Nonterminating Moral Rules, Death and Authentic Life:

From Heidegger to Wittgenstein

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

Abstract

For Heidegger, truth and the world are existentially grounded on Dasein's earnest concern and responsibility towards her own death. Accordingly normative practices are determined by a pre-given structure of human finitude. An important problem to be solved is that under this structure nonterminating rules or principles, including moral truths such as "Love others", cannot be entirely trusted. This paper aims to show the difference of Wittgenstein's view on this subject matter. First, the problem would not arise from his perspective: Even in the forms of life where the finality of death is acknowledged, if we are not misled to think that terminating and nonterminating rules or principles differ in extension or size, the latter norms have their usual place. Second, his pliable notion of forms of life has to be traced back to his widely neglected remarks of "my foundations". His groundwork of normativity carries a spontaneity conception of authentic life, as contrasted with Heidegger's notion understood in terms of self-disclosure.

_____

Heidegger on human finitude and being an authentic person

One central characteristic of an authentic person according to Heidegger in *Being and Time* (*BT*) is that she critically takes over her roles, thanks to her anticipatory understanding of the possibility of death. As John Haugeland (1982) suggests on behalf of Heidegger, a person is a "case of Dasein" (p. 20).[1] Regarding "death", here it does not mean demise or the

_____

[1] We may understand Dasein as a grand pattern of existence that consists of emergent norms, normal dispositions, customs, roles, institutions and so on. Within this grand pattern are various "subpatterns", including that of being a person. However, unlike other subpatterns of Dasein such as Chemistry, Philately and Christmas, people's instituted existence is primordial and essential. For without people, there will be no units of

termination of life, but rather (1) "finitude of possibility" ― "a peculiar situation in which one is unable to take up any possibility and is therefore lacking the ability to act" (Carel 2007, p. 549), and (2) "temporal finitude ― the 'shutting down [of] Dasein's temporal trajectory'" (ibid., p. 547), that is, the inability or limit of projecting into the possible future (see *BT*, p. 379). Only under this anticipation "is every accidental and 'provisional' possibility driven out" (ibid., p. 435), its self-concealments dislodged, its ownmost potentiality-for-Being revealed (that is, the possibilities which Dasein can own up or take responsibility for [see Carel 2007, p. 551]), its uttermost self brought back and its power over its own existence obtained (see *BT*, p. 357).

The authentic way of life characterized by such primordial self-disclosure is called "Being-towards-death". It is essentially accompanied by the "resoluteness" of Dasein. It responds to the call of its conscience to think its possibilities through to the end, and to take up the responsibility for its whole life. Its perspective on everything is transformed ― from the "fallen" state, it wakes up; it no longer is the "anyone" or the "they".

Apart from defining authenticity, resolute being-towards-death accounts for truth. For Heidegger, "truth" has two senses: first, "uncovering", and second, "uncoveredness" (*BT*, p. 263). He contends that "only with Dasein's disclosedness is the most primordial phenomenon of truth attained" (ibid.). This crucial insight is well articulated and summarized in Haugeland

accountability, then no censorship, no norms, no Dasein (see Haugeland 1982, pp. 19-21). Moreover, a person is not some "thing" or "substance"; its distinctive mode of being is its being extant. An important implication for this is that its being what or who it is lies in its self-understanding, which is not only a matter of cognition, but an ability to be "me", to manage "my own life". This Dasein's "me" indicates its self-constancy, that is, steadiness and steadfastness, through resolving conflicts in life (see *BT*, p. 369).

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

(2000) in terms of the three stages of ontical truth's grounding. Stage 1: The intrinsic aim of ontical truth is "to get the entities in some sense 'right'" (Haugeland 2000, p. 50). Taking entities as entities involves undertaking to fulfil this aim and being beholden to the entities. Moreover, ontical truth, say, about the fact that a teacher loves her students is dependent on the ontological truth about the meaning of loving her students, not vice versa. Stage 2: Disclosure of the being of entities is inseparable from self-disclosure. My ability to project myself onto my possibilities (that is, my understanding the being of myself as, say, a teacher) implies my ability to project other entities (including students and universities) onto their possibilities (that is, my understanding the being of other entities). As it is Dasein who undertakes to get entities "right", so in any beholdenness to entities, it has to do with ontical truth's bindingness on Dasein. Stage 3: Resolute being-towards-death is the condition of the possibility of ontological truth (and thus the possibility of ontical truth). Dasein's responsibility to itself can only make sense if it gets itself "right", and getting itself "right" can only be possible if its disclosure is about its self as a whole. Further, such wholeness is not obtained if Dasein does not think through its life to its end, that is, toward its death.

Truth is existentially grounded, so is the world. "If no Dasein exists, no world is 'there' either" (*BT*, p. 417). The "world" consists in a nexus of significance, which has an essential bearing on truth (in particular, ontological truth) and Dasein's disclosure of its "potentiality-for-Being for the sake of which [it] exists" (ibid., p. 384). To live in a resolution and anticipation of death implies that one is constantly certain that the world might change — even radically change. This at the same time suggests that "one has grasped the finitude of one's existence" (*BT*, p. 435), that is, as mentioned above, both the finitude of possibilities and the temporal

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

finitude. The world is maintained under an open attitude: "one holds oneself free for the possibility of taking it back" (ibid., p. 355). Such a way "to be" include, in Hubert Dreyfus's words, "both resisting world collapse by preserving and trying to make sense of anomalies, while at the same time, remaining open to possible world-collapse, thereby being able, should it happen, to accept it as making possible a new beginning" (2005, p. xxxii). Facing the possibility of its death, the authentic Dasein is given "its goal [of life] outright" (*BT*, p. 435) and brought back to its undisguised possibilities that "it has inherited and yet has chosen" (ibid.) — that it really cares for and wants to keep up; but, simultaneously, it realizes its own limit and leaves its world open. So the world structured in resolute being-towards-death is never rigid and everlasting.

Furthermore, "Dasein [as being-in-the-world] is historical" (ibid., p. 381); "Dasein's historicity is essentially the historicity of the world" (ibid., p. 440). Being-towards-death, which consists in Dasein's projecting itself onto its uttermost possibilities, is primarily futural. At the instant of this projective resolution (Heidegger calls it the "moment of vision"), Dasein opens up a horizon of (closed) future (that is, its "potentiality-for-Being", see ibid., p. 379). In this vision a horizon of the past arises as it realizes itself being "thrown" and "abandoned" to this world. The fact that Dasein has already been assigned to a world has now a transformed significance, since this "having-been" ("past") is not a mere "no longer" but "taken up" by Dasein's futural projects. "Only so far as it is futural can Dasein *be* authentically as having been" (ibid., p. 373). It can be said that Dasein's being-towards-death enables it to come back to its ownmost self, taking over what it "already is" and taking hold of its self again. Dasein is thus aware of its inauthentic "having-been" — its forgetfulness and

losing itself in everyday concerns. Besides, a resolute Dasein "is already taking action" (ibid., p. 347). The entities that are encountered and concerned with ("seized upon" [ibid., p. 374]) in the course of its action are made present. These entities are discovered in the horizon of the Present. The existential phenomenon of resolution unites the horizons of the future, past and present; Heidegger calls such a dynamic unity "temporality" (see ibid., pp. 416-417). The finitude with which Heidegger is concerned is basically an essential feature of temporality (see ibid., p. 378).

Temporally structured moral practice: a problem

Authentic existence, in Heidegger's view, consists in resolute being-towards-death. One important component part of Dasein's life is morality. Dasein re-resolves constantly what its goal should be, what actions it should take, what moral beliefs, values and principles it should uphold, what moral feelings it should treasure, and so on. These thoughts (and the ensuing practices) require Dasein to project its being upon the entire range of its possibilities. What are relevant here are not free-floating but "ownmost" possibilities. The condition of the latter kind of possibilities is anticipation of the possibility which is "not-to-be-outstripped", namely, the possibility of one's own death. When Dasein deeply realizes that its being "there" has an end, it "discloses also all the possibilities which lie ahead of that possibility" (*BT*, p. 309). Such anticipation at the same time informs "the possibility of existing as a *whole* potentiality-for-Being" (ibid., emphasis added). In filtering out its genuine commitments, the resolute Dasein "is liberated from [its] lostness in those possibilities which may accidentally thrust themselves upon [it]" (*BT*, p. 308). It can be seen that the authentic Dasein enjoys a core self with an integrity of life. However, such a notion of integrity of life has a peculiar

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

feature, namely, with a tension in my existential responsibility to lead a life of my own between maintaining what I find just and precious on the one hand, and being ready for the possibility of giving it up on the other. In fact, the tension in question can be explained with reference to the intellectual aspect of Heidegger's notion of integrity of life. Dasein undertakes to get the entities right — including itself and other entities of the world. Realizing that its existence is finite, it also discloses that its understanding has a limit, and thus it lives a life with "everything at stake" (Haugeland 2000, p. 73).

Being resolute, Dasein does not merely see but determine what possibilities are of its own. Suppose it takes over the role as a teacher. It is responsible for playing this role. The obligation involved is not abstractly regulated in moral truth. The source of this obligation lies in Dasein's disclosure of its thrown predicament and of the acceptance of its ownmost possibilities. That means, all moral obligations are a "primordial or existential form of self-obligation" (Miyasaki, p. 262). The further ground for this self-obligation is "existential Being-guilty as a form of self-indebtedness" (ibid.). "Being guilty" has two senses here: first, "having something due on account" and second, "being responsible for" (*BT*, p. 327). Dasein's moral obligations or indebtedness towards others are conditioned on its being ontologically indebted to care for its own being (see Miyasaki, p. 261).

Recall the above-mentioned 3-stage grounding of truth. It reveals that truth is ultimately rested on Dasein's resolute being-towards-death. Truth includes, among others, the disclosure of moral norms: for instance, what are possible (or accepted) and impossible (or not accepted, ruled out) for being a teacher are prescribed by the rule of the social role that I play. Such a

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

moral truth has a prerequisite on me, to whom the truth is beholden. Disclosing thoroughly the possibility of my being as a teacher is only obtainable by my anticipatory resolution of my whole life and death. In other words, my moral practice (in which I act in the light of moral truths) is necessarily structured in my finitude.

I am committed to education. Teaching gives me a meaning of life. An important guiding principle for me is that I should love my students. Let me say my comportment towards teaching exhibits my ownmost choice (of my possibilities), out of my earnest understanding and determination (that is, my resolution) in view of my finite existence. My life as a teacher is moral as well as professional. As a supreme principle, love (loving my students) brings coherence, consistency and unity to my teaching life. However, if understood in the Heideggerian sense, can I as an authentic person claim that what I follow is the principle of love? It would not be the principle of love commonly recognized if it had a qualification such as: I leave it open that everything, including this principle, might turn out to be nullity. The principle "Love others" or "Love your students" in ordinary practice prescribes a pattern of behaviour, which is inconsistent with the qualification. The love imperative is usually not held together with any reservation about a possible radical change. There is no implication of "until when" in the principle; I would act in the same way should I not die. This moral principle prescribes a nonterminating pattern of behaviour.

We should not ignore Heidegger's emphasis that Dasein's "finitude does not amount primarily to a stopping, but is a characteristic of temporalization itself" (*BT*, p. 378). It is not his intention to take a finite human life as having an intrinsic end-point. Whether it is possible

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

to have an eternal life is not the primary issue, Heidegger would say. Eternity, if any, has to be conceived under the finitude of temporalization, or comprehended in the horizons of future, past and present; or in other words, any conception of eternity is historically conditioned. "Only because primordial time is *finite* can the 'derived' time temporalize itself as *infinite*" (*BT*, p. 379). Likewise the practice of love is temporally structured. However, accordingly it does not solely involve the principle of love. What is steadfastly committed to here is in fact not this nonterminating rule but the possibility that this rule might become entirely different or that there might no longer be such a rule (although the time when this possibility arrives is indefinite). Heidegger suggests that a resolute Dasein "tends to hold itself free *constantly*" (ibid., p. 356) and that "[s]ince resoluteness is constantly certain of death … resoluteness thus attains a certainty which is authentic and whole" (ibid.). Actually the certainty that features Heidegger's authentic person indicates a pattern of behaviour that has a termination at some indefinite point of time even though time goes on — for there is a gulf between this world and the new world.

It follows that Heidegger's notion of authentic practice (of love) differs from that which we ordinarily do. For him, the latter way of life, which he contends to be inauthentic, is to be undermined. However, the principle of love with a nonterminating nature is my identity-conferring principle, how can I hold an open attitude on it? Moreover, given our finitude, how can we make intelligible the practice of love with the nonterminating principle?

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

_____

Wittgenstein: authenticity and practising nonterminating rules in human life

Wittgenstein's insight in the philosophy of mathematics on following a nonterminating rule can shed light on moral practices. He raises a question in his class: How many numerals have you (that is, a human being) learned to write down? Turing replies: $\aleph_0$ (that is, the first order of infinity). Wittgenstein agrees insofar as "this is the way in which the number $\aleph_0$ is used" (*LFM*, p. 31, quoted in Fogelin, p. 129). By contrast, if the question is: how many numerals are there? An answer "$\aleph_0$" will not make sense. It is fine to give a number to each house along the street. On one side the numerals are in an ascending order of odd numbers, whereas on the other side they are in an ascending order of even numbers. We may imagine that the street is continuously developed as far as possible. So these numerals are in two different series of $\aleph_0$. When a new house is built after the one with the number "100", our technique of counting allows us to give this further house the number "101". It is not a problem. But if we say that there *are* $\aleph_0$ houses on each side of the street as if an endless row of houses are already there, one would not find it intelligible. The lesson is that we should not take the difference between a terminating rule and a nonterminating one as a distinction of magnitude. A nonterminating rule has its function in our finite life. The technique that constitutes the practice of this rule is "unlimited". It "does *not* mean that it goes on without ever stopping ─ that it increases immeasurably; but that it *lacks the institution of the end*, that it is not finished off" (*RFM*, II, 45, emphasis added).[2] A terminating rule, for example, "A person seeking to renounce his or her citizenship must renounce all the rights and privileges associated with such citizenships". Such an end of citizenship has a function in that institution. As for, say,

_____

2 "A game, a language, a rule is an institution" (*RFM*, VI-32).

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

the principle of love, its expiry or cessation does not have any significance unless some institution of human lives is corresponding to it. But such an institution is not possible, for it does not fit into the wider institutions in which love is practised: in particular, trust. The paradigm of trust is constancy and consistency.

Our institutions, customs, practices, and so on, contain shared attunements that are so vital that we have to accept, including "routes of interest and feeling, modes of response, senses of humour and of significance and of fulfilment, of what is outrageous" (Cavell 1976, p. 52) and so on. They constitute "the inherited background against which I distinguish between true and false" (*OC*, §94). Wittgenstein calls such givenness "forms of life". The certainty involved here has to do with our web of beliefs, which form a system (see ibid. §102). My belief in love naturally comes with my beliefs in wholeheartedness, devotion, understanding and willingness which, in like manner, have the earmark of constancy. Moreover, my beliefs are holistically connected to a whole range of my desires, ideals, projects, sentiments, hopes, expectations, judgments, decisions, actions, and so on. All these are due to my education and ensuing practice and life experiences.

However, what makes these attunements different from those that characterize, in Heidegger's terms, inauthentic Dasein who unreflectively absorbs itself in everyday activities? We need to explain that Wittgenstein's notion of forms of life has indeed an authentic implication, but the related concept of authenticity diverges from that of Heidegger. Wittgenstein readers are impressed by his concern of the self, for instance, 'No one can speak the truth; if he has still not mastered himself' (*CV*: 35) and 'Work on philosophy is …

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

actually more of a kind of work on oneself' (*PO*: 161). To follow a rule is to let a norm compel me (see *RFM*, VII-66). The attunements for Wittgenstein thus contain the compellingness ("must") and "ought" I admit to; they are definitely not mere conformism in response to certain social conventions or mere enculturation. "When I say: 'If you follow the rule, this _must_ come out,' that doesn't mean: it must, because it always has. Rather, that it comes out is one of my _foundations_" (ibid., VI-46, emphasis added).[3]

"My" is indicated here because, as mentioned, acceptance is involved; in addition, what I act "shows that [I have] adopted a concept" (*RFM*, VI-7). My action is not merely an application of a rule but manifesting my steadfastness on it owing to the fact that it has significance in my life. "Foundations" suggests that my rule-following activities, which come together with my attunements, are at the ground level explaining the rule that I follow, not vice versa (see

_____

[3] Compared with other commentators, Alice Crary (2007) has already gone very far in explicating the implications of human agency in Wittgenstein's notion of normativity. In her interpretation, Wittgenstein admits the essential contribution of sensitivities in following a rule. Such a practical view does not deny the concept of objectivity per se — what it resists is the abstract requirement inherent in the classical notion of objectivity (the so-called "narrower" conception). The standpoint of customs or practices suggest a "wider" conception of objectivity that involves subjective sensitivities, a kind of subjective response in appropriate circumstances, e.g., "amusing". What a rule or concept traces out is an objectively consistent pattern, "not in a neutrally available region of fact, but rather in the moral outlooks within which they function" (p. 38). The world that a language opens up is already "moralized", since "a person's ability to correctly project any … concept necessarily depends on her possession of a sense of importance of similarities and differences among some set of its applications" (p. 43). The projection of a linguistic rule is not understood in the image of an ideal rigid rail leading to infinity. Nor is the person who has linguistic competence. His sensitivities, which extend to the whole "texture of [his] being" (Murdoch's terms, quoted by Crary), are developing; his attention is open to new uses. What is more, Crary suggests, "By directing attention back to sensibilities we possess as speakers, Wittgenstein hopes to get us to confront our *responsibility* for what we say and think" (p. 122n, emphasis added). Why does responsibility enter the picture of normativity? It is because to account for the normative force, we cannot but trace back to the rule-follower's commitments or what he *accepts*. Here in this paper Wittgenstein's neglected remark on "my foundation" is highlighted. It can be said to have reached a further point on the significance of human agency: *what I cannot but accept constitute the indispensable core of what I am.*

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

_____

ibid.: VI-28). These foundations account for the source of meaningfulness and normativeness of my practice. I might have deliberated and reflected on the right and wrong of my upcoming action using my power of reasoning as best as I could. Indeed I am engaged in the practice of critical thinking. Yet finally all justifications are exhausted and then I simply act "without reasons" (*PI* §211). I thus have reached my "bedrock" (ibid.: §217). My actions rest on some concepts that my life — not solely reason — forces on me (see *CV*: 86e). Wittgenstein (*RFM*, VI-24) writes: "I have a definite concept of the rule. I know what I have to do in any particular case. I know, that is I am in no doubt: it is obvious to me. I say 'Of course'. I can give no reason." So the kind of authenticity that pertains to Wittgenstein's notion of forms of life has a feature of spontaneity. By contrast, Heidegger's authenticity is constituted by self-disclosure. Dasein's ownmost possibilities can only be realized, in particular, by its resolute awareness of its being thrown to this world and the possibility of its being-no-longer-there in the future (which amounts to the possibility of world-collapse).

In Wittgenstein's view, my spontaneous action does not require self-knowledge or knowledge of my ownmost possibilities. It does not mean that it is merely a blind action or without any genuine mark of my life. We can appreciate the spontaneity on behalf of Wittgenstein with reference to the foregoing example about loving my students as follows: First, my action is motivated by my desire to love, or by my care of, my students, and my belief (or knowledge) that love contributes to eudaimonia (happiness) — not by my *knowledge that I have such a desire*. In the context of love, my basic concern is others, rather than myself. I might even try hard to resist self-focused thinking; to act naturally, unreflectively, for others. Second, self-knowledge or self-inquiry is not the only means to avoiding self-deception or pretence.

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

For instance, I might learn a technique of critically examining problematic social expectations in order not to be corrupted by them. In fact, self-investigation is fallible and can be unreliable. It could lead to scepticism about whether I have a true self. But finally my doubt of whether loving others is really what I want has to be settled and shown in my robust spontaneous action. Third, whether loving my students is my real care might emerge beyond my self-awareness. It may only be known after I have struggled between this and other equally urgent concerns at the same time. Or when unable to fulfil my wish to give my time and efforts to my students, or to openly understand them, I feel so frustrated and distressed.[4]

Wittgenstein does not conceive "my foundations" as structured by human finitude, as Heidegger does. Adopting nonterminating rules such as "Love others," I act accordingly despite the limited grounds. As mentioned, my reasons will be exhausted. "Then I am inclined to say: "This is simply what I do" (*PI* §217). For Heidegger, the only truth that can be intelligible to Dasein is historically conditioned owing to Dasein's historicity. But, for Wittgenstein, moral principles (that is, a species of truth to Heidegger) are not so structured by human finitude. Among humans, Wittgenstein would say, different forms of life respond differently to their finitude, be it understood in terms of the finality of death or something to be surpassed in their belief of eternal life or both (that is, taking death as final and eternal life as metaphorical, as a way of life in the human world [see Lash 1978, Phillips 1995 and Burley 2009, for this notion of eternal life]). For if understood in the way Wittgenstein recommends, "Love others" as a nonterminating rule is compatible with all these notions of

---

[4] See Feldman & Hazlett (2013) for a full argument both in favour of the spontaneity concept of authenticity and against the self-knowledge one.

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

human finitude; this principle does not suggest the presence of an endless series of loving acts but rather a *pattern* of action different from the terminating one.[5] And the determinacy problem of following the rule is settled somehow in people's spontaneous responses in their life situations, because "no reason can be given why you should act (or should have acted) *like this*, except that by doing so you bring about such and such a situation, which again has to be an aim you *accept*" (*CV*: 16e).

Concluding remarks

According to Heidegger, genuine normative practices (as opposed to conformism) rest on a structure of human finitude as follows: they must be traced back to two crucial features of authentic human agency, namely, resoluteness and being-towards-death. The disclosure of the being of entities is inseparable from self-disclosure. Dasein's responsibility to itself (and to anything in the world) can only make sense if it gets itself 'right', and getting itself 'right' is only possible if its disclosure is about its self as a whole. Such wholeness is not obtainable if Dasein does not think through its life and death. It realizes its own limit and leaves its world open.

---

[5] It does not follow that the projection of the rule is understood in the image of an ideal rigid rail leading to infinity, as the traditional notion of objectivity suggests. Accordingly the rule-follower's grasp of the rule manifests itself in an indefinitely extended display of correct behaviour like a car running on an infinite rail. Here two restrictions are imposed on normativity: first, correct applications are fixed in advance like ideal, predetermined rails, and second, only bare behaviour, that is, behaviour independent of sensitivities, counts. However, given a series of what we regard as correct applications (bare behaviour without involving any sensitivities), no matter how prolonged it is, it is always consistent with a series of incorrect ones. In addition, we understand that it is not possible to succeed following a rule construed in this way. That is why construing normativity along the traditional line of thinking on objectivity would lead to a paradox or indeterminacy problem. And it is a very important task of Wittgenstein to respond with a concept of objectivity that copes with the problem, in which sensitivities play an essential role (see Crary [2007] for further explanation).

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

In this paper we have discussed that moral principles such as "Love others" that we practise in daily life, which are nonterminating in character, can hardly fit into such a structure as maintained by Heidegger. His insights of authentic life leave us the following question: As finite beings, how can our moral practices in which our actions are governed by nonterminating moral principles or rules be made intelligible? In Wittgenstein's legacy, we have found a helpful answer. That is, terminating and nonterminating rules do not differ in extension or magnitude. Engaged in the latter kind of rules, we actually live our lives in a certain *pattern*, in such a way that should we not pass away, we would go on in the same way.

Wittgenstein's point on the nature of nonterminating rule resolves the problem of moral principles that Heidegger has to face. This point also suggests that Wittgenstein's notion of forms of life or practices is a pliable one, in a sense that it is not subject to the structure of human finitude that Heidegger brings forth. Now one might ask: Would Wittgenstein's notion of forms of life be an inauthentic one, since it is not based on the structure of human finitude in terms of which Heidegger's notion of authenticity is explained? The answer as given in this paper is that there is an implication of authenticity in Wittgenstein's notion of forms of life. His remark on 'my foundations' has been highlighted here so that we can see how prominently the role of human agency plays in his understanding of normative practices. Moreover, Wittgenstein's conception of authenticity has a feature of spontaneity ("I trust [my moral principle] without any reservation" [*OC* §337]), which differs quite radically from

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

Heidegger's notion of authenticity that is based on self-disclosure (I realize the historical nature of my world and hold myself "free for the possibility of taking it back" [*BT*, p. 308]). In Heidegger's view, the life of authentic Dasein is always at risk, whereas in Wittgenstein's view, the life of an authentic person is basically in trust. But it must be further added that in Wittgenstein's view 'my foundations' are not rigid but evolve through my acceptance or adoption of an updated norm or concept in my life, even the notions of mortality and eternal life. He calls attention to the dynamic character of life: 'Life's infinite variations are essential to our life' (CV, 73e), and the occasions when language-games are radically changed.[6] That means, he is concerned with crisis experience — but it occurs only when 'I could not go on with the old language-game any further. In which I was torn away from the sureness of the game' (OC, §617).

_____

[6] Wittgenstein wrote: "A language-game [i.e. a practice] does change with time" (*OC* §256). "Certain events would put me into a position in which I could not go on with the old language-game any further. In which I was torn away from the sureness of the game" (ibid. §617). For Wittgenstein's dynamic notion of practice or language-game, see Huen (2011).

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

REFERENCES

Burley, M. 2009. "Eternal Life and the Finality of Death: A Philosophical Investigation". PhD Dissertation, University of Leeds.

Carel, H. 2007. "Temporal Finitude and Finitude of Possibility: The Double Meaning of Death in *Being and Time*". *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 541–556.

Cavell, S. 1976. "The Availability of Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy". In: S. Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 44–71.

Crary, A. 2007. *Beyond Moral Judgment.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Diamond, C. (ed.) 1976. *Wittgenstein's Lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press [*LFM* in text].

Dreyfus, H. L. 2005. "Forward to Time and Death: Heidegger's Analysis of Finitude". In: C.J. White (2005), *Time and death: Heidegger's analysis of finitude*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. ix–xxxvi.

Feldman, S. D. & Hazlett, A. 2013. "Authenticity and Self-Knowledge". *Dialectica*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 157–181.

Fogelin, R. J. 2009. *Taking Wittgenstein at His word: a Textual Study.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Haugeland, J. 1982. "Heidegger on Being a Person". *Noûs*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 15–26.

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

Haugeland, J. 2000. "Truth and Finitude: Heidegger's Transcendental Existentialism". In: M. Wrathall and J. Malpas (eds.), *Heidegger, authenticity, and modernity: essays in honor of Hubert L. Dreyfus*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 43–77.

Heidegger, M. 2008. *Being and Time.* J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson (trans.) New York: Harper Perennial Modern Thought [*BT* in text].

Huen, K. S. S. 2011. "Critical Thinking as a Normative Practice in Life: A Wittgensteinian Groundwork". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 1065–1087.

Lash, N. 1978. "Eternal Life: Life 'After' Death?". *The Heythrop Journal*. Vol. 19, pp. 271–284.

Phillips, D. Z. 1995. "Dislocating the Soul". *Religious Studies*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 447–62.

Miyasaki, D. 2007. "A Ground for Ethics in Heidegger's *Being and Time*". *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 261–279.

Wittgenstein, L. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*, 2nd ed. G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell [*PI* in text].

Wittgenstein, L. 1969. *On Certainty*, G.E.M. Anscombe & G.H. von Wright (eds.), D. Paul and G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell [*OC* in text].

Wittgenstein, L. 1978. *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*, G.H. Von Wright, R. Rhees & G. E. M. Anscombe (eds.), G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.), 3rd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell [*RFM* in text].

Wittgenstein, L. 1980. *Culture and Value*, G. H. von Wright (ed.), P. Winch (trans.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell [*CV* in text].

Wittgenstein, L. 1993. *Philosophical Occasions*, J. Klagge and A. Nordmann (eds.), Indianapolis: Hackett [*PO* in text].

Kenny Siu Sing Huen

_____

Kenny Siu Sing Huen is a Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

Email: siusing.huen@ubd.edu.bn

Kenny Siu Sing Huen