Despite the enormous influence of *Being and Time* (1927), it is still arguable how successful this early work of Heidegger’s really has been. In fact, after about 1930, Heidegger eventually gave up on the project represented by this work, after he had gained a deeper insight into the meaning of Truth and particularly Untruth (Unwahrheit)\(^1\) and began a “turning” (Kehre) of direction. Despite (again?) dropping the project, Heidegger insisted that he had already started working on the main task of his philosophical thinking in *Being and Time*—to unfold the question of Being (Sein). At a later stage, he carefully evaluated his work in *Being and Time* and claimed that all of the book’s contents and the methods used in the work could be abandoned, except for the notion of the “Time-Space-Play of Being” (Zeit-Spiel-Raum des Seyns). For Heidegger, the main achievement of *Being and Time* was nothing other than that it caused people to start thinking about the domain of Being.

The disclosure of Being in *Being and Time* is, however, based on an inquiry into the nature of human being, and strictly speaking, unfolded by questioning the essence of the human being in his existence—Dasein. It is doubtful whether the theme of the authenticity of Dasein would also have been given up with the abandonment of the project of *Being and Time*. An explicit answer can be found in Heidegger’s essay “Introduction to ‘What is Metaphysics?’”, where he again emphasizes the importance of the essence of human beings in the thinking of Being:

The Thinking attempted in *Being and Time* is “under way” toward bringing our thinking onto a way through which it may enter the relation of the truth of Being to the essence of man, toward opening up a path for thinking on which it may explicitly ponder Being itself in its truth. On this way—that is, in the service of the question concerning the truth of Being—it becomes necessary to meditate upon the essence of human beings [...].\(^2\)

Since *Being and Time*, Heidegger considered the inquiry on authenticity to be a necessary bridge to the domain of Being.\(^3\) The main objective of Heideggerian Philosophy is Being, and the human being is the only medium, place, and ground for the illumination of Being.\(^4\) In order to
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\(^{3}\) See Po-shan Leung, *Eigentlichkeit als Heideggers Wegmotiv—von Sein und Zeit zur Seinsgeschichte* (Waldkirch: Gros, 2007). The development of thinking about authenticity from *Being and Time* to the history of Being is mainly analyzed in four stages.

achieve an immediate experience of Being, we have to realize an original experience of ourselves. The question then immediately arises of why, if the role of the essence of the human being is so crucial for the disclosure of Being, the theme of authenticity is not continuously dealt with after *Being and Time*?

My answer to this question is that Heidegger continuously addressed the problem of authenticity from 1927 onwards, even though the words “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity” both disappear from the titles of his works after *Being and Time*. There is a common misunderstanding of Heideggerian philosophy that stems from our neglect of the importance of namelessness in his thinking. For Heidegger, dealing with a theme does not necessarily imply naming it. Also, the aim behind the namelessness of his thought is to attain a more original disclosure of Being. In this paper, I will not go deeply into the seemingly mysterious but in fact intelligible study of namelessness, which can be found in the whole development of his thought since 1929. Instead, I will explain briefly how Heidegger started his nameless thinking shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*. In the Freiburg lecture, which was delivered in the winter semester of 1929/30, we can find a revised project of authenticity in the nameless.

In the following, I will first demonstrate how Heidegger continuously handled the theme of authenticity, mainly by showing parallel lines of thought about the problem of authenticity in *Being and Time* and in the Freiburg lecture. In particular, the phenomenon of profound boredom will be discussed, in order to examine the changes of temporality between the two projects. Second, I will try to explain how the project of authenticity is inevitably related to the implementation of namelessness. And finally, the importance of namelessness in Heideggerian thought will be reviewed.

I. The Continuity of the Problem of Authenticity in the Nameless

Before discussing the continuity of the study of authenticity, a brief framework of the new project in the Freiburg lecture will be clarified first. The question of Being in *Being and Time* is basically unfolded by means of the Kantian method; that is, by searching for an “a priori condition of possibility” (eine apriorische Bedingung der Möglichkeit) to come to an understanding of Being. However, in the Freiburg lecture, the orientation changed from the condition of possibility towards the “fundamental occurrence” (Grundgeschehen). Heidegger achieved this transformation of the project mainly through two lines of thought. The first involves the namelessness of the theme of authenticity. Its articulation, however, was only made possible through that of the second, namely a new interpretation of the “ontological difference”—a difference between Being and beings. Heidegger explained his revised project at
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the end of the lecture:

With the intrinsically clear distinguishing of ontic and ontological—ontic truth and ontological truth—we indeed have that which is different in its difference, but not this difference itself. The question concerning this difference becomes all the more urgent when we see that this distinction does not arise subsequently by merely distinguishing two separate things lying before us, but in each case belongs to that fundamental occurrence in which Dasein moves as such.7

Here, the ontological difference was no longer being considered by Heidegger as “at hand, but refers to something that occurs.”8 Having overcome the inadequate unfolding of the ontological difference in Being and Time, authenticity as the human essence in the sense of the original relation between Being and Dasein was then freed from the transcendental philosophy of Kant.9 Heidegger then no longer interpreted the basis of authenticity, namely temporality (Zeitlichkeit), as the “condition of possibility,” which is actually considered a kind of “Beingness” (Seiendheit).10 Instead of searching for a transcendental relationship between authenticity and temporality, in this lecture Heidegger showed their primary unity, thus unveiling a more fundamental phenomenon. It is not that he considered temporality to be a ground for authenticity, but rather that authenticity is directly unveiled within temporality as a “fundamental occurrence.”

In order to clarify the phenomenon from this new perspective, Heidegger dealt with the problem of authenticity in a twofold manner. First, in the first part of the lecture, he discussed “awakening a fundamental attunement” (Weckung einer Grundstimmung) of Dasein, a discussion that can be compared with the fundamental analysis of Dasein in division one of Being and Time. Instead of a transcendental analysis within the scope of temporality, Dasein’s primordial relation with Being is here demonstrated through Dasein’s fundamental attunement. The second part of the lecture, namely the world-formation (Weltbildung),11 is based on the foundation of the first part. It is also parallel to the temporal analysis in the second division of Being and Time, in order to further explain the background of individual Dasein. Both analyses, however, serve same purpose: “to prepare our entering into the occurrence of the prevailing of world.”12 Heidegger explained this preparation as a “return of man into the Dasein in him.”13
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8 Ibid.
9 In the Freiburg lecture clearly Heidegger pointed out that: “Transcendental philosophy too must fall.” See ibid., p. 359.
10 See Martin Heidegger, Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics, trans. Richard Taft (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990). A self-criticism can be found in the preface to the fourth edition of this work, where Heidegger clearly stated that, “With Being and Time alone—soon clear that we did not enter into the real question [...] [Being] Beingness—Objectiveness and ‘time’ Schematism but at the same time: the particular way is obstructed and is made susceptible to misinterpretation.”
11 Martin Heidegger, The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics, pp. 350-351. The world-formation is basically regarded as a return of the logos-structure to its fundamental occurrence.
12 Ibid., p. 351.
13 Ibid.
Plainly speaking, a human being will be transformed into Dasein after sensing existentially the vivid possibility of his authentic nature. However, the question then arises of how can we enter into our Dasein—our authentic nature?

Profound Boredom (tiefe Langeweile)

In *Being and Time*, the authenticity of Dasein is regarded as ontological truth, and in that period Heidegger entangled himself in the pursuit of this kind of truth. After discovering the failure of the first exposition of the ontological difference in *Being and Time*, in the Freiburg lecture Heidegger interpreted authenticity not according to “which is different,” but to the “difference itself” (Differenz selbst). In this new interpretation, he clarified authenticity through the analysis of a special kind of mood, namely “fundamental attunement” (Grundstimmung). Different from any psychological mood, fundamental attunement is not an expression of feeling, but rather a “fundamental way of being, indeed of being-there [Da-sein].”

We find that the elaboration of the fundamental attunement of boredom in the Freiburg lecture parallels that of the attunement of anxiety (Angst) in *Being and Time*. The fundamental attunement is also aimed at revealing Dasein’s primordial relation with Being, in which it shows itself vividly in existence as the primordial nature of human beings. The revised attunement is “not a particular being,” but originally referred to Dasein itself, i.e. to its Being-in-the-world. Heidegger plainly described the fundamental attunement in this way: “In positive terms, attunement is a fundamental manner, the fundamental way in which Dasein is as Dasein.” Unlike in *Being and Time*, the authentic attunement (Befindlichkeit) was now being regarded as a primary unity with inauthenticity. Hence, here it contains not only the positive and authentic, but also the negative and inauthentic characteristics of Dasein. In fact, the unity of authenticity and inauthenticity was not something new; it had actually been revealed in *Being and Time* as the primary contradictory nature of human beings, in which however, the inauthentic everydayness of Dasein is derived, but also separated from its authentic nature.

In this lecture, Heidegger more accurately pointed out the innermost contradictory nature of human beings. Instead of merely emphasizing the “being-there” in *Being and Time*, human nature is now clarified as both “being-there” (Da-sein) and “being-away” (Weg-sein). As Heidegger stated,

In the end, this being-away pertains to the essence of being there [Dasein]. It is not something which happens arbitrarily from time to time, but is an essential characteristic of man’s very being that indicates how he is, so that a human being—insofar as he or she
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14 Ibid., p. 67.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
exists—is, in his or her being there, also always already and necessarily away in some manner.\[^{7}\]

Similarly, in *Being and Time*, the “being-there” also means “being-authentic” while in the Freiburg lecture “being-away” means “being-inauthentic.” As in Heidegger’s claim in *Being and Time*, authenticity is the origin of inauthenticity, in the same manner “being-there” is conceived of as the origin of “being-away.” Heidegger clarified that “man has the potential to be away in this manner only if his being has the character of being-there [Da-sein].”\[^{18}\] However, the authentic Dasein, which contains simultaneously the characteristics of there and not-there, is the “how” of “our Dasein-with-each-other.”\[^{9}\] The authentic Dasein is here not manifested as the pure Dasein, i.e. as only “being-there” without “being-away,” that is theoretically sought in *Being and Time*. On the contrary, a more fundamental Dasein can be vividly found in our actual existence as an always and already “being-in-the-world.” It is exactly this phenomenon of Dasein that Heidegger intended to disclose in this lecture. How did he achieve this purpose?

Heidegger’s answer was: through the awakening of fundamental attunement. Different from his early work, Heidegger paid less attention to the “potentiality-for-Being—that is, its Being-free for the freedom of choosing itself and taking hold of itself.”\[^{20}\] Rather, he took the more direct approach of addressing Dasein’s essential relation with Being. Accordingly, he described the mood as “an atmosphere.”\[^{21}\] Rather than emphasizing “resoluteness” (Entschlossenheit), in the Freiburg lecture Heidegger stressed the “letting-be” (sein zu lassen) of Dasein. This implies that Heidegger had shifted his focus from “in each case mineness” (Jemeinigkeit) back to the “existentiality” (Existenzialität) of Dasein.\[^{22}\] He pointed out clearly that “awakening attunements is a manner and means of grasping Da-sein with respect to the specific ‘way’ [Weise] in which it is, of grasping Da-sein as Da-sein, or better: of letting Da-sein be as it is, or can be, as Da-sein.”\[^{23}\] He then further elaborated on the “letting-be” of Dasein as “let-it-be-aware”(wachsein lassen).\[^{24}\] This indicates that authentic attunement is just like a state of being awake, which is our basic condition of existence. We are able to bring ourselves into a state of sleep; at the same time we are potentially able to let ourselves awake. With this demonstration, Heidegger did not seek to represent the situation of anxiety, as he did in *Being and Time*, but tried to let us gain insights into our own existing Da-seins through the experience of boredom.

\[^{7}\] Ibid., p. 63.
\[^{8}\] Ibid.
\[^{9}\] Ibid., p. 100.
\[^{22}\] See *Being and Time*, §9. “In each case mineness” and “existentiality” are described as two essential characteristics of Dasein. However, the elaboration of authenticity in *Being and Time* is mainly based on the former.
\[^{24}\] Ibid., p. 79.
Heidegger revealed, step by step, a profound boredom through the unfolding of a superficial boredom, “This fleeting, cursory, inessential boredom must become essential.” 25 The phenomenon of authenticity can merely exist on the basis of inauthenticity. Accordingly, Heidegger chose three kinds of boredom26 as a central theme to clarify different stages of the authenticity of Dasein. Here we will focus only on the last one, namely, profound boredom.

As the authenticity in Being and Time is based on temporality, a special relationship exists between the fundamental attunement of boredom and the time of Dasein. However, time is here not considered simply as a condition of authenticity; it itself “is” the authenticity. Temporality is therefore manifested through the occurrence of authenticity, so Heidegger mentions the need “to press forward to the essence of time through our interpretation of the essence of boredom.”27 Different from Being and Time, authenticity is not determined through the elaboration of time, i.e. through the analysis of “Being-towards-death.” On the contrary, the essence of time is now disclosed through the clarification of the authenticity in boredom.

This authenticity, as Dasein’s essential relation with Being, is described as “it is boring for one” (es ist einem langweilig),28 i.e. as profound boredom, in which Dasein experiences an initial opening of Being, where “each and every thing moves together at one and the same time into an indifference.”29 In such a mood of indifference, the mastery of the everyday world disappears in its whole emptiness: “The whole situation and we ourselves as this individual subject are thereby indifferent.”30 In the experience of emptiness as “being left empty” (Leergelassenheit), 31 a man is transformed through his “moment of vision” (Augenblick)32 from a personal subject into an indifferent nobody, i.e. from man into Dasein.

In what way was Dasein clarified in the Freiburg lecture? The retreat of “beings as a whole” (Seienden im Ganzen) “first brings the self in all its nakedness to itself as the self that is there and has taken over the being-there of its Da-sein. For what purpose? To be that Da-sein.”33 The human Dasein exists as being authentic, even though the authenticity includes here the paradox of “simultaneously in telling refusal and telling announcement” (versagt und angesagt zugleich).34 The “beings as a whole” breaks down when Dasein realizes its inauthenticity of everydayness. However, Dasein gives rise to the possibilities of its authenticity (das eigentliche

25 Ibid., p. 82.
26 The first form of boredom is called “Becoming Bored by Something”; the second form is “Being Bored with Something and the Passing of Time Belonging to It”; the third one is profound boredom which is described as “It is Boring for One”.
28 Ibid., p. 134.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid., p. 137.
31 Ibid., p. 171.
32 Ibid., p. 149.
33 Ibid., p. 143.
34 Ibid., p. 151.
Ermöglichende)\textsuperscript{35} simultaneously when its inauthentic world breaks down. In this paradox, Dasein becomes existentially aware of all of its intrinsic possibilities in its emptiness.

The paradox, where authenticity co-exists with inauthenticity, implies the phenomenon of temporality as a “unitary universal horizon of time” (einheitliche All-Horizont der Zeit).\textsuperscript{36} Based on this horizon, the “beings as a whole” can be reached and unfolded by Dasein. The Dasein binds itself with this whole horizon of time, where time is shown as a whole emptiness when “beings as a whole” are completely broken down in the profound boredom. However, the inauthentic entire emptiness is only released via an authentic “moment of vision,” which means that the inauthenticity of Dasein arises from its authenticity. Even though the mutual dependency of authenticity and inauthenticity is already mentioned in \textit{Being and Time}, it had not yet been properly clarified in the analysis of temporality.

Unlike the separation in \textit{Being and Time} of temporalities in relation to inauthenticity and authenticity—“now” (Jetzt) and “moment of vision” (Augenblick), in this lecture Heidegger emphasized their unity:

\[\text{T}\text{his is the one unitary phenomenon in which we, or rather the Dasein in us, oscillates out into the expanse of the temporal horizon of its temporality and thus is able only to oscillate into the moment of vision pertaining to essential action. This oscillating in between such expanse and such extremity is our being attuned, this boredom as attunement.}\textsuperscript{37}\]

In the Freiburg lecture the original unity of “horizon of time” and “moment of vision” lets the profound boredom of Dasein emerge as “it is boring for one.” The “moment of vision” opens the entire amplitude of Dasein. Through this paradoxical unity, the tension in the relationships between horizon of time and moment of vision, world and individual, as well as inauthenticity and authenticity, which previously existed in \textit{Being and Time}, dissolves.

In his handling of fundamental attunement in the Freiburg lecture, we find that Heidegger abandoned the conceptual approach that he used in \textit{Being and Time}. Rather, he emphasized the indicative function of language. Instead of clarifying the concept of authenticity as something present at hand, Heidegger attempted to let the vivid occurrence of authenticity show itself in our Dasein. About this turn in his thought, Heidegger stated clearly:

Yet while the everydayness of Dasein—insofar as it maintains itself in inauthenticity—is indeed a sinking back when compared to the moment of vision and its flaring up, it is by no

\textsuperscript{35} See ibid., p. 143, in which “das eigentliche Ermöglichende” is translated into “which properly makes possible.”

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 145.

means to be regarded intrinsically as something negative, and certainly never as something simply present at hand, as some persisting state which would be interrupted by the moments of vision proper to authentic action. The whole connection between authentic and inauthentic existence, between the moment of vision and the absence of such a moment, is not something present at hand which transpires within man, but one which belongs to Dasein.  

Authenticity is no longer being explained as the ontological truth that is revealed as a phenomenon of “Being-towards-death”. Going deeper into the “return to things themselves” (Zu den Sachen selbst), Heidegger proclaimed in this lecture a new understanding of philosophy, namely “philosophizing” (Philosophieren). Thinking is not regarded as the object of Dasein, i.e. representations (Vorstellungen), but rather is Dasein itself. In other words, thinking is revealed in the fundamental occurrence of the existence of Dasein.

II. Reasons for the Namelessness of “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity”

As shown above, Heidegger continued his inquiry into the authenticity of human nature, despite his failure in the project of Being and Time. However, we have to answer the question: Why did the pair of concepts, namely “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity,” disappear in the explication of boredom and world-formation, if the problem of authenticity was really further addressed in the Freiburg lecture?

The disappearance of these two concepts was mainly due to Heidegger’s awareness of the role of language in demonstrating his thought. Strictly speaking, he clearly understood the limitation of using concepts of language in revealing the vivid existence of Being. “‘Concepts’ are said to be representations [Vorstellungen] in which we bring before ourselves an object or entire regions of objects in general.” One of the main characteristics of Western philosophy is revealed in the thinking on representation, in which objects of thought are often rendered by means of the conceptual use of language. The aim of Heidegger’s Philosophy is not only to show the superiority and limitations of conceptual thinking, but also to mark the breakthrough of this sphere of thinking.

In Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning), Heidegger clearly stated the limitations of words and naming: “Every saying of be-ing [Seyn] is kept in words and namings which are understandable in the direction of everyday references to beings and are thought exclusively in
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38 Ibid., pp. 295-296.
39 See ibid., ch. 1 and 2. For Heidegger, philosophizing is regarded as “the withdrawal of metaphysics” which let us “see all things more simply, more vividly, and in a more sustained manner.”
this direction, but which are misconstruable as the utterance of be-ing.”41 According to the traditional and commonsensical understanding of concepts, naming has fulfilled the important task of conceptualization—grasping beings as conceivable objects. Therefore, the abandonment of naming is the first step in the de-objectification of Heideggerian thought. The demand for the de-objectification of thought, however, arises from Heidegger’s deeper understanding of the ontological difference between Being and beings.

In his magnum opus, Heidegger emphasized this difference. However, in the Freiburg lecture he focused on the unitary origin of their differences. As a result of this change, his thoughts on authenticity diverted. Unlike the anticipated phenomenon of death, Heidegger’s analysis of boredom is oriented directly towards the original ground of the diversity of Being and beings. Hence, the distinction between ontic and ontological truths goes back to the fundamental occurrence of a-letheia. It is the original truth that can be experienced vividly by Dasein as a pre-ontological occurrence before the differentiation of the ontological elements. Having realized that the deeper basis of the ontological truth lies in the dynamic unity of concealment and un-concealment of a-letheia, Heidegger gave up the antagonized concepts of ontic and ontological truths as well as “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity.” With the namelessness of these concepts, Heidegger endeavored to avoid the assertion of a persisting state of existence, i.e. not letting “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity” be regarded as present-at-hand in a unified sense. Hence, namelessness indicates a more original, concrete and dynamic occurrence, which exists before the differentiation of representations of “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity.”

Although he abandoned the naming of “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity,” Heidegger never gave up their diversified phenomena. He forsook only the firm assertion of their differences, in order to reveal their common vivid origin of Being. In fact, Heidegger continued to deal with the relationship between authenticity and inauthenticity in other expressions. Their oppositions are now described in other terms, e.g. the “essential” (wesentlich) and “inessential” (unwesentlich) boredom, the “everyday” (alltäglich) and “originary” (ursprünglich) forms of boredom, the “superficial” (oberflächlich) and “profound” (tief) boredom, and so on. Given the differences between authenticity and inauthenticity in Being and Time, there is no difficulty in finding their contradictory relations in the study of boredom. The other set of expressions, however, does not merely show a change of language. With the transformation of language, a shift had obviously taken place in Heidegger’s thinking about “Authenticity” and “Inauthenticity” from a kind of conceptual thinking to an existential occurrence of Dasein.

Parallel to the phenomena of authenticity, the truth is here not divided into different types, namely ontic and ontological truths. Both kinds of truth belong to the occurrence of Being,

41 Martin Heidegger, Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowing), trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), p. 58.
where different levels of disclosure of Being depend on how far and how deep Dasein lets itself go into his existence. The differences between levels of Being are only described by adjectives, and are no longer subsumed into nouns as substantial concepts. With this transformation of language, Heidegger achieved a suitable demonstration of his thought of Being—at the price of clarity and explicitness of expression. However, it is unfair to blame Heidegger for keeping “silent” if one only insists on the traditional and commonsensical view of language and confines oneself to the thinking of beings, leaving no room for understanding how Heidegger’s ambiguity of language lies at the heart of his thought of Being.

III. The Importance of Namelessness in Heideggerian Thought

Heidegger marks a new trend in Western philosophy. To this day, however, his thought—especially his later philosophy—remains controversial. This is not only because of his revolutionary ideas on Being, in which the logical and theoretical tradition of Western thinking is basically given up. The controversy is also due to the difficulty in understanding his expression of language. Indeed, it appears that there was a reason behind his use of such language. From the above analyses, we can understand how Heidegger continued to deal with the problem of authenticity after *Being and Time* by transforming his use of language into the nameless.

Simply by focusing on the problem of namelessness, we find that, to Heidegger, there was a clear distinction between the examining and naming of a theme. In *On the Way to Language*, Heidegger explained that he did not use the terms “phenomenology” and “hermeneutics,” “not—as is often thought—in order to deny the significance of phenomenology, but in order to abandon my own path of thinking to namelessness.”42 Heidegger realized the importance of the namelessness very early on. This realization is not only revealed in his abandonment of titles. Indeed, namelessness marks the start of the Heideggerian thought of de-conceptualization, on which he would place greater emphasis in his later works and provide a detailed elaboration of language. In “Letter on ‘Humanism’” Heidegger makes it clear that “if the human being is to find his way once again into the nearness of being he must first learn to exist in the nameless.”43

The use of naming is necessary for expressing objective and substantial thought, i.e. to grasp the thinking of beings. But Being, as a dimension of thinking that is more original than that of beings, can only be existentially experienced and disclosed by Dasein, instead of being grasped conceptually. Hence, the language used in the metaphysical tradition encounters limitations when it comes to expressing Heidegger’s thinking of Being. In order to avoid understanding Being in a substantial manner, the use of naming has to be abandoned or changed.

In the Freiburg lecture, we see Heidegger endeavoring to revise his use of language, although the effort is only the very first step forward. However, it is important for entering into his “way of language, which is closely related to his unfolding of Being. As Heidegger mentioned, in order to go into the nearness of Being, one must first learn to exist in the nameless. In fact, the namelessness of Heideggerian thought manifests not merely a way of thinking that is different from conceptual thinking and indicates a breakthrough in the metaphysical tradition. It actually reveals a fundamental state of human existence. In this sense, we cannot ignore the characteristic feature of language as an event in Heideggerian thought. Through the use of language, it is not only meanings that can be expressed, but some practical possibilities can also be found, i.e. how Heidegger deals with Being in the existence of language. Since the Freiburg lecture, language, for Heidegger, was not an ordinary tool of communication, but rather a mode of “Saying” (Sage) that speaks the reality of the existence of Being. Therefore, in the Freiburg lecture namelessness marks an initial turn in Heidegger’s language after Being and Time. It provides us with a head start to enter into his later thoughts about language, e.g. why he claimed that “Language is the house of Being” and why he elevated poetry over philosophy. Moreover, in order to realize why and how Heidegger, as he himself claimed, went about unfolding Being from the beginning (Being and Time) to the end, it seems necessary to achieve an understanding of the development of namelessness in his thought.