter 3; Adriaan Peperzak, "A Re-Reading of Heidegger's 'Phenomenoogy and Theology,'" in *The Multidimensionality of Hermeneutic Phenomenology*, ed. B. Babich and D. Ginev (Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2014), 317–37; Peter Capretto, "The Wonder and Spirit of Phenomenology and Theology: Rubenstein and Derrida on Heidegger's Formal Distinction of Philosophy from Theology," *The Heythrop Journal* 55 (2014): 599–611.

[5] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.

[6] Wolfe, *Heidegger's Eschatology*, 113; Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, 70.

There are a number of contextual problems with this interpretation. First, Heidegger later thought "Phenomenology and Theology" important enough, as a genuine sign of his thought at a particular time, to include it in his *Pathmarks*. Second, though there is certainly a growing unease with the prospect of the possibility of positive relations between theology and phenomenology,[7] there is also a history of more optimistic statements concerning their relation.[8] Third, much of "Phenomenology and Theology" is predicated on *Being and Time*. "Phenomenology and Theology" is dependent on the distinction between the ontological science of phenomenology and the ontic sciences, theology among them. Heidegger also draws on the specific example of sin's relation to guilt present in *Being and Time*.

More importantly and directly related to the content of "Phenomenology and Theology," Heidegger goes to great lengths to delineate the boundaries between phenomenology and theology with an eye to those points where theology might profitably engage phenomenology. These more optimistic elements should, then, be taken seriously. "Phenomenology and Theology" should be read as a transitional work. Here Heidegger appears to be working under the already well thought out positive relationship between the two with an eye to his growing belief that the two should be strictly divided. As such, the positive approach is a viable Heideggerian option, one present from 1920 to at least 1927. Therefore, these criteria will be the more immediate concern for evaluating Bultmann and Bonhoeffer.

---

[7] For instance, writing to Elisabeth Blochmann on 8 August 1928, Heidegger looks back on his "Phenomenology and Theology" saying "it was meant to demonstrate how, given that one already stands in the Christian Protestant faith and carries out theology, one ought to take philosophy, provided one wants to take it only as an aid and not as a fundamental agitation." Martin Heidegger and Elisabeth Blochmann, *Briefwechsel: 1918-1969*, ed. Joachim Storck, 2nd ed. (Marbach am Neckar: Deutschen Literaturarchiv, 1990), 18. Similarly, Bonhoeffer says that "the mark of good theology [is] that it provokes good philosophers until their blood boils"; DBWE 11: 235 (DBW 11: 204).

[8] In his 1920-21 lecture course "Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion" Heidegger says, for example, "The theological method falls out of the framework of our study. Only with phenomenological understanding, a new way for theology is opened up. The formal indication renounces the last understanding that can only be given in genuine religious experience; it intends only to open an access to the New Testament." Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 47.

Heidegger's more conciliatory approach begins by asserting that the relation between theology and philosophy is dictated by the respective scientific character of each; initially, at least, the relation is not determined by the division between faith and reason.[9] Theology is a positive, ontic science.[10] Like other ontic sciences such as biology or economics, it is tasked with explicitly investigating a particular subject matter or region of being. Biology is tasked with the explicit investigation of living things; economics is tasked with investigating economic phenomena. Christian theology's task must be to investigate something distinctively Christian. However, that something is not straightforwardly God: "Etymologically regarded, theo-logy means: science of God. But God is in no way the object of investigation in theology, as, for example, animals are the theme of zoology. Theology is not speculative knowledge of God."[11] It may appear that Heidegger is making the strong and counterintuitive claim that God is not a subject of theology. Not so. Heidegger is claiming that God is not an object of investigation in the usual sense; one cannot use speculative knowledge or independent human reason to come to know abstract or metaphysical truths about God. Rather, one must go through Christianity.

Given the claim that speculative knowledge of God is not the aim of theology, it is worth pausing here in order to spell out Heidegger's theological assumptions and dispel potential misunderstandings. It is certainly not the case that Heidegger forbids theology to ask and answer the question of God.[12] To do so, however, one must go through "Christ, the crucified God."[13] This does cut off "autonomous philosophizing" or reason from access to God. And here it is important to note that Heidegger is likely working with Luther's conception of a "theology of the

[9] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 40.
[10] Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 93; Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 40.
[11] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 48.
[12] Prudhomme, *God and Being*, 98.
[13] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44.

cross" as opposed to a "theology of glory."[14] Heidegger might be faulted for not making this explicit; though he may have presumed some shared assumptions on this from his audiences at Tübingen's Lutheran Theological Faculty and the Protestant-dominated Marburg. Certainly not every theologian would find this position appealing, but according to this particular theological position, it seems appropriate.

It might seem then that Christianity is the subject of theology. Heidegger rejects this as a straightforward option as well. Christianity, as an historical phenomenon, is open to investigation by other sciences, but to investigate Christianity as an objective historical phenomenon is not to practice theology.[15] Here, Heidegger is likely critiquing Harnack, Troeltsch, and liberal theology in general.[16] Theology is a science that occurs within Christianity. More specifically, "Theology is a conceptual knowing of that which first of all allows Christianity to become an originarily historical event," i.e. "Christianness [or faith] pure and simple."[17] Theology is the science of faith and that which is revealed in faith.

Another characteristic of ontic sciences is that the subject matter of their investigation is already pre-theoretically, pre-ontologically, or implicitly understood. We already have a pre-theoretical understanding of living phenomena and of economic phenomena.[18] The task of biology and economics is to reflect on that understanding, clarify, and systematize it. Theology, as the science of faith, must reflect on faith and that which is revealed in it to clarify and make

[14] See theses 19 to 21 of Martin Luther, "Heidelberg Disputation," in *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, ed. Timothy E. Lull (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 43–4. Also, Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 213; Crowe, *Heidegger's Religious Origins*, 41–2.
[15] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 43.
[16] Similar critiques are already present in Heidegger's early lectures on religion; Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 19–21 and 115–25.
[17] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 43.
[18] Ibid., 42.

explicit what is already believed in faith.[19] This is the beginning move that will distinguish theology from other ontic sciences.

Theology is then the science of faith in four ways.[20] First, again, theology is the science of faith and that which is revealed in faith. It is important, however, not to reduce or equate faith to a set of propositions or facts. Because faith is not a set of propositions or facts, theology is also not merely a science of such propositions or facts. Faith is a way of living; it is "the very comportment of believing."[21] Theology is, second, the science of this way of living. Third, theology is the science that arises from faith. "It is the science that faith of itself motivates and justifies."[22] Finally, theology, as the science of faith and arising from faith, cultivates faith. Heidegger quickly, however, qualifies the assertion that theology cultivates faith; he elaborates on this task assigning it a purely negative function:

> [T]heological transparency and conceptual interpretation of faith cannot found and secure faith in its legitimacy, nor can it in any way make it easier to accept faith and remain constant in faith. Theology can only render faith more difficult, that is, render it more certain that faithfulness cannot be gained through the science of theology, but solely through faith. Hence theology can permit the serious character of faithfulness as a "graciously bestowed" mode of existence to become a matter of conscience.[23]

Because theology is so dependent on faith, the former is obviously importantly determined by the latter. It is necessary, then, to give an account of faith as a way of life, one which is wholly unique. Faith is a mode of existence.[24] It is one particular way of filling out the universal existential structures of Dasein.

---

[19] Ibid., 44.
[20] Ibid., 45–6.
[21] Ibid., 46.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid. This does seem to conflict with a purported statement by Heidegger in response to a 1923 presentation by Eduard Thurneysen, a close personal and professional associate of Barth. As Gadamer recalls in 1964, Heidegger said, "It is the true task of theology, which it must again find, to search for the Word that is able to call one to faith and maintain one in faith"; Gadamer, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, 198.
[24] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.

Though faith itself is a mode of Dasein's existence, it does not originate from Dasein. Faith "arises *not from* Dasein or spontaneously *through* Dasein."[25] That which does create faith is precisely that which is believed by faith, "revelation" or "Christ, the crucified God."[26] By saying that revelation comes neither through nor from Dasein, Heidegger rejects revelation as a possibility, in his technical sense, of Dasein. This means that revelation itself cannot be a subject of phenomenological investigation.

Faith is, more particularly for Heidegger, rebirth. Heidegger's description of faith as rebirth deserves a full quotation:

> [F]aith is rebirth. Though faith does not bring itself about, and though what is revealed in faith can never be founded by way of a rational knowing as exercised by autonomously functioning reason, nevertheless the sense of the Christian occurrence as rebirth is that Dasein's prefaithful, i.e. unbelieving, existence is sublated therein. Sublated does not mean done away with, but raised up, kept, and preserved in the new creation. One's pre-Christian existence is indeed existentielly, ontically, overcome in faith. But this existentiell overcoming of one's pre-Christian existence (which belongs to faith as rebirth) means precisely that one's overcome pre-Christian Dasein is existentially, ontologically included within faithful existence. To overcome does not mean to dispose of, but to have at one's disposition in a new way.[27]

There is much happening here. This is Heidegger's answer to how one coordinates Christian existence understood both as *simul justus et peccator* and as new creation.[28] The new creation occurs at the existentiell level. Previously the Christian lived in a particular pre-faithful or unbelieving way. With revelation, this pre-faithful, existentiell way of living is destroyed and replaced by a faithful, Christian way of living. Yet, the existential structures remain the same; one lives a justified life that is still determined by Dasein's 'sinful' existential structures.

The more immediately relevant result of the above understanding of faith is its consequence for the interaction of theology and phenomenology. Theology is a particular *ontic*

[25] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 43; emphasis in the original
[26] Ibid., 44.
[27] Ibid., 51.
[28] Cf. Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 96.

science with a particular *positum*, or region of being to be studied. All ontic sciences are beholden to phenomenology as the ontological science. Again, all ontic sciences are concerned with the study of particular regions of being. This is predicated on a pre-theoretical or pre-scientific understanding of that region. These regional understandings of being are predicated on our general pre-theoretical understanding of being in general. That is, we all have an understanding of what it means for things to be. It is phenomenology's task to disclose and explicate how it is that we can understanding being in general. From this task arises the other essential "task of directing all other nontheological, positive sciences with respect to their ontological foundations."[29] Obviously, Heidegger understands theology to be special among the ontic sciences; yet, because theology understands itself as a science, phenomenology may still (co-)direct theology. More particularly, faith, as an existentiell modification of Dasein's existential structures, is informed, at least in part, by those structures. These structures are phenomenology's domain of investigation. Understanding these structures must therefore be instructive for theology. Faith itself does not need phenomenology, but insofar as theology understands itself to be the *science* of faith, insofar as theology wants to make existence in faith conceptually clear, theology needs phenomenology.

What distinguishes theology from other ontic sciences is its unique subject matter. Theology is dependent on faith both for its motivation and as its primary subject of investigation. Faith and its contents come from that which first gives rise to faith, i.e. revelation or Christ. This again comes neither through nor from Dasein. Faith and its contents are not accessible by Dasein's own means. With other ontic sciences, so the implication seems to be, Dasein does or can of itself gain pre-theoretical access to those regions of being that the various other ontic sciences study. This is not so for theology. "[W]hat is revealed in faith can never be founded by

[29] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.

way of a rational knowing as exercised by autonomously functioning reason."[30] Only faith and theology have access to faith and its contents. And because an ontic science must remain true to its subject of study, theology must be (co-)directed by faith.

Theology then has two masters. Theology is beholden to faith for its content and to phenomenology for its scientific nature.[31] If theology wishes to be conceptually clear concerning its explication of faithful existence, it must turn to phenomenology for the basic formal account of Dasein. But the content about which theology must get clear is only available in faith.

Heidegger uses the relation of sin and being-guilty to illustrate his point.[32] Being-guilty, as we saw, is a fundamental existential structure of Dasein. Sin is the existentiell modification or understanding of being-guilty only available to faith. If theology wishes to be conceptually clear and correct concerning faith's understanding of sin, then it should turn to phenomenology for guidance or co-direction, particularly through what phenomenology has revealed concerning being-guilty. However, sin itself is only available in faith; "only the believer can factically exist as a sinner."[33] So theology must also turn to faith for a correct understanding of sin, one existentiell understanding of being-guilty.

Theology has two opposing masters creating a tension for theology. Phenomenology cannot be in or access faith and still be phenomenology. Or, what amounts to the same, one who is in faith cannot perform phenomenology and still be in faith. The two are mutually exclusive positions, yet theology must be guided by both simultaneously.

---

[30] Ibid., 51.

[31] It is important to note, however, that phenomenology's co-directive and corrective role vis-à-vis theology is determined not by phenomenology but by theology itself; Ibid., 53. Though Heidegger seems to take a stronger position in *Being and Time* when he says, "Ontically, we have not decided whether man is 'drunk with sin' and in the *status corruptionis*, whether he walks in the *status integritatis*, or whether he finds himself in an intermediate stage, the *status gratiae*. But in so far as any faith or 'world view', makes any such assertions, and if it asserts anything about Dasein as Being-in-the-world, it must come back to the existential structures which we have set forth, provided that its assertions are to make a claim to *conceptual* understanding"; SZ 180.

[32] Ibid., 51–2. SZ 306n1.

[33] Ibid., 51.

Before going into the details of the tension theology faces when trying to appeal simultaneously to faith and phenomenology, it is useful to explain what the tension is not. For Heidegger, theology's task cannot be the explicit investigation of Dasein's existential structures. This is due to theology's ontic and existentiell nature. To be concerned with particular entities is to not be concerned with being in general. And to be concerned with a particular existentiell way of living, faith for instance, is to not be concerned with Dasein's formal existential structures. There seems to be two related problems with this position that the existential structures of Dasein are "never a theme of theology."[34] First, Heidegger explicitly says that the investigation into Dasein's existential structures is and goes through the existentiell.[35] One can never find 'blank' existential structures. They are always manifested in particular existentiell ways. One must go through actual ways of existing to get to what makes existence in any way possible. Why can't theology go through faith to do the same? Second and in particular, Heidegger himself is indebted in no small part to theological and religious accounts of existence. His phenomenological analysis of Paul's epistles to the Thessalonians and his analyses of Book X of Augustine's *Confessions* anticipate many of the existential structures central to *Being and Time*.[36] In a 1921 letter to Karl Löwith, he identifies himself as a "Christian theo*logian*."[37] And he acknowledges Augustine, Luther, and Kierkegaard as important sources.[38] Heidegger seems to have gone through faith despite phenomenology's inability to access faith.

The question, again, is, why can't theology go through faith to access the existential level, yet Heidegger can utilize theological sources in his phenomenology? What seems to be Heidegger's answer may be unsatisfactory, but it is important to acknowledge it in order to

[34] Ibid., 52.
[35] SZ 313.
[36] Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*.
[37] Kisiel and Sheehan, *Becoming Heidegger*, 100.
[38] SZ 190n 1; GA 63: 5.

properly locate the actual tension. Understanding the answer involves appreciating the centrality of Heidegger's method of formal indication. Formal indication is, again, the method that Heidegger thinks essential for moving from the existentiell to the existential. It involves the bracketing of the particular content contained in any particular way of existing in order to get to the structures that make every way of existing possible. When Heidegger utilizes faithful accounts of existence, he does so through the method of formal indication. This removes the particular faithful content that makes that existence in fact faithful. Theology, if it were to do the same, would also have to bracket faithful content. However, faith is what it is because of this content. And theology, as essentially and intimately connected to faith, is the practice of reflecting on that content. If theology were to bracket faithful content through formal indication it would, by Heidegger's definition, cease to be theology. Part of Heidegger's intent, which in general is fairly consistent throughout his corpus, is to maintain the integrity of both phenomenology and theology.

The tension is strictly located in theology. For Heidegger, faith has no need of phenomenology, and technically, Heidegger should have been able to reach the existential level without the use of religious accounts of existence. Theology, however, requires both.[39] Because of the mutually exclusive nature of faith and phenomenology an actual equitable co-direction of theology by both seems difficult, if not impossible. So which should theology favor, phenomenology or faith?

It certainly seems that most of Heidegger's argumentative weight is placed on phenomenology or philosophy being the queen of the sciences. All other sciences should be directed to their proper subjects by phenomenology. Phenomenology holds the key to

[39] This presupposes that the theologian does or must acknowledge that philosophy has some contribution to make to theology. This is certainly not universally accepted, but both Bultmann and Bonhoeffer at least accept this claim in its most general form.

understanding that entity, Dasein, that engages in scientific inquiry. And for theology, phenomenology investigates the basic structures of Dasein. When theology investigates, from a position of faith, pre-Christian or sinful existence it should utilize the structures disclosed by phenomenology to guarantee conceptual clarity. Even when investigating faithful Christian existence it would seem that theology must utilize phenomenology's findings for the sake of conceptual clarity for "[a]ll theological concepts necessarily contain *that* understanding of being that is constitutive of human Dasein as such, insofar as it exists at all."[40] It would seem then that phenomenology is the structural master of both sinful and faithful existences. This is the conceptual support lying behind what I have termed the positive-appropriative route.

But this option is in tension with other of Heidegger's statements that theology, to remain theology, must be beholden primarily to faith. First, there is the argumentative weight that Heidegger places on all the various ways in which theology is the science of faith. Because of their unique character, revelation, faith, and its contents are not universally accessible. Phenomenology cannot then direct theology as it directs the other ontic sciences; "theology is a fully autonomous ontic science."[41] This then means that "the primary direction (derivation), the source of [theology's] Christian content, is given only in faith."[42] Because faith is primary for theology and phenomenology cannot access the content of faith, it is not essential to phenomenology to direct theology. When phenomenology does aid in directing theology, it is at theology's behest: "The demand, however, that [philosophy] *must* be so employed is not made by philosophy as such but rather by theology, insofar as it understands itself to be a science."[43] If it is theology that requests philosophy's help, and theology is primarily beholden to faith, then

[40] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 51; emphasis in the original
[41] Ibid., 50; "fully" is obviously in tension with much of the rest of Heidegger's presentation.
[42] Ibid., 52.
[43] Ibid., 53.

the help that is accepted must be mediated by faith. Faith also seems to demand this. Faith sees itself as a privileged way of existing, one which has unique access to the truth of both pre-Christian and Christian existences, meaning whatever truth philosophy may offer about either ways of existing must be judged by faith as acceptable or not. Faith then seems to be the final arbiter of truth both of itself and of 'sinful' existence, to which theology, by Heidegger's definition, must conform.

So though theology must be directed both by phenomenology and faith, it cannot be equitably co-directed by both. Both phenomenology and faith, which are again mutually exclusive positions, can make a claim to being the primary guide for theology. If one favors phenomenology, then one is apt to take the positive-appropriate route for theology's use of philosophy. If one favors faith, then one is apt to take the positive-adaptive route.

This tension should not simply be brushed aside. One may be tempted to brush the tension aside as just a tension in Heidegger's biography and one that Heidegger soon moves beyond. One may be tempted to dismiss it as simply contradictory and incoherent. Or one may see "Phenomenology and Theology" as just another, and maybe not all that unique, answer to the question, "What has Jerusalem to do with Athens?" All three under-appreciate Heidegger's attempt to coordinate theology's use of phenomenology and faith.

Taking both theology, or at least important historical instances of it, and philosophy, as Heidegger sees it, seriously means that there can be neither a straightforward "yes" nor "no" to the question of whether philosophy and theology can have profitable relations. As Heidegger says, "it is precisely this *opposition* [between faith and philosophy] that must bear the *possibility of a community of the sciences* of theology and philosophy, if indeed they are to communicate in

a genuine way, free from illusions and weak attempts at mediation."[44] The opposition between faith and philosophy, the presupposition that would lead one to assert that there can be no profitable use of philosophy by theology, is in fact what must ground profitable engagement between theology and philosophy.

As Heidegger understands faith and phenomenology, they share an important concern. Both are importantly concerned with fundamental questions concerning human existence. Phenomenology investigates Dasein's general relation to being that makes any particular way of existing possible at all. Faith involves an implicit or pre-theoretical understanding of human existence *coram Deo*, or before God. More particularly, according to Heidegger, phenomenology and faith are concerned less with particular content of human existence and more concerned with the enactment, the how, of human existence.[45] Theology as the science arising from faith and concerned with faith then shares these same concerns with human existence. Additionally, as a science, theology seeks conceptual clarity concerning human existence bringing theology yet closer to philosophy.

Yet, this dialogue between theology and philosophy is predicated on a difference or, to use Heidegger's stronger word, an opposition. Faith is not philosophy. Philosophy operates under the assumption of an existentiell possibility of a "free appropriation of one's whole Dasein," a position seen by faith as sinful.[46] Faith begins from the existentiell assumption of the *coram Deo*. It is this difference that allows for any dialogue at all. So there must be a dialogue between theology and philosophy, at least at this stage in Heidegger's work; yet this dialogue must always also be a tense one.

---

[44] Ibid.
[45] Heidegger, *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, 86–9.
[46] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.

Both Bultmann and Bonhoeffer share many of Heidegger's positions delineated above. They both take seriously the tension between faith and philosophy from which theology must work. Yet, they represent two different routes one may take in relation to this tension. Bultmann represents the positive-appropriative route; Bonhoeffer represents the positive-adaptive route. They are, therefore, good test cases for how theology may positively engage Heidegger's early philosophy according to Heidegger's own standards.

Bultmann and the Appropriative Route

Bultmann is generally considered an exemplar of a theological appropriation of Heidegger's early philosophy. In hindsight, Bultmann remarks, for example, that "[T]he work of existential philosophy, which I came to know through my discussions with Martin Heidegger, has become of decisive significance for me. I found in it the conceptuality in which it is possible to speak adequately of human existence and therefore also of the existence of the believer."[47] Here we see not only that Heidegger was of "decisive significance" for Bultmann, but more specifically, that Bultmann found that he could use Heidegger's analysis of Dasein to work out an analysis of the existence of the believer, i.e. faithful existence. Bultmann *appropriates* philosophy for the theological task of explicating faith.

Such implicit and explicit reliance on Heidegger, coupled with their close personal relationship, lends support to the position taken by such scholars as John MacQuarrie and Gareth Jones that, with some relatively minor discrepancies, Bultmann's theological use of Heidegger

[47] Bultmann, "Autobiographical Reflections," 288.

remains true to Heidegger.[48] It is undoubtedly true that Bultmann had a good grasp of Heidegger's early philosophy, attempts to remain true to Heidegger, and does often succeed.[49]

It is important to give Bultmann his due by attempting to appreciate the context within which he worked and the problems he was attempting to solve. Bultmann was confessionally Lutheran. Within the Lutheran tradition, there is a prevalent, though not exclusive, trend to allow philosophy access to basic truths concerning human existence in sin.[50] In his own way, Heidegger shares this assumption. Phenomenology can access the existential structures that theology overlays with its understanding of the being of humans as sinful. This presupposition requires that Bultmann take a more conciliatory position to philosophy's theological usefulness.

Bultmann's use of Heidegger comes as dialectical theology is growing as an academic alternative to liberal theology. Dialectical theology, of which Bultmann was a self-avowed member, was faced with the project of not simply destroying the liberal theological tradition, but with offering a positive program of its own. Having developed under similar conditions, Heidegger's phenomenology shared some of the same presuppositions as dialectical theology, at least in general outline. For example, writing to Karl Löwith in 1925, Heidegger says, "What still shows some 'life' is the Barth-Gogarten movement, which is represented in a prudent and independent way by Bultmann—and since I am always subject to being counted among theologians, I permit myself also to accompany this movement, although during a recent debate I

[48] John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965); Gareth Jones, "Phenomenology and Theology: A Note on Bultmann and Heidegger," *Modern Theology* 5, no. 2 (1989): 161–79.

[49] Wolfe argues that Bultmann, in fact, offers critiques of Heidegger's position concerning the relation of phenomenology to theology. As far as I have been able to find, Bultmann nowhere *explicitly* offers such a critique. Seeing some points of Bultmann's own position as critiques of Heidegger on this issue seems to be predicated on her reading of "Phenomenology and Theology" as offering a fairly strict division between phenomenology and theology. However, I think if we appreciate the tension in Heidegger's position, Bultmann appears to offer less a critique and more an attempt to overcome the division by emphasizing the more appropriative route available in Heidegger's position. Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, 178–86.

[50] For instances in Luther's work that Heidegger read and that support such a position see, for example, LW 2:159 and LW 25:434.

expressed my skepticism in a sufficiently clear manner."[51] Such similarities include a distrust of traditional metaphysics, critiques of contemporary methods of historical research, and the attempt to return and retrieve some unsullied origin. These basic similarities allowed Bultmann to see Heidegger as a source for his own constructive dialectical theology.[52]

As various dialectical theologians began developing positive programs, various problems with conflicting resolutions appeared within dialectical theology itself. Such problems include whether and how there might be a legitimate 'natural theology', whether and where there might be a point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*) in human existence for revelation, and how the continuity of pre-Christian and Christian identity might be maintained. Again, Bultmann found in Heidegger specific resources with which to come to his own position on such problems.

It is also important to note that Bultmann's theological position underwent significant changes. In the late teens and early twenties, for example, Bultmann squarely located himself in

[51] Quoted in SJ McGrath and Andrzej Wiercinski, eds., *A Companion to Heidegger's Phenomenology of Religious Life* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), 111n10.

[52] From the beginning of Bultmann's open reliance on Heidegger, he met with intense resistance from theological contemporaries and friends such as Karl Barth, Gerhardt Kuhlmann, Emil Brunner, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. (For examples of such critiques see Gerhard Kuhlmann, "Zum Theologischen Problem Der Existenz: Fragen an Rudolf Bultmann," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 10 (1929): 28–57; Emil Brunner, "Theologie und Ontologie, oder: Die Theologie Am Scheidewege," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1931): 111–22; Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Akt und Sein: Transzendentalphilosophie und Ontologie in der systematischen Theologie*, ed. Hans-Richard Reuter (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1988), 71–2n89.) For example, after repeated attempts by Bultmann to bring Heidegger and Barth together Barth replies in a 1931 letter, "I can only repeat that with your well-known attachment to Heidegger you have done something that one ought not to do as an evangelical theologian (not because he is Heidegger but because he is a philosopher, who as such has nothing to say to and in theology)." Jaspert and Bromiley, *Karl Barth-Rudolf Bultmann Letters 1922-1966*, 65.; translation altered. Soon after "Phenomenology and Theology" Heidegger comes to a similar position. For example, writing to Bultmann in 1929 Heidegger states, "The more often I consider the matter, and it does not happen rarely, it appears to me that all explicit philosophical discussion must disappear from theology and that all power of thought must be transferred to the historical confrontation with the N[ew] T[estment]"; Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Heidegger, *Briefwechsel: 1925-1975*, ed. Andreas Großmann and Christof Landmesser (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2009), 108; Cf. letter of August 8th 1928 in Heidegger and Blochmann, *Briefwechsel: 1918-1969*, 24–6. Reactions from Barth, Brunner, and Bonhoeffer against Bultmann revolve around theological presuppositions concerning the nature of philosophy, theology and their interaction. If one accepts certain theological presuppositions, then one can easily critique Bultmann's reliance on Heidegger from within theology. The more interesting question, at least from my perspective, is whether the extent of Bultmann's reliance on Heidegger is justified from within Heidegger's phenomenology itself.

the developing Barthian dialectical theology.[53] It appears, however, that as his knowledge of and interaction with Heidegger grew, he went through a transitional phase in which he, consciously or not, tried to mediate and combine Heidegger and Barth.[54] By the late twenties and early thirties, Bultmann is decidedly Heideggerian. With such rapid and drastic changes it is of course easy to locate inconsistencies and contradictions across Bultmann's works. In some respects it would be unfair to hold Heideggerian Bultmann to Barthian Bultmann standards and vice versa. As such, I will focus on Bultmann's writings from the late twenties to the early thirties that took Heidegger's position as articulated in "Phenomenology and Theology" as authoritative.[55]

Bultmann, in many ways, begins and executes his theological appropriation of Heidegger correctly by Heidegger's own standards at the time. In his 1930 article, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," written as a justification for his use of Heidegger in response to Kuhlmann's criticisms, Bultmann provides much of the same theoretical justification for the interaction of theology and philosophy that Heidegger did in "Phenomenology and Theology." For Bultmann, philosophy is concerned with "natural man," which is a "purely formal ontological designation," and theology is concerned with the "man of faith."[56] Both philosophy and theology then share human existence as subjects of investigation.[57] Of course, philosophy investigates the formal ontological structures of human existence that can say nothing directly about existence in faith or unfaith; while theology begins from and concerns itself with existence in faith.[58] Though their

[53] Rudolf Bultmann, "Liberal Theology and the Latest Theological Movement," in *Faith and Understanding*, ed. Robert W. Funk, trans. Louise P. Smith, vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), 28–52.
[54] Rudolf Bultmann, "Historical and Supra-Historical Religion in Christianity," in *Faith and Understanding*, ed. Robert W. Funk, trans. Louise P. Smith, 6th ed., vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), 95–115.
[55] It is additionally important to remain in this timeframe, for afterwards and in response to later criticisms, Bultmann does distance himself from Heidegger; however, one cannot, as Tim Labron does, use this later distancing to overturn Bultmann's earlier effusive praise and explicit use of Heidegger. Tim Labron, *Bultmann Unlocked* (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2010), 5, 42–5, and 75.
[56] Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 93.
[57] Ibid., 94.
[58] Ibid.

approaches to human existence are not identical, theology may still make "fruitful use of the philosophical analysis of human existence."[59] For Bultmann, existence in faith is a particular possibility within human existence and therefore is dependent on the formal ontological structures that philosophy discloses and investigates.

To justify this general use of philosophy by theology, Bultmann specifically appeals to the theological concept of "*simul peccator, simul justus*."[60] In nearly identical language to Heidegger's, Bultmann asserts that in entering faithful existence the formal ontological structures are still operative: "If, through faith, existence prior to faith is overcome *existentiell* or ontically, this still does not mean that the existential or ontological conditions of existing are destroyed."[61] That is, all ontic or existentiell ways of existing, including existence in faith, are formally determined by the ontological constitution of human existence. To understand existence in faith, theology must, at least in part, turn to that practice that investigates the formal conditions of existence, i.e. phenomenology. This leads Bultmann to make the fairly strong claim that "in a certain sense, then, theology does 'repeat' the analysis of philosophy, insofar, namely as it can only explicate its fundamental concepts of existence on the basis of an understanding of man's 'being', and insofar as it is dependent on philosophy for the analysis of the meaning of being."[62]

Of course, Bultmann also accepts that theology can only be founded on faith and is then a movement of faith itself, which complicates theology's repetition of philosophy.[63] Because theology is ontic and specifically arises from faith it "does not really learn from philosophy as such, it does not simply take over some philosophical system of dogma, but rather lets itself be referred by philosophy to the phenomenon itself; it lets itself be taught by the phenomenon, by

[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid., 96.
[61] Ibid.; see also Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 315–16.
[62] Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 95.
[63] Ibid., 97.

man, whose structure philosophy seeks to disclose."[64] So far, then, Bultmann lays down the same theoretical framework as Heidegger for the positive use of philosophy by theology.

In practice, Bultmann also does fairly well. Bultmann learns from Heidegger that phenomenology is the return to the phenomena or things themselves. For Heidegger, the nature of phenomena is dictated by the world they are in. As we saw in chapter three, the being of a particular entity is determined by its place in a web of involvements, which is Heidegger's meaning of worldhood. So to go back to the phenomena themselves at least in part means to go back to the world that gives rise to them. What is particularly important about Heidegger's concept of world is that Dasein, human existence, by definition must be its world; Dasein is being-in-the-world. This means that worldhood is a universally applicable concept to all forms of human existence, including Dasein existing in faith, the primary subject of theological investigation. World should then be in some way an important phenomenological concept that theology should be able to use to gain conceptual clarity on its subject matter. This is indeed the case for Bultmann.

As Heidegger is developing his concept of worldhood,[65] Bultmann is beginning to use it for theological purposes. In practice, what is particularly important about Heidegger's worldhood is its methodological conditions. If one wants to understand Greek concepts, then one should investigate the Greek world from which they arise on its own terms. Or, and more to the point, if one wants to understand Christian concepts, one must investigate the faithful world from which they arise, ideally in its earliest form, and in such a way that it is uncontaminated either by supposed 'objective' methods or foreign worlds, such as Greek philosophy. This is just what Bultmann attempts to do with his interpretation of Paul's epistles as the earliest accounts of

[64] Ibid., 95.
[65] Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, 509.

faithful existence and its world. As Bultmann says, a real understanding of Pauline concepts "is therefore only possible through the search for the understanding of existence basic to the text."[66]

If, for example, according to Bultmann, we look to Paul's account of faithful existence we see key anthropological concepts such as 'body', 'flesh', and 'spirit'. These concepts, however, are not understood according to Greek substance ontology.[67] 'Body', according to Bultmann, designates not a natural object among others in an objective world, but "man's being."[68] This existence may then be determined by God and live according to the 'spirit' or it may be determined by sin and live according to the 'flesh'. What is important here is that these concepts do not designate things but ways of existing as seen through faith. So, for example, because 'flesh' is not, as Bultmann reads Paul, human physical existence, sin is not equivalent to sensuality.[69] Rather, sin is determined by human finitude and being-guilty and the rebellion against the recognition of that finitude and guilt.[70] As we saw in chapter four, Heidegger's guilt is characterized by Dasein's radical finitude that does not allow Dasein to get behind its thrownness and become its own creator and simultaneously severely curtails Dasein's ability to choose every possibility open to it. The uniquely ontic or existentiell understanding of guilt as sin in faithful existence, is that humans are creatures, i.e. created, before God and that there is only one authentic possibility, the possibility of being directed at God.

Whether or not Bultmann's biblical interpretation is accurate is not the immediately relevant point. The immediately relevant point is that there are many respects in which, the above example of worldhood as one example, Bultmann has stayed within the appropriate

---

[66] Rudolf Bultmann, "The Significance of 'Dialectical Theology' for the Scientific Study of the New Testament," in *Faith and Understanding*, ed. Robert W. Funk, trans. Louise Pettibone Smith (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), 161.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 326; Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 97.

bounds of theology's and phenomenology's interactions as outlined by Heidegger at this time. According to Heidegger, theology should follow phenomenology's lead by investigating actual human existence and the concepts that arise from that existence. The formal structures of existence, such as 'world' and guilt, may be provided by phenomenology in order to aid theology in focusing on the actual existence it is tasked to investigate, i.e. existence in faith. However, the actual content of the existence and its concept must be and can only be derived from that existence itself.

So far, then, Bultmann has rightly followed the positive-appropriative route for theology's use of phenomenology; however, there is an important respect in which Bultmann takes this route too far by granting phenomenology access to faithful content Heidegger strictly forbids. That is, one can read Bultmann as recognizing the tension in Heidegger's position, choosing to emphasize Heidegger's phenomenology as an authoritative source for theology, and, therefore, presenting a position in which phenomenology has greater access to theological matters than Heidegger allows. Bultmann believes there are essential theological truths contained in Heidegger's fundamental ontology. For example, "If the pre-Christian existence includes an unknowing knowledge of God, then it also includes a pre-understanding of the Christian proclamation. And if philosophy [i.e. phenomenology] explicates this understanding of existence, it also explicates this pre-understanding [of the Christian proclamation]."[71] These hypotheticals are no small matter. If Bultmann's answer is "yes," then he essentially grants phenomenology formal access to faithful content that it should not have. Revelation is what transitions one from pre-Christian to Christian existence and reveals the world of faith. It is only after such an event that beings such as sin, Christ, God, and so forth become available. If one grasps revelation, then one has at the very least a pre-ontological understanding of faithful

[71] Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 330.

content. Granting phenomenology access to revelation is the door by which Bultmann grants phenomenology access to all other faithful content. This is Bultmann's means of overcoming the tension in Heidegger's position. Here Bultmann is attempting to bring theology's two masters, faith and phenomenology, closer together.

Bultmann's argument is essentially this: Philosophy uses pre-Christian existence in its various existentiell or ontic forms to come to the ontological understanding of the existential structures that make possible such pre-Christian existence. According to Bultmann, existentiell pre-Christian existence has a pre-ontological or, in his words, pre-understanding of revelation.[72] This then means, according to Bultmann, that revelation is a possibility of Dasein. Fundamental ontology as the enterprise of coming to know the structure of such possibilities also then has access, even if only formally, to revelation. This then leads Bultmann to assert that Heidegger's phenomenology is a 'natural theology' or preamble to faith useful not only for conceptual clarification, but for coming to know revelation or the Christian proclamation and the entities that appear thereafter in faith.[73]

By making revelation a possibility of Dasein, Bultmann is already at odds with Heidegger. More interesting, however, is how Bultmann supports this assumption by arguing for a pre-ontological understanding of revelation in pre-Christian existence. This assertion is in fact the key to the above argument that phenomenology has access to revelation and thereby theological content. As far as I can discern Bultmann has three sub-arguments for this, all of which in one way or another contravene some fundamental insights of Heidegger's *Daseinanalytik*.

[72] Ibid., 317.
[73] Ibid., 330.

In Bultmann's first argument, he draws on everyday experience and the apparent fact that even pre-Christians have some basic understanding of the propositions of faith.[74] Regardless of any position on the truth of such propositions, a pre-Christian can understand what "forgiveness" means, the basic historical facts of the Roman practice of crucifixion, the meaning of the command "love thy neighbor," and so forth. Since they are not utterly meaningless to pre-Christian existence, pre-Christian existence must have a pre-understanding of them and revelation that provides a faithful understanding of them.

Here, Bultmann, however, does not take into account one of Heidegger's more fundamental insights, which as we demonstrated above forms an important foundation for his proper use of Heidegger. The meaning of such propositions is derived from the particular world or form of existence in which they are contained. While Heidegger does believe there is a continuity of existential structures between pre-Christian and Christian existence, as existentiell ways of existing they are "mortal enemies."[75] Propositions of faith as they occur in these two opposed forms of existence would superficially appear to be similar, but the meaning of such propositions would be equally different. If the faithful meaning of such propositions are not, as Heidegger asserts, rationally available to pre-Christian existence, then they also do not seem to be available to phenomenology either.

Bultmann does attempt to maneuver around this by arguing that such propositions of faith are understood in pre-Christian existence because the life of faith as a possible way of existing is understood by the unbeliever.[76] Bultmann uses the analogy of friendship to support his point. According to Bultmann, a friendless person's understanding of friendship as a concept and

[74] Ibid., 314.
[75] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53; Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 324.
[76] Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 317; Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 99–100. Wolfe also deals with this sub-argument; though my reading of this argument is somewhat different. Wolfe, *Heidegger and Theology*, 183–4.

possibility is, in an important sense, equivalent to that of a person with a friend. One might add particular content concerning one's self and the friend to the possibility of friendship, but the earlier understanding of friendship as a possibility is not further clarified or understood in some appreciably different way.[77]

This is a troubling analogy for a number of reasons. First, in terms of basic experience this seems obviously false. I, living a childless existence, of course still have some understanding of fatherhood as a possibility. However, with actual fatherhood I would expect my understanding of the possibility of fatherhood to gain more than mere particular content. This seems, again, to be evidence of Bultmann contravening the earlier accepted point that the understanding of a possibility arises from a particular way of living. Second and more importantly, friendship is disanalogous to revelation. For Bultmann, the reason a friendless person can understand friendship, despite not having one, is that friendship is a possibility in human existence. Again however, for Heidegger revelation is not a possibility within Dasein. It comes neither through nor from Dasein.

In his second sub-argument, Bultmann takes as evidence of a pre-understanding of revelation in pre-Christian existence the fact that revelation is understood when received.[78] If there were not some pre-formed existential structure which revelation matched, then when received there would be no possibility of understanding it.[79] This option is at least implicitly ruled out by Heidegger's circular characterization of how one receives revelation and faith. Faith comes through "that which is revealed in and with this way of existence, from what is believed.

[77] Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 99–100.
[78] Bultmann, "The Problem of Natural Theology," 315.
[79] Here Bultmann directly contradicts himself. He explicitly rejects the theological concept of a point of contact (*Anknüpfungspunkt*), yet his overall argument requires something within the existential structures of Dasein to act as a point of contact with revelation and even specifically identifies the conscience as that capacity for receiving revelation. Ibid., 316–17.

For the 'Christian' faith, that being which is primarily revealed to faith, and only to it, and which, as revelation, first gives rise to faith, is Christ, the crucified God." [80] Not until the Christian recognizes the central content of faith, that Christ is the crucified God, does that Christian live in faith, yet one cannot recognize and know this content of faith until one is in faith. Faith would not then be a structure to be actualized and filled with faithful content. If there is no structure within pre-Christian existence to which revelation conforms, then fundamental ontology cannot, as Bultmann advocates, function as a preamble to faith.

Third and finally, using the Augustinian-Lutheran tradition that revelation or the Word must come through human words, Bultmann argues that revelation is open to phenomenology via such human words.[81] Discourse, as a fundamental existential structure of Dasein, is an important subject of phenomenology. If revelation comes through discourse, then there should be a way in which revelation, according to Bultmann, is also open to phenomenological investigation. This would only work, however, if there were a necessary relation between words and the Word. According to the tradition with which Heidegger is working, however, the relation is contingent. It is a contingent and free act of God that links any particular instance of reading or hearing human words to the Word. Since any particular ontic instance of discourse would only be contingently linked to revelation, I think this, coupled again with revelation not being a possibility of Dasein, is an indication that revelation is only contingently linked to the existential structure of discourse. Neither an ontic investigation into language nor an ontological investigation into discourse would seem to guarantee any grasp of revelation.

These are some notable problems with Bultmann's account of how phenomenology can have access to revelation and therefore to faith and its contents. However, it arises out of a

[80] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44.
[81] Bultmann, "The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith," 100.

genuine concern to make good on Heidegger's assertion that phenomenology can aid theology in its conceptual practices. But in doing so Bultmann must deemphasize the unique cause of faith and faith as a unique way of life with unique content, all of which make theology an autonomous ontic science. Bultmann must emphasize phenomenology over faith. Though it is an attractive route for the justification for the theological use of Heidegger, it is not the only one.

Bonhoeffer and the Adaptive Route

In *Act and* Being, Bonhoeffer is quite critical of Bultmann; however, these critiques are not necessarily equivalent to critiques of Heidegger. Bonhoeffer critiques Bultmann for making the existential structures of Dasein the mediators of revelation,[82] a position that Heidegger did not seem to hold. Because these structures mediate revelation, Bultmann is able to maintain the continuity of sinful and faithful existences, but only, as Bonhoeffer evaluates it, by downgrading the new existence, or existence in faith.[83] This also means, as Bonhoeffer reads Bultmann, that we may know God through knowing ourselves,[84] which is at least partly rejected by Heidegger's position that one cannot work from the existential structures to faithful content. All of this is predicated on phenomenology being a fundamental starting point for theology. If the previous chapters have demonstrated that Bonhoeffer indeed finds Heidegger's early philosophy theologically useful, then we should expect an alternative approach to that position vis-à-vis Bultmann's option.[85]

Bonhoeffer is certainly not as devoted to Heidegger's early phenomenology as Bultmann was. As we saw, Bonhoeffer has some fairly severe critiques of Heidegger. And a theologically appropriate use of Heidegger involves coordinating him with Kant and reorienting this

[82] DBWE 2: 77-8 (DBW 2: 71-2).
[83] DBWE 2: 100-1 (DBW 2: 96-7).
[84] DBWE 2: 95-7 (DBW 2: 90-2).
[85] As Boomgaarden asserts, Protestant theological reactions to Heidegger have been too superficially associated with Bultmann; Boomgaarden, *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit*, 254.

coordinated position from the perspective of revelation. Bonhoeffer is also not as knowledgeable as Bultmann on Heideggerian matters. He did not have the extended and intimate personal access to Heidegger during the final formative years leading up to *Being and Time* that Bultmann did. And it is quite unlikely that Bonhoeffer had any access to "Phenomenology and Theology."[86] He would have had to glean Heidegger's position from the opening sections of *Being and Time* and its few footnotes and comments related to theology. Despite this, they share remarkable foundational similarities concerning the nature of theology.

Bonhoeffer agrees that theology is a positive science.[87] At least at this stage in his corpus, Bonhoeffer still sees theology as a university discipline; though it is unique among such disciplines given its necessary and intimate relation to the church. As a positive science it reflects on that which is disclosed in faith and known pre-theoretically by a life in faith.[88] His analysis in *Act and Being* of the church, confession, baptism, the structure of faith and sin, preaching, and, preeminently, the person of Christ are all instances of conceptually grasping that which is pre-theoretically believed and understood in faith.

Faith, according to both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer, is a partaking or being in the history revealed and occurring in Christ. Heidegger describes faith as rebirth: "[R]birth does not mean a momentary outfitting with some quality or other, but a way in which a factical, believing Dasein historically exists in *that* history which begins with the occurrence of revelation."[89] Though Bonhoeffer makes this partaking necessarily communal as the church,[90] participation in the

[86] Though Bonhoeffer was certainly familiar with Bultmann's "The Historicity of [Dasein] and Faith," much of which is taken from Heidegger's "Phenomenology and Theology."
[87] DBWE 2: 130-1 (DBW 2: 128-9); DBWE 11: 243 and 245 (DBW 11: 212 and 215).
[88] DBWE 2: 130-1 (DBW 2: 128).
[89] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 44.
[90] Heidegger also allows for the communal, but not at the exclusion of the individual. Ibid., 44 and 46.

history arising from revelation is the hallmark of Bonhoeffer's theological anthropology. One's being in sin or faith is determined by one's existence in Christ's history (*Geschichte*).

These fundamental agreements lead to the crucial agreement that theology, *as a positive science*, is subordinate to philosophy. In his "Thesis Fragment about M. Heidegger and E. Grisebach" Bonhoeffer says,

> For the relationship between philosophy and theology, this means that philosophy precedes theology in both cases (Heidegger and Grisebach).[91]
>
> (1) Theology agrees to this insofar as
>
> (a) it makes use of philosophical terminology and thereby places itself under the claim of the omnipotence of the concept;[92]
>
> (b) in this respect it is actually a positive science subordinated to philosophy, even as a systematic one;
>
> (c) philosophy can do nothing other than view it as such.[93]

That is, theology is the practice of reflective thought that requires conceptualization in order to understand its objects.[94] The 'master' of conceptual, reflective thought is philosophy. Theology must, therefore, turn to philosophy for such "technical" conceptual aid,[95] hence the time he spends in *Act and Being* explicating genuine transcendentalism and genuine ontology and the theological use to which he puts them.

To what use does theology put philosophy, however? For Bultmann, both phenomenology and theology are primarily concerned with human existence. For the former it is existence in general; for the latter it is existence in faith. For Bonhoeffer, existence in faith, theological anthropology, is undoubtedly important. *Act and Being* expends much effort on that

---

[91] This does become more complicated by the *Lectures on Christology* where, for Bonhoeffer, because Christology is the study of the Logos, "Christology is the invisible, unrecognized, hidden center of scholarship, of the *universitas litterarum*"; DBWE 12: 301 (DBW 12: 281).

[92] In his 1930/31 "The Theology of Crisis," Bonhoeffer says, "[I]t must be confessed that Protestantism as yet lacks its proper philosophical terminology"; DBWE 10: 469 (DBW 10: 442).

[93] DBWE 11: 245 (DBW 11: 215); also see DBWE 11: 231-2 (DBW 11: 199-200).

[94] Tietz makes the same basic point. Christiane Tietz, "Bonhoeffer on the Uses and Limits of Philosophy," in *Bonhoeffer and Continental Thought: Cruciform Philosophy*, ed. Brian Gregor and Jens Zimmermann (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 39–41.

[95] DBWE 11: 235 (DBW 11: 204).

task. But that is not the foundational task. In fact, beginning with the anthropological is the fundamental mistake that both dialectical theology and liberal theology share, even if unknowingly. The foundational task is to get conceptually clear on revelation, on theology proper, for this is what determines human existence in faith. If theology is going to use philosophy for its own projects, then the application of philosophy to revelation seems to follow. Heidegger does not say this explicitly, but it seems a plausible outcome of his position in "Phenomenology and Theology." Theology's primary task is the explication of faithful existence. Revelation is that, and only that, which creates faith, and it is that which is primarily revealed in and believed by faith. It would seem then that the theological adaptation of philosophy could not help but first and foremost adapt philosophy to the understanding of revelation.

Of course, it cannot be a simple application of philosophy to revelation. This risks devolving into Christian philosophy, which Heidegger's sees as a bald contradiction, and Bonhoeffer sees as only an eschatological possibility.[96] Theology, using the church's memory and with an eye to its application in the church through preaching,[97] must weed out that which is unacceptable to revelation. The primary characteristic of revelation is the fact that it comes neither through nor from Dasein, i.e. revelation is not a possibility of Dasein. Any theological adaptation of philosophy must maintain and work in light of this important characteristic of revelation vis-à-vis philosophy and theology. As we saw in chapter four, Bonhoeffer's critiques of Heidegger, and therefore that which he finds unsuitable to theology, are those aspects of Heidegger's philosophy that risk making revelation a possibility of Dasein.

[96] DBWE 11: 245 (DBW 11: 213); Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 8; Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.
[97] DBWE 2: 130 and 132 (DBW 2: 128 and 130-1); Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 48.

There is, however, a problem. Despite the attempt to maintain the uniqueness of revelation, even the best theology can never in fact get at revelation or Christ, and this must be read also as a reflexive comment on *Act and Being* itself. Theology always turns revelation into a *Seiend*, an entity. For Bonhoeffer, revelation is neither an entity nor a nonentity. Revelation is not something graspable by human understanding alone, nor is it something beyond the self-imposed limits of human understanding, which would thereby throw such understanding back on itself (*cor curvum in se*). Revelation is the person of Christ who "graciously"[98] chooses to cross the limit of human understanding Christ himself imposes.[99]

This also means that faith itself cannot be a direct object of theology. Faith *is* only in one's direct *act* of relating to Christ. Theology, when it looks at faith, sees not faith, but credulity or religion.[100] Both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer agree that theology is in an important respect subordinate to philosophy. Because theology must conceptually articulate the life in faith, theology must turn to philosophy. But underlying this important agreement is an equally important disagreement. For Heidegger, theology is the science of faith that arises out of faith and, in a negative manner, fosters faith. In contrast, for Bonhoeffer, theology is not faith itself nor is it an act of faith. It is because philosophy and theology are similarly distant from faith that the two are brought closer together and that theology is conceptually subordinate to philosophy.

Though this distance from faith is what brings philosophy and theology closer together, thereby allowing theology to make use of philosophy, it is still faith that separates them. Proper theology still assumes faith and revelation.[101] It still assumes that revelation and a life in faith are

[98] Ibid., 46.
[99] Though Bonhoeffer maintains revelation as the *person* of Christ in contradistinction to revelation being an entity or nonentity, it is still a conceptual distinction. In *Act and Being*, his *theology* turns 'person' into an entity, something that one can conceptually grasp versus the actual encounter in faith with the person of Christ (cf. DBWE 4: ch.2). Bonhoeffer must maintain this reflexive view of *Act and Being* to be consistent.
[100] DBWE 2: 128 (DBW 2: 126).
[101] DBWE 10: 452 (DBW 10: 423-4).

the actual arbiters of truth. With the *help* of philosophy, theology constructs its system all the while knowing that such a system, if theology is proper, must be submitted to the church through preaching to be affirmed or denied. And here Bonhoeffer has taken the second positive-adaptive route opened in Heidegger's "Phenomenology and Theology."

Faith and philosophy are, for both Heidegger and Bonhoeffer, mortal enemies. Faith, for both, necessarily opposes "the free appropriation of one's whole Dasein."[102] In contrast, faith, at least for Bonhoeffer, is the appropriation of one's Dasein by the person of Christ. Rather than philosophy's "posing the question" and "providing the answer" about the human being from within human existence,[103] Christ questions and answers concerning such existence from outside.[104] Theology, even at its best for Bonhoeffer, always risks merely asking about and answering the question of human existence from within. To avoid this it must submit itself obediently and humbly to faith in the church. Faith, or more properly revelation, is then the true determiner of theology's required use of philosophy.

If we return to the overall structure of *Act and Being*, we see this relation to philosophy determined by revelation as a guiding method. Towards the conclusion of *Act and Being* Bonhoeffer says, "The objection that categories of a general metaphysical [i.e. philosophical] kind have also been employed in what has preceded overlooks the necessity of a certain formal 'preunderstanding', on the basis of which alone questions—even if wrong ones—can be raised, whose answer is then returned by revelation, along with a fundamental correction of the question."[105] That is, many may object, as they have to Bultmann, that Bonhoeffer's *Act and Being* has been overly determined by philosophical concepts foreign to theology. However,

[102] Heidegger, "Phenomenology and Theology," 53.
[103] DBWE 10: 390 (DBW 10: 359).
[104] DBWE 12: 305 (DBW 12: 285).
[105] DBWE 2: 153 (DBW 2: 152); translation altered.

Bonhoeffer has, by his estimation, begun not with a formal preunderstanding of human existence drawn from philosophy, but with a formal preunderstanding of revelation drawn from faith. On this basis theology must mine philosophy for concepts adequate for conceptualizing the faithful preunderstanding of revelation and the existence in faith it creates. This conceptualized understanding of revelation and faith are then offered back to revelation in the church for judgment. Philosophy is, according to Bonhoeffer, a means, but neither the beginning nor the end of the theological enterprise.

Conclusion

It is difficult to overestimate the current and likely-to-continue importance of Bonhoeffer's work. A cursory survey of the most recent publications demonstrates Bonhoeffer's importance to theological concepts of peace and pacifism, church/state relations, biblical hermeneutics, theological ethics, ecclesiology, theological education, ecumenicism, and so on. There is essentially no area of theology in which Bonhoeffer is not influential. Though Bonhoeffer located himself firmly in the Lutheran tradition, his influence is not confessionally limited. Reformed, 'Anabaptist', and Catholic theologians find Bonhoeffer to be a useful resource as well.

As one of the giants of twentieth century philosophy, Heidegger's continued relevance is felt even more strongly. There is perhaps no major branch or school of philosophy that does not either trace its lineage back to Heidegger or have to grapple with his legacy. This is nearly equally true in theology. Whether it is a direct influence on such figures as Bultmann, Tillich, Rahner, Marion, or Westphal, or a secondary influence through such individuals, it would be difficult to locate an area of theology untouched by Heidegger or his legacy.

Bonhoeffer and Heidegger are not, however, important merely in isolation. First, they shared a common cultural and intellectual environment. Though Heidegger is seventeen years Bonhoeffer's senior, much of their early intellectual development occurred between the times, between the wars. Though the relevance of their roots is reversed, they had similar roots in philosophy and theology. Both were influenced by the traditions of neo-Kantianism and phenomenology. Both found Luther an important source. And they saw the decline of liberal theology and the rise of dialectical theology. This alone would make understanding the relation between Bonhoeffer and Heidegger worthwhile.

As we have seen, however, it is deeper than simply a shared context and heritage. Bonhoeffer tackles, with genuine concern, Heidegger's early philosophy and its possible relation to theology. Though Bonhoeffer does make some notable mistakes in his reading of Heidegger, his overall understanding is perspicacious. He gets the essentials correct and cuts to the heart of *Being and Time*'s project, that being is temporal. This forms a core conceptual tool in Bonhoeffer's understanding of the person of Christ. If one wants to understand Bonhoeffer's concept of person, then one must understand Bonhoeffer's use of Heidegger, particularly his understanding of temporality. The concept of person is central to Bonhoeffer's early theology; it accounts for revelation and Christ, it accounts for Christian existence and the church, and from there theological epistemology. Understanding the presence of Heidegger in Bonhoeffer's early work is not then an inessential task.

Though Bonhoeffer's explicit and intense engagement with Heidegger was brief, it is not irrelevant for understanding Bonhoeffer's later works. Much of Bonhoeffer's influence is derived primarily from his later works such as *Discipleship, Life Together, Ethics,* and *Letters and Papers from Prison*. The foundation for these more mature and popular works were set,

however, in his earlier, more academic works. It is certainly true that Luther and Barth have stronger and more enduring effects on Bonhoeffer's theology, but the conceptual nuances in Bonhoeffer understanding of time, history, and theological anthropology may still be felt in these later works long after Bonhoeffer drops explicit references to Heidegger. Through his grappling with Heidegger, Bonhoeffer developed answers to the problems of continuity and concreteness that still inform his later work. Heidegger is a relevant voice throughout Bonhoeffer's works.

Though influence was unidirectional, relevance is not. Bonhoeffer's explicit use of Heidegger's *Being and Time* offers us a valuable and underappreciated look into how theology might appropriate *Being and Time*'s core concepts on theology's own terms. While Bonhoeffer does make some mistakes, it is important to remember that Bonhoeffer had little time, a little over a year between the publication of *Being and Time* and the completion of *Act and Being*, with which to grapple with such a lengthy and difficult work. He also did so without the benefit of the industry of commentaries, courses, or personal interactions with Heidegger. Bonhoeffer saw key insights in *Being and Time*, such as the necessity of turning to an analysis of Dasein prior to developing a theory of knowledge, that existence is ecstatic (thrown-projection), and that temporality is the existential core of Dasein. Yet, at least for Bonhoeffer's theology, this is theologically inadequate if Christ or revelation does not become the focal point for theologically appropriating philosophy.

Among Bonhoeffer's contemporaries this is, again, unique. With few exceptions Barth remained silent on Heideggerian matters. Though Brunner does cede the point that Heidegger deserves more attention, he does not genuinely do so himself. Tillich is famous for taking 'existential' philosophy seriously; however, the roots of his theology are well-developed prior to knowing Heidegger, and what influence Heidegger does later have on Tillich seems to be

mingled with other ‘existentialist’ philosophers, such as Sartre and Kierkegaard. Bultmann quite obviously takes Heidegger seriously and is a viable option for how Protestant theology might do so. Bonhoeffer, however, offers an alternative to Bultmann, one which is less beholden to philosophy and places revelation at the center rather than Dasein, as Bultmann does. Yet, Bonhoeffer does not jettison philosophy as a valuable resource for theology. Bonhoeffer can tell us much, then, about a theological adaptation of Heidegger’s early philosophy.

References

Bagetto, Luca. “The Exemplification of Decision in Dietrich Bonhoeffer.” In *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, edited by Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh, 197–204. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Barth, Karl. “An Answer to Professor Adolf von Harnack’s Open Letter.” In *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, edited by Martin Rumscheidt. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. “Fifteen Answers to Professor Adolf von Harnack.” In *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, edited by Martin Rumscheidt, 87–91. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. “No!” In *Natural Theology*, translated by Peter Fraenkel, 65–128. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1946.

———. *Protestant Thought: From Rousseau to Ritschl*. Translated by Brian Cozens. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959.

———. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. 6th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, USA, 1968.

———. *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*. Edited by Hannelotte Reiffen. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991.

Beiser, Frederick. *Hegel*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Bethge, Eberhard. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*. Edited by Victoria Barnett. Revised edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Blattner, William. *Heidegger’s Being and Time: A Reader’s Guide*. New York: Continuum, 2006.

———. “The Concept of Death in Being and Time.” *Man and World* 27 (1994): 49–70.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Act and Being: Transcendental Philosophy and Ontology in Systematic Theology*. Edited by Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. Translated by H. Martin Rumscheidt. DBWE 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

———. *Akt und Sein: Transzendentalphilosophie und Ontologie in der systematischen Theologie*. Edited by Hans-Richard Reuter. DBW 2. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1988.

———. *Barcelona, Berlin, Amerika: 1928-1931*. Edited by Reinhart Staats, Hans Christoph von Hase, Holger Roggelin, and Matthias Wünsche. DBW 10. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Verlag/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1992.

———. *Barcelona, Berlin, New York: 1928-1931*. Edited by Clifford J. Green. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 10. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

———. *Berlin: 1932-1933*. Edited by Carsten Nicolaisen and Ernst-Albert Scharffenorth. DBW 12. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1997.

———. *Berlin: 1932-1933*. Edited by Larry Rasmussen. Translated by Isabel Best, David Higgins, and Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 12. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

———. *Creation and Fall: A Theological Exposition of Genesis 1-3*. Edited by John W. de Gruchy. Translated by Douglas Steven Bax. DBWE 3. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

———. *Discipleship*. Edited by Geffrey B. Kelly and John D. Godsey. Translated by Barbara Green and Reinhard Krauss. DBWE 4. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

———. *Ecumenical, Academic, and Pastoral Work, 1931-1932*. Edited by Victoria J. Barnett, Mark S. Brocker, and Michael B. Lukens. Translated by Anne Schmidt-Lange, Isabel Best, Nicolas Humphrey, Pauck, and Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 11. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

———. *Ethics*. Edited by Clifford J. Green. Translated by Reinhard Krauss, Charles C. West, and Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 6. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

———. *Ethik*. Edited by Ilse Tödt, Heinz Eduard Tödt, Ernst Feil, and Clifford J. Green. DBW 6. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1998.

———. *Gemeinsames Legen; Das Gebetbuch der Bibel*. Edited by Gerhard Ludwig Müller and Albrecht Schönherr. DBW 5. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1987.

———. *Illegale Theologenausbildung: Sammelvikariate 1937-1940*. Edited by Dirk Schulz. DBW 15. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Verlag/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

———. *Jugend und Studium: 1918-1922*. Edited by Hans Pfeifer. DBW 9. Minneapolis: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1986.

———. *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Edited by John W. de Gruchy. Translated by Isabel Best, Lisa E. Dahill, Reinhard Krauss, Nancy Lukens, and Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 8. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.

———. *Life Together and Prayerbook of the Bible*. Edited by Geffrey B. Kelly. Translated by Daniel W. Bloesch and James H. Burtness. DBWE 5. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

———. *Nachfolge*. Edited by Martin Kuske and Ilse Tödt. DBW 4. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1989.

———. *Ökumene, Universität, Pfarramt: 1931-1932*. Edited by Eberhard Amelung and Christoph Strohm. DBW 11. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Verlag/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

———. *Register und Ergänzungen*. Edited by Herbert Anzinger and Hans Pfeifer. DBW 17. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1986.

———. *Sanctorum Communio: A Theological Study of the Sociology of the Church*. Edited by Clifford J. Green. Translated by Reinhard Krauss and Nancy Lukens. Annotated edition edition. DBWE 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

———. *Sanctorum Communio: Eine dogmatische Untersuchung zur Soziologie der Kirche*. Edited by Joachim van Soosten. DBW 1. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1986.

———. *Schöpfung und Fall: Theologische Auslegung zu Genesis 1-3*. Edited by Martin Rüter and Ilse Tödt. DBW 3. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1988.

———. *Theological Education Underground: 1937-1940*. Edited by Victoria J. Barnett. Translated by Victoria J. Barnett, Claudia D. Bergmann, Peter Frick, and Scott A. Moore. DBWE 15. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

———. *The Young Bonhoeffer: 1918-1927*. Edited by Clifford J. Green, Marshall D. Johnson, and Paul Duane Matheny. Translated by Mary C. Nebelsick and Douglas W. Stott. DBWE 9. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

———. *Widerstand und Ergebung*. Edited by Christian Gremmels, Eberhard Bethge, Renate Bethge, and Ilse Tödt. DBW 8. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Verlag/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

Boomgaarden, Jürgen. *Das Verständnis der Wirklichkeit: Dietrich Bonhoeffers systematische Theologie und ihr philosophischer Hintergrund in Akt und Sein*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1999.

Brunner, Emil. “Nature and Grace.” In *Natural Theology*, translated by Peter Fraenkel, 15–64. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002.

———. *The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947.

———. “Theologie und Ontologie, oder: Die Theologie am Scheidewege.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1931): 111–22.

Bultmann, Rudolf. “Autobiographical Reflections.” In *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, translated by Schubert Ogden, 283–88. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

———. “Liberal Theology and the Latest Theological Movement.” In *Faith and Understanding*, edited by Robert W. Funk, translated by Louise P. Smith, 1:28–52. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

———. “The Eschatology of the Gospel of John.” In *Faith and Understanding*, edited by Robert W. Funk, translated by Louise Pettibone Smith, 165–83. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

———. “The Historicity of Man [Dasein] and Faith.” In *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, translated by Schubert Ogden, 92–110. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

———. “The Problem of Natural Theology.” In *Faith and Understanding*, edited by Robert W. Funk, translated by Louise Pettibone Smith, 6th ed., 1:313–31. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

———. “The Significance of ‘Dialectical Theology’ for the Scientific Study of the New Testament.” In *Faith and Understanding*, edited by Robert W. Funk, translated by Louise Pettibone Smith, 145–64. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

———, and Martin Heidegger. *Briefwechsel: 1925-1975*. Edited by Andreas Großmann and Christof Landmesser. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2009.

van Buren, John. “Martin Heidegger, Martin Luther.” In *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essas in His Earliest Thought*, edited by Theodore Kisiel and John van Buren. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.

———. *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Byle, Nik. “Heidegger’s Adam and Bonhoeffer’s Christ: Evaluating Bonhoeffer’s Appraisals of Heidegger.” *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Jahrbuch* 5 (2012 2011): 99–119.

Capobianco, Richard. “Reaffirming ‘The Truth of Being.’” *Continental Philosophy Review* 47 (2014): 275–92.

Capretto, Peter. “The Wonder and Spirit of Phenomenology and Theology: Rubenstein and Derrida on Heidegger’s Formal Distinction of Philosophy from Theology.” *The Heythrop Journal* 55 (2014): 599–611.

Carmen, Taylor. “The Question of Being.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger’s Being and Time*, edited by Mark A. Wrathall, 84–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Crowe, Benjamin. *Heidegger’s Phenomenology of Religion: Realism and Cultural Criticism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.

———. *Heidegger’s Religious Origins: Destruction and Authenticity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

DeJonge, Michael. *Bonhoeffer’s Theological Formation: Berlin, Barth, and Protestant Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

———. “God’s Being Is in Time: Bonhoeffer’s Theological Appropriation of Heidegger.” *Dietrich Bonhoeffer Jahrbuch* 5 (2012 2011): 121–35.

D’Isanto, Luca. “Bonhoeffer’s Hermeneutical Model of Community.” In *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, edited by Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh, 135–48. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Ericksen, Robert P. *Theologians Under Hitler*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Fehér, István. “Phenomenology, Hermeneutics, Lebensphilosophie: Heidegger’s Confrontation with Husserl, Dilthey, and Jaspers.” In *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in His Earliest Thought*, edited by John van Buren and Theodore Kisiel. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Feil, Ernst. *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. Translated by Martin Rumscheidt. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Floyd, Jr., Wayne Whitson. *Theology and the Dialectics of Otherness: On Reading Bonhoeffer and Adorno*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.

———. “Encounter with an Other: Immanuel Kant and G.W.F. Hegel.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, edited by Peter Frick, 83–120. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Frick, Peter. “Introduction.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, edited by Peter Frick, 1–9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. “Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, edited by Peter Frick, 225–44. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Frings, Manfred S., and Roger L. Funk. “Forward.” In *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values: A New Attempt toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism*, xiii – xvi. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Translated by David E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

———. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. Second Revised edition. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Gordon, Peter E. *Continental Divide: Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Green, Clifford J. *Bonhoeffer: A Theology of Sociality*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.

———. “Forward.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Theological Formation: Berlin, Barth, & Protestant Theology*, xi – xiv. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Gregor, Brian. “Formal Indication, Philosophy, and Theology: Bonhoeffer’s Critique of Heidegger.” *Faith and Philosophy* 24, no. 2 (April 2007): 185–202.

Grünwaldt, Klaus, Christiane Tietz, and Udo Hahn, eds. *Bonhoeffer und Luther: Zentrale Themen ihrer Theologie*. Hannover: Amt der VELKD, 2007.

Guignon, Charles. “Authenticity and the Question of Being.” In *Heidegger, Authenticity and the Self: Themes from Division Two of Being and Time*, edited by Denis McManus, 8–20. New York: Routledge, 2014.

———. “Becoming a Self: The Role of Authenticity in Being and Time.” In *The Existentialists: Critical Essays on Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Sartre*, edited by Charles B. Guignon, 119–32. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.

———. *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983.

von Harnack, Adolf. “Fifteen Questions to the Despisers of Scientific Theology.” In *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, edited by Martin Rumscheidt, 85–87. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. “Open Letter to Professor Karl Barth.” In *Adolf von Harnack: Liberal Theology at Its Height*, edited by Martin Rumscheidt. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Harvey, Barry. “Augustine and Thomas Aquinas in the Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, edited by Peter Frick, 11–29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline, Part I: Science of Logic*. Edited by Klaus Brinkmann and Daniel Dahlstrom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. *Hegel's Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Translated by T. M. Knox. Vol. I. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

———. *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*. Edited by Peter C. Hodgson. Translated by R.F. Brown, Peter C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart. Vol. 1. 1–3 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

———. *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*. Edited by Peter C. Hodgson. Translated by R.F. Brown, Peter C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart. Vol. 3. 1–3 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

———. *Science of Logic*. Translated by A.V. Miller. New York: Humanities Press, 1996.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 1962.

———. *Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie (1919/1920)*. Edited by Hans-Helmuth Gander. GA 58. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1993.

———. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana Univerisity Press, 1988.

———. *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*. Translated by Theodore Kisiel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

———. *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

———. *Ontologie (Hermeneutik der Faktizität)*. Edited by Käte Bröcker-Oltmanns. GA 63. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1988.

———. *Ontology-The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

———. *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles: Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung*. GA 61. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985.

———. *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

———. “Phenomenology and Theology.” In *Pathmarks*, edited by William McNeil, translated by James G. Hart and John C. Maraldo, 39–62. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *Sein und Zeit*. 17th ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1993.

———. *Seminare*. Edited by Curd Ochwadt. GA 15. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1986.

———. *The Concept of Time*. Translated by William McNeil. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.

———. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeil and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

———. *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*. Translated by Matthias Fritsch and Jennifer Anna Gosetti-Ferencei. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

———, and Elisabeth Blochmann. *Briefwechsel: 1918-1969*. Edited by Joachim Storck. 2nd ed. Marbach am Neckar: Deutschen Literaturarchiv, 1990.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Translated by F. Kersten. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1982.

Jaspert, Bernd, and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, eds. *Karl Barth-Rudolf Bultmann Letters 1922-1966*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981.

Jones, Gareth. “Phenomenology and Theology: A Note on Bultmann and Heidegger.” *Modern Theology* 5, no. 2 (1989): 161–79.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Edited and translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. Edited and translated by Gary Hatfield. Revised edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Karttunen, Tomi. *Die Polyphonie der Wirklichkeit: Erkenntnistheorie und Ontologie in der Theologie Dietrich Bonhoeffers*. Joensu: Joensuun yliopisto/Teologinen tiedekunta, 2004.

Kisiel, Theodore. *The Genesis of Heidegger’s Being and Time*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

———, and Thomas Sheehan, eds. *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910-1927*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

Knittermeyer, Hinrich. “Transzendentalphilosophie und Theologie. Eine kritische Erinnerung zum 22. April 1924.” *Christliche Welt* 38 (1924): 220–26, 258–67, 354–61, 408–13.

Krötke, Wolf. “Bonhoeffer and Luther.” In *Bonhoeffer’s Intellectual Formation: Theology and Philosophy in His Thought*, edited by Peter Frick, 53–82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Kuhlmann, Gerhard. “Zum theologischen Problem der Existenz: Fragen an Rudolf Bultmann.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 10 (1929): 28–57.

Labron, Tim. *Bultmann Unlocked*. London: Continuum International Publishing, 2010.

Lehel, Ferenc. “Einleitung to Dietrich Bonhoeffers Hegel-Seminar 1933.” Edited by Ilse Tödt. *Internationales Bonhoeffer Forum: Forschung und Praxis* 8 (1988).

Lowe, Walter. “Bonhoeffer and Deconstruction: Toward a Theology of the Crucified Logos.” In *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility*, edited by Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh, 207–22. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Löwith, Karl. *My Life in Germany before and after 1933: A Report*. Translated by Elizabeth King. London: Continuum, 1993.

Luther, Martin. *Career of the Reformer IV*. Edited by Lewis W. Spitz. LW 34. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.

———. *First Lectures on the Psalms II: Psalms 76-126*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. LW 11. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1976.

———. “Heidelberg Disputation.” In *Martin Luther’s Basic Theological Writings*, edited by Timothy E. Lull. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

———. *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 1-4*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. LW 26. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963.

———. *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 5-6; Lectures on Galatians, 1519, Chapters 1-6*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Translated by Richard Jungkuntz. LW 27. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.

———. *Lectures on Genesis: Chapters 1-5*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Translated by George V. Schick. LW 1. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.

———. *Lectures on Genesis: Chapters 6-14*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Translated by George V. Schick. LW 2. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.

———. *Lectures on Genesis: Chapters 45-50*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. Translated by Paul D. Pahl. LW 8. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.

———. *Lectures on Romans: Glosses and Scholia*. Edited by Hilton C. Oswald. Translated by Walter Tillmanns and Jacob A. O. Preus. LW 25. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972.

———. *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Edited by Timothy E. Lull. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

———. "Sermon on Preparing to Die." In *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, edited by Timothy E. Lull, 638–54. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

———. *Word and Sacrament I*. Edited by E. Theodore Bachmann. LW 35. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.

———. *Word and Sacrament III*. Edited by Robert H. Fischer. LW 37. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. 3rd edition. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Macquarrie, John. *An Existentialist Theology: A Comparison of Heidegger and Bultmann*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Marsh, Charles. *Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer: The Promise of His Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

McCormack, Bruce L. *Orthodox and Modern: Studies in the Theology of Karth Barth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.

McGrath, SJ. "Formal Indication, Irony, and the Risk of Saying Nothing." In *A Companion to Heidegger's Phenomenology of Religious Life*, edited by SJ McGrath and Andrzej Wiercinski, 179–205. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

———, and Andrzej Wiercinski, eds. *A Companion to Heidegger's Phenomenology of Religious Life*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

Ott, Heinrich. *Reality and Faith: The Theological Legacy of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1972.

Peperzak, Adriaan. "A Re-Reading of Heidegger's 'Phenomenoogy and Theology.'" In *The Multidimensionality of Hermeneutic Phenomenology*, edited by B. Babich and D. Ginev, 317–37. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2014.

Petzt, Heinrich Wiegand. *Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Plant, Stephen. "'In the Sphere of the Familiar:' Heidegger and Bonhoeffer." In *Bonhoeffer's Intellectual Formation*, edited by Peter Frick, 301–32. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Polt, Richard. *Heidegger: An Introduction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Prudhomme, Jeff Owen. *God and Being: Heidegger's Relation to Theology*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1997.

Przywara, Erich. "Drei Richtungen der Phänomenologie." *Stimmen der Zeit* 115 (1928): 252–64.

Rasmussen, Larry. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Reality and Resistance*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Ratcliffe, Matthew. "Why Mood Matters." In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time*, edited by Mark A. Wrathall, 157–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Rosen, Michael. *Hegel's Dialectic and Its Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Scheler, Max. *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values: A New Attempt Toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism*. Translated by Manfred S. Frings and Roger L. Funk. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

———. *On the Eternal in Man*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009.

Schlier, Heinrich. "Denken im Nachdenken." In *Erinnerungen an Martin Heidegger*, edited by Günther Neske, 217–21. Pfullingen: Neske, 1977.

Sheehan, Thomas. "What If Heidegger Were a Phenomenologist?" In *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time*, edited by Mark A. Wrathall, 381–402. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Taylor, Charles. *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Tietz, Christiane. "Bonhoeffer on the Uses and Limits of Philosophy." In *Bonhoeffer and Continental Thought: Cruciform Philosophy*, edited by Brian Gregor and Jens Zimmermann, 31–45. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.

Tietz-Steiding, Christiane. *Bonhoeffers Kritik der verkrümmten Vernunft*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1999.

Vedder, Ben. *Heidegger's Philosophy of Religion: From God to the Gods*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007.

Wilkes, Nicola J. “Confession of Sin as the Mirror Image of the Fall.” In *God Speaks to Us: Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s Biblical Hermeneutics*, edited by Jens Zimmermann and Ralf K. Wüstenberg, 217–27. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 2013.

Wolfe, Judith. *Heidegger and Theology*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

———. *Heidegger’s Eschatology: Theological Horizons in Martin Heidegger’s Early Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Zimmermann, Jens. *Humanism and Religion: A Call for the Renewal of Western Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Appendix A: Permissions

Dear Mr. Byle,

thank you very much for your license request as well as your patience.

We gladly grant you permission to reprint the requested article.
Please mention the original copyright of the Gütersloher Verlagshaus edition:

Nik Byle, Heidegger's Adam and Bonhoeffer's Christ. Evaluating Bonhoeffer's Appraisals of Heidegger
...
Published in: Dietrich Bonhoeffer Yearbook 5 – 2011/2012, edited by Clifford J. Green, Kirsten Busch Nielsen, Christiane Tietz
© 2012, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, Gütersloh, in der Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH

With best regards
Teresa Mex

Abdruckrechte
Kösel Verlag | Gütersloher Verlagshaus

Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH | Neumarkter Str. 28 | 81673 München
Tel. +49 (0) 89- 4136-3106 | Fax +49 (0) 89- 4136-3733
teresa.mex@randomhouse.de | www.randomhouse.de