From Matter to Earth: Heidegger, Aristotle, and "The Origin of the Work of Art"

Khafiz Kerimov

ABSTRACT: This article focuses on Heidegger's engagement with the distinction between form and matter in the 1935 essay "The Origin of the Work of Art." This distinction is articulated by Aristotle in the context of production (of useful equipment), which is taken to be finished once a certain matter (potentiality) is subjected to a certain form or shape (actuality). Insofar as Aristotle takes actuality to have primacy over potentiality, he is unable to think material potentiality as such (save in the paradoxical idea of "prime matter"). Against the Aristotelian thinking of hylomorphism, however, Heidegger takes art as an instance of the reversal of the traditional relationship between form and matter. By appealing to artworks, Heidegger shows an excess of material potentiality over form and function, which he calls "earth."

KEYWORDS: art, earth, form, matter, potentiality

CONTACT: Department of Philosophy, DePaul University; k.t.kerimov@gmail.com

Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual 9 (2019): 116–44.

I. INTRODUCTION

Heidegger's philosophical program in the 1920s could be described in terms of a critical engagement with the technological interpretation of being, i.e., an understanding of being rooted in the Greek conception of τέχνη. Heidegger's diagnosis of the Western metaphysical tradition runs something like the following. From Greek ontology onward philosophy has approached beings as artifacts, as something produced or designed (GA 33: 137/117).[1] But that means that Greek ontology is characterized by a certain "forgetting" of those beings that cannot be accommodated by the structure of τέχνη. Such is the case, according to Heidegger, with (human) Dasein: "Dasein has apparently been forgotten in naive ancient ontology" (GA 24: 156/SZ 111). Indeed, *Being and Time* can be viewed as articulating a fundamental ontology of Dasein beyond the technological interpretation of being.[2]

However, something surprising transpires in the 1930s: Heidegger begins a series of meditations on the work of art, as a result of which the question of Dasein leaves center stage.[3] Yet, art ostensibly belongs to the very sphere of τέχνη that Heidegger diagnosed as problematically reductive in the 1920s. Chief among these meditations is Heidegger's 1935 text "The Origin of the Work of Art" (along with two other unpublished versions of the same essay).

Yet, it would be incorrect to say that "The Origin of the Work of Art" marks the end of Heidegger's critique of the paradigm of τέχνη. In the 1930s, rather, Heidegger's criticism of τέχνη begins to employ the very conceptual resources inherent in the Greek conception of τέχνη. Central to Heidegger's "immanent" engagement with τέχνη in the 1935 work is the form-matter distinction, whose most significant formulation in the history of philosophy belongs to Aristotle. In "The Origin of the Work of Art" Heidegger shows that while the form-matter distinction has been traditionally applied to artworks, this distinction is in fact inappropriate for this purpose (just as it is inappropriate with regard to the human Dasein), for it stems from the sphere of produced tools. Heidegger thus conceives of an artwork not as a compound of form and matter but as something that emerges in

a strife between world and earth. Therefore, as the common interpretation has it, the form-matter structure is rejected by Heidegger (in favor of the concepts of world and earth).

However, in this essay I will argue that the project of "The Origin of the Work of Art" lies not in a rejection of the form-matter distinction but in a reformulation thereof. My suggestion is that the relationship of inheritance and transformation between Aristotle and Heidegger in the 1935 essay is much more complicated than is customarily assumed.

In particular, I will focus on Heidegger's reintrepretation of Aristotle's concept of matter as "earth" (*Erde*). I would suggest that the notion of the earth articulates Heidegger's attempt to think material potentiality *at the limit* of the form-matter structure. Given its focus on Aristotle's hylomorphism, however, this essay might appear to go against the letter of Heidegger's text. Therefore, it calls for a brief methodological remark. Now, as a number of commentators have not failed to suggest, Heidegger indeed finds the form-matter distinction inappropriate for understanding art. As Françoise Dastur puts it, for instance, "matter and form are categories that are not relevant in the case of the work of art, which is not the result of a fabricating process."[4] What's more, Michel Haar specifically denies that the earth can be conceived by analogy with prime matter: "[The] Earth cannot be reduced to the pure passivity of a 'prime matter' that is to be informed."[5] Insofar as Heidegger's earth is an attempt to think materiality at its limit, however, I would suggest that it is best understood in relation to Aristotle's own liminal idea of prime (or first) matter (πρώτη ὕλη). Indeed, Aristotle has already broached the limits of the form-matter structure (albeit in a way that is different from Heidegger's) with his idea of prime matter as a pure potentiality. Thus, in this article I will approach Heidegger's concept of the earth in terms of a pure, formless potentiality. Such is the way in which the originality of Heidegger's interpretation of τέχνη in "The Origin of the Work of Art" can be best appreciated, and this is what this essay purports to accomplish.

The essay is divided into three sections. In the first section of this article I will consider the emergence of the form-matter distinction in Aristotle's philosophy, in particular, in its relation to the being of useful tools and equipment. My chief aim in the first section is to show the subordination of material potentiality to form and actuality in human equipment. In the second section of this article I will investigate Aristotle's concept of prime matter, which is situated at the very limits of the form-matter structure (and against the background of which Heidegger's notion of the earth is best understood). In the third section of this article I will consider Heidegger's reformulation of matter as earth in the context of the artwork. My suggestion is that for Heidegger art gives rise to a rethinking of the traditional distinction between form and matter. In the work of art matter (as earth) is no longer subordinate to form, and potentiality is no longer subordinate to actuality.[6] Although the primary focus of this essay is Heidegger's transformation of matter into earth, in the third section I will also consider Heidegger's conception of world (to the extent that it clarifies the meaning of the concept of earth).

II. FORM, MATTER, AND EQUIPMENT

In "The Origin of the Work of Art" Heidegger turns to the ancient Greek understanding of art as τέχνη, which has nothing to do with aesthetics.[7] While aesthetics is concerned with the object (and subject) of feeling, art as τέχνη is about the act of coming into being.[8] Such is the definition of τέχνη in Book VI of the *Nicomachean Ethics*: "[To] practice art is…to consider how something capable of being or not being [ἐνδεχομένων καὶ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι]…may come into being."[9] While this definition is nowhere present in the essay,[10] Heidegger seems to hint at it, when he writes in the Third Section of "The Origin of the Work of Art" that the work of art "*is* at all rather than is not [ist *und nicht vielmehr nicht ist*]" (GA 5: 53/190). In fact, this formulation hints at two sources at once: One of them is Leibniz's fundamental question "Why is there something instead of nothing?,"[11] and the other is Aristotle's definition of art. According to Book VI the *Nicomachean Ethics*, τέχνη

is a rule (or knowledge) accompanying production (ἕξις μετὰ λόγου ποιητική), in the same way as prudence (φρόνησις) is a rule accompanying action.[12] Now, making (or production) is a species of coming-to-be (γένεσις), which Aristotle describes as a change (μεταβολή) from something to something.[13] However, it is not just production that belongs to change and coming-to-be; alongside technical production Aristotle also recognizes natural generation and change. Aristotle separates natural beings from the objects of ποίησις, because the former have in themselves "a source of source of motion and rest,…but a bed or a cloak [qua artifact]…has no innate impulse of change."[14]

However, as I have already mentioned in the introduction, the form-matter paradigm (which is the keystone of the concept of production) stems from the domain of produced equipment rather than that of living beings (GA 5: 13–14/154–55). It is only then that the distinction of form and matter is applied to the rest of beings (including living beings). Now, Aristotle would not deny that the distinction between form and matter originates in the sphere of artifacts. As he suggests in the opening of the *Physics*, the natural path of investigation proceeds from the products of art to the natural beings.[15] The sphere of τέχνη is the necessary starting point of Aristotle's study, because it discloses something that cannot be disclosed by simply looking at φύσις. Such is one of the crucial distinctions between φύσις and τέχνη, which is introduced in Chapter 11 of Book Z of the *Metaphysics*. Aristotle notes that the products of art are "brought into being in materials different in form, such as a circle in bronze or stone or wood."[16] When it is a matter of art, therefore, the same εἶδος can be brought into more than one kind of material, i.e., in bronze *or* stone *or* wood.[17] What this lack of necessary relation means for Aristotle, however, is that it is easy to separate form and material in thought. The objects of art thus admit material variability, for "the bronze or the wood does not in any way belong to the thinghood of the circle, because of its being separated [χωρίζεσθαι] from them."[18] When it is a matter of φύσις, on the other hand, the separation between form and matter is not obvious, for the form does not exist in other kinds of material substratum. Therefore,

in the case of natural beings, says Aristotle, "it is difficult to subtract [ἀφελεῖν] the form in thought."[19] Indeed, the human form cannot be in bronze or wood; rather, "the form of a human being always appears in flesh and bones and parts of that sort."[20] The form and matter of a living being appear as having an absolutely necessary relation, i.e., they are inseparable.

Now, in contrast to natural beings, the source of the objects of τέχνη lies in the soul of the craftsperson, which is external to the objects themselves. That source has to do with the form of the product, i.e., what Heidegger calls "[an] anticipated look of the thing, sighted beforehand" (GA 24: 150/SZ 106). That is to say, the craftsperson conceives of a form (i.e., design) of what she is going to make in her mind before she begins the process of making. Such an anticipated look (proto-typical image or *Vor-bild*, in Heidegger's words) "shows the thing as what it is before the production and how it is supposed to look as a product" (GA 24: 150/107). When it is a matter of useful tools, the form or look is determined by function and serviceability; for example, a knife has the particular form that it does in order to cut. In the language of Heidegger's analysis of tools in *Being and Time*, tools are determined by their *Wozu* (whereto, assignment), by human projects and purposes (GA 2: §15, 92/SZ 68). Yet, the anticipated look or form would have no existence without the matter in which the craftsperson realizes it.[21] Although *Being and Time* lacks an ontology of art, then, Heidegger already recognizes the material component of artifacts in the 1927 work: "Hammer, tongs, nails in themselves refer to – they consist of – steel, iron, metal, stone, wood. 'Nature' is also discovered in the use of the useful things, 'nature' in the light of products of nature" (GA 2: §15, 94/SZ 70).[22] From which it follows that in addition to their *Wozu*, useful tools are also marked by their *Woraus* (whereof), which refers to matter. "The work to be produced is not just useful for…; production itself is always a using of something for something" (GA 2: §15, 94/SZ 70). What this means is that production requires some pre-existing matter – nothing comes from nothing, as it were.[23] Now, the source of matter, which is always already there, refers to the beings of nature (φύσις). Properly

considered, then, the task of production is to bring a form into some suitable matter provided by nature: The iron saw comes from the one that is without matter (i.e., the anticipated look).[24] And the product can be considered finished exactly at the moment when its matter is fully subjected to a given form.

Aristotle explains in the *Metaphysics* that the craftsperson "will not make a saw out of wool, or out of wood either."[25] From which it follows that the matter has to be different when the products are different: It is requisite for a saw to have teeth made of iron. Thus, the form "prescribes in each case the kind and selection of the matter – impermeable for a jug, sufficiently hard for an ax, firm yet flexible for shoes" (GA 5: 13/154). But the selection of matter in turn depends on the function assigned to the useful tool, be it an ax or shoes. Thus, the craftsperson does not consider natural beings as they are but addresses them in terms of their suitability for being used in production.[26] From the standpoint of production, then, the matter of the artifact is not considered *as such* but as the iron of which the saw is to be made, nothing more. Here matter is discovered in the context of use, not as itself; what is according to φύσις is thus subordinated to the productive intention. This is exactly what Heidegger must have in mind when he writes in "The Origin of the Work of Art": "The matter is all the better and more suitable, the less it resists being absorbed in the equipmental being of the equipment" (GA 5: 32/171, tm). When the choice of matter is right, therefore, the matter is inconspicuous, does not seem to play a role in equipment: An iron saw is just a saw, in conformity with the form. "Because it is determined by usefulness and serviceability," explains Heidegger, "equipment takes into its service that of which it consists: the matter. In fabricating equipment – e.g., an ax – stone is used, and used up [*gebraucht und verbraucht*]. It disappears into usefulness" (GA 5: 32/171).

Now, Aristotle identifies the material cause with the question ἐξ οὗ ("from out of which?" or "whence?").[27] Given that the act of γένεσις is temporal, i.e., takes time, the meaning of the question could be likewise taken as temporal. Otherwise stated, the question concerning the

material cause is about the past source of the artifact. Now, Walter Brogan emphasizes exactly the temporal dimension of change when he writes that "a characteristic of change is that it is *no longer* that from out of which it changes."[28] This is what the name μεταβολή itself suggests: "[There] is one thing before [πρότερον] and another after [ὕστερον]."[29] While the "before" of change refers to the matter marked by the deprivation of form, i.e., "what is shapeless, formless or disordered," the "after" refers to the finished product, to something that has the desired form.[30] The lack of form in question, however, refers to an incidental (κατὰ συμβεβηκός) deprivation, i.e., deprivation of the form of a house at which production aims.[31] So, the matter in question is deprived of form only from the standpoint of the productive intention of the craftsperson. The material cause is, according to art, only potentially a formed product, because it does not yet have the desired look. From the perspective of ποίησις, therefore, matter has to be left behind, relegated to the past. Herein lies the "pastness' of ὕλη: Although it is something out of which the product has been made, it is itself left behind. And this is exactly how Aristotle describes the process in Book VI of the *Physics*: "[What] changes something stands apart from that from which it changes, or leaves it behind [ἀπολείπειν; to forsake, to withdraw]."[32] To be sure, the Greek verb ἀπολείπειν does not mean that the material cause disappears entirely in the formed product. Rather, as I have already suggested, the product is finished when the matter deprived of form is fully subjected to form. Hence, what is truly left behind is not the matter as such but its initial state of deprivation, which is also the state of readiness (or openness) to acquire a form. That is, once the stone, which can potentially be many things, is shaped into a statue, it is no longer capable of becoming something else, at least, not right away. In Book II of the *Physics* Aristotle relates a joke, originally belonging to Protarchus, which illustrates precisely what might be called the finitude (pastness) of material potentiality. Aristotle says that beings without the power of choice can be neither fortunate nor unfortunate, "except metaphorically, as Protarchus says the stones out of which altars are made are fortunate, because they are

honored, while their quarry-mates are trampled on."[33] My suggestion is that the presupposition underlying this joke is that, once the matter is enformed, it is improbable that it will take another form. So, having lost their capacity to become an altar, quarry-stones will remain quarry-stones. In other words, every act of ποίησις is a foreclosure of sorts of some of the δύναμις that belongs to the used up matter. Evidently, then, the framework of production considers material potentiality within the parameters of the past. That is, produced equipment has no future, or rather it lacks an open, determinable future. For a lack of a better expression, its future is deprived of potentiality.[34] As I am about to show, the parameters of an artwork are the opposite of those of equipment: In the work of art, the material component precisely preserves its potentiality, its openness, from subjection to form and function, and thus preserves its future, as it were.

Indeed, as Heidegger will suggest in "The Question Concerning Technology," τέχνη does not necessarily entail the subordination of matter to usefulness. Heidegger notes that the essence of Greek τέχνη is intrinsically ambiguous: "It has often been pointed out that Greeks, who knew a few things about works of art, use the same word, τέχνη, for craft and art and call the craftsman and the artists by the same name: τεχνίτης" (GA 5: 36/184).[35] The essence of τέχνη thus harbors in itself not just the possibility of technology but also the possibility of art. Then, art is a different mode of revealing from technology, a higher mode of revealing, according to Heidegger, although it, too, originally belongs to what the Greeks used to call τέχνη.[36] "This producing that brings forth, e.g., erecting a statue in the temple precinct, and the ordering that challenges…are indeed fundamentally different, and yet they remain related in their essence" (GA 7: 22/QCT 21). Before I proceed to the question of the work of art, however, it is vital to consider the concept of Aristotle's philosophy that could be said to mark the very limits of his distinction between form and matter (and thus of the technological interpretation of being, as it were). The concept spoken of here is, of course, Aristotle's own concept of prime matter.

III. ARISTOTLE'S PRIME MATTER

Now, the state of the deprivation of form, which is the starting point of manufacturing in Aristotle, is always only a relative rather than absolute deprivation. When it is a matter of making a statue out of a piece of bronze, for example, all that is relevant is that the original shape of bronze is *not* the desired one. Though deprived of the desired form, however, the piece of bronze is far from formless; instead, it possesses its own relative form. Otherwise, bronze would lack any being or actuality, i.e., it would not exist in the first place. Then, the concepts of form and matter in Aristotle are relative. In Aubenque's words, "[what] is matter in relation to this form is itself a form in relation to some more primitive matter."[37] Yet, the relativity of the form-matter distinction in Aristotle naturally introduces the risk of a regress *ad infinitum*: If every material possesses a form (in order to be actual), then form cannot be ever removed or expunged from matter, which can turn into an infinite regress. Hence, whenever we try to separate matter from form, the matter appears to have its own form, and we have to repeat the procedure. Now, the problem of infinite regress is a recurrent problem in Aristotle's philosophy, and it is customarily solved by introducing an absolute first term.[38] As far his hylomorphism is concerned, Aristotle solves the problem of the infinite regress by introducing the so-called primary bodies (τα σώματα τὰ πρῶτα), which he also calls perceptible (αἰσθητά) or simple (ἁπλά) bodies, or elements (στοιχεῖα): fire, earth, water, and air.

However, Aristotle does not entirely solve the problem of the infinite regress in this way, for the primary bodies are themselves defined by a member of each of the following contrary pairs: on the one hand, hot and cold; on the other hand, wet and dry. Properly considered, then, primary bodies can exchange qualities, thus change into one another (for example, water can evaporate into air). However, change is impossible without some underlying potentiality, as Aristotle shows in Book I of the *Physics*: "[In] all…cases of change…it is obvious that there must be some underlying subject which undergoes the change."[39] If all change requires an underlying subject (matter or potentiality), and

if Aristotle's primary bodies can mutate into one another, then there must be a substratum for the primary bodies themselves. Such appropriate substratum of the elements in Aristotle is what is traditionally called "prime matter." As Aristotle explains, "'the hot' is not matter for 'the cold,' nor 'the cold' for 'the hot,' but the substratum is matter for them both."[40] Inasmuch as prime matter underlies the basic contrary qualities, however, it lacks all quality itself. As Aristotle explains in the *Metaphysics*, prime matter is deprived of "anything else by which being is made definite.…The ultimate underlying subject is in itself neither something nor so much, nor is it anything else; and it is not even the negations of these, for these too would belong to it as attributes."[41] Yet, what is formless and lacks all quality cannot exist, according to Aristotle. We read elsewhere in Aristotle that "matter is that which has points and lines at its limits and cannot possibly ever exist without qualities and without shape."[42] From which it follows that prime matter simply does not exist, or only ever exists potentially, which is, however, a contradiction in terms.[43]

And yet, prime matter *must* exist (even if it is not separable from what it underlies); otherwise, the reciprocal transformation of Aristotle's elemental bodies would not be possible. What is more, given that prime matter functions as an underlying subject, it must possess those formal qualities that make change possible.[44] But, as I have just emphasized, Aristotle's prime matter appears to lack any qualities altogether. Now, Aristotle's purported solution to the paradox of prime matter is as follows:

> Our theory is that there is matter of which the perceptible bodies consist, but that it is not separable but always accompanied by contrariety, and it is from this that the so-called elements come into being…However, since the primary bodies are also derived in this way from matter, we must explain about these also, reckoning as a source and as primary the matter which is inseparable from, but underlies, the contrarieties.[45]

While Aristotle's solution removes the paradox of prime matter's separate existence, it is still difficult to see how something entirely indeterminate can serve as an underlying subject. And it is difficult to see Aristotle's prime matter as anything more than an *ad hoc* solution to the problem of the infinite regress of matter. And yet, inasmuch as the concept of prime matter renders Aristotle's hylomorphism partially incoherent, it also reveals something important about it. That is, the paradox of prime matter makes evident that in Aristotle's philosophy the concept of matter (potentiality) cannot be conceived without its opposite, i.e., form (actuality), to which it is subjected. For Aristotle, then, potentiality cannot be thought as such but always instrumentally, in the context of use and function, as subordinated to form. Insofar as the concept of prime matter is at once necessary and contradictory, then, the matter-form structure is brought *to its limit* with this concept.

In the second section of "The Origin of the Work of Art," I would suggest, Heidegger recognizes virtually the very same problem of the infinite regress of form and matter (in slightly different terms). Heidegger writes incisively:

> A stone presses down and manifests its heaviness. But while the heaviness exerts an opposing pressure upon us it denies any penetration into it. If we attempt such a penetration by breaking open the rock, it still does not display in its fragments anything inward that has been opened up. The stone has instantly withdrawn again into the same dull pressure and bulk of its fragments. (GA 5: 33/172)

My suggestions is that the problem that Heidegger raises in this passage is that the concepts of form and matter are relative. In this connection, William McNeill explains that "even the 'atom' supposedly indivisible can, like every particle, in principle be divided into ever smaller, subatomic particles. But in this ongoing process of splitting, a process that is in principle infinite, we never reach an 'inside' of things."[46] To never reach an 'inside' of an object, I submit, means exactly that matter

cannot be accessed as such, in a formless state. Thus, it is the same problem that for Aristotle results in the paradoxical concept of prime matter that Heidegger traces in the passage above. And that matter shrinks from disclosure has to do with the form-matter structure itself. However, Heidegger will transform this negative implication into something positive: The work of art will disclose matter in its very resistance to disclosure, thus it will disclose matter as such. In the work of art, therefore, matter exhibits a resistance to determination similar to that of Aristotle's prime matter, and it does so right away. Properly considered, then, instead of trying to solve the problem of infinite regress, Heidegger does not even let the regress begin. Such is the role of the work of art for him: Matter speaks differently in the artwork, it speaks in the mode of silence, resistance, or refusal. It is at this point that the traditional concept of matter can be said to undergo a reformulation (into earth) in Heidegger: "It shows itself only when it remains undisclosed and unexplained. Earth thus shatters every attempt to penetrate it" (GA 5: 33/172). And in the language of the first version of the essay, the earth is "a ground which, since it is essential and always closing itself off, is an abyss [*Abgrund*]."[47] In the next section I will consider precisely the way in which matter (reformulated by Heidegger as earth) is disclosed in the work of art, beyond the limitations of form and function.

IV. MATTER, EARTH, AND ARTWORK

In the third section of "The Origin of the Work of Art" Heidegger defines two specific marks or characteristics (*Kennzeichen*) of the work of art. Heidegger never explicitly indicates the first *Kennzeichen* of the artwork, but he does indicate the second one: "Not so when a work is created. This becomes clear in the light of the second characteristic, which may be introduced here" (GA 5: 52/189). If Heidegger's explanation of the second characteristic (which clarifies the first) comes after the quoted sentence, then an account of the first characteristic must come before it. Indeed, in the previous paragraph Heidegger emphasizes the difference between equipment and artwork as regards the role

of matter in them. Although the manner in which matter is employed in art "to be sure, looks like the employment of matter in handicraft," suggests Heidegger, it is an illusion "that artistic creation is also an activity of handicraft. It never is" (GA 5: 52/189). Therefore, the first *Kennzeichen* must be about the role of matter in an artwork, which is radically distinct from the role that it fulfills in equipment (indeed, to the extent that the very term "matter" becomes inappropriate).[48]

As I have already suggested in relation to Aristotle, and as Heidegger suggests now, "[the] production of equipment is finished when a material has been so formed as to be ready for use. For equipment to be ready means that it is released beyond itself, to be used up in usefulness" (GA 5: 52/189).[49] By contrast, it is characteristic of an artwork that it "does not use up or misuse the earth as matter, but rather sets it free to be nothing but itself" (GA 5: 52/189). Equipment consumes, or uses up, the matter of which it consists, i.e., it subordinates matter to a determinate function. By determining the use in advance, that is, the equipmental mode of production puts demands to matter rather than lets it be itself. However, that is not what transpires in the work of art, as Heidegger shows with the example of the Greek temple:

> By contrast the temple work…does not cause the material disappear, but rather causes it to come forth [*hervorkommen*] for the very first time and to come into the open region of the work's world. The rock comes to bear and rest and so first becomes rock; the metals come to glitter and shimmer, colors to shine, tones to sing, the word to say. (GA 5: 32/171)

If what makes matter disappear in equipment is its subordination to usefulness, then the artwork causes matter to "come forth for the very first time" precisely by releasing it from usefulness. Indeed, the deconstruction (in the Heideggerian sense of *Destruktion*) of the matter-form structure is accomplished here in a single step, i.e., by suspending usefulness. Heidegger writes: "To be sure, the sculptor uses stone just as the mason uses it, in his own way. But he does not use it up…To be sure,

the painter also uses pigment, but in such a way that color is not used up but rather only now comes to shine forth" (GA 5: 34/173). In contrast to matter in useful tools, in the work of art matter as earth comes forth as nothing but itself, independently from function.[50] In Miguel de Beistegui's words, "in the work of art, there is an excess of materiality, or earth, over function."[51] But when the parameters of usefulness are suspended by Heidegger, it is no longer the question of the traditional concept of matter. It is at this juncture that Heidegger reformulates the ὕλη of the artwork as earth: "Nowhere in the work is there any trace of a work material [*Werkstoff*]" (GA 5: 34/173).[52] Rather, as Heidegger has it, "[that] into which the work sets itself back, and thereby allows to come forth, is what we called 'the earth'" (GA 5: 32/171). And further Heidegger writes: "[What] looks like the thingly element [i.e., matter], in the sense of our usual thing-concepts, in the work taken as object is…its earthy character [*das Erdhafte*]" (GA 5: 56–57/194). As far as artworks are concerned, then, Heidegger explicitly substitutes the concept of matter for the concept of earth. If for Heidegger metaphysics has been (at least, in part) defined by the technological interpretation of being, and if in the artwork matter is released as earth, then his conception of earth can be understood as matter taken non-metaphysically.[53]

Heidegger introduces the second characteristic of the work of art immediately after the first one. In fact, the second *Kennzeichen* is supposed to elucidate the first, retrospectively. Heidegger describes the second characteristic as follows: "[In] contrast to all other modes of production, the work is distinguished by being created so that its createdness is created into the created work [*in das Geschaffene mit hineingeschaffen ist*]" (GA 5: 52/189).[54] As we already know, there are created (produced) objects other than artworks (e.g., equipment). Hence, what Heidegger calls *Geschaffensein* (createdness) is not an exclusive property of an artwork. Indeed, "[everything] brought forth surely has this endowment of having been brought forth, if it has any endowment at all" (GA 5: 52/189).[55] And yet, inasmuch as that createdness is created into the work of art, the property of *Geschaffensein* is made manifest in art, "in an expressly specific way [*eigens*]" (which is not the case in equipment) (GA 5: 52/190, tm). Thus, artworks are characterized by Heidegger by a

certain kind of self-referentiality (of createdness, specifically): What the artwork makes manifest is exactly that it has been brought forth, that is a product of ποίησις. Heidegger describes this self-referential quality of the work of art in terms of that-ness (*das "Daß"*).[56] Heidegger is worth quoting at length here:

> [The] simple *factum est* ["it is made"] is to be held forth into the open region by the work: namely this, that unconcealment of a being has happened here, and that as this happening it happens here for the first time; or, that such a work is at all rather than is not [*daß solches Werk ist und nicht vielmehr nicht ist*]…this thrust, this "that it is" [*dieses "Daß"*] of createdness, emerges into view most purely from the work. (GA 5: 53/190)

Having reintroduced createdness in terms of that-ness, Heidegger contrasts it with the being of equipment for the second time:

> To be sure, 'that' it is made is a property also of all equipment that is available and in use. But this 'that' does not become prominent in the equipment; it disappears in usefulness. The more handy a piece of equipment is, the more inconspicuous it remains that, for example, this particular hammer is. (GA 5: 53/190)

At this juncture, recall that what makes an equipment equipment is what Heidegger calls *Wozu*, its purposive assignment or function. It follows that what renders the that-ness of a useful tool inconspicuous is exactly purposive referentiality. By contrast, that same usefulness is suspended in the work of art, which is what makes the artwork's existence, its that-ness, self-referential and conspicuous.[57] That is to say: the work of art is not subordinate to any further end and portrays nothing; instead, it simply is (rather than is not).

It is far from insignificant that Heidegger resorts to the formula *daß es ist* in his description of the second mark of an artwork, in addition to the fact that it carries an implicit, and double, reference to Aristotle and Leibniz (and Schelling, as well). For, in spite of the substantial

shift in philosophical vocabulary between *Being and Time* and "The Origin of the Work of Art" (and, to be sure, the few terms that are preserved in the latter work, e.g., "world," undergo a considerable transformation), the *Daß* formula is to be found at important junctures in both works.[58] One such important moment in *Being and Time* is §29, where Heidegger writes: "And even in the most indifferent and harmless everydayness the being of Dasein can burst forth as a naked 'that it is and has to be [*Daß es ist und zu sein hat*].' The pure 'that it is [*daß es ist*]' shows itself, the 'whence [*Woher*]' and the 'whither [*Wohin*]' remain in darkness" (GA 2: §29: 134/SZ 131). While the problematic of *Being and Time* remains largely outside the scope of this article, what is of concern here is that the (human) Dasein is in darkness concerning its origin and destination (purpose).[59] Unlike the being of equipment, then, the being of Dasein has no pre-assigned purpose; rather, the Dasein *just is*, and nothing more could be said about it (at least, *a priori*). That is exactly what Heidegger means by formulating the that-ness of Dasein as thrownness (*Geworfenheit*) or facticity (*Faktizität*): As it were, Dasein is thrown into existence (it has not chosen to exist), *factically*, without a model or purpose to fall back on. Indeed, we can say no more of the human Dasein than *that it is* (although, as Heidegger adds, the Dasein also *has to be* in its very thrownness). And yet, that is exactly wherein Dasein's freedom lies, i.e., in the indeterminateness of "whence" and "whither." In the vocabulary of potentiality (possibility), that Dasein's "whence" and "whither" are veiled entails that Dasein's potentiality is not exhausted by actuality. Rather, for Dasein, "[higher] than actuality stands possibility [*Möglichkeit*]" (GA 2: §7: 38/SZ 36). My suggestion is that Heidegger's use of the *Daß* formula in "The Origin of the Work of Art" betrays a similar logic: What Heidegger finds in the work of art is its own peculiar sort of freedom, i.e., freedom from purposive assignment, as well as potentiality (earth) that is higher than actuality.

As we have seen, the two characteristics (or marks) of the work of art stem for Heidegger from one and the same operation of suspending the artwork's function; the artwork is, for a lack of a better expression, *useless*. Then, although the two marks of the artwork might have

appeared disconnected at first, in truth, Heidegger's *Kennzeichen* are closely bound together. Given that for Heidegger it is the second mark that clarifies the first (rather than *vice versa*), the connection could be formulated as something like the following: If the the work of art is not subjected to any purpose (for the work simply is), which is its second mark, then the material is released to be nothing but itself (as earth), which refers to its first mark. However, insofar as it is precisely form and function that afford intelligibility to matter, Heidegger's earth (as matter in excess of function) cannot but appear as refusal of intelligibility. Indeed, that the matter of an artwork is without assignment entails that earth for Heidegger only appears as resistance to disclosure, as concealment. "But what exactly does appear [in an artwork]?" asks Dastur appropriately, "Not a material which is waiting for a form which will make it invisible, but that which resists all attempts of penetration."[60]

Such is indeed the self-secluding nature of the earth, in Taminiaux words, "which we best reach 'when we can say no more of beings than they are.'"[61] Now, recall that the problem with Aristotle's prime matter, which refers to something like pure, boundless (ἄπειρος) potentiality without form, was precisely that it could not appear. But the existential status of prime matter is paradoxical, undecidable, because it marks the limits of the form-matter distinction. It cannot appear, in other words, because it lies outside the technological interpretation of being. What transpires in the work of art, however, is exactly that matter appears (albeit as refusal) as free from form and function, from the technological interpretation; it appears *as itself*, for the first time. But for matter to appear "as itself" means to appear as potentiality free from function, thus to appear as refusal. If we were to limit ourselves to Aristotle's terminology, then, the concept "earth" would correspond exactly to prime matter. Indeed, the work of art is the closest we get to something like a *phenomenal appearing* of πρώτη ὕλη. In this regard, Heidegger writes incisively: "The earth appears openly cleared as itself only when it is perceived and preserved as that which is essentially undisclosable, that which shrinks from every disclosure and constantly keeps itself closed up" (GA 5: 33/172). What is at stake in the work of art, I would submit,

is therefore nothing less than a "phenomenologization" of the resistance of prime matter: With the earth, concealment itself is brought into appearance *as* concealment.

In contrast to πρώτη ὕλη, however, Heidegger's concept of earth designates not a merely passive potentiality *for* actualization (i.e., a potentiality subservient to actuality) but something that indeed stands *higher* than actuality. As Backman explains, "[in] Aristotle's production oriented model…materiality…as such is articulated in negative terms, as *in*articulate *in*determinacy that still *lacks* articulation and is therefore a mere potential…for being articulated."[62] Then, although Aristotle articulates the concept of prime matter in terms of resistance to form and function, for him the former is still subordinate to the latter. Thus, Aristotle considers materiality (almost without exception) in terms of a lack (or deprivation) of form. In the work of art, on the other hand, Heidegger attempts to conceive of materiality in terms of excess (in relation to form) rather than lack. Although Aristotle's thinking of prime matter (at the limit of the form-matter structure) can be said to inform Heidegger's conception of earth, then, Heidegger evidently goes (at least) one step further than Aristotle. That is to say, inasmuch as the matter of an artwork is not subjected to function, the work of art retains its material potentiality, its determinability, thus its future, open (here, possibility indeed stands higher than actuality). While in useful tools matter is exhausted in and by a given form, the matter of an artwork remains unused, as it were, even after the process of production has finished. To be sure, the wood of a table, say, can still be made into something else (e.g., a wooden door), but that possibility is merely *per accidens*, i.e., the wooden table would have to cease to exist first. On the other hand, as far as the work of art is concerned, its potentiality to be other than it is is intrinsic in its essence. In other words, it is a *per se* power of an artwork to become something that it is not (while remaining, for a lack of a better expression, the artwork that it is). And it is precisely in its refusal to portray anything, to perform a function, that the potentiality of an artwork keeps its openness to determination, its freedom (recall §29 of *Being and Time*). Such is

the fundamental challenge of Heidegger's thinking of earth: To think silence and refusal of the earth together with the overflow of potentiality "contained" therein. The difference between matter and earth, or between the useful tool and the artwork, is that the latter preserves its δύναμις, its potentiality, while the former does not. When reformulated as earth, therefore, matter is not the "past" of the work but its future, excessive potentiality to be otherwise.[63]

Now, the claim that the potentiality (i.e., earth) of the work of art is boundless, excessive, like Aristotle's πρώτη ὕλη, might appear as an overstatement. But to say that the potentiality of the artwork is boundless is not to say that it can mean anything at any given moment; rather, it is to say that its meaning cannot be exhausted at any given moment. So, while the εἶδος of the useful tool is fixed, subjected to a definite *Wozu* (what-for), the form of the artwork is expressly open to interpretation. This is how the work of art, of which we can say no more than that it is, nonetheless calls for an interpretative, hermeneutic decision, recurrently and repeatedly. However, this does not mean that the artwork can be interpreted in an infinite number of ways; rather, the range of interpretation is at each time limited, as well as made possible, by what Heidegger calls the world (*Welt*). The concept of world is defined by Heidegger as follows:

> The world is not the mere collection of the countable or uncountable, familiar and unfamiliar things that are at hand. But neither is it a merely imagined framework added by our representation to the sum of such given objects.…World is *never an object* that stands before us and can be seen. World is the *ever-nonobjective* [immer Ungegenständliche] to which we are subject as long as the paths of birth and death, blessing and curse keep us transported into being. (GA 5: 30–31/170)

The first part of the definition is negative, while the second part is more positive. First, Heidegger rejects understanding world as an object (or collection thereof) or as objective, i.e., the world is *ungegenständlich*.

And yet, the world is something to which we human beings are subject; herein lies the positive part of the definition. "By the opening up of a world," adds Heidegger, "all things gain their lingering and hastening, their remoteness and nearness, their scope and limits" (GA 5: 31/170). One might say then that the world is what grants beings inhabiting it significance, reveals them in this or that way, meaningfully and with sense. The concept of world refers to "the non-thematic background of all the ways of revealing – perceiving, acting, desiring, appraising, attunement and understanding."[64] This means that things (including artworks) cannot be just anything, i.e., the work of art cannot but appear in a *particular* world of meaning, in a *particular* relational context. Indeed, that is what Heidegger's concept of world in "The Origin of the Work of Art" refers to: a historically determined configuration of meaning. It is within this historical articulation alone that things (and, especially, artworks) can be meaningful, give rise to various interpretations. Such is also the way in which the work of art discloses the character of the world into which the human Dasein is thrown: A historical world is reflected in an artwork.

And yet, as was already mentioned, there is an excess of potentiality in the work – this is its earthly (as opposed to "material") aspect. From which it follows that no historical world can exhaust earth, for the earth harbors the potentiality to be otherwise at all times.[65] And it is art that is capable of bringing forth what is potential in earth into appearance, such that "everything becomes otherwise than it is [*alles anders ist als sonst*]" (GA 5: 59/197, tm). Then, the relationship of an artwork to world is not merely descriptive, i.e., the former does not merely reflect the latter; rather, it is capable of disclosing something new about the world. In Sandra Bartky's words, "the artist's discovery of meaning [in the world] is at the same time a founding of meaning."[66] Such is indeed the power of art: "to transform our accustomed ties to world and earth and henceforth…all usual doing and prizing, knowing and looking" (GA 5: 54/191). Thanks to this transformative power of art, the world *worlds*, and history enters the picture, saving us "as much from fatalism as from eternal logical necessity."[67] Indeed, the concept of world in Heidegger is processual-historical rather than fixed and eternal. By the

same token, the concept of truth (*Wahrheit*) no longer refers in "The Origin of the Work of Art" to something eternal: "[Truth] does not exist in itself beforehand, somewhere among the stars" (GA 5: 49/186).[68]

Now, with the collapse of a world, works of art can themselves be subject to passing away: "The Aegina sculptures in the Munich collection, Sophocles' *Antigone* in the best critical edition, are, as the works they are, torn out of their own native sphere.…World-withdrawal and world-decay can never be undone. The works are no longer the works they were" (GA 5: 26/166). Be the letter of Heidegger's text as it may, if the artwork has the capacity to open up a world by itself, then it must be capable of transcending world-decay. This is what it means to say that the earth (of the work) is ἄπειρος: The work cannot be limited or bounded, in a word, exhausted, by any particular world. "That this lies in the earthly sensuousness of the works (thanks to which they can appear across different ages) the works of art themselves show us," writes David Espinet, "for, in their sensuous givenness and in spite of all cultural and historical distance, they are *always more and other than mute hieroglyphs*."[69] Following Espinet, I would suggest that the potentially of the work speaks across worlds. The work is unlike the quarry-stones from Book II of the *Physics* that will remain quarry-stones; the work of art has a future in the full sense of the term. If the potentiality of an artwork is indeed higher than actuality, then the work of art (as having an earthly aspect) could never lack a future (in principle). And it could be equally said that without earth, this strange and unfamiliar source, there could not be a future, there could not be possibility in the first place. In turn, art is one of the ways in which that strange source of future is brought into phenomenal appearance, in its very resistance to and refusal of phenomenality.

V. CONCLUSION

The epilogue of "The Origin of the Work of Art" quotes Hegel's famous sentence: "Art is and remains for us, on the side of its highest vocation, something past" (GA 5: 68/205). Heidegger uses this sentence as an occasion to raise the question of the future of art: "The truth of Hegel's judgment has *not yet* [noch nicht] been decided" (GA 5: 68/205, my).[70]

Then, although Heidegger agrees with Hegel's judgment, he nonetheless keeps the question of art undecided (unlike, it seems, Hegel himself). For it is indeed possible that it is only in relation to Hegel's own conception of art that art belongs to a past period.[71] That is, another conception of art could be (and may have been) possible. And this other conception would not belong to the past because it would not relegate matter or earth to the past. Indeed, what I have attempted to show in this essay is that it is precisely the "not yet" that forms the heart of Heidegger's thinking of the work of art. For what the work of art makes manifest is the inapparent potentiality of a historical world, which is what Heidegger calls the "earth." Inasmuch as art brings earth into phenomenal appearing (albeit as opaque, self-secluding), then, the truth of the work of art lies precisely in the "not yet." Crucial for Heidegger's conception of art is his reformulation of the traditional form-matter distinction, which, as I have shown, considers material potentiality within the parameters of the past, that is, as exhausted by form in the productive process. By means of an immanent critique of the form-matter structure, which originates most distinctively in Aristotle's philosophy, Heidegger endeavors to rethink matter as no longer subordinate to form (as it is the case with useful tools). To this end, Heidegger reformulates the concept of matter as "earth," which designates matter free from subordination to form. In order to elucidate Heidegger's complicated reformulation of matter as earth, this essay has interpreted Heidegger's conception of earth against the background of Aristotle's concept of prime matter, which designates something like pure potentiality. It is precisely insofar as the matter of the work of art is not subjected to form and function, then, that the work of art keeps an open, determinable future ("not yet"), and its potentiality stands higher than actuality.

NOTES

I would like to express my thanks to William McNeill, Peg Birmingham, and Sean Kirkland of DePaul University, Peter Fenves of Northwestern University, and Jean-Luc Marion of the University of Chicago for their useful help and crucial advice in my work on this article.

1 The entirety of GA 33 is devoted to Aristotle's discussion of actuality and potentiality in the opening chapters of Book Θ of the *Metaphysics*.

2 The reason why Heidegger reformulates the human being as Dasein is precisely to avoid falling back into the technical paradigm. That is, if production always rests on a preconceived design or essence to be realized, then the point is to deny the human being an essence (e.g., rational animal or ζῷον λόγον ἔχων) by calling it [Heidegger claims that Dasein is prior to gender, and does not use the expression *ein Dasein*] Dasein, a term "which is a pure expression of being" (GA 2: §4, 12/SZ 11).

3 For an extended discussion of this shift, see William McNeill, "Tracing *technē*: Heidegger, Aristotle, and the Legacy of Philosophy," in *Heidegger's Question of Being: Dasein, Truth, and History*, ed. Holger Zaborowski (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2017), 71–89.

4 Françoise Dastur, "Heidegger's Freiburg Version of 'The Origin of the Work of Art,'" in *Heidegger Toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930s*, ed. James Risser (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999), 128. See also Michel Haar, *The Song of the Earth: Heidegger and the Grounds of the History of Being*, trans. Reginald Lilly (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), 60. In this regard, Jussi Backman is one of the few commentators who takes such an hermeneutical approach to the 1935 text. See *Complicated Presence: Heidegger and the Postmetaphysical Unity of Being* (New York: SUNY Press, 2015), 146: "Heidegger is not inviting us to simply discard the matter/form distinction in the context of art. Rather, he wants to reopen and rethink this articulation by no

longer deriving it from the traditional paradigm of a produced implement." However, Backman does not actually spend any time tracing the transition from matter to earth.

5 Haar, *The Song of the Earth*, 58.

6 Although it is beyond the scope of this essay, my reading of Heidegger's concept of earth against the background of Aristotle might help better understand Giorgio Agamben's work on potentiality. See, for example, Agamben's seminal essay "On Potentiality," in *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*, ed. Daniel Heller-Roazen, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 177–84.

7 See Diana Aurenque, "Die Kunst und die Technik. Herstellung, ποίησις, τέχνη," in *Heideggers "Ursprung des Kunstwerkes": Ein Kooperativer Kommentar*, ed. David Espinet and Tobias Keiling (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2011), 33.

8 See, for example, GA 5: 56/193.

9 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Joe Sachs (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2002), VI, 1140a10–13. See also GA 9: 280–81/214.

10 At the same time, Heidegger refers exactly to Chapters 3 and 4 of Book VI of the *Nicomachean Ethics* in GA 7: 14/QCT 13.

11 See David Espinet, "Kunst und Natur. Der Streit von Welt und Erde," in Espinet and Keiling, *Heideggers "Ursprung des Kunstwerkes,"* 63, where he writes that "under the aesthetic proviso Heidegger thus reformulates the wonder expressed in the question: 'Why are there beings at all rather than nothing?'" (this and all other quotations are my translations).

12 See Pierre Aubenque, *La Prudence chez Aristote* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), 66. Cf. also GA 5: 46–47/184.

13 See Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1032a12–14.

14 Aristotle, *Physics*, trans. Joe Sachs (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996), II, 192b13–19. Interestingly, given that φύσις is a spontaneous self-production, an *autopoiēsis* of sorts, Heidegger stipulates in 1954 that it is a "production in the highest sense" for Aristotle (GA 7: 12/QCT 10).

15 Aristotle, *Physics*, I, 184a16–21.

16 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1036a31–32.

17 Heidegger emphasizes precisely this point in GA 9: 253–54/194.

18 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1036a33–34. See also Pierre Aubenque, "Sur l'ambivalence du concept aristotélicien de substance," in *Ontologie et Dialogue: Hommage à Pierre Aubenque*, ed. Nestor L. Cordero (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2000), 103, who appears to have something similar in mind: "In order to be explained, the mode of composition [of compound substances] ought to have an essential articulation, i.e., the deductibility of essence or form. This deductibility is given only in those cases where composition follows some intention or telos" (this and all other quotations are my translations).

19 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1036b2–3, tm.

20 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1036b3–4.

21 For Heidegger's discussion of the etymology of the word ὕλη as "the woods that yield wood as construction matter," see GA 9: 274/209–10.

22 See Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 102–103.

23 See Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1032b31–32. One might say that production requires a pre-existing matter, because otherwise it would either amount to creation ex nihilo or generate infinite regress (i.e., each underlying thing would require a making of its own underlying thing).

24 See Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1032b12.

25 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, H, 1044a29.

26 See Walter Brogan, *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 38–46.

27 For a discussion of the various senses of the preposition ἐκ, see Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Δ, Chapter 24.

28 Brogan, *Heidegger and Aristotle*, 37, em.

29 Aristotle, *Physics*, V, 225a1–2.

30 See Aristotle, *Physics*, I, 190b17–20.

31 For Aristotle's discussion of the distinction between καθ' αὐτό and κατὰ συμβεβηκός (or *per se* and *per accidens*) see *Physics*, I, 191b4–10.

32 Aristotle, *Physics*, VI, 235b8–9.

33 Aristotle, *Physics*, II, 197b9–11.

34 When Heidegger returns to the question of τέχνη almost two decades later (in "The Question Concerning Technology"), the productive intention begins to correspond or, rather, gives rise to the concept of enframing (*Gestell*). What enframing refers to is an aptitude that considers beings as matter for the ends that are established by the human being. In this way, enframing shares its essence with τέχνη. Yet, enframing is something like τέχνη at its limit: "The revealing that rules in modern technology is a challenging [*Herausfordern*], which *puts to nature unfair demands*" (GA 7: 16/QCT 14, tm, em). Therefore, enframing does not just approach nature as matter but makes demands on nature on the basis of some pre-established project. Therefore, enframing is not open to the possibilities inherent in the matter, but neglects them. Nature is thereby reduced to a reserve of abstract energy.

35 See also GA 7: 14/QCT 12–13.

36 See Robert Bernasconi, "The Greatness of the Work of Art," in *Heidegger Toward the Turn: Essays on the Work of the 1930s*, ed. James Risser (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999), 113, where he writes: "Heidegger turns to art not because of its power to destroy, nor because of its radical difference from the technological order. It is the proximity between art and technology, between the work and equipment, which opens the possibility that art might offer an essential meditation and a decisive confrontation with technology."

37 Pierre Aubenque, *Le problème de l'être chez Aristote* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994 [1962]), 480. All quotations are my translations, my emphasis.

38 See Aubenque, *Le problème de l'être chez Aristote*, 266.

39 Aristotle, *Physics*, I, 190a33–34.

40 Aristotle, *On Generation and Corruption*, I, 329a31–32.

41 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Z, 1029a20–25, tm.

42 Aristotle, *On Generation and Corruption*, I, 320b16–17.

43 On this point, see, for example, Daniel Graham, "The Paradox of Prime Matter," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 25:4 (October 1987), 477.

44 See Graham, "The Paradox of Prime Matter," 483.

45 Aristotle, *On Generation and Corruption*, I, 329a24–31.

46 William McNeill, *The Glance of the Eye: Heidegger, Aristotle, and the Ends of Theory* (New York: SUNY Press, 1999), 287. See also Haar, *The Song of the Earth*, 13.

47 Martin Heidegger, "On the Origin of the Work of Art (First Version)," translated by Jerome Veith, in *The Heidegger Reader*, ed. Günter Figal (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2009), 137.

48 Concerning the question of distinguishing between artworks and equipment, see Bernasconi, "The Greatness of the Work of Art," 101.

49 See Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 61.

50 See Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 112.

51 Miguel de Beistegui, *Aesthetics after Metaphysics: From Mimesis to Metaphor* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 71.

52 On the different sense of the term *Erde* in "The Origin of the Work of Art" (and beyond), see Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 57–64.

53 See Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 49.

54 Heidegger repeats this construction twice in this paragraph; therefore, it must be quite important.

55 To be more exact, Heidegger distinguishes between "createdness [*Geschaffensein*]" and "producedness (for a purpose) [*Angefertigtsein*]" as two different kinds of "bringing forth [*Hervorbringen*]" (GA 5: 44/182).

56 See Richard Polt, "Meaning, Excess, and Event," *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 1 (2011), 35.

57 In this regard, in the same paragraph Heidegger goes as far as to suggest that not knowing "the artist and the process and the

circumstances of the genesis of the work" only makes the thatness more prominent.

58 See Bernasconi, "The Greatness of the Work of Art," 97.

59 See Polt, "Meaning, Excess, and Event," 32, 36.

60 Dastur, "Freiburg Version," 128; see also Backman, *Complicated Presence*, 147–48.

61 Jacques Taminiaux, *Poetics, Speculation, and Judgment: The Shadow of the Work of Art From Kant to Phenomenology*, trans. Michael Gendre (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993), 148.

62 See Backman, *Complicated Presence*, 147.

63 In "Meaning, Excess, and Event" Richard Polt describes a very similar dynamic (including, very briefly, in "The Origin of the Work of Art") in terms of "excess" (31–38).

64 Espinet, "Kunst und Natur," 48.

65 See, for example, Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 3, 48.

66 Sandra Bartky, "Heidegger's Philosophy of Art," in *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker*, ed. Thomas Sheehan (Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1981), 270.

67 Haar, *Song of the Earth*, 2. On Heidegger's shift from earth as the matter of an artwork to earth as a "historical structure," see Bartky, "Heidegger's Philosophy of Art," 268–70.

68 See Dastur, "Freiburg Version," 126.

69 Espinet, "Kunst und Natur," 65, em.

70 On this point, see also Dastur, "Freiburg Version," 125.

71 Dastur, "Freiburg Version," 125.